

---

**APPENDIX O**  
**TRAVEL MANAGEMENT**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
<b>O TRAVEL MANAGEMENT APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>O-1</b>
O.1 Introduction .....	O-1
O.1.1 How to Read/Use this Document.....	O-2
O.1.2 Summary.....	O-2
O.1.3 Authority and Guidance for Travel Management.....	O-3
O.2 Travel Plan Designation Process.....	O-3
O.2.1 Background.....	O-4
O.2.2 Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Process.....	O-5
O.2.3 Trails and Routes Data-Collection Workshops.....	O-5
O.2.4 Identification of Issues .....	O-6
O.2.5 Developing Planning Criteria .....	O-6
O.3 CRVFO Travel Plan Data Collection and Alternative Development .....	O-10
O.3.1 Introduction .....	O-10
O.3.2 Goal.....	O-10
O.3.3 Route Designations and ID Team Meetings.....	O-10
O.3.4 Mechanized Routes .....	O-12
O.3.5 Foot and Equestrian Travel.....	O-13
O.4 Plan Maintenance and Changes to Route Designations .....	O-13
O.5 Implementation Process .....	O-14

## TABLES

Table	Page
Table O-1 Trails and Routes Data Collection Workshop Attendance .....	O-5

## FIGURES

Figure	See Attachment 1
Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Colorado BLM – Travel Zones	

- Legend for All Figures
- Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone A
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone B
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone C
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone D
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone E
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone F
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone G
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone H
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone I
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone J
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone K
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone L
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone M
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone N
  - Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative A Travel Routes in Zone O



---

**FIGURES** *(continued)*

Figure

See Attachment 1

---

Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone E  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone F  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone G  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone H  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone I  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone J  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone K  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone L  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone M  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone N  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone O  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone P  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone Q  
Colorado River Valley Field Office - Alternative D Travel Routes in Zone R

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# APPENDIX O

## TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

---

### O.1 INTRODUCTION

Comprehensive travel management is the proactive management of public access, natural resources, and regulatory needs to ensure that all aspects of road and trail system planning and management are considered. This includes route planning, inventory and evaluation, innovative partnerships, user education, mapping, monitoring, signing, field presence and law enforcement (Bureau of Land Management [BLM] IM CO-2007-020). Comprehensive travel management planning should address all resource use aspects, such as recreational, traditional, casual, agricultural, commercial, and educational, and accompanying modes and conditions of travel on public lands, not just motorized or off-highway vehicle activities (Appendix C of the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook 1601-1).

Scoping has consistently demonstrated comprehensive travel management as a major issue to be addressed in land use plans. Increased demand for access to public lands, combined with the research on the impacts of roads on resources and resource uses, has increased the need for a well designed and managed transportation system.

Though historically focused on motor vehicle use, comprehensive travel management encompasses all forms of transportation. These modes include travel by foot and horse and by mechanized vehicles such as bicycles, as well as the numerous forms of motorized vehicles from two-wheeled (motorcycles) and four-wheeled, such as all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), to cars and trucks.

The term off-road vehicle is outdated and has been replaced by the more widely-used term off-highway vehicle (OHV). Off-road vehicle is defined in 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a) as “any motorized vehicle capable of or designated for, travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain.” This definition has been updated using the term “OHV” in the National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, finalized by the BLM in January 2001. The intent of the National Strategy was to update and revitalize management of off-highway motor vehicle use on BLM-administered lands. The national strategy provides guidance and recommendations to accomplish that purpose.

The process of development and content of the draft Colorado River Valley Field Office ([CRVFO] formerly known as Glenwood Springs Field Office) travel plan is described in this document.

### **O.1.1 How to Read/Use this Document**

This document addresses the process by which the CRVFO Interdisciplinary (ID) Team has developed the draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) alternatives for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized uses in the planning area. This document takes the reader through the process of travel planning within the Field Office (FO).

- The Land Use Planning decisions of the travel plan define the areas within each FO that are designated Open, Limited, or Closed to OHV use, and the number of miles of designated routes under the Limited category.
- The Implementation decisions of the travel plan that are included in this document are the designations (e.g., foot, horse, mechanized, motorcycle, ATV, and full-sized vehicle) of routes within areas delineated as Limited to Designated Roads and Trails. Other implementation actions include signage, maps, public information, kiosks, monitoring, and working with partners. However, these particular types of actions have not been addressed in this travel plan designation process and remain to be addressed as the implementation process continues.

The analysis of impacts for the travel plan will be completed within the draft RMP/EIS. Attachment 1 contains the preliminary travel maps for the CRVFO.

### **O.1.2 Summary**

Land Use Planning Decisions – Code of Federal Regulations (43 CFR Part 8340) require BLM to designate all public lands as Open, Closed or Limited for Off Highway Vehicle use. These designations are made in the RMPs or in plan amendments. Additionally, the criteria for route designation are established in the RMP.

Implementation Decisions – The designation of routes within the areas specified as "Limited to Designated" is an implementation decision. Designation involves the selection and identification of roads and trails to be included in a travel plan system, as well as the allowable types of use on each of these routes.

Management common to all action alternatives include the following, as developed by the ID Team in preliminary alternative-development meetings

In areas identified as “Limited to Designated” routes, only designated routes are open to motorized use.

- Areas and trails shall be located to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources of the public lands.
- Areas and trails shall be located to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats.
- Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors.
- Any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions.

- Wilderness Study Areas are to be either designated as limited or closed to OHV use, and must be managed and monitored to comply with the interim management policy nonimpairment standard.
- As required in 43 CFR Sec. 8342.3 (Designation changes): "The authorized officer shall monitor effects of the use of off-road vehicles. On the basis of information so obtained, and whenever the authorized officer deems it necessary to carry out the objectives of this part, designations may be amended, revised, revoked, or other actions taken pursuant to the regulations in this part."

### **O.1.3 Authority and Guidance for Travel Management**

Alternatives have been developed based on the following authority and guidance specific to travel management for the BLM:

- Executive Order No. 11644, February 8, 1972 – This order established criteria by which federal agencies were to develop regulations for the management of OHVs on lands under their management. Agencies are to "monitor the effects" of OHV use on their public lands and, "on the basis of the information gathered, they shall from time to time amend or rescind designation of areas for OHV use "as necessary to further" its policy.
- Executive Order No. 11989, May 25, 1977 – This order amended Executive Order 11644 and authorized agencies to adopt a policy that particular lands can be considered closed to OHVs once it is determined that OHV use "will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects" to particular resources.
- 43 C.F.R. Part 8340 – OHV Regulations that establish criteria for designating lands as Open, Limited, or Closed to the use of OHVs.
- IM 2004-005, Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the BLM Land Use Planning Process.
- OHV – National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, USDI, BLM, January 2001.

### **O.2 TRAVEL PLAN DESIGNATION PROCESS**

A goal of the CRVFO planning process is to develop, with its cooperators, a travel plan that will provide access to public lands, while protecting resource values. The goals and objectives of these travel plans apply to all areas of travel management including access to resources, appropriate recreation opportunities that at the same time protect public land resources, ensure public safety, minimize conflicts among the various public land uses, and provide for support of the local economy.

More specifically, desired future conditions or desired outcomes are stated as goals and objectives. Goals are broad statements of desired outcomes (RMP-wide and resource or resource use specific) and generally are not quantifiable or measurable. Objectives are more-specific desired conditions or outcomes for resources to meet the resource/resource use goal. For key issues, objectives are different across alternatives; for other issues, objectives can be the same across alternatives.

Management actions and allowable uses are designed to achieve the objectives. Management actions include management measures that will guide future and day-to-day activities such as administrative designations (e.g., ACECs, suitable segments for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System), land tenure zones, and proposed withdrawals. Allowable uses indicate which uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited, such as

stipulations. Allowable uses also identify lands where specific uses are excluded to protect resource values, or where certain lands are open or closed in response to legislative, regulatory, or policy requirements.

Implementation decisions generally constitute site-specific on-the-ground actions and are not addressed in the RMP revisions, with the exception of travel management decisions and a few other specific areas.

### **O.2.1 Background**

In the early 1980s, in response to the Presidential Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, the BLM began designating all public lands in one of three OHV designation categories. Thus public lands within the CRVFO RMP planning area were designated as open, limited to existing roads and trails, limited to designated roads and trails, and closed to OHV use. The designations are as follows:

**Open** – The BLM designates areas as "open" for intensive OHV use where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel. However, motor vehicles may not be operated in a manner causing or likely to cause significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat improvements, cultural or vegetative resources or other authorized uses of the public lands (See 43 CFR 8341).

**Limited** – The "limited" designation is used where OHV use must be restricted to meet specific resource management objectives. In the current guidance context, this means limited to designated roads and trails (a route network designated by the BLM in its RMP). These routes may also be limited to: a time or season of use depending on the resources in the area (for example, threatened and endangered species' habitat or nesting areas, crucial winter ranges, etc.); and/or type of vehicle use (ATV, Motorcycle, four-wheel vehicle, etc.)

**Closed** – The BLM designates areas as "closed" if closure to all vehicular use is necessary to protect resources, ensure visitor safety, or reduce resource or use conflicts. Access by means other than motor vehicle access is generally allowed. The FO Manager may allow motor vehicle access on a case-by-case basis or for emergencies.

In the current RMP process, state and national guidance for the OHV Limited category designation has changed. Designating Open, Closed, and Limited areas for OHV use continues to be mandated, but under the Limited category only the "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails" sub-category is recommended. The designation of the sub-category "Limited to Existing Roads and Trails" is no longer a recommended option. Eliminating the "Limited to Existing Roads and Trails" sub-category prevents confusion and enforcement problems concerning new unauthorized routes being created and then used by the public because they are then "existing". By policy (IM No. 2004-005), BLM discourages the use of the "Limited to Existing Roads and Trails" category.

Many roads within the CRVFO were constructed to create access to public land improvements and projects for timber/vegetation management, gas/mineral development, range management and various ROWs. Some of these roads are maintained by the permittee to maintain the improvement, such as a livestock/wildlife pond or fence. Numerous roads were not necessarily intended to become permanent public access or open for recreational use but have become popular routes for visitors engaged in mechanized/motorized recreation activities. The majority of mechanized/motorized routes were created or "pioneered" by public land users themselves. Open travel designations that permit cross-country mechanized and motorized use, high levels of

use, and improvements in mechanized/motorized vehicle technology have allowed public land users to gain access to and through more terrain. The repeated passage of vehicles maintains these routes. Not designed but created, these routes are often rutted and eroded.

In the 1984 Glenwood Springs RMP, the BLM designated all public lands within the CRVFO planning area as Open, Closed, and Limited to Existing and Designated Roads and Trails. Subsequent plans providing travel management direction for the CRVFO include the Red Hill Management Plan (1999), the Bocco Mountain SRMA OHV and Recreation Management Implementation Plan (1999), and the Castle Peak Travel Management Plan (1997). Other plan amendments listed in the *Federal Register* amended travel management within the planning area by implementing seasonal and yearlong restrictions on OHVs.

Travel management area designations were made in accordance with criteria set forth in 43 CFR 8340. As a result, approximately 4 percent of BLM-administered public lands in the CRVFO planning area are designated Closed, with another 26 percent subject to restrictions. The remaining 70 percent of the CRVFO planning area is open to motorized vehicle use.

### O.2.2 Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Process

Between March and June 2008, the CRVFO ID team held meetings specifically concerning the travel plan. During this time, the CRVFO coordinated efforts with the White River National Forest by evaluating USFS designations on routes crossing federal land boundaries.

### O.2.3 Trails and Routes Data-Collection Workshops

The CRVFO hosted three trails and routes data-collection workshops in 2007. The workshops were held to: 1) allow the public to review the BLM's inventory for accuracy and completeness; 2) provide information on routes that are missing from the BLM's inventory; and 3) offer suggestions for reroutes or new trail sections that would complement the existing route system. Table R-1 shows the date, location, and number of attendees for each workshop. All meetings were from 4pm to 7pm.

**Table O-1**  
**Trails and Routes Data Collection Workshop Attendance**

Location (Colorado)	Date	Number of Attendees
El Jebel El Jebel Community Center 0020 Eagle County Drive	June 12, 2007	14
Gypsum Gypsum Recreation Center 52 Lundgren Boulevard	June 13, 2007	7
Rifle Fire Protection District Station 1 1850 Railroad Avenue	June 14, 2007	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>23</b>

Each open house was structured in a similar format. Attendees were asked to sign in, and then were briefed on the room layout and goals and objectives of the workshop. Two-page information sheets summarizing the BLM's planning effort and travel management process, RMP Newsletter Volume 1, Number 1, and comment forms to document attendees' comments on new or existing routes were made available.

An overview map was displayed at the entrance of the room that showed the FO boundary and the different travel management zones within the FO. The CRVFO was divided into 15 travel management zones, which were labeled A through R. Dividing the FO into a number of management zones enabled the public to focus on a specific area of interest.

Work stations were set up around the room with topographic- and aerial photograph-based maps displaying the inventoried trails and routes for each zone. Attendees were asked to complete a comment form and draw on the maps to document any missing existing trails and routes. Proposed new routes were also drawn on the maps. Pencils and markers were available to edit the maps.

The comment period for routes and trails data collection was open until July 20, 2007. The public could submit comments by completing the comment form and sending it via email, US mail, facsimile, or hand delivery to either FO. All travel management zone maps and comment forms were available at the six workshops, at the CRVFO, and on the project Web site ([www.blm.gov/rmp/co/kfo-gsfo](http://www.blm.gov/rmp/co/kfo-gsfo)).

#### **O.2.4 Identification of Issues**

Travel management issues were identified by BLM resource specialists in the preparation plan, through the public scoping process for the CRVFO RMP, and by input from the public in during scoping specifically for travel management planning.

BLM staff identified the following factors describing the condition of travel management within both planning areas, thereby identifying the need for developing a Comprehensive Travel Management plan.

- A lack of comprehensive travel management that considers the relationship between various resources, access for authorized permittees, and recreation uses.
- The lack of planning for recreational experiences that preceded the construction of historic routes.
- Unauthorized uses emanating from designated routes causing impacts on other resources.
- Subdivision of private property creating new access points to public lands.
- Routes that are open to motorized use being accessible only to adjacent landowners.
- Conflicts between recreational users.

During scoping, the BLM received 162 comments about travel management and transportation issues. This represents 26 percent of the total comments received on planning issues, thereby constituting the category that received the most comments overall. From the comments received, the following planning issue statement was developed:

Travel management and transportation—How will transportation be managed to protect natural and cultural resources, provide motorized and nonmotorized recreation opportunities, reduce user conflicts, enforce route designations and closures, and improve public access?

#### **O.2.5 Developing Planning Criteria**

Considerations of both social and physical elements help define the criteria for a travel plan. The social aspects include public demands, historical uses, existing rights-of-way, permitted uses, public access, resource development, law enforcement and safety, conflicts between existing or potential uses, recreation

opportunities, local uses, and cultural and economic issues. Physical aspects include the terrain, soils, water, vegetation, and watersheds, connectedness of routes, special designations, demands for specific types of vehicle use, and manageability considerations.

The comprehensive travel plans for the CRVFO will manage access on public lands in accordance with existing law, executive orders, proclamation, regulation, and policy. General planning criteria for the Resource Management Plan (RMP) process includes:

- Decisions – All decisions made in the RMP will only apply to public lands administered by the BLM.
- Existing Rights – The plan recognizes current, valid existing rights.  
Specific to the travel plan, the criteria include:
  - National OHV Policy – Decisions regarding OHV travel will be consistent with the BLM's National OHV Strategy.
  - RS 2477 – ROWs may exist across the CRVFO, although adjudication is beyond the scope of this RMP.

**OHV Designation Criteria**

Vehicle use restrictions would be established where there are known high resource values that would otherwise be damaged or destroyed. Criteria are defined in 43 CFR 8342.1:

- Designated areas and designated trails shall be located in a manner to minimize impacts to physical resources (soils, watershed, vegetation, air, and other resources) and to prevent impairment of wilderness suitability.
- Designated areas and designated trails shall be located to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Special attention will be given to protect endangered or threatened species and their habitats.
- Designated areas and designated trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreation uses.
- Designated areas and designated trails shall not be located in officially designated wilderness areas or primitive areas, and shall be located in natural areas only if the authorized officer determines that off-road vehicle use in such locations will not adversely affect their natural, esthetic, scenic, or other values for which established.

**CRVFO Criteria for Travel Plan**

In addition to the criteria defined in 43 CFR 8342.1, preliminary screening criteria that were considered during the route designation process, and would be considered during future route modifications, are outlined below:

**1. Environmental Conditions**

a. General

- Does access on the route promote resource damage/concerns?
- Is the route causing resource damage?

- b. Soil stability
  - Is the route within a highly erosive soils area?
  - Does the route cross slopes of 50% or greater?
- c. Wildlife habitat (e.g., winter range, nesting/brooding and rearing habitat, calving/fawning areas)
  - Is the route a known issue within big game winter range?
- d. Special status species habitat
  - Is the route a known issue within special status species habitat?
- e. Proximity to riparian areas and/or 303(d) streams
  - Is the route causing damage to water quality?
  - Does the route negatively impact wetlands/riparian/fens/mires?
- f. Visual resources
  - Does the route conflict with Visual Resource Management class objectives?
- g. Cultural/paleontological resources
  - Is the route creating an issue for any historic properties?
  - Is the route creating an issue for any areas of Native American concern?
  - Does the route cross significant paleontological areas?
- h. Special management areas
  - Is the route within a Wilderness Study Area?
  - Is the route within a Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC) Area?
  - Is the route within an area determined to contain wilderness characteristics?
  - Does the route conflict with Special Recreation Management Area objectives?
  - Does the route conflict with Area of Critical Environmental Concern objectives?

**2. Route conditions:**

- a. General
  - Is the route a BLM-maintained route?
  - Is the road condition poor and/or unsustainable?
  - Is the route unsafe (e.g., steep, no turn-around)?
- b. Parallel routes
  - Does the route run parallel to another existing route?
- c. Spurs
- d. Dead end
  - Is it a dead-end route (0.5-mile or less)?
- e. Does the route end at private property?

- f. Access
  - Is there legal public access?
  - Is there an existing right-of-way?
- 3. User conflicts, such as:**
  - a. Motorized versus non-motorized
  - b. Motorized/mechanized versus non-mechanized
- 4. Administrative purposes, such as:**
  - a. Is the route necessary for rangeland activities?
  - b. Is the route necessary for wildland fire suppression activities?
  - c. Is the route necessary for safety?
  - d. Is the route necessary for resource management and permitted activities?
- 5. Public purposes, such as:**
  - a. Accessing public or private land
  - b. Destinations for specific activities
    - Does the route have recreation value (no special destination)?
  - c. Types of desired use (motorized, mechanized, non-motorized/non-mechanized)
- 6. Route, vehicle type and size limitations, such as:**
  - a. > 50" wheel base for (full-size vehicles)
  - b. < 50" wheel base (ATVs)
  - c. Single track (motorcycles/mountain bikes)

### ***Route Designations in Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs)***

Information Bulletin No. 99-181 (BLM) directs BLM to comply with the wilderness nonimpairment mandate (Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 [FLPMA], Section 603(c)). BLM must monitor and regulate the activities of off-highway vehicles in the Wilderness Study Areas to assure that their use does not compromise these areas by impairing their suitability for designation as wilderness. The BLM's Off Road Vehicle Regulations (43 CFR 8342.1) require that BLM establish off-road vehicle designations of areas and routes that meet the non-impairment mandate. It is the BLM's policy that cross-country vehicle use in the WSAs does cause the impairment of wilderness suitability. Thus, the BLM should establish off-road vehicle designations in WSAs that limit vehicular access to boundary roads, or ways existing inside a WSA that were identified during the inventory phase of the wilderness review.

### ***Administrative Access and Use***

Routes considered for Administrative Use Only were discussed by the ID Team. These administrative categories could include routes to stock ponds and other range improvements, guzzlers, and BLM facilities. The CRVFO reserves the right to allow travel on these routes to permittees, BLM employees, or whomever it deems appropriate on a case-by-case basis.

### **Emergency Uses**

By regulation, any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions. Emergency uses in WSAs are covered under the BLM's Interim Management Policy, Section I.B.11 and 12.

### **Temporary Limitations or Closures**

Whenever the authorized officer determines that OHV use will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects on resources (i.e., soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural, historic, scenic, recreation, or other resources), the area must be immediately closed to the type of use causing the adverse effects (43 CFR 8341.2). Such limitation or closures are not OHV designations.

## **O.3 CRVFO TRAVEL PLAN DATA COLLECTION AND ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT**

### **O.3.1 Introduction**

As part of the BLM's RMP revisions process, the BLM is developing a complementary travel management plan for all BLM-administered lands within the FO. The revised RMP will comprehensively plan for all types of travel (recreational, casual, agricultural, industrial, administrative, etc.) and accompanying modes and conditions of travel, including motorized, mechanized, and nonmechanized (muscle-powered) uses. It is now Colorado BLM policy (CO-IM-2007-20) to restrict all off-highway vehicle use within limited areas to designated routes.

### **O.3.2 Goal**

The goal of the travel plan is to provide opportunities for a range of motorized and nonmotorized access and recreation experiences on public lands while protecting sensitive resources and minimizing conflicts among various users.

This process includes preparing a range of alternatives for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The BLM will provide a range of alternatives as to which areas of the FO will be Open to OHV travel, which areas will be Closed to OHV travel, and which areas will be limited to designated routes. Within the limited areas, BLM will provide a range of alternatives by varying miles of designated routes.

### **O.3.3 Route Designations and ID Team Meetings**

ID team meetings in the CRVFO to address route/resource conflicts and route designations were held from June 2007 through June 2008. The FO Manager conducted each meeting, and every route proposed for designation within the CRVFO boundaries was evaluated.

The purpose of the route designation ID Team meetings was three-fold:

1. Gather input from ID team on conflicts identified and mitigation proposed by each resource specialist. Identify (where known) the purpose and need for the route in question. Where conflicts with resources existed, these conflicts were discussed and resolved during the meeting, and final proposals for the various alternatives were established.
2. Formulate three action alternatives for the travel plan: The Conservation alternative emphasizes resource conflicts over the purpose and need for the route. The Commodity alternative emphasizes the purpose and need for the route over resource conflicts. The Balanced alternative weighs both resource conflicts and the purpose and need.

3. Develop a designed system of designated routes that fulfills the management goal for the planning area.

The RMP administrative record contains details of the conflicts identified for each route or route segment and BLM's conclusions as to designation, by alternative. All travel recommendations were examined on an area by area and route-by-route basis, usually by employing geographic information system (GIS) and other digital and physical mapping to overlay physical constraints, public comments, and background topography and/or aerial photography, with existing routes and their public and administrative uses.

As discussed above, resource specialists identified potential conflicts with proposed routes, and characterized the severity of the conflict. In general, routes with serious resource conflicts (or less severe, but multiple conflicts), and no obvious purpose and need, were recommended for non-designation. There were many routes where resource concerns conflicted with established purpose and need. These routes typically were recommended for non designation under Alternative C, but were designated under Alternative D. Whether or not to designate a route under Alternative B was decided by a weighing of the route's importance against the severity of the identified resource conflicts. In many cases, the potential conflict was resolved by reducing the number of parallel and redundant routes.

### **Cultural Resources**

Existing routes may go through identified cultural or paleontological sites. Use of these routes may hasten erosion, exposing more of the site to natural or human-caused damage. Cross-country travel in particular can exacerbate this problem. Site densities may be such that any access to the area could put such resources at risk

### **Recreation**

Scoping has shown a desire on the part of some publics for more areas to be managed for nonmotorized recreation. In response to this, BLM may decide to manage certain areas for more primitive forms of recreation, or to reduce user conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users. In such areas, and under different plan alternatives, the existence of certain roads (or a redundancy of such) may pose a conflict with underlying recreation management goals and objectives.

### **Riparian**

There are numerous streams, rivers, and other watercourses that run through the "limited" OHV category area. Routes are often located in riparian areas in canyons and drainage bottoms to avoid the more difficult uplands. Use of these routes can contribute to loss of riparian vegetation, degrade stream banks, and lead to erosion problems. There are also numerous washes within the "limited" OHV category area that do not support riparian vegetation, and merely provide a channel for water during storm events. Compaction of soils in these washes can lead to accelerated flood velocity, further contributing to erosion and sedimentary transfer.

### **Soils**

Any surface disturbing activity, including routes, on sensitive soils will cause increases in salinity and sedimentation levels. Roads and off-road travel can cause impacts to watersheds by impacting soil health and water quality. Impacts can include soil compaction, decreased soil stability, loss of vegetation and biotic soil crusts, loss of functioning floodplains, accelerated erosion, water quality degradation, and increased salinity contributions.

### **WSAs and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)**

WSAs are managed under the BLM's Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review (IMP) so as not to impair their suitability for preservation as wilderness. Each of these WSAs has wilderness characteristics. They are greater than 5,000 acres in size, natural in appearance, and provide outstanding opportunities for solitude and/or primitive recreation. Many also possess supplemental wilderness values including cultural resources and wildlife values.

The IMP specifies that, at a minimum, motorized vehicles are only allowed on pre-existing inventoried ways in WSAs. Use of vehicles off boundary routes and on these ways is permitted only for emergencies, search and rescue operations, official purposes for the protection of human life, safety, and property; protection of lands and their resources, and to build and maintain structures and installations permitted under the IMP.

Today's OHVs are more varied, powerful machines capable of accessing steeper and rougher terrain than was possible over 20 years ago when the WSAs were designated. Motorized use in and around certain WSAs has increased dramatically, and involves sports utility vehicles (SUVs), trucks, all terrain vehicles (ATVs), and motorcycles. As discussed earlier, designating motorized routes within WSAs can lead to the impairment of wilderness character, whether through increased risks of off-road travel or intruding upon the solitude that wilderness users seek.

The Executive Order No. 3310 on December 22, 2010 authorized LWCs to be considered for designation as Wild Lands through the land use planning process when appropriate. The BLM Manual 6300-2-*Lands with Wilderness Characteristics in the Land Use Planning Process*, when finalized, will contain text that further details the process of considering LWC for Wild Land designation. If the BLM determines that LWC within the CRVFO should be designated as Wild Lands, then travel would be closed to OHV use or limited to designated routes only. Other proposed Wild Lands management actions are further described in Appendix F.

### **Wildlife**

Roads can threaten wildlife populations due to habitat fragmentation, stress caused by human activities at critical times such as birthing or winter, and impacting resources (e.g., water, vegetation) upon which wildlife depend. Off-route travel can exacerbate these effects. Disturbance from human activity can cause increased stress, deplete energy reserves, make animals more susceptible to disease and parasites, and lead to abandonment and avoidance of habitat. Limiting travel to designated routes, reclaiming unnecessary or illegal routes, and seasonal closures, help lessen the impact on wildlife and wildlife habitats.

### **O.3.4 Mechanized Routes**

Mechanized use includes mechanical devices such as bicycles that are not motorized. CRVFO concluded that routes not designated for motorized travel generally would be available for mechanized, foot, and equestrian travel. As with all designations in the travel plan, BLM reserves the right to change designations in the future, should resource issues warrant such action. Exceptions to permitting mechanized use on routes not designated for motorized use are "ways" in WSAs. In those cases where motorized use on such routes is prohibited, the same prescriptions would apply to mechanized use, as a means of enhancing wilderness values. The same would apply to routes not designated for motorized use in those areas the BLM chooses to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics (in those alternatives of the DEIS containing such areas). In addition, routes not designated for motorized use will not be available for mechanized use in areas identified as hiking or other non-mechanized focus areas. Under IMP, BLM reserves the right to close these trails to mechanized use, should such use lead to degradation of resource values.

### **O.3.5 Foot and Equestrian Travel**

Foot and equestrian travel would continue to be allowed in all areas of CRVFO, except as specifically prohibited.

### **O.4 PLAN MAINTENANCE AND CHANGES TO ROUTE DESIGNATIONS**

The RMP must include indicators to guide future plan maintenance, amendments, or revisions related to OHV area designations or the approved road and trail system within Limited areas. Indicators could include results of monitoring data, new information, or changed circumstances (IM 04-005, Attachment 2).

Actual route designations within the Limited category can be modified without completing a plan amendment, although NEPA compliance is still required. The Federal regulations at 43 CFR 8342.3 state: “The authorized officer shall monitor effect of the use of off-road vehicles. On the basis of information so obtained, and whenever the authorized officer deems it necessary to carry out the objectives of this part, designations may be amended, revised, revoked, or other action taken pursuant to the regulation in this part.”

Within the RMP, FOs must establish procedures for making modifications to their designated route networks. Because future conditions may require the designation or construction of new routes or closure of routes in order to better address resources and resource use conflicts, a FO will expressly state how modification would be evaluated.

As noted in IM 2004-061, plan maintenance can be accomplished through additional analysis and land use planning, e.g., activity level planning. BLM will collaborate with affected and interested parties in evaluating the designated road and trail network for suitability for active OHV management and envisioning potential changes in the existing system or adding new trails that would help meet current and future demands. In conducting such evaluations, the following factors would be considered:

- Routes suitable for different categories of OHVs including dirt bikes, ATVs, dune buggies, and 4-wheel drive touring vehicles, as well as opportunities for joint trail use.
- Needs for parking, trailheads, informational and directional signs, mapping and profiling, and development of brochures or other materials for public dissemination.
- Opportunities to tie into existing or planned route networks.
- Measures needed to avoid onsite and offsite impacts to current and future land uses and important natural resources; among others, issues include noise and air pollution, erodible soils, stream sedimentation, non-point source water pollutions, listed and sensitive species' habitats, historic and archeological sites, wildlife, special management areas, grazing operations, fence and gate security, needs of non-motorized recreationists, and recognition of property rights for adjacent landowners.
- Public land roads or trails determined to cause considerable adverse effects or to constitute a nuisance or threat to public safety would be considered for relocation or closure and rehabilitation after appropriate coordination with applicable agencies and partners.

Those areas managed as Closed will not be available for new motorized or mechanized route designation or construction.

Regulations at 43 CFR 8342.2 require BLM to monitor the effects of OHV use. Changes should be made to the Travel Plan based on the information obtained through monitoring. Procedures for making changes to route designations after the record of decision (ROD) is signed are established in the RMP.

Site specific NEPA documentation is required in order to change the route designations in this Travel Plan.

### **O.5 IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS**

Implementation decisions are actions to implement land use plans and generally constitute BLM's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. These types of decisions are based on site-specific planning and NEPA analyses and are subject to the administrative remedies set forth in the regulations that apply to each resource management program of the BLM. Implementation decisions are not subject to protest under the planning regulations.

Instead, implementation decisions are subject to various administrative remedies. Where implementation decisions are made as part of the land use planning process, they are still subject to the appeals process of other administrative review as prescribed by specific resource program regulations after BLM resolves the protests to land use plan decisions and make a decision to adopt or amend the RMP.

Travel planning and implementation process includes the following:

- A map of roads and trails for all travel modes.
- Definitions and additional limitations for specific roads and trails.
- Criteria developed to set parameters and to specify limitations.
- Guidelines for management, monitoring, and maintenance of the system.
- Indicators to guide future plan maintenance, amendments or revisions related to OHV area designations or the approved road and trail system within limited areas.

The travel management networks should be reviewed periodically to ensure that current resource and travel management objectives are being met (43 CFR 8342.3).

In the final decision document, designated OHV routes will be portrayed by a map entitled "Field Office Travel Plan and Map". This map will be the basis for signing and enforcement. The FO will prioritize actions, resources, and geographic areas for implementation. The implementation goals include completing signage, maps, public information, kiosks, and working with partners.