

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700029

A. List of Restoration Activities

The Project is to permanently close an unauthorized user created motorized trail and return of land, plant communities, and plant covers to conditions comparable to those of surrounding lands. The trail is approximately .5 miles in length and is located in Long Valley. This Project is located in prime sage grouse habitat.

Treatments include: barricading motorized access by the placement of wood post and beam barricades; vertical mulching; planting and seeding of native vegetation; hand construction of water control devices; interruptive and educational signing of BLM's actions and public outreach.

Also see page 22 of the Environmental Assessment.
http://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/bishop_pdfs/eadocs/fy06/restoration_ea_final_for_web.pdf

Deliverables to be completed are: The wildlife botanist will plan, direct, monitor and maintain resource management information system records, produce reports of the out-planting of native vegetation. Federal law enforcement officer will monitor twice per week and report findings to resource personnel. Archaeologist will identify, evaluate and provide mitigation to cultural resources affected by the Project. Recreational planner will coordinate, plan, schedule, administer, provide labor, produce maps, keep records and deliver report to Division/Commission. Park ranger will construct barricades, construct erosion control devices, install and maintain signs/maps/information, perform outreach, patrol, keep logs, and maintain the Project as necessary. California Native Plant Society will propagate native plants, and maintain the propagation center. Mapping supplies include printer ink and paper to produce maps and laminate to protect the maps when posted on an outdoor signboard. Supervision cost include direct supervision of BLM employees by a line officer. (This cost will be paid by the Bureau).

Authority: The proposed action is in conformance with the Bishop Resource Management Plan (RMP), approved March 25th, 1993. The proposed action was developed to implement RMP guidance and designed to conform to General Policies, Area Manager's Guidelines, Valid Existing Management, Standard Operating Procedures, Decisions and Support Needs prescribed in the Bishop RMP.

RMP Decisions and Standard Operating Procedures that support the proposed action can be found at the following Web site and are on file at the Division.

http://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/bishop_pdfs/eadocs/fy06/restoration_ea_final_for_web.pdf

B. How the Proposed Project Relates to OHV Recreation

The Project will help sustain OHV use in the area because by repairing damaged lands it demonstrates BLM's commitment to limiting motorized recreation to designated routes only. Illegal trails such as this only harm motorized recreation since other users may see it as a wanton disregard of natural and cultural resources. Additionally, the Project would seek to improve critical sage grouse habitat. This species has been considered for federal listing. Listing could greatly limit OHV use in sage grouse habitat.

C. Size of Project Site

Approximately ½ mile. View shed and habitat fragmentation would be improved by as much as 40 to 250 acres.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

Post project monitoring would be conducted bi-annually to assess the proposed action's effectiveness. Visitor use and compliance monitoring would be conducted twice weekly and be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed Project and determine maintenance or enforcement needs. Please see p 31-33 of the environmental assessment for details on cumulative effects and monitoring at:

http://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/bishop_pdfs/eadocs/fy06/restoration_ea_final_for_web.pdf

E. List of Reports

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

As stated in the Project description, the law enforcement or park rangers would patrol the area at a minimum of twice per week. The route would be physically barricaded to prevent OHVs into the area. Educational signing would be placed at the barricade. This is a "challenge" dead-end hill climb. Experience has shown that these types of route (non loop) closures and restoration projects generally tend to be successful.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700029

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

[Long Valley Restoration](#)

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

[Restoration Long Valley](#)

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
 Application: Restoration Long Valley

6/2/2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
APPLICANT NAME :	BLM - Bishop Field Office		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration Long Valley	PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	
PROJECT TYPE :	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>The Project is to permanently close an unauthorized user created motorized trail and return of land, plant communities, and plant covers to conditions comparable to those of surrounding lands. The trail is approximately .5 miles in length and is located in Long Valley. This Project is located in prime sage grouse habitat.</p> <p>Treatments include: barricading motorized access by the placement of wood post and beam barricades; vertical mulching; planting and seeding of native vegetation; hand construction of water control devices; interruptive and educational signing of BLM's actions and public outreach. Also see page 22 of the Environmental Assessment. http://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/bishop_pdfs/eadocs/fy06/restoration_ea_final_for_web.pdf</p> <p>Deliverables to be completed are: The wildlife botanist will plan, direct, monitor and maintain resource management information system records, produce reports of the out-planting of native vegetation. Federal law enforcement officer will monitor twice per week and report findings to resource personnel. Archaeologist will identify, evaluate and provide mitigation to cultural resources affected by the Project. Recreational planner will coordinate, plan, schedule, administer, provide labor, produce maps, keep records and deliver report to Division/Commission. Park ranger will construct barricades, construct erosion control devices, install and maintain signs/maps/information, perform outreach, patrol, keep logs, and maintain the Project as necessary. California Native Plant Society will propagate native plants, and maintain the propagation center. Mapping supplies include printer ink and paper to produce maps and laminate to protect the maps when posted on an outdoor signboard. Supervision cost include direct supervision of BLM employees by a line officer. (This cost will be paid by the Bureau).</p> <p>Authority: The proposed action is in conformance with the Bishop Resource Management Plan (RMP), approved March 25th, 1993. The proposed action was developed to implement RMP guidance and designed to conform to General Policies, Area Manager's Guidelines, Valid Existing Management, Standard Operating Procedures, Decisions and Support Needs prescribed in the Bishop RMP.</p> <p>RMP Decisions and Standard Operating Procedures that support the proposed action can be found at the following Web site and are on file at the Division. http://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/bishop_pdfs/eadocs/fy06/restoration_ea_final_for_web.pdf</p>		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Other-Federal Law Enforcement Office Notes : Federal law enforcement will monitor twice per week and	160.000	50.000	HRS	8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
 Application: Restoration Long Valley

6/2/2009

Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
report findings to resource personnel.						
Botanist Notes : The wildlife botanist will plan, direct, monitor and maintain resource management information system records, produce reports of the out-planting of native vegetation.	80.000	47.000	HRS	1,880.00	1,880.00	3,760.00
Recreation Planner Notes : Coordinates, plan, schedule, administer, provide labor, produce maps, keep records and deliver report to Division/Commission.	40.000	45.000	HRS	0.00	1,800.00	1,800.00
Park Ranger Notes : Construct barricades, install and maintain signs, patrol, keep logs, and maintain the Project as necessary.	160.000	38.000	HRS	3,040.00	3,040.00	6,080.00
Archeologist Notes : Archaeologist will identify, evaluate and provide mitigation to cultural resources affected by the Project.	40.000	25.000	HRS	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
Other-Supervision Notes : Supervision cost include direct supervision of BLM employees by a line officer.	40.000	65.000	HRS	0.00	2,600.00	2,600.00
Total for Staff				13,920.00	9,320.00	23,240.00
2	Contracts					
3	Materials / Supplies					
Other-Safety Notes : Replacement of misc safety equipment.	1.000	200.000	MISC	200.00	0.00	200.00
Other-Green House Notes : Maintenance of green house and seed storage unit.	1.000	500.000	MISC	500.00	0.00	500.00
Other-4x4 Post and Beam Notes : 4x4 post and beam barricade.	40.000	10.000	EA	400.00	0.00	400.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
 Application: Restoration Long Valley

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Signs Notes : Misc signs, markers and decals.	4.000	45.000	EA	0.00	180.00	180.00
	Total for Materials / Supplies				1,100.00	180.00	1,280.00
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
	4x4 Vehicle Notes : Vehicle use law enforcement,park rangers and botanist.	4000.000	0.420	MI	0.00	1,680.00	1,680.00
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Administrative Costs						
	Administrative Costs-Field Office Overhe Notes : Administrative costs from the national level of 19.4% waived. Overhead would include, computers, mailings, printers, plotter paper and other office disposables.	1.000	1000.000	EA	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
	Total Program Expenses				15,020.00	12,180.00	27,200.00
	TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES				15,020.00	12,180.00	27,200.00
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES				15,020.00	12,180.00	27,200.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
 Application: Restoration Long Valley

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	13,920.00	9,320.00	23,240.00	
2	Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	1,100.00	180.00	1,280.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	1,680.00	1,680.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Administrative Costs	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	
Total Program Expenses		15,020.00	12,180.00	27,200.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		15,020.00	12,180.00	27,200.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		15,020.00	12,180.00	27,200.00	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700029

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? Yes No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. ITEM 2 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? Yes No
(Please select Yes or No)
- c. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. Yes No
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 3 – 9

ITEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

No negative impact to wetlands, navigable waters, and sensitive habitats and species would occur. (Including threatened and endangered species). Projects would be designed to ensure no additional opportunity for sediment (the major water quality pollutant) transport in to streams, springs and shallow pond locations. Additionally, sensitive habitats and species would benefit from the Project by restoring habitat and removing habitat fragmentation. Water quality and habitat is furthered discussed in Environmental Assessment CA-170-06-26 and can be viewed at:

ITEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

Since the High Desert OHV Plan (1993), cumulative past actions have consisted of about 30 restoration projects improving up to 30 acres of public land including annual maintenance of about 25-30 miles of motorized routes. These actions have occurred across 750,000 acres of public land in the eastern Sierra. Some motorized access opportunities have been lost with access use shifting to the remaining 2,400+ miles of routes on public lands.

BLM is currently implementing between 2 and 4 restoration projects totaling about 0.5 acres of surface area with annual route maintenance totaling about 3 miles per year.

These past and present projects have cumulatively improved cultural resources, vegetative and wildlife habitat, visual resources, etc. Additionally, annual maintenance has kept motorized access opportunities available and protected adjacent resources for public appreciation and use.

Although it is uncertain what projects would be identified as reasonably foreseeable future actions, past and present restoration/management practices lead us to believe that between 2 and 6 projects would be targeted annually for implementation, totaling possibly 2 - 4 acres of surface restoration. Several miles of annual route maintenance would continue to have beneficial effects for motorized access use.

Over the next ten years, the aggregate value of all expected future projects would expand the benefits to more modest levels of up to 40 acres of public land restoration and improvement. The proposed action would create several positive future effects from multiple and small incremental project accomplishments. This overall improvement would have commensurate benefits to wildlife populations including water, wetlands, air quality, and soils. Native vegetation would recover better with a corresponding decline in weed infestation. Soil compaction and erosion would lessen while fugitive dust emissions and sediment deposition in water would also decrease.

Similar applications would affect cultural resources cumulatively where it is expected that individual positive benefits to correct access related impacts would culminate to an overall regional improvement in archeological integrity and record preservation.

The additive value of up to 60 miles of expected route maintenance, repair, or redesign would facilitate motorized recreation opportunities regionally. The impacts would cumulatively benefit the broad public land base in the eastern Sierra from Olancha north to Topaz Lake.

ITEM 5 - Soil Impacts

The possibilities that this project would have such an effect are none. The project seeks to lessen impacts by closing steep hill climbs or routes to vehicles (and, where necessary for recovery, foot traffic) where highly erodible soil exist. During implementation personnel would avoid steep slopes, highly erodible soils and sensitive areas and would not create new or braided hiking trails through repeated use. No structures or roads would be built. Project vehicles are restricted to existing roads, trails and parking areas.

OHV impacts to soil resources are a direct result of vegetation removal and alteration. Loss of plant cover increases the effects of the desert environment on soils. As shade, wind protection, and organic litter are lost on a site, wind velocities over the soil surface increase, water infiltration is reduced and microorganisms naturally found in the soil may be impacted. This process leads to poor soil structure and loss of topsoil, soil fertility and water retention properties (Bainbridge and Virginia 1990). These soil impacts are exacerbated when OHV routes occur on steep, topography, especially in desert scrub plant communities.

ITEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources

The project will have a positive effect on scenic values. All projects would be implemented to conform to prescribed visual resource management (VRM) classes. Restoration sites currently have a high visual contrast with the surrounding vegetation in the view shed. This draws the observer's attention to the surface disturbance, thus compromising VRM class objectives. The project seeks to improve visual resources by bringing back natural vegetation patterns.

ITEM 7 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) Yes No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) Yes No

If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts.

ITEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts

The possibility that uses may go elsewhere is present. To help prevent off-site impacts rangers will patrol the surrounding areas looking for new routes. We currently have a complete GPS inventory and aerial photos taken in 2005. Patrol personnel have this data available to them for use in the field.

Past Projects, such as this, have not increased the use in the vicinity of the Project site.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

[Restoration EA](#)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700029

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- 76% or more (10 points)
 51% - 75% (5 points)
 26% - 50% (3 points)
 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 5

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- Domestic water supply (4 points)
 Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
 Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
 Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
 Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [2]
 Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
 Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [1]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

Loss of upland habitat for sage grouse may result in the species being "listed" as threatened or endangered. This listing may result in OHV use restrictions in the area. U.S. Fish and Wildlife have been studying this species for possible listing.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
 Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
 OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
 Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
 Management decision (1 point)
 Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
 Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

Protect sage grouse habitat. Environmental Assessment, FONSI and Decision Record CA-170-05-65.

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 10

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- Use of native plants and materials
- Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- Educational signage
- Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Federal law enforcement officer will monitor twice per week and report findings to resource personnel.

Treatments include barricading motorized access by the placement of post and beam wood barricades, vertical mulching, planting and seeding of native vegetation, hand construction of water control devices, interruptive and educational signing of actions and public outreach.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- No (No points) Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

Bishop Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 1993
High Desert OHV Management Plan 1991
High Desert Environmental Assessment CA-170-98-50

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
 Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
 Other Grant funding (2 points)
 OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

BLM would fund 100% future (three years out) operational costs. BLM's Financial and Business Management System.

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
- Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

A public meeting to discuss and take comments on the proposed project was conducted on August 24th, 2005 at the Crowley Lake Community Center, 458 Pearson Road, Crowley Lake, California. Attendance was limited but included representatives of the Saline Preservation Association, Friends of the Inyo, and Eastern Sierra Quail Unlimited.

A press release regarding the proposed project that included a brief description of the project area and objectives, notification of the public meeting, and a request for comments was distributed on August 15th, 2005.

KIBS radio covered the proposed project in a news story on August 23rd, 2005 that briefly described the project area and objectives, and also included notification of the public meeting and request for comments.

An article regarding recreational hot tub use and BLM concerns about sage grouse habitat and other resource issues in Long Valley was published in The Sheet, a local news and views paper from Mammoth Lakes, California on September 17th

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- 4 or more (4 points) 2 to 3 (2 points)
 1 (1 point) None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Advocates for Access to Public Lands, Saline Preservation Association, Friends of the Inyo, and Eastern Sierra Quail Unlimited.

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
 Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
 Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
 Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- No (No points) Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

We have held public meetings and met with stakeholders. We have unanimous support for this project. With additional funds, we will be able to camouflage the trail, add barricades and educational signing.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
- 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)