

## Trail 32 Reroute (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700348

### A. Statement of Planning Objectives

The planning objectives for this project are to reroute the Letts Ridge trail (trail 32). Trail 32 is a major trail artery for the Mendocino National Forest, Grindstone Ranger District. It is one of four trails that connect the southern OHV area to the northern OHV area and runs directly across the north-east corner of a section of private property. A change in ownership of the private lands upon which this trail crosses has resulted in the Forest being required to close this section of trail, as the owner has determined not to grant public access on his private land. After numerous attempts to negotiate an easement with the landowner, negotiations have failed. In order to maintain the functionality of trail system as a whole, Trail 32 needs to be rerouted to avoid the landowner's private property. In order to determine the best alternative for development of a reroute this funding request will allow us to survey landline boundaries, conduct trail design and layout in accordance with Best Management Practices and complete environmental studies.

### B. Relation of Proposed Project to OHV Recreation

With the recent closure of Trail 32, OHV recreation is now limited to fewer routes that connect campgrounds, trail heads and the rest of the trail system together. With the incremental increase of OHV users each year to the Mendocino National Forest, Trail 32 is a major artery of the Grindstone Ranger Districts trail system, and serves to disperse use throughout the entire trail system. Without Trail 32 connecting the OHV system together, other trails will likely see more impacts and potential concerns with erosion, likely resulting in difficulty with sustaining impacted trails in a sound, useable manner. The closure of Trail 32 is limiting current OHV recreational opportunities. With the identification and development of a reroute, unauthorized use on private lands will be prevented and the sustainability of the trail system will be enhanced.

### C. Statement of Activities

This funding request is for the landline survey, trail layout and design, and study of the environmental affects associated with a trail reroute. The funding will identify a feasible reroute for Trail 32 around the private land owners' property.

### D. List of Reports

Boundary Survey - Letts Ridge Trail 32, reroute, Mendocino National Forest

NEPA document (Decision Memo, EA or EIS), Letts Ridge Trail 32 reroute

Trail Design and Layout - Letts Ridge Trail 32, reroute, Mendocino National Forest

## Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700348

**1. Timeline for Completion**

Attachments:

[Trail 32 Letts Ridge](#)

**2. Optional Project-Specific Application Documents**

**3. Optional Project-specific Maps**

Attachments:

[Boundary Survey map](#)

[Proposed reroute map](#)

**Project Cost Estimate**

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
<b>APPLICANT NAME :</b>	USFS - Mendocino National Forest		
<b>PROJECT TITLE :</b>	Trail 32 Reroute (FINAL)	<b>PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :</b>	G09-02-10-P02
<b>PROJECT TYPE :</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION :</b>	The planning objectives for this project are to reroute the Letts Ridge trail (trail 32). Trail 32 is a major trail artery for the Mendocino National Forest, Grindstone Ranger District. It is one of four trails that connect the southern OHV area to the northern OHV area and runs directly across the north-east corner of a section of private property. A change in ownership of the private lands upon which this trail crosses has resulted in the Forest being required to close this section of trail, as the owner has determined not to grant public access on his private land. After numerous attempts to negotiate an easement with the landowner, negotiations have failed. In order to maintain the functionality of trail system as a whole, Trail 32 needs to be rerouted to avoid the landowner's private property. In order to determine the best alternative for development of a reroute this funding request will allow us to survey landline boundaries, conduct trail design and layout in accordance with Best Management Practices and complete environmental studies.		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>							
<b>Program Expenses</b>							
<b>1</b>	<b>Staff</b>						
	Other-Boundary survey	5.000	403.000	DAY	2,015.00	0.00	2,015.00
	Other-Archaeologist	10.000	342.230	DAY	3,422.00	0.00	3,422.00
	Other-Biologist-animal and plant	8.000	367.710	DAY	2,942.00	0.00	2,942.00
	Other-NEPA Coordinator	5.000	393.570	DAY	1,968.00	0.00	1,968.00
	Other-Hydrologist/Geologist	10.000	315.290	DAY	3,153.00	0.00	3,153.00
	<b>Total for Staff</b>				13,500.00	0.00	13,500.00
<b>2</b>	<b>Contracts</b>						
	Other-Trails Unlimited	17.000	1200.000	DAY	20,400.00	0.00	20,400.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
 Agency: USFS - Mendocino National Forest  
 Application: Trail 32 Reroute (FINAL)

3/1/2010

Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
Other-BLM Landline Survey Notes : BLM BOUNDARY SURVEY COST ESTIMATE TRAIL 32 - LETTS RIDGE REROUTE PROPOSAL MENDOCINO NATIONAL FOREST	1.000	65200.000	EA	30,000.00	35,200.00	65,200.00
Item Quantity Unit Unit Price Total						
A. Corner Maintenance 7 Each \$300.00 \$2,100.00						
C. Corner Search 12 Each \$800.00 \$9,600.00						
E. Control Survey 13 Mile \$2,000.00 \$26,000.00						
F. Corner Moumentation 9 Each \$500.00 \$4,500.00						
G. Mark and Post 3.0 Mile \$5,000.00 \$15,000.00						
H. Records and Reports 1 Lump Sum \$8,000.00 \$8,000.00						
Total Project Estimate \$65,200.00						
2010 Forest Contribution \$35,200.00						
Grant Request \$30,000.00						
<b>Total for Contracts</b>				50,400.00	35,200.00	85,600.00
<b>3 Materials / Supplies</b>						
<b>4 Equipment Use Expenses</b>						
Field Vehicle	1.000	281.000	MOS	281.00	0.00	281.00
<b>5 Equipment Purchases</b>						

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
 Agency: USFS - Mendocino National Forest  
 Application: Trail 32 Reroute (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
6	Others						
7	Indirect Costs						
<b>Total Program Expenses</b>					64,181.00	35,200.00	99,381.00
<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>					64,181.00	35,200.00	99,381.00
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>					<b>64,181.00</b>	<b>35,200.00</b>	<b>99,381.00</b>

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
 Agency: USFS - Mendocino National Forest  
 Application: Trail 32 Reroute (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>					
<b>Program Expenses</b>					
1	Staff	13,500.00	0.00	13,500.00	
2	Contracts	50,400.00	35,200.00	85,600.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	281.00	0.00	281.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	
<b>Total Program Expenses</b>		<b>64,181.00</b>	<b>35,200.00</b>	<b>99,381.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>		<b>64,181.00</b>	<b>35,200.00</b>	<b>99,381.00</b>	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>		<b>64,181.00</b>	<b>35,200.00</b>	<b>99,381.00</b>	

## Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700348

### 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. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No)  Yes  No

### ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378?  Yes  No  
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. 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. (Please select Yes or No)  Yes  No
- e. 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 4 – 10

This funding request is to complete the planning and analysis associated with a reroute of Trail 32 around private property. This project will result in a plan and NEPA decision selecting an alternative to pursue for a reroute. No ground disturbing activities will occur under this Planning Grant.

### ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

### ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

### ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

### ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

### ITEM 8 - 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 9 - 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

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

**ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts**

**CEQA/NEPA Attachment**

## Planning Project Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700348

### 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

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

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

### 2. Planning Project - Q 2.

#### A Planning Project - Page 1

2. The Planning Project would address the following 4

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

- Potential effects of OHV Recreation on special-status species habitats  
 Potential effects of OHV Recreation on cultural resources  
 Potential effects of OHV Recreation on soil conditions  
 Potential effects of OHV Recreation on water quality  
 Potential effects of OHV Recreation on other recreation uses  
 Potential effects of OHV Recreation on adjacent lands.  
 Potential impact to relationships between OHV Recreation and local residents  
 Toxic or hazardous materials within a Project Area or adjacent property that may impact OHV Recreation  
 Trail issues such as traffic patterns, trails closures, appropriate uses, etc.

#### B. Planning Project - Page 2

Explain each statement that was checked

The NEPA analysis will address the species habitat, cultural resources, soil conditions and water quality. With the recent closure of Trail 32, other trails will likely see more impact and erosion which could impact water quality. Current OHV recreation opportunities will be limited if a reroute for Trail32 is not developed to re-connect the trail system together. The identification and development of a reroute will discourage unauthorized use on private lands. The other trails in the system will see more impact, if a reroute is not developed. This may become detrimental to maintaining the sustainability of other system trails.

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

- 6 or more items checked (4 points)  4 to 5 items checked (3 points)  
 2 to 3 items checked (2 points)  1 or no items checked (No points)

### 3. Motorized Access - Q 3.

3. The Project would lead to improved facilities that provide motorized access to the following nonmotorized recreation opportunities 6

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each, up to a maximum of 6 points (Please select applicable values)

- Camping  Birding  
 Hiking  Equestrian trails  
 Fishing  Rock Climbing

Other (Specify)

**4. Public Input - Q 4.**

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

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

- Publicly noticed 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

Grindstone District staff spoke over the phone to members of the Valley Climbers Motorcycle Club, Richmond Ramblers Motorcycle Club and Oakland Motorcycle Club regarding the issue of Trail 32 being closed during Enduro events scheduled for 2010. Forest Service staff also discussed the closure of Trail 32 in a meeting hosted by Blue Ribbon Coalition, District 36 American Motorcyclist Association and several ohv clubs on Jan 11 2010.

**5. Stakeholder Input - Q 5.**

5. If the Project were approved, the planning process would incorporate substantial stakeholder input: 5

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

- No (No points)  Yes (5 points)

If 'Yes', explain, specifically, how it would be 'substantial'. Identify stakeholders

The project will be posted in the Mendocino National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions. Several OHV clubs that participate in permitted events on the Forest (Valley Climbers, Richmond Ramblers, Oakland Motorcycle Club) have expressed interest in this project and support continued connectivity of the trail system through this project. These clubs, as well as other stakeholders such as Blue Ribbon Coalition and District 36 American Motorcyclist Association are expected to provide input during the planning of this project.

**6. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 6.**

6. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 0

(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)

**7. Sustain OHV Opportunity - Q 7.**

7. The Planning Project sustains OHV Opportunity in the following manner 10

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

- Project will develop management plans for existing OHV Opportunity (4 points)  
 Project will complete environmental review for an OHV Development Project (3 points)  
 Project supports development of OHV Opportunities adjacent to population centers (3 points)  
 Project supports development of OHV Opportunities in areas that lack legal OHV Opportunity (2 points)  
 Project will develop a system of designated OHV routes for an existing OHV Opportunity (2 points)

Explain each statement that was checked

This project will allow us to develop an analysis and plan which will result in implementation of the reroute of Trail 32. The Grindstone Ranger District is only three hours away from the Sacramento and Bay Area metropolitan areas, and is seeing incremental increases of OHV users each year as populations increase and opportunities for quality riding areas decrease. This project will complete a loop system and tie in the trail system as a whole. The identification and development of a reroute will discourage unauthorized use on private lands.

**8. Identification of Funding Sources - Q 8.**

8. Funds for implementing the completed plan have been identified 0

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

No (No points)

Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

Reference Document

**9. Offsite Impacts - Q 9.**

9. The Planning Project would address offsite impacts relative to the Project Area (e.g., sound, fugitive dust, runoff): 5

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

No (No points)

Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

The environmental analysis will address any potential on and off site impacts related to this project proposal.