

**Off-Highway Vehicle
Mixed Use
on
National Forest System Roads
on
Pacific Southwest Region Forests**

Position Paper

April 2008

Recreation Outdoor Coalition
Sylvia Milligan
4000 Beacon St
Anderson, CA 96007

Contents

Summary of ROC's Recommendations	3
Forward	4
Introduction	4
Recommendations	5
Recommendation #1	5
Recommendation #2	5
Recommendation #3	7
Recommendation #4	8
Recommendation #5	14
Recommendation #6	21
Exhibit 1 Proposed Regional Direction	23
Author Biographies	27

Summary of ROC's Specific Recommendations

1. ROC supports the concept of designating national forest roads, trails and open areas for OHV travel in accordance with the November 2005 Travel Management Regulations.
2. ROC requests most unpaved NFS roads be designated for OHV travel (mixed use) unless an exception exists. These exceptions should be very few on those roads where mixed use has historically occurred and where the criteria in attached draft letter are met (see Exhibit 1).
3. Road maintenance levels should be based on agency needs, travel demand (traffic volume) and desired public use in collaboration with affected stakeholders to ensure appropriate access is provided.
4. ROC requests the attached draft letter be signed by the Region 5 Regional Forester to amend Region 5 direction on how to conduct mixed use analyses. The amended direction will streamline the mixed use analysis process and provide more efficient use of agency personnel and taxpayer dollars by eliminating expensive “process steps” that do not conform with national mixed use guidance.
5. National level FS policy and guidance should be clarified regarding:
 - A. The role of the FS Manual and FS Handbook.
 - B. Which NFS roads are subject to the Highway Safety Act.
 - C. The definition of vehicle class and composition.
 - D. Guidance to equate vehicle speed, volume and road surface type to maintenance level.
 - E. Guidance to equate vehicle speed, volume and road surface type to crash probability and crash severity.
6. ROC recommends the national forests engage recreation user groups to assist with recreation planning and to establish active volunteer programs. Such programs will enhance collaborative relationships and provide needed services at considerable savings to the agency.

Background information and supporting rationale for each of these recommendations follows.

Forward

The Recreation Outdoor Coalition (ROC) is a 501(c)3 non-profit group. This status was obtained at personal expense in order to assist the local National Forests with recreation planning, grant funding, and volunteer programs.

The mission of the Coalition is to promote access, multiple-use, environmental stewardship, tolerance and safety for those recreating on our public lands.

ROC's goal is to share information with the public and educate users about what is happening on our public lands. ROC represents hikers, quad riders, equestrians, dirt bikers, canoeists, jeepers, snowmobilers, and environmentalists. We have physically disabled and older members, as well as young families, who depend on motor vehicles to get out and enjoy the "back country" areas of our national forests.

ROC also interacts with the leaders from statewide recreational organizations and serves as a liaison between those it represents and elected officials and government agencies.

ROC has seen some damage done to NFS lands by undisciplined recreationists (both motorized and non-motorized). We make educational contacts with them, when we can, to point out the effects of their actions.

ROC has been actively working with several northern California national forests during the implementation phase of the Route Designation Process (RDP). This planning process implements the agency's 2005 Travel Management Rule.

Introduction

Many people own and enjoy riding off-highway vehicles (OHVs). Some of them go to developed OHV parks, use private lands and/or use public lands.

California's growing population and the expanding availability of OHVs have dramatically increased the demand for riding opportunities in the State. The majority of the United States Forest Service (FS) regulations and policies were prepared a number of years ago. Existing agency policies are being re-written and updated at this time. As a result, there is inconsistent application of the current OHV regulations when allowing or not allowing OHV use on National Forest System (NFS) roads, particularly in the Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5, i.e. California).

The term mixed use, as used by the FS (EM-7700-30), is defined as the designation of a NFS road for use by both highway-legal and non-highway legal motor vehicles. Designating NFS roads for motorized mixed use involves safety and engineering considerations.

ROC's Recommendations

- 1. ROC supports the concept of designating national forest roads, trails and open areas for OHV travel in accordance with the Forest Service's November 2005 Travel Management Regulations.**

Our group endorses the national objectives of designating roads, trails, and areas for OHV travel. Our concern is how the process is being implemented, especially in Region 5 (R5). The focus of this position paper is to bring your attention to these issues.

- 2. ROC requests most unpaved NFS roads be designated for OHV travel (mixed use) unless an exception exists. These exceptions should be very few on those roads where mixed use has historically occurred and where the criteria in draft letter are met (see Exhibit 1).**

Existing R5 direction only allows mixed use on NFS roads currently maintained for high clearance vehicles where passenger car traffic is discouraged. This equates to only maintenance level 2 (ML 2)¹ roads being available. These roads are generally short, dead end spur roads. Regional direction restricts non-highway legal OHVs on NFS passenger car roads with a maintenance level of 3, 4 or 5. Implementation of this direction will require trailering OHVs between dead end spurs. For passenger car roads to be considered for mixed use, Forest Engineers must submit detailed road data to the Regional Director of Engineering, who then completes an engineering analysis for each proposed road. Funding and FS staff to conduct in-depth analyses on thousands of miles of passenger car roads does not appear to be reasonable or practical given the Forest Service's road budget.

Some forests such as the Lassen National Forest have implicitly permitted OHV travel on all their unpaved roads, subject to officer discretion for enforcement. As a result, OHV use is well established on the Forest's maintenance level 2-4 roads and on unpaved county roads through the Forest. There has never been a documented mixed use accident in the Lassen's history.

If the FS wishes to reduce the unroaded impacts from OHV activity via the route designation process, then more routes (linked roads) need to be made available for OHV travel. FSH 7709.55 (8/3/92) Chapter 30, Section 31.23, para 2.b(2) Examples of Opportunities (b) states: "A loop road can be designated for OHV and ATV traffic between periods of commercial use."

On July 10, 2006, the Directors of Engineering and Recreation in the Washington, DC headquarters issued Interim Procedures for Engineering Analysis of Motorized Mixed Use to the Regional Foresters. Their procedures included the following:

¹ Maintenance levels are described on page 7.

“Starting Point for Analysis

In general, the starting point for engineering analysis should be state traffic law. Where the responsible official proposes to depart from state traffic law or otherwise change current travel management direction by authorizing motorized mixed use where it would otherwise be prohibited, that decision must be advised by engineering analysis conducted by a qualified engineer. Engineering analysis is not required to maintain the status quo; if state law authorizes motorized mixed use on some NFS roads, we need not complete engineering analysis to publish a motor vehicle use map reflecting those designations.”

State law in California, Section 38001 Vehicle Code (VC) states in part:

“For purposes of this division, the term “highway” does not include fire trails, logging roads, service roads regardless of surface composition, or other roughly graded trails and roads upon which vehicular travel by the public is permitted.”

The Deputy Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) sent a clarifying letter to the R5 Regional Forester on December 19, 2007, which said in part:

“We are not familiar with all the ML 3 Forest Service roadways, but if they are gravel or other dirt or unpaved roads that have been operating as mixed use roadways for years, it is our belief these roads would fall under the “roughly graded trails and roads upon which vehicular travel by the public is permitted” portion of Section 38001 VC and would, therefore, be eligible for your mixed-use definition.” (Underline added for emphasis.)

In a follow-up letter to ROC from CHP, dated February 20, 2008, regarding OHV use on unpaved ML 4 roads, Captain A.V. Aclaro states:

“The intent of my December 19, 2007, correspondence was to impress upon the Forest Service, that they have the authority to designate their roads appropriately, following their mandated route designation process.”

Captain Aclaro further cites Forest Service Handbook 7709.58: “Management Decisions: The distinction between maintenance levels is not always sharply defined. Some parameters overlap two or more different maintenance levels. Select maintenance levels based on the best overall fit of the parameters of the road in question. In those situations where the parameters do not indicate a definite selection, use the desired level of user comfort and convenience as the overriding criteria to determine the maintenance level.”

We conclude from this that National Interim Direction and the State Vehicle Code do not prohibit OHV travel on unpaved NFS roads regardless of their maintenance level. In fact, in December 2005, the Washington Office issued *Guidelines for Engineering Analysis of Motorized Mixed Use on National Forest System Roads* (EM-7700-30), which says any NFS road can be considered for motorized mixed use. The document’s

main focus is using engineering judgment and analysis to assess the crash probability and crash severity when mixing highway legal and non-highway legal traffic.

3. Road maintenance levels should be based on agency needs, travel demand (traffic volume) and desired public use in collaboration with affected stakeholders to ensure appropriate access is provided.

When ROC met with Lassen National Forest employees charged with implementation of the RDP on March 4, 2008, we were told they can not designate ML 3, 4, or 5 roads for mixed use because of the Highway Safety Act. Furthermore, these maintenance levels can not be reduced because the inventoried miles of more expensive passenger car roads are the basis for each forest's road maintenance funding. Regional office staff has invalidated this argument. In fact, they are encouraging Forest Supervisors to bring their road systems in alignment with their road budgets (i.e. reduce their maintenance levels and thereby their maintenance costs).

Road maintenance levels should be assigned based on the desired public use after public scoping, consistent with agency guidance and policy for conducting roads or travel analyses. Maintenance levels should not be assigned solely by agency staff without considering broader public input and travel needs.

FS-643 (8/99) Roads Analysis report and Forest Service Manual (FSM) and Forest Service Handbooks (FSH) define road maintenance levels (ML) as follows:

- Level 1* – Closed for more than 1 year. Not subject to the Highway Safety Act.
- Level 2* – High-clearance vehicles. Not subject to the Highway Safety Act.
- Level 3* – Passenger vehicles, surface not smooth. User comfort and convenience are low priorities.
- Level 4* – Passenger vehicles, smooth surface with a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience. Most roads are aggregate surfaced.
- Level 5* – Passenger vehicles, dust free, possibly paved.

Maintenance level 3, 4 and 5 roads are subject to the Highway Safety Act and Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Given the comment that the Highway Safety Act (HSA) precludes OHV use on ML 3, 4 and 5 roads, we carefully reviewed the FSM and FSH to understand where and how the HSA affects these decisions. We found roads subject to the HSA have to meet certain safety standards as defined in FSM 7733 and FSH 7709.59. The HSA, however, does not prevent the FS from designating these roads for travel by non-highway legal vehicles.

Traffic volume, speed, desired public use and vehicle classes should be the criteria used to determine maintenance levels and safety standards. It appears MLs are established for other reasons. The "Needs Clarification" section (recommendation 5) provides suggestions for making a linkage.

The general public user of NFS roads (and even FS employees) can not distinguish the difference between road maintenance levels, but they can distinguish paved versus unpaved roads. If we use the Lassen National Forest as an example, all their ML 2 and 3 roads are unpaved and most of their ML 4 roads are also unpaved.

ML 2 and 3 roads should be designated for OHV travel provided there is no crash history or other concerns. A formal engineering analysis is not needed on these roads unless by exception. Unpaved ML 4 roads may undergo an engineering analysis when considering mixed use if risk factors such as speed and traffic volume are a concern. Each Forest Engineer should make that determination and conduct the appropriate level of analysis. ML 5 roads, i.e., paved or dust controlled roads, shall undergo an engineering analysis to determine the safety of linking OHV users to a campground, gas station or store.

If a state or county paved highway is involved, then the appropriate mixed use analysis is needed (called combined use for highways).

The enclosed draft letter with revised regional direction on conducting engineering analyses would address our concerns (see Exhibit 1).

4. ROC requests the draft letter in Exhibit 1 be signed by the Region 5 Regional Forester to amend direction on how to conduct mixed use analyses. The amended direction will streamline the mixed use analysis process and provide more efficient use of agency personnel and taxpayer dollars by eliminating expensive “process steps” that do not conform with national mixed use guidance.

On November 9, 2005, the FS issued new travel management regulations for off-highway vehicle use in the National Forests and Grasslands. Current FS Manual (policy and direction) and Handbook (guidance) do not reflect any changes in travel management policy and guidance for the Regions and National Forests following the issuance of the 2005 regulations. See www.fs.fed.us, \Pubs, Regs, Manuals,\ FSM-Manual file 7700 and FSH-Handbook file 7709.55–59. There are letters and e-mails providing interim direction. The Route Designation Process is underway service-wide, to be completed by the end of 2009.

On January 26, 2005, the R5 Regional Forester sent a letter to the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol asking for clarification of VC 38001 and VC 38026. The Commissioner’s April 7, 2005 said: “In response, if these roads are open to passenger vehicle use, and not specifically posted authorizing OHV use, they would not be legal roadways for OHVs.” (This erroneous interpretation was later rescinded.)

On June 1, 2005, the former national Director of Engineering, E. Vaughn Stokes, sent an e-mail to one of ROC’s constituents. He stated: “We are not nationally restricting use on passenger car roads, but are only requiring ‘engineering judgment’ be used when considering mixed traffic. If there are more restrictive requirements than this, they are Regional or Forest imposed. It is our intent that a well designed ‘designated’ system

that considers the safety and enjoyment of all users and protection of resources be our goal. Utilization of existing roads that are hardened and drained can go a long way to meeting most primary objectives.” A copy of this e-mail was forwarded to Dale Bosworth, then Chief of the Forest Service, by Mr. Stokes.

In December 2005, the FS issued EM-7700-30, *Guidelines for Engineering Analysis of Motorized Mixed Use on National Forest System Roads*. The beginning of the third paragraph of this document states: “Qualified engineers may use these guidelines to analyze any (emphasis added) NFS road being considered for motorized mixed use. The baseline for the analysis will be Forest Service regulations and directives and applicable State and local laws.”

EM-7700-30, page 2, under Documentation of Engineering Judgment, says mixed use designations without engineering analyses may be granted when three conditions are met:

- The use is consistent with state and local law.
- Mixed use already exists.
- There is no documented crash history involving motorized mixed use.

On July 10, 2006, the Directors of Engineering and Recreation in the Washington Office issued Interim Procedures for Engineering Analysis of Motorized Mixed Use to the Regional Foresters, et. al. This letter includes the following:

Page 1 - “This letter is intended to expand on and supplement the Chief’s interim guidance, pending publication of final directives.”

Motorized Mixed Use is the designation of an NFS road for use by both highway-legal and non-highway-legal motor vehicles (FSM 7705)."

Page 2 - Qualified Engineers for identifying accident risks must have knowledge and experience in at least 6 major categories;

And - “In general, the starting point for engineering analysis should be state traffic law. Engineering analysis is not required to maintain the status quo; if state law authorizes motorized mixed use on some NFS roads, we need not complete engineering analysis to publish a motor vehicle use map reflecting those designations. (Underlining added for emphasis)

Page 3 - Operator Requirements. “The travel management rule requires the designation of roads, trails and areas by vehicle class . . .” (vehicle class not clearly defined). And “Requirements for operator qualifications (including age limits) and personal protective equipment are established by state law. We do not intend to use the travel management rule to regulate operator requirements or equipment.”

On August 21, 2006, the R5 Regional Forester established R5 Policy on motorized mixed use on NFS roads until FS Manuals and Handbooks are revised to reflect the

2005 travel management regulations. The Regional Forester's letter says:

"Motorized mixed use guidance requires an engineering analysis be performed by a qualified engineer prior to designation of NFS roads for mixed use; delegates authority to the Regional Director of Engineering to identify qualified engineers; and provides guidelines on the skills a qualified engineer should have.

Region 5 policy is to operate the road system under our jurisdiction in compliance with state law. Mixed use designations that conflict with state law should only be proposed where they are needed to meet Forest Plan goals (route designation).

Region 5 policy on designation of qualified engineers for performing mixed use analysis is:

Roads Maintained for High Clearance Vehicles (ML 1 and 2) -The Director of Engineering will designate individuals on a Forest that have the skills necessary to perform mixed use analysis at the Forest Supervisor's request. Forest Supervisors should provide the Director with a narrative describing how the individuals meet the WO guidelines for qualified engineers.

Roads Maintained for Passenger Cars (ML 3, 4, and 5) - The Director of Engineering will retain the qualified engineer designation in the Regional Office. Forest Supervisors proposing mixed use designation on roads maintained for passenger cars will provide the Director of Engineering sufficient information to complete the engineering analysis including the following:

1. Description of the proposed roads including maps showing the roads and other pertinent information.
2. Purpose served by the mixed use designation including how the proposed designation is needed to meet Forest Plan goals.
3. Travel analysis that supports continued maintenance of the road(s) for passenger cars.
4. Road maintenance sustainability analysis that shows how maintenance to support the traffic, including any necessary traffic control devices, will be funded.
5. Current Road Management Objectives (RMO's).
6. Documentation of coordination with local road agencies that may be affected by the designation.
7. Documentation of coordination with law enforcement agencies that may have jurisdiction on the roads.

8. Any other information the Director may need to evaluate the probability and severity of accidents on the proposed roads including information on the factors listed in publication EM 7700-30.”

And - “Forests are encouraged to review the road management objectives for their road system during the designation process. Operation and maintenance of the road system should be sustainable with current budget realities and take into consideration the type of traffic the Forest wishes to authorize.”
(Underlining added for emphasis.)

Then on June 20, 2007, the R5 Regional Forester issued another interim guideline for mixed use analysis:

“1. **Qualified Engineer** - Continue using the process in the August 21, 2006 letter for the designation of qualified engineers.

2. Motorized Mixed Use Analysis:

A. Consistent with the proposed directives and the July 10, 2006 WO letter, motorized mixed use analysis is not required when the following conditions are met:

- 1) The road is currently maintained for high clearance vehicles and passenger car traffic is discouraged.
- 2) The road is currently open to use by all vehicles and the operation of all vehicles is legal under state law.
- 3) There is no documented crash history involving motorized mixed use on a road or similar roads in the vicinity.

The qualified engineer shall document the above facts and include the documentation in the route designation project record. Use the “engineering judgment form” in the Mixed Use Guide with a statement in the comment field that the road(s) meet the conditions above and a mixed use analysis was not performed.

B. For roads that do not meet the conditions listed above:

- 1) Perform motorized mixed use analysis when:
 - a) The road is currently maintained for passenger cars and the proposed lowering of the maintenance level would allow non-highway licensed vehicles to operate on the road legally under state law.
 - b) There is a proposal to allow motorized mixed-use on a road where motorized mixed use is currently prohibited.
 - c) Crashes involving motorized mixed use have been documented.
 - d) Based on other available information, the qualified engineer determines that performing mixed use analysis is

appropriate.

2) Perform motorized mixed use analysis on all roads maintained for passenger car use where motorized mixed use is *currently allowed* or proposed.

3. Completion of Motorized Mixed-Use Analysis:

Motorized mixed use analysis required above must be completed prior to issuing a Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM).

4. Authorizing Motorized Mixed Use:

Only the responsible official may authorize motorized mixed use. Consult with the Regional Forester prior to authorizing motorized mixed use on roads maintained for passenger cars."

On December 19, 2007, Mr. J. A. Farrow, Deputy Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol, wrote to Regional Forester Randy Moore. The following are excerpts from his letter:

"Since the August 2007 meeting, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) has received inquiries from recreational groups and other interested individuals regarding this issue and after reading your letter, I believe clarification of the CHP's position and the April 2005 letter is necessary.

When Mr. Blackwell contacted the CHP in January 2005, he asked specific questions without providing any history/background to the issues. Our response was accurately drafted to answer his specific questions, but it was not intended to apply to all of the national forest system roads; the USFS roadways are too diverse in their composition, especially the ML 3 roadways.

It was never our intent to imply that the USFS could not designate their ML 3 roadways for legal off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. Therefore, with our new knowledge of the history and background of the issues, we will once again answer the 2005 questions.

1. Are your ML 3 roadways considered highways under Section 38001 of the California Vehicle Code (VC)?
2. Do the combined use regulations (Section 38026 VC) apply to your roadways?

The VC has to be general in nature so it may apply to different situations and interpretations. Section 38001 VC states:

For purposes of this division, the term highway does not include fire trails, logging roads, service roads regardless of surface composition, or other roughly graded trails and roads upon which vehicular travel by the

public is permitted. (Underline added for emphasis.)

We are not familiar with all the ML 3 Forest Service roadways, but if they are gravel or other dirt or unpaved roads that have been operating as mixed use roadways for years, it is our belief these roads would fall under the 'roughly graded trails and roads upon which vehicular travel by the public is permitted' portion of Section 38001 VC and would, therefore, be eligible for your mixed-use definition. (Underline added for emphasis.)

Additionally, I think it is important to point out that mixed use and combined use are two different functions. Mixed use is a USFS term and applies to USFS roads and does not require the CHP's approval before designation. Combined use is more restrictive than the USFS mixed use category as it requires OHV riders to be licensed operators as well as to have current vehicle insurance.

Combined use is defined in the VC and is intended for roadways that are included in the definition of highway, but which do not qualify for the Section 38001 VC exception for purposes of allowing registered off-highway vehicle use. These have generally been paved roads that are part of a local or state designated street and highway system." (Underlining added for emphasis.)

And:

"It is unfortunate that our first letter has, at times, been misinterpreted and resulted in unintended consequences." (Underline added for emphasis.)

CHP re-affirmed our long standing belief that fire trails, logging roads, service roads, regardless of surface composition, or other roughly graded trails and roads fall under Section 38001 of the VC. Gravel or other dirt or unpaved roads that have been operating as mixed use roadways for years also fall under Section 38001.

In their February 20, 2008 letter to ROC, CHP stated, again, "The intent of my December 19, 2007 correspondence was to impress upon the Forest Service, that they have the authority to designate their roads appropriately, following their mandated route designation process." Moreover, the CHP letter cites Forest Service Handbook 7709.58, which says "The distinction between maintenance levels is not always sharply defined. Some parameters overlap two or more different maintenance levels." ROC asserts maintenance levels should not be used to determine whether travel by non-highway vehicles is legal under State traffic law. The distinguishing road feature should be: is the road paved or unpaved? We interpret paved roads to be highways under the VC. Given CHP's two letters, mixed use is legal under the VC on all NFS unpaved roads regardless of their maintenance level.

On March 4, 2008, ROC participated in a meeting with the core staff responsible for conducting the Route Designation Project on the Lassen National Forest (LNF). During this meeting, LNF staff said they would be designating only ML 2 roads for OHV use. They do not have the funds and work force to evaluate over 700 miles of unpaved ML 3

and 4 roads for mixed use per current regional direction. They also said they are hearing from the Regional Office (RO) that ML 3 roads will only be designated after RO staff prepares an engineering analysis for each proposed road.

ML3+ roads serve as important connectors to a forest's ML 2 road system. Using the LNF as an example, ML 3+ roads also connect with unpaved county roads where mixed use is and will continue to be allowed. The lack of integration with allowed OHV use on unpaved county roads will make no sense to the riding public if OHV travel on the forest's ML 3+ system is greatly restricted. It will also make enforcement difficult and put FS law enforcement officers in an untenable position of explaining these prohibitions to the public.

On March 27, 2008, R5 Regional Forester Randy Moore affirmed the Region's continued commitment to the two previous regional policy letters regarding mixed use.

"In August of 2006 and June of 2007, this office issued letters addressing regional policy for qualified engineers and conducting motorized mixed use analysis on national forest system roads. The letters were intended to provide policy for the Region until the Washington Office manual and handbook revisions on travel management were issued. The manual and handbook revisions are not expected to be issued until later this year. Continue to use the policy in the attached letters to guide your work on route designation where there will be motorized mixed use on national forest system roads."

Current R5 direction is a major barrier to successfully completing the route designation process. This direction is far more restrictive than national mixed use direction and guidance. It imposes significantly more process steps for considering mixed use on passenger car roads. The regional process is designed to fail since ROC is well aware the FS does not have the workforce or funds to complete engineering analyses on each passenger car road desired for mixed use designation. As a result, non-highway legal vehicle travel on thousands of miles of NFS unpaved passenger car roads will be prohibited. Current OHV riding opportunities on forests like the LNF will be greatly reduced when the RDP is completed without a change in regional direction. The draft letter in Exhibit 1 contains the revised direction we want to see adopted.

5. National level FS policy and guidance should be clarified.

As a result of working on the Route Designation Process for the past several years, researching the on-line Directive System and interim direction via letters, we have identified several sections of the National Directive System that would benefit from reevaluation and clarification. The FS Washington Office has the lead for amending the agency's national directives. The recommendations in this section are directed to that FS staff level.

- A. Clarify the role of the FSM and FSH.
- B. Clarify which NFS roads are subject to the Highway Safety Act.
- C. Define vehicle class and composition.

- D. Provide guidance to equate vehicle speed, volume and road surface type to maintenance level.
- E. Provide guidance to equate vehicle speed, volume and road surface type to crash probability and crash severity.

Again, existing USFS Direction is available on the web at www.fs.fed.us \Pubs, Regs, Manuals\FSM-Manual 7700 Transportation and FSH-Handbooks 7700 Transportation.

A. Clarify the role of the Forest Service Manual (FSM) and Forest Service Handbook (FSH).

“FSM 1111.03 - Policy (5/11/01) The Manual (FSM) is the basic and ruling component of the Directive System and the principal administrative source of continuing direction for the conduct of Forest Service programs and activities.”

“FSM 1112.03 - Policy (5/11/01) The Handbooks (FSH) complement the Forest Service Manual. They are the principal source of specialized guidance and instruction for carrying out direction issued in the Manual.”

Understanding the role of the FSM and FSH is important. In meetings with employees, the use of the phrase that something “is required per the Manual” is often heard. We find at times that what the FSM requires gets confused with the ways or options to accomplish it in the FSH. As a case in point, carefully review B below.

B. Clarify which NFS roads are subject to the Highway Safety Act.

FSM 7705–Definitions (1/12/01)

“Roads subject to the Highway Safety Act. National Forest System roads that are open to use by the public for standard passenger cars.”

FSM 7730.3–Policy (8/26/05)

“2.d. Document operational status as to whether the road is subject to or excluded from the Highway Safety Act (FSM 7705).”

FSM 7731.11–Strategies (8/25/05)

“2. Make a clear distinction between those roads that are subject to the Highway Safety Act (FSM 7701.3), and those that are excluded from the Act. Roads excluded from the Act are not intended for use by prudent drivers of normal passenger cars.”

FSM 7733.03–Policy (8/26/05)

“1. Operate and maintain National Forest System roads that are subject to the Highway Safety Act (FSM 7705) for safe passage by prudent drivers in standard passenger cars.

“2. Utilize a Safety Management System (FSM 7733.2) to ensure road user safety on all roads subject to the Highway Safety Act. Units are encouraged to

utilize safety management systems on other National Forest System roads operated and maintained for passenger cars.”

FSM 7733.2–Highway Safety Program and Safety Management System (8/26/05)
“1. Highway Safety Program. Highway safety requirements are found in FSH 7709.59 Chapter 40” (see below).”

“2. Safety management System. A safety management system must comply with applicable Federal Highway Administration requirements (23 CFR 500.108) and include the following.

- a) Accident Surveillance
- b) Traffic Surveillance–volume and type data of roads subject to HSA
- c) Inventory of Safety Appurtenances (obstructions along the road)
- d) Maintenance of Safety Appurtenances”

FSH 7709.59 Transportation System Operations Handbook (3/1/91), Chapter 40–
Highway Safety Program.

41–Safety Standards. Applicable sections discussed below (in part)

41.1–Standard 9–Identification and Surveillance of Accident Locations.

41.2–Standard 12–Highway Design, Construction and Maintenance. The applicable sections of Standard 12 are listed below. Comply with these recommended standards:

1. Section A–Design Standards
2. Section F–Construction and Maintenance Warning signs
3. Section G–Railroad Crossings
4. Section H–Roadway Maintenance
5. Section I–Hazard Identification/Correction
6. Section J–Highway Features for Accident Prevention and Survivability
7. Section K–Post Crash Program

41.3–Standard 13–Traffic Engineering Services

41.4–Standard 14–Pedestrian Safety

41.5–Standard 16–Debris Hazard Control and Cleanup

What is a prudent driver?

The best definition of “prudent” found in the dictionary is “wisely cautious in practical affairs.”

And what is a standard or normal passenger car?

Upon scanning the newspaper ads, passenger cars are typically: Chevrolet Impala or Monte Carlo, Ford Taurus, Dodge Intrepid, Chrysler 300, Honda Accord, Nissan Altima, all with “P” rated tires.

Based upon years of travel on all levels of NFS roads, our judgment is that a prudent driver of a standard passenger car will nearly always stay on a paved ML 5 road. There are, of course, exceptions to this.

Therefore, we consider the roads subject to the Highway Safety Act should be listed in the FSM as the paved or ML 5 roads. Note FSH 7709.59, Section 41.2, references Highway. Note the California Vehicle Code excludes unpaved roads from the classification of “highway.”

Confusion occurs because FSH 7709.58 (7/28/95)–Transportation System Maintenance Handbook Section 12.3 Maintenance Levels directs that the “Highway Safety Act applies to ML 3, 4 and 5 roads.” Note, the Safety Standards do not prohibit OHV use of the road. The bottom line is: The FS can still designate mixed used on roads subject to the HSA.

C. Define vehicle class and composition.

There are many different kinds of motor vehicles in use today. To provide uniformity and common understanding, we suggest the following for Travel Management.

Define vehicle class as follows:

Simply stated, any vehicle is an OHV/ORV if it can go off the highway. Some vehicles can handle it easier than others. Some drivers are more prudent than others.

Define vehicles as either “highway legal or non-highway legal” and if they are more or less than fifty inches wide. Consider the following:

Highway Legal Vehicles, i.e. all vehicles registered in California under VC 4000 and not excepted under section VC 38010 and having a metal license plate, are not considered off-highway vehicles. These include, for example:

- Buses
- Trucks
- Passenger cars (Chevrolet Impala, Ford Taurus, Dodge Intrepid, Cadillac Sedan DeVille, etc.)
- Vans
- Pickups
- Sport Utility Vehicles (Ford Explorer, Jeep Cherokee, Grand Cherokee, or Toyota Rav4)
- “Jeep” type with white metal registration plates
- Motorcycles with white metal registration plates
- Any of these may be 2WD or 4WD.

Non-highway Legal Vehicles, i.e. all vehicles registered in California under VC 38006, 38010 and 38012 and having a green registration sticker, are considered off-highway vehicles. These include, for example:

2 wheels/tires capable of running on a fifty inch or less surface.
VC 436. *An off-highway motorcycle or motor-driven cycle which is subject to identification under this code.* These include, for

example: a dirt bike or trail bike displaying the “green” registration sticker.

3 or more wheels/tires capable of running on a fifty inch or less surface.

VC 111. “All-terrain” means a motor vehicle subject to subdivision (a) of Section 38010 which is all of the following:

- (a) Designed for operation off of the highway by an operator with no more than one passenger.
- (b) Fifty inches or less in width.
- (c) Nine hundred pounds or less unladen weight.
- (d) Suspended on three or more low-pressure tires.
- (e) Has a single seat designed to be straddled by the operator, or a single seat designed to be straddled by the operator and a seat for no more than one passenger.
- (f) Has handlebars for steering control.

These include, for example: a 3 wheeler or quad. Any of these may be 2WD or 4WD.

4 or more wheels/tires capable of running on a fifty inch wide or wider running surface. These include, for example:

“Jeep” type vehicles that are non-highway legal (generally modified)

“Gator”

“Ranger”

Dune Buggy or Rail

Any of these may be 2WD or 4WD

And Snowmobiles. VC 557 defines: a snowmobile is a motor vehicle designed to travel over ice or snow in whole or in part on skis, belts or cleats, which is commonly referred to as an Over Snow Vehicle (OSV).

To simplify communication as to which of these vehicles can be used, and where and how they fit into management systems, we recommend they be classified as follows in the directive system:

<u>Vehicle Class</u>	<u>Terminology Listed Above</u>
1	Highway Legal, 2WD or 4WD
2 OHV	Non-highway Legal <50”wide 2 wheels/tires
3 OHV	3 or more wheels/tires, 2WD or 4WD Non-highway Legal > 50” wide
4 OHV	4 or more wheels/tires, 2WD or 4WD Non-highway Legal, Snowmobiles

Define composition as follows:

In traffic engineering jargon, composition refers to the different types of vehicles using a given road. For the Travel Management Rule, consider using composition in the context of the vehicle class or classes allowed (or desired) on a given road as shown on the previous page.

D. Provide guidance to equate vehicle speed, volume and surface type to maintenance levels.

The terms speed and volume are used throughout the rules, regulations and national directive system. We have only found one place (FSH 7709.58, 9/4/92, Exhibit 1) that mentions volume and speed. It says traffic volume and speed increase with maintenance level.

A common forest level perception is the assignment of road maintenance levels dictate a forest's funding level. The higher the maintenance level, the more road funds a forest will receive. According to regional office staff, this is incorrect. In fact, R5 is encouraging Forest Supervisors to take a hard look at the number of miles in the higher maintenance levels as the agency is unable to afford maintaining all these roads. ROC asserts maintenance level should be assigned based on agency needs, travel demand (using average daily traffic or ADT on the road), and desired public access.

There is a lot of discussion about doing traffic surveillance, but little appears to be getting done. Current agency funding levels indicate this short fall will continue. Therefore, additional guidance is needed for determining the appropriate road maintenance level. The following estimates are offered and linked to the Road Maintenance Level System:

Table 1: Indicators for Determining Road Maintenance Levels

<i>Road Maintenance Level</i>	<i>Observed Speed Range</i>	<i>Design Speed</i>	<i>ADT Range</i>	<i>Average Design ADT</i>	<i>Surface Composition</i>
2	2-20	15	0-10	5	Native
3	10-35	25	10-30	20	Native or Aggregate
4	25-40	35	30-60	45	Aggregate
5	35-45+	45	60+	60+	Paved

Based on the above table, the average daily traffic for an ML 3 road would be 0.8 vehicles per hour, statistically speaking. For ML 4 roads, 45 ADT is equivalent to 1.9 vehicles per hour or 32 minutes apart.

E. Provide guidance to equate vehicle speed, volume and surface type to crash probability and crash severity.

FSH 7709.59 (3/1/91) Chapter 52.2 and EM-7700-30 (12/05) both discuss crash probability and crash severity (consequences). Neither document provides any guidance on how to evaluate the measurable indicators, i.e., volume, speed, etc., to the

intangibles. The tables below were developed in conjunction with a mixed-use analysis completed by ROC for the Lassen NF in 2005:

Table 2: Indicators for Accident Probability

Probability of an Accident	Benchmark Rankings	
	High	Low
Crash History	Several Crashes	None Known
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	>150	30 or less
User Knowledge	Not Acquainted	Well Acquainted
Average Speed (MPH)	>40	25 or less
Cross Section Changes	Changes	None Abrupt
Surface Type Changes	Changes	No changes
Curvature	Abrupt	Smooth
Road Widths (feet)	Variable	Uniform

Table 3: Indicators for Accident Severity

Severity of an Accident	Benchmark Rankings	
	High	Low
Average Speed (MPH)	>40	25 or Less
Clearance from Hazards	Little or none	Standards Met
Alignment & Sight Distance	Poor	Standards Met
Roadway Gradient	>12%	<12%
Downhill Side Slopes	>60%	<40%
Radical Speed Changes	Many	Few

A form for each analyzed road was prepared. The observed conditions for each of the items was listed to the right of the table and a judgment was made about being High, Medium or Low risk. In addition, each form listed the objective and operational maintenance level, functional class, service level, surface type, season of use, percent of highway legal vehicles and percent non-highway legal vehicles.

In trying to determine a low probability ADT number to use for an ML 3 road, ROC's engineer did some checking in other Regions of the USFS to see what was being used. He found R3 and R6 use 30 ADT. R4 and R8 use 100 ADT. Our engineer chose to use the conservative 30 ADT.

He also considered the following before settling on the indicators in Tables 2 and 3.

Probability of Accidents

	<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>
Mix vehicle class	50% class 1 & 50% class 2/3	Same	Same
Speed exceeds design by	150%	75%	50%
ADT exceeds daily by	300%	200%	100%

Consequences of Accidents

Severe - 10 or more reportable accidents per site

Moderate - 5 to 10 reportable accidents per site

Minor - 0 to 5 reportable accidents per site

OR

Severe - Results in potentially disabling injury or death (FSH 7709.59.51.3)

Moderate - Property damage exceeding \$4,000 or bodily injury requiring professional medical assistance.

Minor - An accident that is not a Reportable Off-Highway Vehicle Accident.

Useful indicators for accident probability and severity, along with examples of rankings, should be included in the directives for Forest Engineers to consider.

6. ROC recommends the national forests engage recreation user groups to assist with recreation planning and to establish active volunteer programs. Such programs will enhance collaborative relationships and provide needed services at considerable savings to the agency.

In April 2005, the National OHV Collaboration Summit was held in San Diego, CA. One of the Summit’s goals was to present information about the collaborative process – what works, who to engage, what the pitfalls are and how to navigate around bumps in the road. Information on effective public involvement strategies to OHV route designation were also shared. Representatives from most national and State OHV organizations attended the Summit with the hopeful intent of practicing what they learned with staff from the local national forests.

The route designation process offers another opportunity to establish a true partnership with the Forest Service in both planning and implementing each forest’s travel management plan. To date, this promise has not been fulfilled. Here are a few examples.

On the Lassen National Forest, ROC has been rebuffed for years after doing considerable work to establish a motorized “backcountry discovery trail” on existing NFS roads around the Forest. The “Share the Dream Trail” has been proposed to LNF staff since 1999 and has yet to be officially designated. At the request of the Forest Supervisor, traffic counts were taken and an engineering analysis prepared in 2005 for each ML 3 and ML 4 road proposed for mixed use. Over 60 ROC volunteers collected traffic count data all summer long. The engineering analysis was prepared by ROC’s licensed professional traffic engineer (also a retired Forest Engineer) and met national mixed use analysis guidelines that were still in draft form at the time. The analysis was sent to the Regional Engineer and Director of

Engineering in the Washington Office since it was one of the first ones completed using the national guidelines for mixed use analysis. The Regional Engineer has not signed off on the analysis pending the submittal of additional information from the LNF. The Forest Service even insinuated the data was biased since the volunteers had a vested interest in manipulating it to achieve their end result. The Forest Service is still concerned about mixed use on passenger car roads. They have yet to acknowledge it is legal under the State vehicle code on unpaved ML 3 and 4 roads.

ROC prepared the nomination report for the Share the Dream Trail, which has not been approved. A road sign plan for Backcountry Discovery Trails was drafted and submitted to the regional office for review. This plan and a new discovery trail logo were approved as long as the signs are consistent with the MUTCD. ROC volunteers are ready to adopt the Lassen's discovery trail system and install road signs when the LNF purchases them.

The LNF received a State grant to prepare an interpretive driving guide for another discovery trail through the Forest. ROC volunteers reviewed and edited this guide. It has yet to be published and the grant funds will soon expire. ROC volunteers continue to help with numerous trail maintenance projects on the Forest from grooming snowmobile trails to restoring eroded OHV trails and blocking cross-country travel.

During the RDP, ROC submitted numerous routes for LNF staff to consider for designation. Very few of these routes were included in the Forest's October 25, 2007 Notice of Intent. In fact, only 37 miles of new OHV routes were proposed out of 1,137 miles that were inventoried (a mere 3 percent). Mixed use on passenger car roads (ML 3, 4, and 5) that link with the Forest's ML 2 road system are, for the most part, not being considered due to lack of staff and funds.

Volunteer services are not appreciated or used to the extent they could be if there was more reciprocity by LNF staff for providing access to desired OHV use areas. ROC's chairperson was even investigated by FS law enforcement in March 2008 for allegedly making threatening comments at a FS meeting. It is difficult to enlist volunteers when past history has shown many of their efforts have not been effective in influencing change and when proponents feel intimidated.

ROC would like the RDP to be a partnership with the Forest Service. The recommendations above are all reasonable and appropriate. Restricting future OHV travel on existing NFS passenger car roads in the Lassen National Forest and in other R5 national forests will create a tidal wave of resentment from users who are trying their best to work with the agency. It is a looming reality for every California national forest until regional direction is amended.

The Forest Service needs all the help it can get to maintain OHV trails and mixed use roads, sign them, prepare and print maps, solicit funds, and educate users. Each national forest should have an "Adopt a Trail" program composed of hundreds of motivated volunteers. They are out there. Many are highly skilled and some even have road maintenance equipment to assist the forests. RDP could and should be a springboard for collective action by both the agency and the users. ROC wants to assist northern California national forests with the RDP, but collaboration is a two way street. So far, they feel largely ignored.

Exhibit 1

Revised Regional Forester's Letter (draft)

File 7700/2350
Code:
Route
To:

Date: DRAFT

Subject: Motorized Mixed Use on NFS Roads

To: Region 5 Forest Supervisors

On August 21, 2006 and June 20, 2007, this office issued letters under file code 7700/2350 concerning Region 5 policy for motorized mixed use on NFS roads. This letter updates that policy relevant to the December 19, 2007 and February 20, 2008 letters from the California Highway Patrol (CHP). These letters clarify the operation of non-highway licensed vehicles on unpaved passenger car roads.

In his December 19, 2007 letter, the CHP Deputy Commissioner concludes: "It was never our intent to imply that the USFS could not designate their ML 3 roads for legal off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. We are not familiar with all the ML 3 Forest Service roadways, but if they are gravel or other dirt or unpaved roads that have been operating as mixed use roads for years, it is our belief these roads would fall under the 'roughly graded trails and roads upon which vehicular travel by the public is permitted' portion of Section 38001 and would, therefore, be eligible for your mixed-use definition." VC 38001 states: "For purposes of this division, the term 'highway' does not include fire trails, logging roads, service roads regardless of surface composition, or other roughly graded trails and roads upon which vehicular travel by the public is permitted."

CHP's February 20, 2008 letter states: "The intent of my December 19, 2007 correspondence was to impress upon the Forest Service, that they have the authority to designate their roads appropriately, following their mandated route designation process." In addition, the CHP letter cites Forest Service Handbook 7709.58, which says "the distinction between maintenance levels is not always sharply defined. Some parameters overlap two or more different maintenance levels."

Region 5 policy is to operate the road system under our jurisdiction in compliance with State law. Given CHP's two recent letters, maintenance levels are not useful indicators of whether non-highway legal vehicles may operate on NFS passenger car roads under State law. A more appropriate indicator is road surface type and the road definitions in Section 38001 of the California Vehicle Code. We have determined it is legal for non-highway vehicles to operate on all unpaved NFS roads. The use of non-highway legal vehicles on NFS paved roads must conform to State law. Mixed use designations that conflict with State law should only be proposed where they are needed for public access and to meet Forest Plan goals (route designation) consistent with the 2005 Travel Management Rule.

Please follow these revised guidelines for mixed use analysis.

1. Qualified Engineer: Motorized mixed use guidance requires an engineering analysis be performed by a qualified engineer prior to designation of NFS roads for mixed use. Region 5 policy on designation of qualified engineers for performing mixed use analysis is:

A. Unpaved Mixed Use Roads Maintained for High Clearance Vehicles and Unpaved Mixed Use Roads Maintained for Passenger Cars

The Director of Engineering will designate individuals on a Forest who have the skills necessary to perform mixed use analysis at the Forest Supervisor's request. Forest Supervisors should provide the Director with a narrative describing how the individuals meet the WO guidelines for qualified engineers.

B. Paved Roads Maintained for Passenger Cars

The Director of Engineering will retain the qualified engineer designation in the Regional Office for NFS paved roads. Forest Supervisors proposing mixed use designation on paved roads maintained for passenger cars or in conflict with State law will respond to items 1 through 8 in the Regional Forester's August 21, 2006 letter. Submit the engineering analysis to the Director of Engineering for review.

2. Motorized Mixed Use Analysis:

A. Consistent with the proposed directives, the July 10, 2006 WO letter, and the WO "Guidelines For Engineering Analysis Of Motorized Mixed Use On National Forest System Roads" (EM-7700-30), motorized mixed use analysis is not required when all the following conditions are met:

- 1) The proposed designation is consistent with State and local law.
- 2) The road being considered for designation currently has motorized mixed use.
- 3) There is no documented crash history involving motorized mixed use on the road or similar roads in the vicinity (from EM-7700-30).

Even when the above three conditions apply, documentation of engineering judgment without a full engineering report is subject to the discretion of the qualified engineer. The qualified engineer shall document the above facts and include documentation in the route designation project record. Use the "engineering judgment form" in the Mixed Use Guide with a statement in the comment field that the road(s) meet the conditions above and a mixed use analysis was not performed. No NEPA analysis is needed for National Forest System roads and current motor vehicle uses on those roads unless changes in travel management are proposed.

B. For roads that do not meet the conditions listed above:

- 1) Perform motorized mixed use analysis when:
 - a) The road is currently paved, maintained for passenger cars, and the proposed lowering of the maintenance level would allow non-highway licensed vehicles to operate on the road legally under State law. (Such as lowering a ML 5 paved road to a unpaved ML 3 or 4 road).

- b) There is a proposal to allow motorized mixed-use on a road where motorized mixed-use is currently prohibited under State law.
- c) Crashes involving motorized mixed use have been documented.
- d) Based on other available information, the qualified engineer determines that performing mixed use analysis is appropriate.

3. Completion of Motorized Mixed-Use Analysis:

Motorized mixed use analysis required above must be completed prior to issuing a Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM).

4. Authorizing Motorized Mixed Use:

Only the responsible official may authorize motorized mixed use. Consult with the Regional Forester prior to authorizing motorized mixed use on paved roads where it is currently prohibited under State law.

RANDY MOORE
Regional Forester

cc: George Kulick
Marlene Finley
Kathy Mick
Colleen O'Brien
Gary Lybrand
pdl r5 forest engineers
pdl r5 rec officers
pdl r5 route designation
Robert H Shuker

Author Biographies

Sylvia Milligan, Chair
Recreation Outdoors Coalition
4000 Beacon Drive
Anderson, CA 96007

The mission of the coalition is to promote responsible access, multiple-use, good stewardship, tolerance and safety for those recreating on our public lands. We are committed to supporting the federal policies and directives while promoting recreational access for the American public.

ROC works with many North State clubs including the following:

Backcountry 4x4 Club
Volcano Riders Snowmobile Club
Butte Meadows Snowmobile Club
Lake Almanor Snowmobile Club
North State Snowchasers
Sierra-Cascade Snowmobile Club
Redding Sno-Riders Snowmobile Club
LaPorte Snowmobile Club
Mt. Shasta Snowmobile Club
Feather Falls Snowmobile Club
Shasta Rock Rollers (quad Club)
Redding Dirt Riders
Shasta County Sportsmen Club
Shasta Miners Association
Paradise Ridge Rider
Rolling Thunder Off-road Club
Black Sheep 4x4 Club
Redding 4 Wheel Drive Club

ROC also provides countless hours of volunteer work through their member clubs and organizations. Below is a partial list of projects our volunteers have been involved in over the past three years:

- Trash pickup and trail maintenance at the Chappie OHV Area (BLM)
- OSV Trail maintenance in all areas of the Lassen NF (brushing out, hazard tree removal)
- Summer long traffic counts for the proposed Share the Dream Trail in the Lassen NF
- Engineering analysis for the proposed Share the Dream Trail in the Lassen NF
- Preparation of the nomination report and NEPA for the proposed Share the Dream Trail
- Preparation of a regional road sign plan for backcountry discovery trails
- Clean up, sign repair and trail maintenance in High Lakes OHV Area in the Lassen NF
- Brushing out cross-country ski and hiking trails in the Mineral area, Lassen NF

- Installing snowmobile route markers in the Lassen NF
- Reviewing and editing the Lassen NF winter recreation map
- Preparing the Lassen's winter recreation sign plan and researching several vendors to purchase signs
- Posting and maintaining recreation (locator) signs along the trails for all winter snowmobile areas, Lassen NF
- Volunteer grooming of trails from all snowmobile trailheads on the Lassen, Plumas, and Shasta-Trinity NFs
- Reviewing and commenting on the construction plans for two new snowmobile trailheads in the Lassen NF
- Cleaning restrooms at campgrounds and trailheads
- Cutting trees and removing rocks from forest roads
- Removing culverts and rocking stream crossings for watershed restoration
- Blocking cross-country ski trails with rocks, trees, etc. to prevent motorized access
- Blocking cross-country travel to eliminate unauthorized OHV routes
- Removing appliances, household trash, and litter from forest land
- Reviewing and editing the Lassen Backcountry Discovery Trail interpretive driving guide
- Partnering with forests to complete a backcountry discovery trail on the Plumas NF
- Riding with FS employees to look at potential discovery trail routes, and securing support for the project from elected officials
- Hundreds of hours working on the Route Designation Process on the Lassen, Plumas and Shasta-Trinity NFs
- Submitting letters of support for grant applications for projects on the Lassen, Plumas and Shasta-Trinity NFs
- Lobbying for State grant funds for forest recreation projects and law enforcement efforts
- Securing positions on two county Resource Advisory Committees to promote forest health and facility improvements in a variety of recreation sites
- Working with forest watershed teams to protect resources
- Attending numerous meetings and field reviews with FS staff to coordinate projects and volunteer work

Sylvia Milligan graduated from Chico State University with honors. She is a retired school teacher after spending 23 years teaching all facets of education. Sylvia is actively involved in the following organizations:

Chairperson, Recreation Outdoors Coalition
 Northern California Region Director, California-Nevada Snowmobile Association
 Board Member: Sierra Access Coalition
 Member: Shasta County Resource Advisory Committee
 Member: State Winter Recreation Committee
 Alternate member – State Recreation Resource Advisory Committee

For the past 15 years, Sylvia has worked with the four county boards of supervisors, elected officials, and both State and federal agencies in this area on recreational issues. She has successfully lobbied for hundreds of thousands of dollars for the federal agencies in northern California. She has also traveled to Washington, DC and the State capitol a number of times to lobby for recreational issues.

Since the beginning of the Route Designation Process in Region 5, Sylvia has spent hundreds of hours on the ground looking at potential routes to provide sustainable OHV opportunities for the public on the national forests in northern California. She has worked with many individuals and clubs explaining the process and looking at their routes to present to the forests.

Sylvia has arranged countless hours of volunteer support for any type of service needed ranging from trail maintenance to summer-long traffic studies. She is not compensated in any way for her time or expenses.

H. Richard Tatman retired after a Forest Service career of 34 years. During that time he served on several forests in Region 5, working in all phases of engineering, from reconnaissance to construction, as Assistant Forest Engineer. Dick finished his career as Forest Engineer on the Lassen NF, the position he held when he retired in 1991. In this position he received the Regional Engineer of the Year award in 1989. He also had two tours in the Regional Office. During the first tour, as Regional Planning Engineer, he was a member of the WO Transportation Analysis Group at PSW, prepared and implemented R5 Traffic Surveillance Guidance and was the Engineering representative on the Regional RARE 2 team.

On the second tour as Regional Transportation Analyst Staff Engineer, Dick was a member of the National team drafting the Transportation Planning Handbook. He developed and implemented the Route Analyst Certification Program, conducted transportation plan training in five Regions and was a core team member for the Regional Land Management Planning Guide preparation.

Dick has a Bachelor's Degree in Civil Engineering from Chico State University and is a California Registered Traffic Engineer. He has been an active volunteer in roads, trails, winter and summer recreation programs for several years and is a member of the Recreation Outdoor Coalition board. In 2000 and 2005, Dick received recognition as the National Retiree Volunteer of the Year for his work on the Lassen and Plumas NF's Backcountry Discovery Trails.

Robert W. Andrews holds a degree in forestry from the University of Minnesota. He is a member of the national Honorary Forestry Society, Xi Sigma Phi. He is a certified forester with the Society of American Foresters and retired in July 2007 after a 35 year career with the Forest Service. During his career, Bob worked on the Superior, Ottawa, Medicine Bow, Lassen, and Green Mountain National Forests as well as in the Washington Office. He became a District Ranger in 1981 on the Middlebury District, Green Mountain National Forest. He served 18 years as the District Ranger on the

Eagle Lake District, Lassen National Forest, prior to his retirement. This District had a reputation for teamwork and leadership in forest restoration, especially aspen and biomass/fuels treatments.

As a District Ranger, Bob was a strong supporter of recreation improvements and customer service. During his tenure, the Lassen NF constructed the first campground with RV hook-ups on his District to better respond to customer demand. Three new snowmobile trailheads, a highly popular paved, non-motorized trail, and a major boat launch were constructed. He led the construction of Camp Ronald McDonald at Eagle Lake, which serves children with special needs or from low income families.

Bob received numerous performance awards for his leadership, teamwork, and program accomplishments during his career. He and his family are currently developing a ranch outside Susanville.

Elizabeth Norton retired in January 2008 after a 31 year career with the Forest Service. During her federal career she worked on the Superior National Forest in Minnesota, the Ottawa National Forest in Michigan, the Plumas and Lassen National Forests in California, the Green Mountain National Forest in Vermont, and in the Washington Office. She served as the Public Services Officer for the Lassen National Forest in Susanville for 15 years (1993-2008). In this position, she provided program leadership for recreation, wilderness, trails, interpretation, special uses, heritage resources, land management planning (including route designation), geographic information systems, NEPA, lands, minerals, partnerships, grants, and agreements. Elizabeth and her team secured millions of dollars in grant funds to support the Lassen's recreation and trails programs to enhance visitor services. Significant recreation and trail facility improvements were completed.

During her Forest Service career, Elizabeth served on the regional NEPA/Forest Plan Implementation training cadre for several years, national task force for developing the agency's Recreation Agenda, national taskforce for appeals and litigation, and regional taskforce for developing and implementing the R5 recreation strategy. She has received numerous national, regional and Forest Supervisor performance awards in recognition of her leadership in grants, agreements, community partnerships, NEPA, forest planning, and recreation management.

Elizabeth holds a bachelor's degree in Spanish and a master's degree in Forest Management from Syracuse University in New York. She resides in Susanville where she and her husband manage a ranch. They enjoy wilderness hiking, camping, canoeing, skiing, and four-wheeling. Elizabeth is an active volunteer with the Recreation Outdoor Coalition promoting outdoor recreation in the North State. She is a board member with the Lassen Park Foundation, a non-profit that raises funds to implement projects on the Lassen National Forest and Lassen Volcanic National Park.