



## Plumas NF OSV plan Comment Highlights



### How to comment

Online: <https://cara.ecosystem-management.org/Public/CommentInput?Project=47124>

Comments may be mailed, delivered, or faxed to:

Plumas National Forest,

Attn: Katherine Carpenter

159 Lawrence Street,

Quincy, CA 95971 (Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., FAX (530) 283-7746)

### Pacific Crest Trail (PCT)

The PCT Management Plan mentions non-motorized buffer zones and designated crossings only if the trail is managed for xc skiing and snowshoeing. That includes signs, plowed parking and trail markers visible above the snowline. The Plumas does NOT do this, so designating buffers and crossings is not consistent with the management plan. The plan also states that language relating to corridors or zones should be removed from the national and scenic trails act with specific regards to the PCT.

### Minimum Snow Depth Requirements

The Plumas must definite adequate *snow cover* for OSV use to occur. We all know that snow has far too much variability to use a hard depth number to define this. Tell the Plumas to define it as follows:

Adequate snow cover is defined by a layer of dense, packed snow, or deeper fresh snow sufficient to support your vehicle, and prevent damage to forest resources. Remind them that minimum snow depth requirements are not in their Forest Management Plan.

### Elevation as management prescription

If adequate snow cover exists, elevation is irrelevant. Tell them there is no need to cut off designated areas below a given elevation. Tell them this is redundant and only serves to unnecessarily limit OSV opportunities. There is no such thing as a 'normal' snow year any more, and elevations with adequate snow cover vary widely from storm to storm

### Contact is not 'conflict'

Skiers and snowshoers interact and cross paths with snowmobilers all the time. Let the Plumas know that 'conflict' is a subjective interpretation of an interaction, not a given assumption whenever user groups interact. Tell the Plumas not to grant a private wish list in the form of a management plan to a small vocal minority who just want snowmobiles removed from the forest.

The DEIS states that the Plumas must minimize conflicts between classes of vehicles. This is a holdover from summer travel management and has no basis in winter vehicle use. Snowmobiles, snowbikes, groomers and tracked quads or side by sides do not conflict with one another. Tell them there is no need to designate classes of Over Snow Vehicles by 50" width.

### Lake Davis

The Plumas is proposing to limit OSV use by Lake Davis citing Bald Eagle protection zones as part of their management plan. The Bald Eagle has been listed as a species of least concern for over a decade now. Tell the Plumas they need to issue a forest plan amendment to bring their out of date Forest Management Plan up to date with current regulations.

### **Jamison Creek**

The Plumas is proposing to close the areas around Jamison, Rock and Grass Lakes due to the drainage being 'eligible for Wild and Scenic River designation'. The Wild and Scenic Rivers act was enacted as a response to the widespread massive dam construction occurring in America in the 50's and 60's. Not only does Jamison Lake have an impoundment (dam), this trickle of a seasonal creek is no danger whatsoever of becoming the next big hydroelectricpower project. Tell the Plumas that they are abusing the spirit of the act, and that OSV use in no way shape or form threatens the wild or scenic character of Jamison Creek.

Jamison Creek, Florentine Canyon, Smith Lake, the north face of Mt Elwell are also designated as RX8 (semi primitive non-motorized). The RX8 guidance specifically states "Allow no motorized travel except over-the-snow and management access". Tell them that closing these areas would violate their own Forest Plan.

### **McRae Meadow**

The Plumas claims claiming closing this area is to protect aquatic species. Remind them that OSVs travel on snow, not water-bound wildlife.

### **Mt Fillmore**

The Plumas is proposing to close All of Mt Fillmore. This area is designated in the forest plan as "minimal management" RX7 which has no mention of recreational use. The Plumas claims this closure is to maintain a botanical special interest area for 2 rare plant species. Over Snow Vehicles travel on snow, not plants. Tell the Plumas this area has long-standing historical OSV use that has not degraded these plant species. The Plumas also has Mt Fillmore designated in their Forest Plan as a cattle allotment. Remind them that snowmobiles are less of a threat to plant species than cattle.

### **Bucks Lake Area**

Bucks Lake Wilderness represents just under 24,000 quiet, non-motorized acres immediately accessible from the plowed parking area on Bucks Lake road. Yet the Plumas is Proposing to also close the Clear Creek/Black Gulch area to enhance non-motorized recreation. Remind the Plumas that their own Forest Plan designates this area as "roaded modified" and that quiet recreation is abundantly available just up the road. Tell them to leave Black Gulch open from the East side of the Wilderness boundary to Silver Lake Road.

### **Thompson Peak**

The DEIS states that Thompson Peak is the only easily accessible backcountry skiing area the Janesville Susanville Area. The entire eastern escarpment is easily accessible backcountry skiing. The Plumas plan fails to recognize Janesville Grade/County Rd 208 as a public, non-Forest Service right of way. Tell them this route should be designated and that the backcountry skiing terrain is not where snowmobilers ride. The backside of Thompson peak should be designated as open.

### **Dixie Mountain**

The Proposal closes all of Dixie mountain due to a potential botanical special interest area to protect Bailey's Ivesia. Remind the Plumas that his plant is a non-native, non-threatened species that grows in vertical volcanic cliff faces where OSVs do not travel. Where the plant may be in soils, remind them that they've defined adequate snow cover to protect the species. Tell them that Routes 24N02Y and 24N64 in the summer motor vehicle use map need to be designated OSV trails.

### **Grizzly Ridge**

Grizzly Ridge is designated as a potential Roadless Area and as semi-primitive RX8. The Roadless management direction in the Forest Plan simply states that no roads be constructed. Remind the Plumas that OSVs travel on snow and do not need roads. Tell them that OSV use here does not conflict with their designation. RX8 specifically states Allow no motorized travel except over-the-snow and management access". Tell them that closing this area. would violate their own Forest Plan.