HRSP Road and Trail Management Plan

Stakeholder Meeting 6: Agencies

12/7/2010

6 attendees

Questions and comments

Any roads in park now that will be decommissioned (besides unutilized)?

- -Not there yet, no proposal
- -General plan says road above Weott supposed to be removed (road to trail conversion)

Fire management

- -Decommissioning roads makes it harder to manage fires (ex. Canoe Fire)
 - -park vulnerable to fire due to lightning and visitor access to backcountry
 - -Peavine needs to stay
- -If new trails put in and the public can access an area of the park, then CalFire wants/needs a road for vehicle access for fire control
- -Bull Creek drainage mostly inaccessible for fire access
- -Perimeter Rd connects into Greig Rd, but there is a spot where road does not continue onto Chapman's property. There was talk of connecting with Chapman's roads for fire suppression, but Chapman shut down.

Where at in the process/ what do we want out of this meeting?

- -Informal information seeking and input
- -Identify opportunities and constraints

Connections outside park

- -Consider connections between Gilham Butte properties and possibly others to the west
- -Save the Redwoods League's Redwoods to the Sea
- -Do not need a specific route in the plan, but can say something about connecting to Gilham Butte lands to the west in the future as a placeholder in the plan
- -Possibilities for connections between Sinkyone, Humboldt Redwoods and King Range

Concerns about putting trails through old growth or even mature growth, especially murrelet habitat

- -DFG recommends no new trails through old growth or mature growth
- -USFWS main issue is also old growth and murrelet habitat
- -may need incidental take permit
- permitting process is a constraint to be aware of
 - -depends on trail location and likelihood of take
- -DFG needs to know what the plan will eventually encompass, especially regarding old growth -specific routes and locations
 - -concerns not just about incidental take during construction, but also intrusion of the route through habitat

-may need habitat conservation plan, can take a long time (up to 2 years)

Considering camps/ facilities?

- -Not specifically, but will consider environmental camps and campgrounds that already exist
- -General plan calls for no increase in hardened surface (no new campgrounds unless others are removed)

Fisheries issues?

- -permits for crossings
- -no improvements before fixing problems
 - -currently, no culvert/fish passage issues known. Possibly some CalTrans (email list if so).
- -water diversion?
 - -routine grading uses water trucks, pulls water out of creeks (needs permit)
 - -any new backcountry troughs for horses would be considered water diversion
 - -in general, get into compliance with fish and game codes, require 1600 permit
 - -size of pump, rate of diversion and screening all have new requirements (email to Jay and Brian)
 - -fire fighting still exempt?
 - -not always, depends on size of fire
- -more input to come

Any new developments to state rd 254 needs encroachment permits

-CalTrans concern is safety and good visibility

Mountain bike groups

- -BLM experience is they are very willing to help and want places to go
 - -have a lot to gain by working with them
 - -were an invisible user group to BLM for some time, although they were there
- -treadwear issues on new BLM trails relatively non existant (some issues along about 100 feet of trail perhaps)

Lots of illegal ATV use on Look, Peavine, Grasshopper and Squaw

Bull Creek paving is nice