

Trail Program
Hoosier National Forest

April 8, 2002

Abstract: This document serves as a trail implementation and management plan to identify forest trail policy and guide future trail development.

Submitted by: /s/Les Wadzinski Date 4/8/02
LES WADZINSKI
Recreation Program Manager

Reviewed by: /s/Brad Lidell Date 4/8/02
BRAD LIDELL
Forest Engineer

Approved by: /s/James E. Denoncour Date 4/9/02
JAMES E. DENONCOUR
Tell City and Brownstown District Ranger

Approved by: /s/Kenneth G. Day Date 4/9/02
KENNETH G. DAY
Forest Supervisor

For more information contact:

Les Wadzinski, Recreation Program Manager
Hoosier National Forest
811 Constitution Avenue
Bedford, IN 47421
Office: 812-275-5987
FAX: 812-279-3423
TDD: 812-275-8717

Table of Contents

List of Tables	i
Introduction.....	1
Trail Policy.....	1
General.....	1
Use Type	2
Monitoring and Inspections	2
Maintenance	2
Construction.....	3
Standards	3
Marking.....	4
Information.....	4
Regulations	5
Trailheads.....	5
Documentation.....	5
Use of Roads	5
Cross Forest Trails	6
Special Use Permit Trails.....	6
New Trail Proposals.....	7
Implementation Schedule.....	7
USDA Forest Service Participants	9
References Cited	10
Appendix A: Public Comments from Trail Review Letter	11
Appendix B: Suggested Trail Inspection Checklist	29
Appendix C: Special Use Permit Trail Criteria	30
Appendix D: Trail Summary	31

List of Tables

Table 1: Supplemental Trail Standard	3
Table 2: Implementation Schedule of Possible Trail Projects	7

Introduction

This document is an implementation and management plan for the trail program on the Hoosier National Forest. It updates the previous plans of August 3, 1995 and December 12, 1997. The purpose of this document is to provide specific guidance for the management of trails on the Hoosier National Forest and supplements the general guidance found in the Land and Resource Management Plan (USDA 1991).

It is emphasized that this is *not* a decision document, and represents no commitment on the part of the Forest Service to implement any proposals appearing herein. This program will be implemented to the extent that resources allow. The reader is cautioned that outside influences such as funding, staffing, and environmental factors may at times affect the forest's ability to implement the program. New trails listed in Table 2 must each be analyzed on their own merit, and will be subject to review required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). They may or may not be implemented.

This program represents the results of ten years of ongoing contact with the public concerning the use of trails on the Hoosier National Forest. The 1995 and 1997 versions of this program were written after an extensive public involvement effort that occurred from February 1992 through March 1994. Two citizen's task forces made recommendations that were presented to the public for additional comment through mailings and open houses. The Forest Plan was amended in June 1994 to reflect this new guidance. Over the years forest managers continued to meet with user groups, sponsored open houses, and in the Fall of 2000 sponsored a series of trails workshops for the public and Hoosier National Forest staff. Based on input from those workshops and ongoing public contact, the forest suggested changes to the trail program. These suggestions were mailed to 2,326 interested users for comment.

Other sources were also consulted to determine use and demand. The State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (Indiana Department of Natural Resources 2001) and a social assessment (Welch *et al.* 2001) provided useful data as well as information compiled by forest staff (Wadzinski 2001 and 2002).

This public input and use and demand information was considered, and this document was developed to update the trail program to reflect the current needs and conditions regarding trails.

Trail Policy

General

The forest trail policy is twofold: 1) provide quality trail opportunities year around to as many users as possible, and 2) adequately protect forest resources while providing these opportunities.

Use Type

The Hoosier National Forest will provide the greatest number of trail miles to the most user groups by allowing most trails to be used together by hikers, horse riders, and mountain bikers. This policy is based on the fact that Indiana has only 4% of its land base in public ownership, and large blocks of public land are very rare. There is simply not much land available to construct long distance trails for each user group. Two options are possible: users could have single use trails but with fewer trails and trail miles, or they could have more trails and trail miles with hike/bike/horse use. During the public involvement process in 1992-1994, most trail users preferred to share the trails in the interest of having more trail miles available. The ban on off road vehicle use remains.

Monitoring and inspections

As resources allow, trails are inspected once annually and after major storm events. A suggested checklist is provided in Appendix B.

Use is monitored as resources allow. Options include trail counters, parking lot counts, and record keeping of visual observations by forest staff.

The soil scientist randomly selects sites for monitoring and may at times include trails.

Public comment regarding trails are recorded and reviewed by forest staff. Comments are obtained from phone calls, public meetings, and customer comment cards.

Results from monitoring are reported in the annual Hoosier National Forest Monitoring Plan.

Maintenance

Maintenance is performed based on the results of the monitoring effort.

Minor maintenance includes clearing blowdowns, brushing, cleaning or replacing drainage control structures, marker replacement, spot gravelling, and litter removal.

Heavy maintenance includes the use of construction equipment to install or reshape drainage devices, establishing the trail tread, and installing gravel. (Mechanical equipment is not allowed in the Deam Wilderness in which case hand crews are used). The grade of gravel used is the finest mix possible that will withstand the expected use and slope, generally grade 73 or finer.

Construction

New trail construction consists of the following steps: approval in this trail document, NEPA analysis, funding, layout and design by engineering staff, and construction.

Standards

Maintenance and construction standards shall be in accordance with Forest Service Handbook 2309.18 and is supplemented by those found in Table 1. These standards have not changed from the 1997 version of this document. The Forest Plan allows four trail classes, however, experience has shown that two of these classes are most appropriate for the current trail system. Wilderness trails fall into the rugged class; all other forest trails fall in the moderate class.

Table 1, Supplemental Trail Standards

Trail Class	Easy	Moderate	Mod/Rugged	Rugged
Definition	Heavy use, wide, short, in or near developed recreation areas	Heavy use, wide, long, little chance for solitude	Light use narrow, long, some chance for solitude	Light use, narrow, long, chance for solitude, wilderness
Clearing Height	10'	10'	10'	10'
Clearing Width	10'	10'	6'	6'
Construction Tread Width	8'	8'	1-3'	2'
Maintained Tread width	5'	5'	2-3'	2'
Tread & Crossing Materials	Natural or synthetic	Natural when possible, blend synthetics with surroundings	Dirt, gravel, or native rock, timbers or rough appearing lumber	
Tread Stability	Goal: sink no more than 4"			
Grade	6% recommended; 10% allowed; 15-18% for 300' with approval			

Marking

Currently a variety of systems are in place and include the following: brown plastic posts with decals, colored plastic discs and diamonds on trees, colored stenciled blazes on trees, and wooden routed signs. The forest will move to the following system for consistency as resources allow:

Non-wilderness trail markers

- * Use stenciled blazes on trees as reassurance markers, and color-coded for use type.
- * Use plastic posts or signs with arrow decals at intersections, points of confusion, or where trees are unavailable.
- * At major entry points to a trail system, use the yield courtesy sign and plastic post with decals indicating type of use allowed on that trail. Single use trails will not need the yield sign.
- * As resources allow, use “you are here” maps at intersections and entry points. Trails may be numbered and or named.

* Color coding:

Bike/hike/horse	blue
Horse/hike	red
Bike/hike	yellow
Hike	white

Note: connector trails on German Ridge and Two Lakes Loop are orange.

Wilderness trail markers

- * Use wooden routed signs at entry points and points of confusion.
- * Trails may be numbered and or named.

Information

The public is made aware of trail opportunities through Recreation Opportunity Guides (ROGs), the forest web site, and the Trails Illustrated map.

At least one trailhead on each trail (with the exception of short interpretive or hiking trails) contain a bulletin board with the following information: rules and regulations, the location and number of the nearest emergency phone, a trail ROG showing the map, information about the recreation fee demonstration program, and other user ethics messages. ROGs may be dispensed.

Directional signs from major highways to trailheads are in place where possible. The forest is working to improve signage to trailheads.

Regulations

The following summarizes current regulations regarding trail use:

Horses and bicycles must stay on designated trails. Hikers may hike anywhere.

Horses are not allowed in trailheads for trails that do not allow horses. Bicycles are allowed in any trailhead, but may not use the trail itself if it is not designated for bicycle use.

Other means of transport such as wagons, buggies, and motorized vehicles are not allowed on trails or any National Forest System (NFS) lands except on legal roads.

Horse and bike riders 17 years of age or older must purchase a trail permit under the provisions of the recreation fee demonstration program.

Trailheads

Trailheads generally consist of a graveled lot, SA 1 sign, and bulletin board.

Five horsecamps (Blackwell, Hickory Ridge, Shirley Creek, Youngs Creek, and German Ridge) also double as trailheads and provide day use parking for any user type allowed on that trail.

Trailheads that are not horsecamps do not provide restrooms or trash receptacles.

Documentation

Trails are included in the USDA Forest Service's inventory control system known as INFRA. Costs, past work, structures such as culverts, and future needs are identified by trail number and mile post.

All trail routes are mapped with GPS. Distances have been determined using an ATV odometer (with the exception of the wilderness). That method has been determined to be more accurate than GPS when determining distances on hilly terrain.

Use of Roads

All weather roads are not considered part of the trail system. An all weather road is defined as a regularly traveled road passable by a sedan. At their own discretion, and within local laws, users may make their own connections between trails using such road as a link.

Users are advised of this precaution on the ROGs.

Cross-Forest Trails

Two opportunities exist for trails that cross the Hoosier National Forest: the cross-country American Discovery Trail (ADT) and the cross-state Knobstone Trail.

The forest has cooperated with the ADT and has allowed marking on Mogan Ridge East and West, Tipsaw, and Two Lakes Loop trails. Users of the ADT must comply with the use type of the particular trail segment they are using. Most of the ADT that is within the Hoosier National Forest purchase boundaries is routed on roads. ADT volunteers are responsible for marking. ADT volunteers are required to obtain permission before marking or completing other work on NFS lands.

The Knobstone Trail is administered by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources and currently ends south of NFS land near Brownstown, IN. The forest will consider cooperating on this trail if and when the Department of Natural Resources is able to acquire property or right-of-ways that would enable the trail to reach NFS lands. It is expected that the forest would use the existing routes for the Nebo, Fork Ridge, and D Trails, with a possible tie in to the Department of Natural Resources' Tecumseh Trail to the north.

Other cross-forest trails proposed by other government agencies will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Special Areas

A "special area" is an area with unique value and is identified in the Forest Plan. Forest Plan guidance states that trails and other developments in special areas must be consistent with protecting the unique values for which the area was designated. Management plans are developed for each special area, and determine which types of uses are acceptable. If a management plan for a particular special area allows trails, they may be considered. Some areas do not yet have plans completed. In those cases no trails will be considered until the management plan is completed and trails are found to be acceptable.

Special Use Permit Trails

A special use permit trail is a trail that an adjacent landowner could build and maintain on National Forest System land for the purpose of legally accessing a nearby trail system. A fee is charged for this permit. Restrictions and other details may be found in Appendix C.

To date, the demand for special use permit trails has been manageable. To prepare for the possibility that more numerous requests are received in the future, the forest plans to investigate methodologies to limit the number of commercial operations on each trail. Special use permit trail guidelines may be amended pending that outcome.

New Trail Proposals

Many new trail proposals were received in response to the scoping process for this document. Each was analyzed and the Forest Service response is described in Appendix A. Those with merit were adopted and are listed in Table 2. No additional proposals will be considered unless some change of conditions warrants it. The purpose of this policy is to allow forest managers the opportunity to look at the trail program in the context of the “big picture”. Prior to this approach, the forest would receive numerous requests for new trails from a variety of user groups in a variety of locations. It was difficult to conduct trail planning when the frequent inflow of new requests constantly changed the situation. By periodically looking at the trail program as a whole, forest managers can do a better job of planning, and allocate scarce resources to the right places at the right time.

Trails are also limited by density per Forest Plan guidance. The current density and forest trail summary information can be found in Appendix D.

Implementation Schedule

Future trail and trailhead projects are being considered based on public input for this document. Implementation of these proposals is dependent upon funding, staffing, and the results of environmental analyses. Table 2 summarizes possible projects that would add significant facilities to the trail program. Maintenance, rehabilitation, and other routine projects are not listed here.

Table 2, Implementation Schedule of Possible Projects

Project	Target Fiscal Year	Miles (approximate)	Status/notes
Complete Springs Valley multiple use trail	2002	10.8	Under construction
Complete Deam Wilderness trail reroutes	2002	1.5	Under construction
Stock water at horsecamps	2002-2004		Investigating possibilities
Install parking lot at Pioneer Mothers Highway 150 entrance, make part of trail accessible	2002	1.0	Analysis underway
Bring old Buzzards Roost hiking trail back on line	2002	1.0	Maintenance underway
Construct Pate Hollow hiking trail	2003-2004	4.0	

Project	Target Fiscal Year	Miles (approximate)	Status/notes
Construct short loop connectors at Lick Creek trail and Youngs Creek trail	2004-2005	1.0	
Construct Shirley Creek North multiple use trail	2004-2006	11.0	
Construct Tincher hiking trail	2006-2007	14.0	
Connect to Knobstone or Tecumseh trails		unknown	Waiting on DNR to acquire land or rights-of-way
Construct Shirley Creek West multiple use trail		10-20	Construct if demand warrants; need to acquire land

USDA Forest Service Participants

Lester Wadzinski – Recreation Program Manager, Team Leader

B.S. Recreation, Indiana University, 1973

M.S. Recreation Resource Management, Slippery Rock University, 1983

Russ Christensen – Civil Engineering Technician

A.A. Forestry Tech, College of Redwoods, 1972

Kim Earney – Civil Engineering Technician

A.A. Drafting Technical, Chadron State College, Nebraska, 1976

Brad Lidell – Civil Engineer, Engineering & Information Resources Program Manager

B.S. Civil Engineering, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1982

Pat Merchant – Soil Scientist

B.S. Agronomy, Iowa State University, 1968

Dave Morris – Forestry Technician (Recreation)

A.S. Conservation Law Enforcement, Vincennes University, 1977

Sue Peterson – Civil Engineer, Transportation Specialist

B.S. Agricultural Engineering, University of Illinois, 1979

Professional Engineer, State of Indiana 1991

Eric Sandeno – Outdoor Recreation Planner/Wilderness Manager

B.S. Recreation Resources Management, Oregon State University, 1992

Regis Terney – Forest Planner

B.S. Forest Science, Penn State University, 1974

Bruce Whittredge – Lead Forestry Technician (Recreation)

Continuing Education Courses, California State University, Sacramento, Colorado State University, and Indiana University

References Cited

Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Outdoor Recreation. 2000. Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan 2000-2004. Indianapolis, IN, 212 p.

Merchant, Pat. 2002. Memorandum to Les Wadzinski dated April 8, 2002 (File code 2550). Hoosier National Forest, Bedford, IN. 1 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1991. Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 2309.18 - Trails Management.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1991. Plan Amendment, Hoosier National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. 90 p.

Wadzinski, Les. 2001. Trail use data from trail permit sales. Memorandum to file dated December 14, 2000 (file code 2350). Hoosier National Forest, Bedford, IN. 4 p.

Wadzinski, Les. 2002. Estimation of horse and bike trail use for CY 2001. Memorandum to file dated January 22, 2002 (file code 2350). Hoosier National Forest, Bedford, IN. 4 p.

Welch, David; Croissant, Cynthia; Evans, Tom; Ostrom, Elinor. 2001. A Social Assessment of the Hoosier National Forest. Center for the Study of Institutions, Populations, and Environmental Change. Indiana University. Bloomington, IN. 84 p.

Appendix A

Summary of Responses to 1/12/01 Trail Review Letter

This document is a summary of public response to the Hoosier National Forest trail review letter of January 12, 2001. The Forest mailed the letter to 2,326 interested trail users as a follow up to three public workshops held during the Fall of 2000. That letter summarized the results of those workshops, offered suggestions for changes to the existing trail program, and asked the public to provide comments regarding those suggestions.

Thirty-three responses were received in the form of letters, phone calls, e-mail messages, and personal meetings. Each response was assigned a number to identify the respondent and track the comments. If the respondent commented as a representative of an organization, then that organization's name is noted.

Section 1 summarizes proposals for new trails. In that summary, a "P" indicates a proposal, and "R" indicates the USDA Forest Service response.

Section 2 summarizes comments and suggestions. In that summary, a "C" indicates a comment, and "R" indicates the USDA Forest Service response.

The source of the comment or proposal is indicated by number in parenthesis. Like comments were grouped together.

The following list identifies those who responded:

Name	Organization Represented	Response #
Altringer, Linda	Midwest Trail Ride	3
Anderson, Frances		15
Bright, Dan Hofstetter, Rick	Story Inn	26
Brown, Denzil		18
Brown, Jason and Jerry		20
Bussabarger, Harold		33
Dawes, Karen	Hoosier Horsemen	4
Dorsett, Kerry and Brian		21
Dowell, Gary		13
Duffy, Betty		6
Frisinger, Charles, S.	Hoosier Hikers Council	30
Gilliat, Lynn	Orange County Saddle Club	25
Homoya, Michael A.	Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Nature Preserves	11
Kautz, Brian		12
Kendall, Myra		22
Landis, D		27
Lyons, Clara	Birdseye Trading post	10
Martens, Nina		31
McCormick, Janet		24
Mittenthal, Suzanne Hobaugh, Fred Wilcoxson, Bonnie Willmering, Charles Wilson, W. Kent	Hoosier Hikers Council	1
Peters, Carl L.		16
Pfieffer, John Yakimchick, Mike	Hoosier Horsemen	32
Quebbemen, Kena		17
Revalee, Sharon		8
Rohrbacher, Oswald		2
Rollins, Yvette	Hoosier Horsemen	5
Showalter, GeGe		19
Simonelic, Ken	Hoosier Mountain Bike Association	29
Sipes, Charlotte		23
Stickel, Steve		28
Weldy, Jody	Indiana Trail Riders Association	9
Whitlow, Maggie	Hoosier Horsemen , Indiana Trail Riders Association	7
Yakimchick, Mike		14

Section 1 Trail Proposals

Trail Proposals from the Biking Community

P: Connect Nebo Trail and Hickory Ridge Trail with a bike/hike trail. (29)

R: The land in between those two trails is a mix of private ownership and Corps of Engineers land leased to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. The Forest Service has no jurisdiction over that land. In addition, the Hoosier National Forest will continue the policy of providing the greatest number of trail miles to the most user groups by allowing most trails to be used together by hikers, horse riders, and mountain bikers. This policy is based on the fact that Indiana has only 4% of its land base in public ownership, and large blocks of public land are very rare. There is simply not much land available to construct long distance trails for each user group. Two options are possible: users could have hike/bike trails but with fewer trails and trail miles, or they could have more trails and trail miles with hike/bike/horse use. There are also some groups that want more hiking-only trails, which would further reduce the number of trails and trail miles available. During the public involvement process in 1992-1994, most trail users preferred to share the trails in the interest of having more trail miles available.

Trail Proposals from the Hiking Community

P: Provide nature trail or short foot trail on Frog Pond Ridge. (1)

R: The Charles C. Deam Wilderness is limited to 40 miles of trail per the Forest Plan. The 40 mile limit was established during an extensive public involvement process in 1992-1994. The limit was recommended by a citizen's task force and presented to the public for comment. It was adopted by the Forest Service and the Forest Plan was amended to include this guidance. The limit was imposed because the area is a designated wilderness and it would be inappropriate to have a large number of trails available. To change the maximum 40 mile limit, an amendment to the Forest Plan would be required. The area is still a designated wilderness, and there is still a need to limit the total number of miles. Therefore, the forest is not interested in amending the Forest Plan.

At this time there are 36.3 miles of trail. A trail relocation project has recently been approved that will add 1.5 miles, leaving only 2.2 miles for a new trail. The forest needs to keep a few miles in reserve in the event some unforeseen circumstance dictates a need to add some miles. An example of this might be severe tornado damage or tree disease that would require a trail to be rerouted around an affected area via a longer route. Therefore, there is simply no room left in the Deam Wilderness for any additional trail miles.

Because of the wilderness designation, it would be inappropriate to construct interpretive signs and exhibits that one normally associates with nature trails. A short foot trail would

also not be in keeping with the wilderness concept of making the experience a challenge. It is for this reason that all loops in the Deam Wilderness are long. Hikers may hike off trail if they choose and if they have the skills to do so.

P: Provide a backpack loop in the Deam Wilderness and close some segments to horse use to accommodate this. (1)

R: Backpacking is already provided for on the 36.3 miles of trail currently available and is also allowed anywhere off trail. The reader is referred to the discussion above as to why new trail miles are not possible. There are currently 31.3 trail miles open to horse use. This number was also based on the 1992-1994 public involvement process, and included discussion of how many miles of trail were needed by horse riders. There have been numerous and frequent requests since that time for even more trail miles to be opened for horse use, indicating that many horse riders feel the number of miles is already too low. While we understand that some hikers do not like to use multiple use trails, we ask all users to be tolerant and share this limited resource.

P: Re-establish the hiking trail at Buzzard Roost. (1)

R: This is a good idea. We inspected the trail and found it to be in reasonably good condition. We are working on bringing it up to standard.

P: Extend the Hemlock Cliffs Trail to Mesmore Cliffs. (1)

R: There are already hiking trails in the area of Hemlock Cliffs and we must be cautious that we don't take on more trails than we have the capacity to build and maintain. Two new hiking trails are proposed at Tincher and Pate Hollow with the intention of meeting hiking needs in the northern part of the forest.

P: Work with Yellowwood State Forest on a connector to the Tecumseh Trail.

R: The forest is willing to work with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources on connecting long distance trails to the Hoosier National Forest trails. Two opportunities exist to connect with trails administered by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. One is the Knobstone Trail near Brownstown, IN. The second is the Tecumseh Trail to the north of Elkinsville, IN. The biggest obstacle is that the forest does not own the property in between. It is a mix of private ownership and Corps of Engineers land leased to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, and the Forest Service has no jurisdiction over that land. If the Indiana Department of Natural Resources were to develop trails on those lands, the forest would be willing to cooperate. Currently, the forest does provide a short link to the D Trail at the border with Yellowwood State Forest. That would be a likely place to start a connection. If a link were to occur, the forest would favor the use of two existing routes: the multiple use Nebo Trail, and the hiking-only Fork Ridge Trail. Using the existing routes has several advantages: it eliminates parallel trails in the forest and the disturbance that causes, eliminates the need for the expensive environmental analysis that would be required for a new route, and

eliminates the expense of constructing a new trail. Again the forest must be cautious to not exceed its capacity to manage trails.

P: Provide a backpack loop on the Hickory Ridge area, and close some segments to horses to accommodate this.

R: Backpacking is already provided for on the 46.7 miles of trail currently available and is also allowed anywhere off trail. There have been numerous and frequent requests for even more trail miles to be opened for horse use, indicating that many horse riders feel the number of miles is already too low. This trend is evident in the proposals brought forward in this document. While we understand that some hikers do not like to use multiple use trails, we ask all users to be tolerant and share this limited resource.

P: Do not add multiple use trails at Shirley Creek, rather add a single use trail. (1)

R: The policy of the Hoosier National Forest is to provide for as many users as possible through multiple use trails. This policy is based on the fact that Indiana has only 4% of its land base in public ownership, and large blocks of public land are very rare. There is simply not much land available to construct long distance trails for each user group. Two options are possible: users could have hike/bike trails but with fewer trails and trail miles, or they could have more trails and trail miles with hike/bike/horse use. During the public involvement process in 1992-1994, most trail users preferred to share the trails in the interest of having more trail miles available.

Trail Proposals from the Horse Community

P: Do not close Ogala or German Ridge South. (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 32)
Do not maintain German Ridge South Trail but keep on the books for future use. (18)

R: The forest has decided to keep those trails open.

P: Support Springs Valley Trail. (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18)

R: Construction has started on this trail and is expected to open by spring 2002.

P: Support Shirley Creek trail additions. (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18)

R: Comment noted. Shirley Creek North will be kept in the program as a pending project. Shirley Creek West will be kept in the program as a possible future project. Shirley Creek West will not likely be built in the near future because the terrain and length indicate construction costs would be very high, and the Forest Service does not own the necessary land.

P: Supports the Knobstone connection as a multiple use trail. (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 14)

R: Comment noted.

P: Connect Deam Wilderness to Hickory Ridge. (3, 4, 5, 32)

R: Because of the wilderness designation, the Deam Wilderness is required to be managed in a manner much different than the rest of the forest. We are obligated to promote wilderness values, one of which is to provide wilderness users a sense of solitude. We have therefore limited access and have tried to isolate the wilderness from the crowding and other impacts that would pour in if there were a connection to another trail. Our goal is not to encourage use in the wilderness or make it easy, but rather to make it challenging and discourage those that are not pursuing a wilderness experience. For those visitors that do not wish to deal with wilderness challenges, there are many opportunities for non-wilderness recreation nearby.

P: Allow the proposed Tincher hiking trail to be multiple use. (20, 21, 22, 23, 24)

R: The Tincher area is an area designated as a “special area” in the Forest Plan, which is an area with unique value. Forest Plan guidance states that trails and other developments in special areas must be consistent with protecting these unique values. Management plans are developed for each special area, and determine which types of uses are acceptable. In this case, the Tincher area is a karst area with many sinkholes and underground drainages. There was concern about erosion into karst features from impacts from horses or bikes. For this reason, the Tincher Area Management Plan allows hiking only trails.

P: Open a trail in the Story area. (4, 5, 26)

R: It is approximately one mile from Story, IN to National Forest System (NFS) land, and two miles to the nearest existing trail. The land in between is a mix of private ownership and Corps of Engineers land leased to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. The Forest Service has no jurisdiction over that land.

P: Open a trail to Maxine’s restaurant in Bartlettsville, IN. (4, 5, 15, 32)

R: There are several reasons why a trail to that area is not feasible. First, NFS land is located about ¼ of a mile north of the town of Bartlettsvilles, and the Forest Service doesn’t have jurisdiction over the private land in between. Second, while it would be possible to stay on NFS land to Highway 446, the trail would be difficult and very expensive to build to standard because of the steep terrain. Third, the trail would have to cross State Highway 446, creating a safety hazard. Finally, to stay on NFS land, the route would have to connect with the Deam Wilderness. That would create a sixth access point to the wilderness, and the Forest Plan limits the number of access points to five.

P: Connect the Midwest Trail Ride (MTR) special use permit trail # 80 to the Hickory Ridge Trail #2 or #9. (3, 4, 5, 33)

R: That trail was originally proposed by MTR in 1995 and was analyzed in an Environmental Assessment completed in 1996. Forest staff reviewed that decision in light of the renewed interest in that trail. The Decision Notice for that proposal, dated March 14, 1996, stated several reasons for not selecting that trail: loss of solitude, too many trails in the area, loss of ridgetop hunting opportunities, adjacent landowner concerns, resource impacts from additional ground disturbance and stream crossings, and depletion of miles from the limits for trails in Management Area 6.4. (Each management area on the forest is limited in the density of trails, and this addition would have significantly depleted that limit). After a review of the 1996 analysis, forest staff concluded that conditions have not changed and the same concerns remain.

P: Provide shorter loops in the Deam Wilderness such as north from Blackwell or connect Grubb Ridge to Cope Hollow. (3, 4, 5, 19).

R: Because of the wilderness designation, the Deam Wilderness is required to be managed in a manner much differently than the rest of the forest. We are obligated to promote wilderness values, one of which is to provide a challenging experience. We have designed the trails to be longer for the purpose of increasing the challenge. Our goal is not make the wilderness experience easy, but rather to make it challenging and discourage those that are not pursuing a wilderness experience. For those visitors that desire less of a challenge, the nearby Hickory Ridge Trail offers many opportunities for short loop rides.

P: Connect Ogala Trail with Hickory Ridge or Nebo Trails. (3, 4, 5, 9, 14)

R: There is a substantial amount of private land in between those trail systems which the forest does not have jurisdiction over. Also, such a trail would require numerous additional new miles, and would likely exceed the capacity of the forest to build and maintain trails.

P: Connect special use permits trail 80 and 90 to eliminate off trail riding at Grouse Hollow Lake. (3)

R: MTR has offered to establish and maintain that trail connector. They have the right to submit an application to amend their special use permit, and the forest would then consider that proposal. It would require an environmental assessment which can be quite expensive. In addition, the terrain just south of Grouse Hollow Lake is very steep, which may make it impossible to install a trail there. We would like to emphasize that approval of that trail would be questionable.

P: Add two short loops at Youngs Creek Trail and one short loop at Lick Creek Trail. (25)

R: We will consider these proposals.

P: Add a western extension to the Youngs Creek Trail. (25)

R: A new trail at Springs Valley is now under construction that will supplement Youngs Creek and Lick Creek Trails for a total of 28.8 trail miles within five miles of each other. That should adequately meet the riding needs in that area. In addition, any additional trails would likely exceed the capacity of the forest to build and maintain trails.

P: Add a loop to Nebo Trail. (15)

R: A loop would be a nice addition to the Nebo Trail, however, there are several obstacles. To make the loop to the west would require the trail to pass through Browning Hill which has been designated as a special area. A trail could not be considered there until a management plan for that area is completed. It is probable horse and bike use would not be permitted in that area because of the unique vegetation that makes it a special area. To the east, there is private land intermingled with NFS land which would make it difficult to lay out a sensible route. Also, as stated several times earlier, the forest is wary of taking on more facilities than it can afford to keep up. Currently, riders willing to use county roads can make a loop using Combs Road and going through Elkinsville.

Section 2 Comments and Suggestions

Trail Permits

C: There were suggestions to charge hikers for the use of trails. (3, 4, 15)

R: The trail permit program is designed to help recover costs from those activities that require a higher level of development and more expense. The trails used by horses and mountain bikes are subject to greater impacts and require a much higher level of development and maintenance than those used only by hikers. In fact, very little of the Forest's trail maintenance budget is directed toward hiking-only trails because the impact is much less and they simply do not need that much work. The current Forest budget is adequate to maintain hiking-only trails and does not need to be supplemented with money from the trail permit program. The situation is similar to camping. A fee is charged to camp in a developed campground where campers require a higher level of development such as a graveled pad, electricity, water, and so on. Primitive camping, where little development is required, is free.

C: There were suggestions to issue a 12-month permit instead of a calendar year permit (13, 28).

R: This suggestion was considered. However, there are several advantages to staying on a calendar year system. In order to encourage local businesses to participate as vendors, we have made every attempt to keep the procedures as simple as possible. A calendar year system eliminates the need for the vendor to indicate a date of issue, and an officer can easily tell if the permit is current simply by looking at the color (which changes every

year). We have had some problems with daily permits being issued without dates, and we want to avoid that problem with the annual permits. The system also simplifies record keeping by connecting inventory, sales, expenses, and income to a given time frame (calendar year), instead of having to reconcile vendor's books over a constantly changing 12-month period. Simplified record keeping also keeps down administrative costs.

C: Some respondents noted it was difficult to find vendors (28, 31).

R: It is acknowledged that some areas do not have conveniently located vendors. The Forest Service has made every attempt to encourage and make it easy for businesses to become vendors, but some do not wish to participate. In some more remote areas, there are simply no businesses that could serve that purpose. We also investigated other possibilities such as permit dispenser machines or self service fee tubes. These were dismissed due to security concerns or cost. The program functions very much like obtaining a hunting license. Hunters generally know that licenses may not be readily available when hunting in remote areas and will obtain them ahead of time. With the program now in its fourth year, we are encouraging trail users to develop that same foresight. We will continue to maintain contact with our neighboring businesses to encourage their participation.

C: Respondents stated the Forest Service has kept its word on the use of fee revenue (4, 5).

R: Comment acknowledged, thank you.

C: There was a suggestion to charge higher fees for high maintenance trails (13).

R: It would complicate the permit process by having to issue specific permits for specific trails. It would also create a burden on the user because they would have to buy several permits if they wanted to ride several different trails.

C: There was a concern about fees affecting economically disadvantaged people. There was also a concern that economically disadvantaged people were not buying the permits but still using the trails, resulting in erroneously low use being recorded (28).

R: There are several measures in place to mitigate the effect on people that may have trouble affording the permit. Hiking remains free to all users, discounts are available to holders of Golden Age and Golden Access Passports, and youth riders aged 16 and under are exempt from the program. Furthermore, the cost of the fee represents a small fraction of the equipment costs to participate, either as a horse or bike rider, and should not be a determining factor. The trail count methodology accounts for users riding without a permit. For a complete explanation of the use count methodology, see our website at www.fs.fed.us/r9/hoosier, Recreation Opportunities, Trail Permits.

C: There was support for user fees and the resulting work as long as the fees support improvements to multiple use trails (3, 4, 5).

R: Comment acknowledged. The legislation that authorizes the fee program requires that 80% of the fees be returned to the facilities from which they were collected, in this case multiple use trails. Fifteen percent can be used for collection purposes such as buying the trail permits, signs, etc. Five percent is returned to the Regional Office to be used for large scale recreation capital improvement programs. The income cannot be used for unrelated expenses such as office overhead or on trails where the permit is not required. For a complete report of the fee program see our website at www.fs.fed.us/r9/hoosier, Recreation Opportunities, Trail Permits.

Gravel

C: Some respondents stated that they were now satisfied with the use of gravel and some liked the change to using a fine grade of gravel. (3, 4, 5, 15, 19).

R: Comment acknowledged.

C: Some also suggested the use of geotextiles (3, 5).

R: We will experiment with the use of geotextiles in problem areas.

C: Some respondents had concerns related to gravel and trail width. Some opposed the use of course gravel, did not like the trail widening and gravelling, were concerned about invasive plants from crushed limestone, suggested using creek or regular gravel, and felt “crushed limestone” rather than “gravel” was more correct terminology (11, 13, 16, 27).

R: We no longer use course gravel. There have been two instances on the Hickory Ridge trail where course gravel was recently used on a temporary basis. One was to provide a haul road for access to repair the Grouse Hollow dam. The other was to provide a haul road for a private landowner who had legal access over the trail route. These areas will be repaired as resources allow.

The wide trail is required to efficiently haul the gravel during construction or rehabilitation. We have investigated smaller equipment, but found that many additional trips are required which in turn creates additional impacts and is more expensive. Our policy is to let trails grow back in and return to a narrower setting after the work is completed. While this does not occur in all cases due to environmental conditions, it has been successful and participants in the 2000 field trips were able to view examples.

The forest soils scientist was consulted regarding the concern about exotic species. His findings are as follows. He states that the risk of exotic plant invasion from the use of gravel is minimal. The lateral zone of influence on surrounding soils from gravel made from crushed limestone is less than two feet from where the gravel is placed. The Calcium ions are tied up rapidly and those not taken up by plants are leached vertically into the soil. Water diversion structures on the trails reduce the amount of water moving

off the trails during rainstorm events which in turn limits the amount of loosened gravel and fines that will move off the trail. Trails provide much less opportunity for exotic plant invasion than the many miles of county gravel roads and road ditches that deliver large volumes of water and gravel materials at high velocity, which can in turn can carry exotic seeds long distances along road corridors. (Merchant 2002)

The forest soils scientist was also consulted regarding the suggestion to use creek gravel. To remove large quantities of creek gravel using mechanical equipment, the work would likely require an extensive permit and analysis process (Merchant 2002). Also, there could be undesirable impacts on streams. In addition, oftentimes the location of creek gravel is a long way from where it is needed and would necessitate the construction of a haul route. In most cases, it is more efficient and better for the resource to use commercial gravel. One exception to this is the Deam Wilderness where mechanical means of extraction are not permitted, only small quantities are used, long distance hauling is nearly impossible, and natural materials are in keeping with wilderness values.

According to *The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition*, gravel is defined as “An unconsolidated mixture of rock fragments or pebbles.” It appears we are using the term correctly and is consistent with local usage such as in references to a “gravel road”.

Miscellaneous comments and general suggestions

C: There were many offers for volunteer assistance along with statements that volunteers could do much of the needed trail work on the Forest. (3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 14, 17, 19, 26, 28, 29, 32)

R: All offers of volunteer assistance are appreciated, welcomed, and are a valuable supplement to the trail program. We just ask that people understand there is a lot more that goes into the program than what meets the eye. The trail program is a very large and complex effort. We need professional scientists to perform environmental analysis, engineers with expertise in trail layout, heavy equipment and operators, large quantities of gravel, and staff that have had Forest Service training for activities such as chainsaw operation. All of these functions must be available forty hours a week over much of the year, require large amounts of money, and in some cases require special certifications or licensing. These are requirements that are beyond the capabilities of most volunteer organizations. However, volunteers do have much to offer and bring their own special expertise to the Forest, particularly from the user’s perspective. This is a very valuable asset and we hope to continue such relationships.

C: Some respondents questioned the results and reliability of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources’ State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). (5, 6, 8, 13, 16, 27)

R: It is acknowledged that the SCORP does not provide all the answers. However, there is not a lot of reliable scientific information regarding recreation use in Indiana, and this

document provides the latest and best information available. The reader is encouraged to view the SCORP at <http://www.in.gov/dnr/outdoor/planning/index.html> for more details concerning how the data was collected, where it was collected, and so on.

C: Some respondents questioned our trail use data taken from tag sales. (4,5,8)

R: We feel the data is a reasonably close estimate and the methodology was endorsed by professional researchers. The reader is referred to our website at www.fs.fed.us/r9/hoosier, Recreation Opportunities, Trail Permits.

C: One respondent suggested a trail use survey by Forest Service staff. (16)

R: The survey mentioned in the previous response provides useful information. We are continuing our data collection and are counting trail use by hikers, horse riders, and bike riders on multiple use trails.

C: There was concern about illegal ATV use. (10)

R: This is an ongoing problem. We are doing the best we can to enforce that prohibition with the resources we have.

C: There were suggestions for better signage and brochures for roads, trailheads, and trails. (2, 4, 5)

R: There is no doubt that information for Forest users is very important. The Forest website offers excellent information as well as downloadable maps. We also distribute Recreation Opportunity Guides (ROGs) with trail information and maps, and have available for sale an excellent trail map published by a company called Trails Illustrated. All trails are marked either by plastic markers, wooden signs, or painted blazes. All of the larger trails now have information boards at the trailheads. We acknowledge that roadside signs directing users to trailheads could be improved and we will work on that problem.

C: Some respondents liked the recent workshops. (3, 4, 5, 26)

R: Comment acknowledged, thank you.

C: Water at German Ridge would increase use of camp and income. (17)

R: We agree, although it may be very expensive to run the water lines. We are investigating possibilities.

C: More trail miles and facilities such as parking and camping will space horse riders out thus not overburdening just a small number of trails. (7, 17)

R: While that concept seems to make sense, current use patterns do not support this idea. Our use study shows about 77% of trail permit sales occur in the very northern portion of

the Forest which serves the Deam Wilderness, Hickory Ridge, and Nebo Ridge trails and little use occurs elsewhere in the forest. We are reluctant to add new trails in areas where it is demonstrated that use is already low. In the northern area where use is high, there is little room available for new trails and a large number of miles are already in place. It appears users are attracted to certain areas and are not willing to travel to the southern part of the forest to use additional trails.

C: Some trail segments need to be rerouted to improve drainage. (28)

R: We agree. This type of work is considered during annual trail inspections and is addressed as resources allow.

C: Designate trails into three maintenance classes: fully maintained trail, casually maintained trail, non maintained trail. (19)

R: We have an obligation to maintain trails to Forest Service standards. These standards are specifically designed to protect soil and water resources while providing a safe and enjoyable trail experience. A “casual” or “no-maintenance” trail would leave open the possibility of soil and water degradation, especially if those trails were to receive heavy use or were to be impacted by some external factor such as heavy rains.

C: Let riders use old trails not currently used. (14, 19)

R: If there is an old trail that was not designated as of the 1995 Trail Program, it may be that it was in an unacceptable location or there was simply no interest expressed by the public. If a route was to be considered for use as a trail, we would need to complete an environmental analysis. We are considering specific trail proposals as part of this review process, some of which are old trails.

C: Make notation of trail difficulty on maps. (13)

R: Rating the trails is very subjective depending upon the perspective of the trail user. The U.S. Access Board has developed draft accessibility guidelines for trails in conjunction with the American with Disability Act. Among other things, these guidelines will likely include provisions for informing users of what to expect on trails such as steepness, length, width, obstacles, etc. The idea is to not rate the trails, but inform the user of trail conditions and let them make their own decisions about difficulty. We will await the outcome of that effort and respond accordingly.

C: Scoping letters for projects need to clearly state how users will be affected if the proposed action is implemented. (4, 5)

R: We agree and will try and improve upon this. However, interested parties are cautioned that it may not be possible to cover all ramifications of a proposed action in a scoping letter. For example, the scoping process may reveal an issue that would require a particular action or restriction that was unknown when the scoping letter was written. The

best way to be informed of all impacts of a proposed action is to carefully review the predecisional environmental assessment. That document will include all issues raised during the scoping process. Interested parties commenting on the scoping letter will automatically receive a copy. It may also be viewed on our website or a hard copy will be sent upon request.

C: Surprised at the statement that horse trail use has reached a saturation point. (3)

R: As a point of clarification, we stated in our trail review that...“we feel we are reaching the saturation point in terms of what we can provide and still be good stewards.” What this means is that we have reached a point where we cannot provide more services and facilities with the resources (staff and budget) we have. As stated earlier, many of the trails in the southern part of the Forest are relatively uncrowded and are certainly not saturated.

Comments specific to biking:

C: Need more single track, more miles, greater difficulty trails. (13, 29, 31)

R: The forest currently has 13 trails and 170.7 miles open for use by mountain bikes. As stated above, we have many miles of trail in the southern portion of the forest that are underused. For most of our trails the design must meet the requirements of three user groups: hikers, horse riders, and bike riders. It is difficult to design trails that perfectly meet the needs of all three groups. In addition, it is further complicated by subgroups such as beginner or advanced riders. We simply can't meet all needs, but do provide multiple use trails in order to accommodate as many user groups as possible.

C: Trails are well maintained. (31)

R: Comment is noted.

C: There was a concern that the expense of multiple use trails may prompt closures. (29)

R: The forest maintains the trails with a combination of regular budget dollars, recreation fee income, and volunteer assistance. Heavy maintenance has been recently completed on much of the trail system allowing us to get somewhat “caught up” on our long term, expensive maintenance. We do not anticipate having to close trails due to expense.

C: There was a suggestion to consider seasonal use. (29)

R: The trails on the forest are currently designed to be all weather trails. Seasonal closure has been considered and even tried at the German Ridge trail. Several problems are noted. Enforcement is very difficult if not impossible given the remote setting of the trails and the low ratio of officers to trail miles. Also, some “no ride” seasons might be dry and users would be needlessly prohibited, and some “ride” seasons may be unseasonably wet and users would ride on unprotected trail tread. In reality, the trails would likely be

ridden regardless of weather or season, and resource damage would occur during wet periods. We feel we can serve more users more often, and better protect the resource if we harden the trails and allow use anytime.

C: One respondent suggested more bike/hike only trails and re-designating some multiple use trails for bike/hike. Reasons given were to reduce costs and improve user experience. (29)

R: Indiana has only 4% of its land base in public ownership, and large blocks of public land are very rare. There is simply not much land available to construct long distance trails for each user group. Two options are possible: users could have hike/bike trails but with fewer trails and trail miles, or they could have more trails and trail miles with hike/bike/horse use. There are also some groups that want more hiking-only trails, which would further reduce the number of trails and trail miles available. During the public involvement process in 1992-1994, most trail users preferred to share the trails in the interest of having more trail miles available.

It is acknowledged that bike/hike trails would likely be cheaper to build and maintain than trails that include horses. However, in the interest of providing the most miles for the most users, the forest is willing to incur the additional expense to build and maintain multiple use trails.

We believe the policy has worked well over the last few years, and while not all users are happy, it does provide the most opportunity to the most people.

C: There was a suggestion to provide three levels of difficulty and three levels of facilities: recreational, intermediate, and advanced. (29)

R: This is a good idea. However, it would be very difficult for the forest to provide a service that is refined to the level of three sub-categories of one user group. The forest has a tremendous amount of responsibility in terms of providing adequate and safe recreational opportunities for a wide variety of users, and it is important that we not take on too much. As one may notice from the diversity of the comments in this document, it is challenging to meet the needs of just the three major trail user groups (horse/hike/bike). To further break out one of those groups would likely increase the potential for conflict with the other user groups. For example, an advanced trail with steep hills and jumps may be a safety issues for hikers or horses.

C: There was support for multiple use trails as a good value. (28)

R: Comment acknowledged.

Comments specific to hiking:

C: There was general support to add more hiking trails. (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 18, 21)

R: Comment acknowledged.

C: There were comments that hikers were rarely seen on trails. (14,16)

R: The probability of seeing hikers on trails is dependent upon many factors. The following facts are presented for information. The forest has kept data on the number of hikers observed on multiple use trails during patrols by the trail permit ranger. In 2000, 11% of the users observed on multiuse trails were hikers and in 2001, 31% of the users observed on multiuse trails were hikers. Furthermore, a social assessment of the Hoosier National Forest completed in 2001 by Indiana University's Center for the Study of Institutions, Populations, and Environmental Change found that 88% of respondents liked using the forest for hiking. We conclude that there is significant hiking use on the forest.

C: Some hikers stated they didn't like multiple use trails due to impacts, that such trails were defacto horse trails, single use trails were possible and desirable, and some multiple use trails should be converted to hiking-only. (1, 30)

R: It is recognized that not all users are happy with multiple use trails. We are proposing to add two long hiking-only trails to provide more opportunities. However, adding or converting more trails to hiking-only would curtail opportunities for other user groups. Indiana has only 4% of its land base in public ownership, and large blocks of public land are very rare. There is simply not much land available to construct numerous long distance trails for each user group. Two options are possible: users could have hiking-only trails but with fewer trails and trail miles, or they could have more trails and trail miles with hike/bike/horse use and deal with the inconveniences that come with that option. During the 1992 –1994 public involvement process, most trail users preferred to share the trails in the interest of having more trail miles available.

C: One respondent stated there is a certain individual and organization that is opposed to horses and influences forest management decisions. (16)

R: Individuals and organizations often exercise their freedom of speech and express opinions about forest policy. It is acknowledged that we have received comments in opposition to horse use. When dealing with an issue, we strive to make sound decisions based on what is best for the resource and the public as a whole, and not on a particular organization or individual.

C: One respondent asked why hiking is an issue when hikers can go anywhere. (8)

R: Hikers may travel off trail, but many prefer to have a marked trail with a comfortable tread surface.

C: One respondent stated hikers do less damage and fewer horse trails mean more money for hiking trails. (12)

R: It is acknowledged that hikers have less impact on trails. It is also acknowledged that if trails open to horses were not offered on the forest, there would be more funds for other activities. However, horse riding is offered on multiple use trails. We plan to continue to offer such trails in the interest of providing the most opportunity to the most people while still protecting the resource.

C: There was a comment that more emphasis should be placed on the backcountry at the Mogan Ridge area. (1)

R: That area is already managed as backcountry area. The Forest Plan divides the forest into zones where various management guidelines are in place. That area lies in Management Areas 6.4 and 8.2, both of which promote a backcountry, non-consumptive type of setting. There is also a 12.3 mile multiple use trail and 6.6 mile hiking trail to allow forest users a chance to experience this area.

C: One commenter suggested trail registration system to be checked by a ranger to ensure the hiker is safe. (2)

R: The forest simply does not have the staff to do daily checks of trails.

Comments specific to horseriding:

C: Comments were received suggesting an increase in miles of trail open to horses. (3, 4, 5, 7)

R: One new trail 10.8 miles in length is under construction in the Springs Valley area. However, the likelihood of new trails after that is questionable. Indiana has only 4% of its land base in public ownership, and large blocks of public land are very rare. There is simply not much land available to construct additional trails. In addition, adding more trails is very expensive both in terms of initial construction costs and ongoing maintenance costs.

C: Some respondents were opposed to any closure of trails to horse use. (3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 17)

R: Forest staff further reviewed the two trails proposed for closure and decided to keep them open. No trails are proposed for closure.

C: A respondent stated they didn't want any of the trail permit income spent on hiking trails.

R: The legislation that allows us to collect the fee states that the money must be spent on the facilities for which it was collected. Since we collect the fee only for use of multiple use trails, it can't be spent on hiking-only trails.

C: There were two suggestions received for water at Blackwell Horsecamp. (8, 15)

R: The Blackwell Horsecamp provides a major access point for the Deam Wilderness. Because of the wilderness designation, the Deam Wilderness is required to be managed in a manner much different than the rest of the forest. We are obligated to promote wilderness values, one of which is to provide wilderness users a sense of solitude. If water were to be provided, the camp would likely attract even more users, which in turn would decrease the opportunity for solitude as more and more people used the wilderness. Unlike traditional recreation areas on the forest, our goal at Blackwell is not to accommodate more users, but rather to encourage fewer users, and only those who are seeking a wilderness experience.

Appendix B Suggested Trail Inspection Checklist

Trail name	
Segment	
Date	
Inspector	
Checklist:	Observations and recommended action:
Brushing adequate?	
Mowing adequate?	
Obstructions or blowdowns?	
Markers present and intact?	
Tread condition?	
Water draining properly?	
Stream crossings impacted?	
Illegal activity?	
Litter?	
Other	
Other	

Appendix C

Special Use Permit Trail Criteria

Eligibility: Adjacent landowners, or those with legal right-of-way on adjacent lands, may apply for a permit. The Forest is divided into management areas or zones that limit trail density. In cases where trail density is near the limit in that management area, priority will be given to those applications that serve more than one landowner. Several landowners may apply jointly. Special use permit trails are prohibited in the Charles C. Deam Wilderness.

Criteria: The proposed trail route must not impact sensitive environmental or archeological resources, must be built and maintained to Forest Service standards, and must not cause the trail density in that management area to be exceeded.

Costs: Applicants may expect to incur costs from three sources. First, fees for the use of Forest Service land would be assessed based on the amount of land occupied. Second, to comply with environmental laws, environmental analysis must be completed for ground disturbing activity such as a new trail. There may be a fee for analysis. Third, the applicant would also be responsible for any costs of construction and annual maintenance. The costs for such a trail may range from less than a hundred dollars to several thousand, depending upon the complexity of the project.

Responsibility: The permittee would be responsible for the construction and annual maintenance of the trail. The work may be done by the permittee or a hired contractor. Forest Service personnel would conduct periodic inspections.

Use: The public would be allowed to use the trail on National Forest land up to the property line of the adjacent landowner.

Application process: Applicants must submit the following:

- Form. Propoponent Proposal For Use Of National Forest System Lands. Mail to the address on this letterhead. The form is also available on the Hoosier National Forest website at: www.fs.fed.us/r9/hoosier under the category of Special Uses.
- Map of the trail route. A topographical map is preferred. Maps are available at this office (order form available on the website under the category of Recreation Opportunities).
- Operating plan. This plan should include specifics on construction and operation, such as what construction techniques and materials would be used, how the trail would be marked, what maintenance work would be done every year, and how many users you expect to be on the trail annually.

Time frame: Depending upon the complexity of the project, the processing time may range from a few months to a year or more. Applicants are encouraged to apply well in advance of the desired use season.

Appendix D Trail Summary

Mgt Area	2.4	2.8	5.1	6.2	6.4	7.1	8.1	8.2	8.3	Total Miles	Use Type
Trail:											
Birdseye		11.8								11.8	Multiple
Brown Co D				2.1						2.1	Horse/hike
Celina Interp						0.8				0.8	Hike
Fork Ridge		3.5								3.5	Hike
German R		24								24	Multiple
Germ R Lake						1.5				1.5	Hike
Hardin Ridge						2				2	Hike/bike
Hemlock Cliff								1.2		1.2	Hike
Hickory Ridge		34.1			12.6					46.7	Multiple
Nebo Ridge				8.6						8.6	Multiple
Lick Creek				7.5						7.5	Multiple
Mogan West					12.3					12.3	Multiple
Mogan East								6.6		6.6	Hike
Ogala		6								6	Multiple
Oriole East	1	7.8								8.8	Multiple u
Oriole West				7.2						7.2	Multiple
Pioneer Mom							0.8			0.8	Hike
Shirley Creek					19.4					19.4	Multiple
Springs Valle										0	Multiple
Saddle Lake						2.2				2.2	Hike
Tipsaw						5.9				5.9	Hike/bike
Twin Oaks Int						1.4				1.4	Hike
Two Lakes		8.2				7.5				15.7	Hike
Deam West			31.4							31.4	Hike
Deam Sycam			4.9							4.9	Hike/horse
Youngs Cr		10.5								10.5	Multiple
Flynn SUP					0.6					0.6	Multiple
MTR SUP					7.2					7.2	Multiple
Peters SUP					0.1					0.1	Multiple
SIH SUP		4			2.5					6.5	Multiple
Murphy SUP					0.1					0.1	Multiple
MidAme SUP		0.3									Multiple
Hildebra SUP		0.4								0.4	Multiple
NFS Miles	1	105.9	36.3	25.4	50.9	21.3	0.8	7.8	0	242.8	
SUP Miles	0	4.7	0	0	10.5	0	0	0	0	15.2	
Grand Total	1	110.6	36.3	25.4	61.4	21.3	0.8	17.8	0	258	
Acreage	16411	102186	12965	18458	23371	6357	72	18397	616	198833	
Square Miles	25.64	159.67	20.26	28.84	36.52	9.93	.11	28.75	.96	310.68	
Max density	2.0	2.5	NA	2.0	2.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Current densit	0.04	0.69	1.79	0.88	1.50	2.14	7.11	0.27	-	0.83	
Max miles	51.3	399.2	40.0	57.7	73.0	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Current Miles	1.0	110.6	36.3	25.4	54.8	21.3	0.8	7.8	-	258.0	
Miles remain	50.3	288.6	3.7	32.3	18.2	NA	NA	NA	NA		

Appendix D continued:

<i>Type Trail</i>	# Trails	# Miles
NFS bike/hike/horse	11	162.8
NFS bike/hike only	2	7.9
NFS horse/hike only	2	33.5
NFS hike only	10	38.6
Total	25	242.8
Total NFS hiking avail	25	242.8
Total NFS biking avail	13	170.7
Total NFS horse avail	13	196.3