

## **West Warm Springs Wilderness Inventory Update Process Summary**

In updating wilderness inventory information for the West Warm Springs area, internal draft guidance provided by the state wilderness lead was utilized (See Attachment 1). The project planning area that initiated the need for a wilderness inventory update was the preparation of the West Warm Spring Allotment Management Plan.

### **Citizen Information Received**

BLM received some preliminary information regarding a proposed Buzzard Creek WSA from the Oregon Natural Desert Association (ONDA) in early September of 2007. On September 19, 2007 the BLM received the final information for ONDA's 462,828-acre Buzzard Creek proposed WSA. ONDA included in their information a narrative report, maps, photos, photo and route logs and GIS data with their route and photo point data, all of which were considered as part of the BLM's wilderness inventory update process for BLM lands within the project area. The photos submitted by ONDA were taken in July of 2004 and June of 2005. They identified the Buzzard Creek proposed WSA as having no routes which meet their definition of a boundary road and included state land within their proposal. However, the BLM has no authority to evaluate wilderness values on state land, so these lands were not included in the update conducted on BLM units.

### **Unit Boundary Determination Process**

In July and August of 2007, engineering, maintenance and resource staff were contacted and asked to identify routes within and outside of the project planning area that they were familiar with that would meet BLM's boundary road criteria. In late August and early September, a route analysis was conducted by BLM staff in the field for 55 routes that were identified as needing additional field verification. The BLM staff conducting the route analyses received a field orientation by Laura Dowlan (Wilderness Specialist) related to boundary road requirements and completed the Wilderness Inventory Maintenance Route Analysis form. Many of the roads identified earlier by staff were also driven during this field review process and one of the staff members that conducted the route analysis field review also participated in the interdisciplinary (ID)-team meeting for the units identified. Road determinations and other unit boundary criteria (developed ROWs and non-federal ownership) were used to identify the preliminary unit boundary roads to be reviewed by the ID-team. Most of the BLM unit boundary roads identified are numbered roads that are part of BLM's current transportation system identified within its Facility Asset Management System (FAMS) database.

Many of the interior routes not identified as boundary roads may have been mechanically improved or maintained at some point in the past and may be maintained in the future as needed. Most are in a useable condition by two-wheeled drive high clearance vehicles, but during the field review, relatively regular use was not as evident and other supporting information about their use was not identified in the field or in the ID-team meetings, so these routes were not identified as boundary roads for this particular update effort. Some of these routes are also part of the Burns BLM transportation system identified in FAMS.

## **ID-Team Meetings**

An ID-team consisting of BLM staff (See Attachment 2) from the Burns District met on January 24, 2008 to evaluate all of the BLM Units identified as over 5,000 acres. Prior to the ID-team meeting Laura Dowlan (Wilderness Specialist) and Brett Page (Outdoor Recreation Planner) reviewed ONDA photos to identify those which applied both to routes that the BLM had determined to be boundary roads and other general landscape photos to be reviewed by the interdisciplinary (ID)-team. The ID-team was also provided with ONDA's maps and narrative information prior to the meeting.

In general, ONDA's reports indicated that the routes that the BLM had identified as boundary roads were unmaintained, eroded, washed out, overgrown, and little used. The ID-team reviewed both ONDA and the BLM photos. Based on their knowledge of the routes and the BLM and ONDA information reviewed, the ID-team concurred with the BLM boundary roads identified. They are roads that have been mechanically improved or maintained at some point. Some of ONDA's photos show minimal vegetation in the roadway, which tends to be more evident in the spring and early summer when some of the ONDA route photos were taken. However, these roads are still currently in a useable condition by two-wheeled drive high clearance vehicles. A few of ONDA's photos also showed roads as being flooded out, however the water shown on these roads is very seasonal and is generally only present for a few days or weeks in the spring, or for a few days following a rain event. The rest of the year, these roads are still useable during dry conditions.

The BLM found that the boundary roads would be maintained in the future as needed to provide for a variety of uses and these roads do not require annual maintenance to remain in a useable condition. Road uses by grazing permittees include motorized access for monitoring and managing cattle, distributing salt and checking and maintaining range improvements. Use by the BLM staff includes motorized access for wildfire suppression, maintaining range improvements, monitoring cattle and rangeland/resource conditions, and other resource management activities. Use by the public is primarily associated with recreational activities. Use of the boundary roads identified by the BLM does occur on a relatively regular basis, with some use in the late spring but most use occurring in the summer and fall.

There were a few routes which the ID-team identified as needing additional field verification and these routes was later field checked and unit boundaries were updated where necessary. The potential changes to the boundaries were considered as part of the ID-team review and did not modify the findings for the units (Units 6 and 25).

As a result, the ID-team concurred with the BLM unit boundary determinations that ONDA's Buzzard Creek proposed WSA is not one large roadless unit, but is made of several BLM units that are similar to, though not exactly the same, as those units identified by the BLM in the 1979 and 1980 wilderness inventory effort. There were units within ONDA's Buzzard Creek proposed WSA that did not include any portion of the West Warm Springs Allotment and these units were not evaluated as part of this update effort, but may be updated in the future as needed. The ID-team evaluated 26

BLM units (343,917 acres) that met the 5,000-acre size requirement. There were several smaller units identified, each less than 5,000 acres in size for a total 25,659 acres. None of these units met any of the size exception criteria and they were not evaluated further. Included in the evaluation was information provided by ONDA that included photos, narratives and maps.

In addition to the route information, the ID-team also reviewed both ONDA and BLM information related to the presence of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation for each of the BLM's units over 5,000 acres in size. The ID-team also reviewed and evaluated the information ONDA provided, related to supplemental values present in their proposed WSA. In the final report three units were found to have the required wilderness characteristics (size, naturalness and outstanding recreation or solitude), and the supplemental values were documented where present.

Information considered by staff included:

**Wilderness Inventories**

- 1977 – BLM Wilderness Inventory Unit photos that are part of unpublished internal BLM documents.

**Wilderness Documents**

- April, 1979 – Proposed Initial Inventory – Roadless Areas and Islands Which Clearly Do Not Have Wilderness Characteristics.
- November, 1980 -Wilderness Inventory –Oregon and Washington, Final Intensive Inventory Decisions.

**Other Relevant Information**

- Internal guidance (See Attachment 1) related to updating wilderness inventory information for BLM lands received from Dave Harmon, the State Wilderness Specialist (July 2007).
- Wilderness Inventory information and recommendations submitted to Burns District by Oregon Natural Desert Association (ONDA) on September 19, 2007.
- Information from both the 1992 Three Rivers Resource Area RMP/ROD and the 2003 Lakeview Resource Area RMP/ROD related to recreation, visual resources and special areas.
- Current geographic information system (GIS) data on existing rangeland development projects, vegetation treatments, vehicular travel routes/roads, land ownership, etc.
- 2005 National Agriculture Imagery Project (NAIP) digital images.
- Photos and staff information from the BLM's route analysis effort.
- Staff knowledge of roads and the general area as a result of conducting their duties.

There were also eight units which included lands within the Lakeview District. BLM staff from the Burns and Lakeview Districts met (See Attachment 2) on February 11, 2008 for additional input and review. Lakeview staff was also provided with information

ONDA submitted, prior to and during the meeting. The BLM staff from the Lakeview District concurred with the findings of the Burns District ID-team.

### **Summary of BLM Findings**

The BLM found that 23 of the units (302,118 acres) that were each over 5,000 acres in size did not have wilderness characteristics present. Most of these units were similar to units in the original inventory and no changes in current conditions were identified that modified the original wilderness inventory findings. Three BLM units (41,799 acres) were found to have wilderness characteristics present and the supplemental values were documented for these units.

More specific information related to boundary roads and the presence of wilderness characteristics is documented in a report prepared for each individual unit that was evaluated.

There were several units under 5,000 acres in size (25,658 acre total) which did not meet any of the size exception criteria and these units were not evaluated any further.

# Attachment 1

## H-6300-1-WILDERNESS INVENTORY MAINTENANCE IN BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON

### A. Overview

This Handbook provides policy, direction, procedures and guidance for BLM OR/WA employees for maintaining wilderness inventories under Section 201 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA). This handbook does not address Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs).

### B. Policy

The wilderness resource is part of the BLM's multiple-use mission. In addition to its value as a setting for primitive and unconfined recreation or solitude, these lands provide a range of other benefits.

1. **Wilderness Inventory Maintenance.** The BLM has already prepared and is now responsible for maintaining on a continuing basis an inventory of the wilderness resource on public lands. The wilderness inventory may need to be updated when: the public or BLM identifies wilderness characteristics as an issue, BLM has new information concerning resource conditions, or additional lands are acquired, or as part of the environmental baseline in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document.
2. **Documentation.** Managers must document their review and consideration of new information.

### C. Historical Background

The inventory will evaluate wilderness characteristics as discussed in Section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964, and incorporated in FLPMA, which states:

“A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.”

## **D. Wilderness Inventory Maintenance Procedures**

1. **Maintaining the Inventory.** Section 201 of FLPMA requires the BLM to maintain an inventory of all public lands and their resources. The BLM has discretion in implementing this direction. District Offices may choose the best method of maintaining their wilderness inventory. Normally, District Offices will do this in the context of a land use plan, when new information exists, or when conditions change. The primary function of inventory maintenance is to determine the presence or absence of lands with wilderness characteristics. Keeping an inventory current requires gathering information and preparing a permanent file for any new inventory. It is essential that an adequate record of the inventory and subsequent updates be maintained that documents inventory findings, including relevant narratives, maps, photographs, citizen information, and any other relevant information.
2. **The Wilderness Inventory Maintenance Process.** Wilderness inventory maintenance is the process of determining the presence or absence of lands with wilderness characteristics. An up-to-date inventory should document existing conditions as opposed to potential conditions that may result from a future planning decision. Where inventory data exists, an interdisciplinary team familiar with the area may conduct much of the review using available information (*e.g.* existing maps and photos) and field checking as necessary.

When Citizen Information has been submitted regarding wilderness characteristics, document the submitted materials including: Date of Submission; Name of Proponent; Name of Proposal and/or Area Identified by the Proponent; BLM District(s) and Field Office(s) Affected; Type of material Submitted (*e.g.* narrative, map, photo). Evaluate any submitted citizen information regarding the validity of proposed boundaries of the area(s), the existence of roads and other boundary features, the size of the area(s), and the presence or absence of wilderness characteristics based on relevant information available in the office (prior BLM inventories, ID team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.). Compare existing BLM knowledge with the submitted citizen information.

If an area fails to meet either the size or naturalness criterion, document why the area does not meet these criteria. There is no need to conduct a complete inventory on these lands.

### a. **Identify Lands Requiring Inventory Maintenance.**

1. Identifying the specific area to be inventoried requires combining existing land status and available road inventory data. Where acquired lands are inventoried, the area to be

reviewed may be larger than the acquired lands because of the need to look at contiguous roadless federal lands.

2. Assign each area a name and number for reference purposes.
3. Initiate a permanent documentation file for each area (Appendix A).

b. Conduct Inventory Maintenance.

Complete the Inventory Area Evaluation form (Appendix B), along with a Road Analysis (Appendix C), and a Photo Log when applicable (Appendix D) for each area.

**3. Wilderness Characteristics.**

a. Analysis of Roads. Offices undertaking inventory maintenance should address the effect of roads and other impacts on lands with wilderness characteristics by identifying any roads and their influence on the boundary of the area described (see Glossary for definitions).

b. Analysis of Wilderness Character. The inventory will evaluate wilderness characteristics as discussed in Section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964, and incorporated in FLPMA. In order for an area to have wilderness characteristics, it must possess sufficient size, naturalness, and either outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. In addition, it may also possess supplemental values.

1. Size. Determine if the size criterion will be satisfied for areas meeting one of the following situations and circumstances:

- a. Roadless areas with over 5,000 acres of contiguous BLM lands. State or private lands are not included in making this acreage determination.
- b. Any roadless island of the public lands of less than 5,000 acres.
- c. Roadless areas of less than 5,000 acres of contiguous BLM lands where any one of the following apply:
  - (1) They are contiguous with lands which have been formally determined to have wilderness or

potential wilderness values (*i.e.* a Wilderness Area or Wilderness Study Area), or

(2) It is demonstrated that the area is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition, or

(3) They are contiguous to other Federal lands with identified wilderness characteristics, and the combined total is 5,000 acres or more.

2. Naturalness.

a. Affected Primarily by the Forces of Nature. Determine if the area is in a natural condition.

(1) It must appear to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, and people's work must be substantially unnoticeable. Examples of man-made features that may be considered substantially unnoticeable in certain cases are: trails, trail signs, bridges, fire towers, fire breaks, fire suppression facilities, pit toilets, fisheries enhancement facilities, fire rings, hitching posts, snow gauges, water quantity and quality measuring devices, research monitoring markers and devices, radio repeater sites, air quality monitoring devices, fencing, spring developments, overgrown and barely visible two-track ways, and small reservoirs.

b. Describing Human Impacts. Document significant human impacts within the area. If several minor impacts exist, summarize their cumulative effect on the area's degree of naturalness.

(1) The review of human impacts will assess the presence or absence of apparent naturalness (*i.e.* do the works of humans appear to be substantially unnoticeable to the average visitor?). There is an important difference between an area's natural integrity and its apparent naturalness:

(a) Natural integrity refers to the presence or absence of ecosystems that are relatively unaffected by human activities.

(b) Apparent naturalness refers to whether or not an area looks natural to the average visitor who is not familiar with the biological composition of natural ecosystems versus human-affected ecosystems.

(2) Caution should be used in assessing the effect of relatively minor human impacts on naturalness. Some human works are acceptable so long as they are substantially unnoticeable. Avoid an overly strict approach to assessing naturalness.

(3) Human impacts outside the area will not normally be considered in assessing naturalness of an area. If, however, an outside impact of major significance exists, it should be noted in the overall inventory area description and evaluated for its direct effects on the area.

3. Solitude or a Primitive and Unconfined Type of Recreation. Determine if the area "...has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation..." The word "or" in this sentence means that an area only has to possess one or the other. The area does not have to possess outstanding opportunities for both elements, nor does it need to have outstanding opportunities on every acre, so long as these opportunities are identified somewhere within the area. This also holds true when an area is contiguous to lands with identified wilderness characteristics. In most cases, the two opportunities can be expected to go hand-in-hand because some types of primitive recreation, such as hiking and camping, are enhanced when opportunities for solitude are outstanding. An outstanding opportunity for solitude, however, may be present in an area offering only limited primitive recreation potential. Also, an area may be so attractive for recreation use that it would be difficult to maintain an opportunity for solitude.

Each area must be assessed on its own merits or in combination with adjacent lands with wilderness character. As a general rule, the boundary of a unit is to be determined based on evaluation of the imprints of man within the unit, and should not be further constricted on the basis of opportunity for solitude or primitive and

unconfined recreation. Do not disqualify an area based on a finding that outstanding opportunities exist in only a portion of the area. Do not compare the lands in question with other parcels to arrive at some concept of “the best of the best”. For inventory maintenance purposes, however, it can be appropriate to compare the lands in question to existing WSAs in the surrounding area and their rationale, to insure some level of consistency in evaluating opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. It is not permissible to use any type of rating system or scale, whether numerical, alphabetical, or qualitative, in making the assessment. Good judgment is necessary in determining that outstanding opportunities either do or do not exist in each area.

- a. Solitude. Determine whether or not the area has outstanding opportunities for solitude.
  - (1) In making this determination, consider factors that influence solitude only as they affect a visitor’s opportunity to avoid the sights, sounds, and evidence of other people in the area.
  - (2) Factors or elements influencing solitude may include size, configuration, topographic and vegetative screening, and ability of the visitor to find seclusion. It is the combination of these and similar elements upon which an overall solitude determination will be made. It may be difficult, for example, to avoid the sights and sounds of people in some areas unless the area is relatively large. Outstanding opportunities for solitude can be found in areas lacking vegetation or topographic screening. A small area could also provide opportunities for solitude if, due to topography or vegetation, visitors can screen themselves from one another.

b. Primitive and Unconfined Recreation. Determine whether or not the area offers an outstanding opportunity for a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.

- (1) In making this determination, consider those activities that provide dispersed, undeveloped recreation which do not require facilities or motorized equipment.
- (2) Some examples of primitive and unconfined types of recreation are: hiking; backpacking; fishing; hunting; spelunking; horseback riding; climbing; river running; cross-country skiing; snowshoeing; dog sledding; photography; bird watching; canoeing; kayaking; sailing; sight seeing for botanical, zoological, or geological features; or other activities permitted in Wilderness Areas.
- (3) An area may possess outstanding opportunities for a primitive and unconfined type of recreation through either the diversity in primitive and unconfined recreational activities possible in the area or the outstanding quality of one opportunity. Other factors to consider include:
  - (a.) Present visitor use of an area is not necessary in evaluating this criterion. The factor to be determined is whether an outstanding opportunity is present, regardless of the amount of use.
  - (b.) A trail system or convenient access is not essential for an outstanding opportunity for primitive and unconfined recreation. The absence of these facilities may increase opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.
  - (c.) The presence or absence of water is not essential for an n outstanding primitive recreation opportunity.
  - (d.) The presence of “challenge” and “risk” are appropriate, but not essential, for an outstanding

primitive recreation opportunity to exist in an area.

4. Supplemental Values. Determine if the area contains ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. Supplemental values are not required, but their presence should be documented where they exist.

c. Boundary Delineation. Define the area with wilderness characteristics to exclude substantially noticeable human-caused impacts. Minor impacts rarely require an adjustment. Where there are several minor impacts, they should be evaluated for their cumulative effect on an area's apparent naturalness. The defined area of the lands with wilderness characteristics must meet the previously described size criteria.

1. Natural portions of an area located between individual human imprints should not be automatically excluded from the area.
2. When establishing the boundary, do not create a setback or buffer from the physical edge of the imprint of man.
3. Developed rights-of-way (ROW) are treated like other significant impacts and the boundary should be drawn to the outer edge of the ROW.
4. An area can have wilderness characteristics even though every acre within the area may not meet all the criteria. The boundary should be determined largely on naturalness rather than being constricted on the basis of opportunity for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. Locate boundaries to exclude only the unnatural portions of the area, except for unusual cases involving constricted boundaries.

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

### \_B\_

**Boundaries:** Inventory area boundaries are normally formed by roads, property lines, rights-of-way, or other substantially noticeable imprints of human activity. Dead-end roads (*i.e.* “cherrystem roads” may extend into the area and are excluded from the area, which will modify the area boundary.

### \_C\_

**Contiguous:** lands or legal subdivisions having a common boundary; lands having only a common corner are not contiguous.

### \_L\_

**land use plan:** a set of decisions that establish management direction for land within an administrative area, as prescribed under the planning provisions of the FLPMA. They are an assimilation of land use plan level decisions developed through the planning process at 43 CFR 1600, regardless of the scale at which the decisions were developed.

### \_N\_

**National Landscape Conservation System:** A system of congressional, Presidential, or other designated areas managed by the BLM, the components of which include National Monuments, national Conservation Areas, Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Historic Trails , National Scenic Trails, the California Desert Conservation Area, and the Headwaters Forest Reserve.

**naturalness:** an area must retain its “primeval character.” It should be an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by humans and their activities.

### \_O\_

**opportunity:** a situation or condition favorable for attainment of a goal.

**outstanding:** standing out among others of its kind, conspicuous; prominent. Superior to others of its kind; distinguished; excellent.

### \_P\_

**primitive and unconfined recreation:** non-motorized, non-mechanized (except as provided by law), and undeveloped types of recreational activities. Bicycles are mechanical transport.

**public lands:** any land and interest in land owned by the United States within the several States and administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management, without regard to how the United States acquired ownership, except: lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf; lands held in trust for the benefit of Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos; and lands where the United States retains the mineral estate but the surface is private.

\_R\_

**road:** The BLM will continue to base the definition of what constitutes a “road” from the FLPMA’s legislative history. The language below is from the House of Representatives Committee Report 94-1163, page 17, dated May 15, 1976, on what became the FLPMA. It is the only statement regarding the definition of a road in the law or legislative history.

“The word ‘roadless’ refers to the absence of roads which have been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road.”

The BLM previously adopted and will continue to use the following sub-definitions of certain words and phrases in the BLM road definition stated above:

- a. **“Improved and maintained”** – Actions taken physically by people to keep the road open to vehicle traffic. “Improved” does not necessarily mean formal construction. “Maintained” does not necessarily mean annual maintenance.
- b. **“Mechanical means”** – Use of hand or power machinery or tools.
- c. **“Relatively regular and continuous use”** – Vehicular use that has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis. Examples are: access roads for equipment to maintain a stock water tank or other established water sources; access roads to maintained recreation sites or facilities; or access roads to mining claims.

A road that was established or has been maintained solely by the passage of vehicles would not be considered a road, even if it is used on a relatively regular and continuous basis. Vehicle roads constructed by mechanical means but that are no longer being maintained by mechanical methods are not roads. Sole use of hands and feet to move rocks or dirt without the use of tools or machinery does not meet the definition of “mechanical means.” Roads need not be “maintained” on a regular basis but rather “maintained” when road conditions warrant actions to keep it in a usable

condition. A dead-end (cherry-stem) road can form the boundary of an inventory area and does not by itself disqualify an area from being considered “roadless”.

\_S\_

**setback:** a buffer or border, including “zone of influence.”

**solitude:** The state of being alone or remote from others; isolation. A lonely or secluded place.

\_T\_

**trammel:** anything that impedes or hinders free action.

\_W\_

**wilderness :** the definition contained in Section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 891).

DRAFT

**H-6300-1-WILDERNESS INVENTORY MAINTENANCE  
IN BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON**

**APPENDIX A – PERMANENT DOCUMENTATION FILE**

The permanent documentation file should include the following:

1. **Inventory Area Evaluation:** Appendix B.
2. **Road Evaluation:** Appendix C.
3. **Inventory Maps:** Inventory maps used in conducting and documenting findings of wilderness inventories must be retained. Maps should depict the area name, number, boundary, and any proto points.
4. **Photo Documentation:** Documentation could include a descriptive log and photographs (Appendix D).
5. **Miscellaneous:** Include additional notes, forms, and documents.

DRAFT

**H-6300-1-WILDERNESS INVENTORY MAINTENANCE  
IN BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON**

**APPENDIX B – INVENTORY AREA EVALUATION**

**Evaluation of Current Conditions:**

1) Document and review the existing BLM wilderness inventory findings on file, if available, regarding the presence or absence of individual wilderness characteristics, using Form 1, below.

2) Consider relevant information regarding current conditions available in the office to identify and describe any changes to the existing information (use interdisciplinary (ID) team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.), and document your findings on Form 2, below.

When Citizen Information has been submitted regarding wilderness characteristics, document the submitted materials including: date of Submission; Name of District(s) and Field Office(s) Affected; Type of material Submitted (e.g. narrative, map, photo). Evaluate any submitted citizen information regarding the validity of proposed boundaries of the unit(s), the existence of roads and other boundary features, the size of the unit(s), and the presence or absence of wilderness characteristics based on relevant information available in the office (prior BLM inventories, ID team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.)

Conduct field reviews as necessary to verify information and to ascertain current conditions. Reach conclusions on current conditions including boundaries, size of areas and presence or absence of wilderness characteristics. Fully explain the basis for each conclusion on form 2, including any critical differences between BLM and citizen information.

Document your findings regarding current conditions for each inventoried area. Describe how the present conditions are similar to, or have changed from, the conditions documented in the original wilderness inventory. Document your findings on Form 2 for each inventory area. Cite to or attach data considered, including photographs, maps, GIS layers, field trip notes, project files, *etc.*

Year \_\_\_\_\_

Inventory Unit Number/Name \_\_\_\_\_

**FORM 1**

**DOCUMENTATION OF BLM WILDERNESS INVENTORY FINDINGS ON RECORD:**

**1. Is there existing BLM wilderness inventory information on all or part of this area?**

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if more than one unit is within the area, list the names/numbers of those units.):

**a) Inventory Source:** \_\_\_\_\_

**b) Inventory Unit Name(s)/Number(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**c) Map Name(s)/Number(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**d) BLM District(s)/Field Office(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**2. BLM Inventory Findings on Record:**

Existing inventory information regarding wilderness characteristics (if more than one BLM inventory unit is associated with the area, list each unit and answer each question individually for each inventory unit):

Existing inventory information regarding wilderness characteristics<sup>1</sup>:

Inventory Source: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Unit#/ Name</b>	<b>Size (historic acres)</b>	<b>Natural Condition? Y/N</b>	<b>Outstanding Solitude? Y/N</b>	<b>Outstanding Primitive &amp; Unconfined Recreation? Y/N</b>	<b>Supplemental Values? Y/N</b>

\_\_\_\_\_

**FORM 2**

Use additional pages as necessary

**DOCUMENTATION OF CURRENT WILDERNESS INVENTORY  
CONDITIONS**

a. Unit Number/Name \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Is the unit of sufficient size?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

[State the BLM acreage of the unit. Describe the boundaries of the unit (roads, property lines, etc.) If the area meets one of the exceptions to the size criterion, check "Yes" and describe the exception. If more than one inventory unit is involved, list the acreage in each and evaluate each unit/subunit separately. Complete the analysis for (1), (2), (3),(4) and (5) for each unit or sub-unit. If you check "No" above, check "N/A" (Not Applicable) in the remaining boxes below, and you need not provide additional evaluation for the unit or subunit. Use additional space as necessary.]

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT CONDITIONS: (Include land ownership, location, topography, vegetation features and summary of major human uses/activities).

(2) Is the unit in a natural condition?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

Description:

(3) Does the unit have outstanding opportunities for solitude?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

Description:

(4) Does the unit have outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

Description:

(5) Does the unit have supplemental values?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

Description:

**Summary of Findings and Conclusion**

Unit Name and Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Summary

Results of Analysis:

1. Does the area meet any of the size requirements? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No
2. Does the area appear to be natural? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No
3. Does the area offer outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_NA
4. Does the area have supplemental values? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_NA

Conclusion

Check One:

\_\_\_\_\_ The area-or a portion of the area-has wilderness character.

\_\_\_\_\_The area does not have wilderness character.

**Prepared by:**

**Team Members:**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

(Names, Titles, Date)

**Approved by:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Field Manager**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date**

*This form documents information that constitutes an inventory finding on wilderness characteristics. It does not represent a formal land use allocation or a final agency decision subject to administrative remedies under either 43 CFR parts 4 or 1610.5-2.*

**H-6300-1-WILDERNESS INVENTORY MAINTENANCE  
IN BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON**

**APPENDIX C – ROAD\* ANALYSIS**

(Factors to consider when determining whether a route is a road for wilderness inventory purposes.)

**Wilderness Inventory Area Name and Number (UNIT\_ID):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Route Name and/or Identifier:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Include Transportation Plan Identifier, if known, include route number supplied by citizen information when available)

**I. LOCATION:** refer to attached map \_\_\_\_\_ and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

**II. CURRENT PURPOSE OF ROUTE:**

Examples: Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment).

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

**III. ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY:**

Is a road right-of-way associated with this route? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Unknown \_\_\_\_

**IV. CONSTRUCTION**

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

Examples:

Paved \_\_\_\_\_ Bladed \_\_\_\_\_ Graveled \_\_\_\_\_ Roadside Berms \_\_\_\_\_

Cut/Fill \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

**V. IMPROVEMENTS**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

By Hand Tools \_\_\_\_\_ By Machine \_\_\_\_\_

Examples:

Culverts \_\_\_\_\_ Stream Crossings \_\_\_\_\_ Bridges \_\_\_\_\_ Drainage \_\_\_\_\_

Barriers \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

**VI. MAINTENANCE:**

A. Is their Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Hand Tools \_\_\_\_ (Y/N) \_\_\_\_\_ Machine \_\_\_\_ (Y/N) \_\_\_\_\_

Explain: \_\_\_\_\_

B. If the route is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM in the event this route became impassable?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**VII. REGULAR AND CONTINUOUS USE:**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Describe evidence (vehicle tracks observed) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**VIII. CONCLUSION:**

To meet the definition of a road, items IV or V, and VI-A or B, and VII must be checked yes.

Road: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Explanation:

Evaluator(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\* **road:** An access route which has been **improved and maintained** by **mechanical means** to insure **relatively regular and continuous use**. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road.

a. **“Improved and maintained”** – Actions taken physically by people to keep the road open to vehicle traffic. “Improved” does not necessarily mean formal construction. “Maintained” does not necessarily mean annual maintenance.

b. **“Mechanical means”** – Use of hand or power machinery or tools.

c. **“Relatively regular and continuous use”** – Vehicular use that has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis. Examples are: access roads for equipment to maintain a stock water tank or other established water sources; access roads to maintained recreation sites or facilities; or access roads to mining claims.

DRAFT



## **Attachment 2**

### **Staff Consulted with on Roads**

Stanley Woodworth, Civil Engineering Technician  
John Petty, Civil Engineering Technician  
John Bethea, Maintenance Manager  
Terry Carroll, Road Maintenance Worker  
Daryl Ross, Equipment Operator  
Bill Anderson, District Range Management Specialist

### **Burns District ID-Team**

Laura Dowlan, Outdoor Recreation Planner (Wilderness Specialist)  
Brett Page, Outdoor Recreation Planner  
Nick Miller, Wildlife Biologist  
Mike McGee, Wildlife Biologist\*  
Rob Sharp, Range Management Specialist  
Ronda Purdy, Range Technician  
Scott Thomas, Archeologist\*\*  
Fred McDonald, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist  
Willie Street, Range Management Specialist  
Autumn Richardson, SCEP Range Management Specialist

\* Mike McGee participated in the ID-team, but transferred to another district and did not participate in the review of the final reports.

\*\* Scott Thomas was not able to participate in the ID-Team Meeting, but he was consulted with regarding archeological resources in the units.

Matt Obradovich, Wildlife Biologist was also consulted with in regards to BLM's current Special Status Species List.

### **Lakeview District ID-Team**

Kim McLean, Outdoor Recreation Planner – Lakeview District  
Paul Whitman, Planning & Environmental Coordinator  
Jayna Ferrell, Range Management Specialist  
Todd Forbes, Associate Field Manager