

# Appendix E


## Energy and Minerals



This appendix provides detailed background on mineral and energy developments.

**In this appendix:**

Reasonably Foreseeable Mineral and Energy Developments in the Eugene, Roseburg, and Medford Districts and the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District .....	E-3
Restrictions and Requirements on Mineral and Energy Exploration and Development Activity .....	E-33





# Reasonably Foreseeable Mineral and Energy Developments Summary

**TABLE E-1. FLUID MINERAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**

	Eugene	Roseburg	Medford	Klamath Falls
Conventional Oil/Gas	N/A	Zero to 114 wells	N/A	N/A
Seismic notices of intent		Expected to be confined to existing road systems; negligible effects.		
Road construction		7 miles new road = 39 acres.		
Well pad		Nested wells and services = 114 acres.		
Collection pipe:		Collection piping will utilize road prism.		
Plug & abandon wells		No additional effect.		
Coal bed natural gas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Seismic notices of intent				
Road construction				
Well pad				
Collection pipe:				
Plug & abandon wells				
Geothermal	N/A	N/A	N/A	See below.

For Klamath Falls Resource Area:

**Geophysical Exploration (includes seismic reflection and gravity/magnetic field surveys):**

- Notices of Intent: 2; Very small acres disturbed
- Exploratory Wells: 1-2: 0.1 acre per site; .25 acre per well for roads. 0.35-0.7 acres total disturbance

**Geothermal Operations:**

- Notices of Intent:
  - Surface Geophysical Surveys: 6: very limited surface disturbance
  - Temperature Gradient Holes: 5: 0.1 acre per site; .25 acre per well for roads. 2.25 acres total disturbance

Exploration wells: 5 wells; One acre per well pad; 40 ft. wide ROW @ 0.5 mile per well = 17 acres total disturbance

**Geothermal Power Plant Development:**

- 1 possible in the life of the plan; if proposed, evaluate separately in cooperation with the State.

**Direct Use of Geothermal Energy for space heat:**

- 2 possible; evaluate separately if proposed



**TABLE E-2. SALABLE MINERAL DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO SUMMARY FOR 2008-2018**

	Roseburg	Salem	Eugene	Coos Bay	Medford	Klamath Falls
New quarries	1	5	2	5	3	1 to 2
Acres disturbed	2 acres per quarry, plus ½ acre for access.					2 to 3 acres per quarry, plus ½ acre for access.
Existing quarries	60  6 quarries expanded @ 2 acres per quarry	38  8 quarries expanded. Less than 2 acres per quarry.	71  4 quarries expanded at approximately 1 acre each.	32  6 quarries expanded. Less than 2 acres each quarry.	188  10% of quarries expanded at less than 1 acre per quarry, plus 1/10 acre per quarry for new access.	18 quarry & cinder sites used Intermittently.
Depletions	10 quarries	2 quarries	2 quarries	1 quarry	5 quarries	Up to 4 quarries
Decorative stone		3 to 6 sales per year	1 to 2 sales per year		750 sales over the 10-year period	1 to 2 sales per year

**TABLE E-3. LOCATABLE MINERAL DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO**

	Roseburg	Salem	Eugene <sup>a</sup>	Coos Bay	Medford	Klamath Falls
Bench Placer notices	2	10	6	6	80	0
Roads	0.3 acres per	0.3 acres per	0.3 acres per	0.3 acres per	Of 80 estimated, 10 would have roads at ½ acre per notice.	0
Test pits, support facility	1 acre per notice	1 acre per notice	1 acre per notice	1 acre per notice	1 acre per notice on average.	
Notice to plan	1	1	0	1	0	0
Vein notices	2	4	4	one	100 notices; surface disturbance 1 to 5 acres per notice.	4
Roads	3 per notice 40x200 = ½ acre per notice	3 per notice 40x200=1/2 acre per notice	3 per notice 40x200= ½ acre per notice	3 per notice 40x200= ½ acre per notice	Mostly existing roads; minimal temporary roads; estimate 0.50-acre for half of the notices; and zero acres for the other half of the notices.	Mostly existing roads; minimal temporary roads.
Support facilities	1 acre per notice	1 acre per notice	1 acre per notice	1 acre per notice	1 acre for half of the notices (many current notices take ore off-site for processing).	
Sample sites	½ acre per notice	0.50-acre per notice	0.50-acre per notice	0.50-acre per notice	Ten holes per notice; 0.1 acre per hole; estimate 1/5 of the notices will drill a hole.	Ten holes per notice; 0.1 acre per hole.
Plans of Operation	1	1	1	1	15 (lode & placer)	0
Exploratory holes	5; 0.1 acre per hole; roads 40x300= 0.75 acre	Ten; 0.1 acre per hole; roads 40x300= 0.75 acre	Ten; 0.1 acre per hole; roads 40x300= 0.75 acre	Ten; 0.1 acre per hole; roads 40x300= 0.75 acre	Ten; 0.1 acre per hole; roads 40x300= 0.75 acre. Estimate ½ of the plans will be lodes and have exploratory holes.	
Support facility	1 acre	1 acre	1 acre	1 acre	1 acre per plan	
<b>Second Phase Exploration</b>						
Roads	5 (standard as above)= 2.5 acres	10 (standard as above)= 2.5 acres	10 (standard as above)= 2.5 acres	10 (standard as above)= 2.5 acres	Mostly existing roads; minimal temporary roads; estimate ½ acre for ½ of the plans; zero acres for the other half of the plans.	



	Roseburg	Salem	Eugene <sup>a</sup>	Coos Bay	Medford	Klamath Falls
Drill pads		10 holes, 0.1 acre per hole	10 holes, 0.1 acre per hole	10 holes, 0.1 acre per hole	10 holes, 0.1 acre per hole; on ¼ of the plans.	
<b>Mine Development</b>						
Bench placer	One; 1 acre	One, 7.5 acres	one; 7.5 acres		Eight of the plans are estimated to be bench placers at five acres per plan.	
Lode	One	one	None		Seven of the plans are estimated to be lodes with one requiring a 25 acre heap leach.	
Surface excavation	1 acre	10 acres			5 acres per plan.	
Stockpile topsoil	1 acre	2acres			1 acre per plan.	
Support facility	1 acre	2acres			1 acre per plan.	
Roads	1 acre	2 acres			Less than 1 acre per plan.	
<b>Mineral Processing</b>	Done offsite	Done offsite			One acre for half of the plans.	
Silica sand deposit		One	<sup>a</sup> see footnote	one		0
Mine site		21 acres		20 acres		
Stockpile heavy minerals		One acre		2 acres		
vegetation stockpile		One acre		½ acre		
Office & magnetic separation		One acre		One acre		
Laterite placer plan of operation				One plan		0
Exploratory Holes drilled				10 @ 0.1 acre per hole		
New temporary Roads				0.75 acres total		
Support facility				One acre		
<b>Second Phase Expansion</b>						
Temporary roads				2.5 acres total		
Ten additional drill holes				One acre total		
Recreational mining	5 notices; 2 Acres total	30 notices; 7.5 acres total	30 notices; 7.5 acres total	30 notices; 7.5 acres total	800 Estimate 300 acres, this is disturbance only under the water level.	See suction dredging above.

<sup>a</sup> Eugene footnote: Locatable minerals with silica sand potential withdrawn from mineral entry in the Florence area. However, sand is excavated and removed from BLM property near Florence, Oregon, on an easement granted to the adjacent landowner.



# **Foreseeable Development of Oil and Gas Resources Scenario for the BLM Eugene, Roseburg, and Medford Districts and the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District**

## **Summary**

This report estimates the potential for occurrence of oil and gas activity on Federal acreage managed by the BLM in the Eugene, Roseburg, and Medford Districts, and in the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District during the next 10 years. The analysis is based on current developments within and outside of these Districts, including historical Oil and Gas investigations that began with the first exploration well drilled near Newberg in 1902. This analysis compliments the similar discussion for the Coos Bay and Salem Districts where proven hydrocarbon resources exist.

It is expected that, with a few exceptions, most public domain and revested Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands will be available for leasing of hydrocarbon energy resources subject to management by guiding stipulations. A review of oil and gas occurrence potential, oil and gas system and play analysis, oil and gas production activities, potential for resource occurrence and development, and leasing was made to establish the oil and gas potential presented here. This information was used to project activity through 2018. Given the current incipient nature of petroleum development in Oregon in 2007 (i.e., current coalbed natural gas development and new exploration of the Mist Gas Field), completely new assumptions and information that could impact Reasonably Foreseeable Development scenarios for each district may occur during the course of the next 10 years and beyond.

The districts are in western Oregon and encompass lands within all or parts of eight counties: Linn, Lane, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Curry, Coos, and Klamath. The potential for occurrence of conventional petroleum in the districts has been the focus of numerous studies. These investigations have resulted in one developed field in the Salem District (Mist Gas Field), beginning with a discovery well in 1979. A prospect for coalbed natural gas is being developed in the Coos Bay District. However, small amounts of conventional and unconventional oil and gas have been found throughout western Oregon, based on the projected sedimentary basins.

Research has identified sedimentary basins, petroleum systems, and coal basins. Based on these petroleum systems, five plays and associated prospects have been identified. The research cited within this report projects that these plays have low to moderate potentials for development.

Based on BLM protocol for mineral potentials, it is further projected that the Eugene and Medford Districts, and the Klamath Falls Resource Area have low to moderate potential for petroleum occurrence and low potential for development. Therefore, it is unlikely that petroleum will be developed in these BLM administrative areas within the 10-year Reasonably Foreseeable Development scenario for the planning area. The Roseburg District contains plays, prospects, and an area of focused petroleum shows that project a moderate potential for petroleum occurrence and a moderate potential for development. The BLM-administered acreage with this moderate potential is approximately 37,000 acres.

It is anticipated that the Roseburg BLM-administered lands could have a development of up to 114 wells, with total disturbed acreage up to approximately 153 acres within the 10-year Reasonably Foreseeable Development scenario.



## Introduction

This Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) describes scenarios for leasable oil and gas commodities within lands managed by the BLM's Eugene, Roseburg, and Medford Districts and the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District (collectively referred to as districts). The purpose of this RFD scenario is to provide models that anticipate the level and type of future petroleum development activity in the planning area, and to serve as the basis for analyzing cumulative impacts. The RFD first describes historic and current development. Future trends and assumptions for hypothetical exploration and extraction operations are then described. All projections are estimates based on available information presented in the Historic and Current Development section.

## Methodology

Extensive review of existing literature was completed, as well as acquisition of unpublished information. Resulting information, such as prospects, plays, basins, exploration wells, seeps, coal exposures, and petroleum encounters in water wells, were crafted into Geographic Information Systems (GIS) map layers. These layers were then incorporated into GIS maps of BLM-administered lands and geologic mapping. The results provided quantifiable locations and acreages estimates of petroleum potentials, or lack of, for BLM-administered lands within each district boundary (USDI BLM 2008).

## Scope

This RFD is based on the known and inferred mineral resource capabilities of the lands involved, and applies to conditions and assumptions discussed under Historic and Current Development, as well as Future Trends and Assumptions. Changes in geologic data, interpretation, and/or economic conditions that alter the RFD may result in deviation of these projections over time.

Impacts caused by oil and gas development, as well as impacts to oil and gas development, cannot be assessed without estimating future oil and gas activity. Such estimates of future activity incorporate:

- oil and gas occurrence potential, as documented by historic research and papers
- oil and gas system and play analysis (including existing plays currently developed and the potential development for new plays such as identified sediment basins and Coalbed Natural Gas)
- oil and gas production, including economics and technology
- potential for resource occurrence and development
- leasing and development, including Federal and non-Federal activities

The above factors cannot be predicted with certainty, but some generalizations are possible. The estimates presented here are based on past and present activities as well as on trends within and without the Districts, including future price deviations. These estimates may be lower than what may actually happen if price and play developments are more positive than anticipated. Likewise, if expansion of existing plays is not successful, if new plays are not developed, and/or if commodity prices are less than anticipated, these estimates may be exaggerated.



## Historic and Current Development

### Oil and Gas Occurrence Potential

The districts encompass lands in eight counties, including Linn, Lane, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Curry, Coos, and Klamath counties. The districts are located in western, southwestern, and southern Oregon. The BLM-management extends to both Public Domain (PD) and revested Oregon and California Railroad (O&C) lands. It is expected that most of these lands will be available for mineral leasing.

Petroleum development in the districts has been the focus of numerous studies such as Dillar (1909, 1914, as found in Weissenborn 1969 and others), Washburne (1914 as found in Olmstead et al. 1989), Stewart and Newton (1954), Newton (1969), Newton (1980), Olmstead et al. (1989), Niem and Niem (1990), and Ryu et al. (1996). The districts have also been the focus of numerous industry explorations and investigations, by such companies as Northwest Natural (Oregon Natural Gas Development), Mobil Oil Corporation, Methane Energy Corporation, Standard Oil Company of California, Guarantee Oil Company, Sinclair Oil & Gas Company, Amoco, as well as numerous others (Olmstead et al. 1989, Niem and Niem 1990, Stewart and Newton 1954, Meyer 2007).


Although exploration of Western Oregon has been more or less continuous since 1902, three major peaks of petroleum exploration have occurred. The first took place between 1920 and 1940. This peak of exploration was very wide-spread, as there was little geologic information guiding the exploration. The second peak occurred between 1940 and 1960, and investigated the deeper Oligocene and Eocene marine sediments. This phase culminated in the discovery of the Mist Gas Field in 1979 (Olmstead et al. 1989, Olmstead and Alger 1985, Houston 1997). The third occurred in the 1980s, with the placement of deep wells up to 13,177 feet total depth (Niem and Niem 1990). This third peak has continued into the search and development of unconventional petroleum resources such as Coalbed Natural Gas, with a play being developed in the Coos Bay Basin.

Little oil and gas exploration has been conducted in the Medford District and Klamath Resource Area (Niewendorp 2008, Wiley 2008, Wells 2008). Oil and gas exploration wells have been drilled, with at least two shows (see *Figure E-1*). A potential oil shale deposit was also been identified. These are located in or near a delineated coalfield, identified as the Rogue River Coalfield (Olmstead et al. 1989, Stewart 1954, Sidle 1981; Jackson County 1989, 2004, 2006). Most energy investigations have focused on geothermal explorations (Niewendorp 2008).






FIGURE E-1. WESTERN OREGON OIL AND GAS INVESTIGATIONS AND PROJECTIONS



Source: USDI BLM 2008, Olmstead et al. 1989, Niem and Niem 1990, Newton et al. 1980, Stewart and Newton 1954, Sidle 1981, Newton 1969, Kvenvolden et al. 1995, Mason and Erwin 1955



## Oil and Gas System and Plays

The Eugene and Roseburg Districts are part of a structural sedimentary basin system that extends onshore and offshore from the Klamath Terrains boundary north to the Columbia River (extending into Washington as the Puget-Willamette Trough); from the continental shelf east to the Cascade Mountain/Willamette Valley interface. This is known as the Western Tertiary Basin Province (Olmstead et al. 1989). This province has been of interest for petroleum exploration since the 1880s (Newton 1969, Orr and Orr 2000), with exploratory oil and gas drilling beginning in 1902 near Newberg (Stewart and Newton 1954, Olmstead et al. 1989).

The northern portion of the Western Tertiary Basin Province possesses at least six identified basins or sub-basins (Newton 1969, Orr and Orr 2000, Olmstead et al. 1989). These basins include:

- Tualatin Basin (a sub-basin of the Willamette Valley)
- Willamette Valley
- Newport Basin (a sub-basin of the larger off-shore Newport Basin)
- Tillamook Basin (a sub-basin of the larger off-shore Newport Basin)
- Astoria Basin
- Nehalem Basin (or arch)

Of these, the Willamette Basin extends into the Eugene District (see *Figure E-2*).


The Willamette Valley basin extends from the southern end of the Puget Sound Trough at the Columbia River south into the Eugene District. This basin is mapped adjacent to the Tyee Basin through parts of the Salem District and the Eugene District (see *Figure E-2* and *Figure E-3*) (Newton 1969, Ryu et al. 1996). The lower rock, or basement rock, is the Eocene Siletz River Volcanics or Kings Valley Siltstone. Overlying these are sandstones and siltstones to the Eocene Nonconformity. This nonconformity is covered by volcanics, overlain by sandstone, limestone, and coal beds. The assemblage is capped by the Columbia River Basalts, which are covered by tuff and silt. The petroleum potential boundary in the Eocene rock is defined to the east by the change from marine sediment to volcanic sediment (facies change) (Newton 1969) (see *Figure E-2*). Numerous wells with gas shows have been drilled within the valley. The eastern edge of the valley provides numerous possibilities for structural traps, with the marine beds providing source rock for petroleum accumulations. Even though numerous holes have been drilled and source and structure is present, true potential has not been clearly defined. The Eocene Nonconformity (marine facies) is at maximum the mapped depth of 5,000 feet below sea level (Newton, 1969).

The southern portion of the Western Tertiary Basin Province is identified as the Tyee Basin. This basin extends north from the Klamath Terrains to approximately the Lincoln City-Salem Latitude (Ryu et al, 1996). The Tyee Basin is actually composed of two basins: the NE-SW oriented Umpqua basin of early Eocene age and the north-south oriented Tyee Forearc Basin of middle Eocene age. The Umpqua Basin is divided by the Umpqua Arch, composed of a volcanic high. The two sub-basins include the Smith River Sub-Basin, located east of Florence and Reedsport, and the Myrtle Point-Sutherlin Sub-Basin along the southern boundary (Ryu et al. 1992, 1996). The Yaquina Sub-Basin of the Salem District could be considered as part of the Tyee Basin, as well as the southern portion of the Willamette Valley Sub-Basin (Ryu et al. 1996; Newton 1969). The Coos Basin overlies and bounds by mapping, the Tyee Basin to the west (Ryu et al. 1996) (refer to *Figure E-2*).

The basin structure is controlled by compression resulting from the subducting easterly moving Juan de Fuca plate in relation to the overriding westerly moving North American Plate. The fold axes are oriented north-south (Orr and Orr 2000). The northern basins are defined by the contact between the Miocene or Oligocene rock and Eocene rock. This is a point of erosion of the Eocene rock, which was covered by Miocene or Oligocene rock, defined as a nonconformity (unconformity if covered by Miocene or Oligocene




FIGURE E-2. BASIC UNDERLYING GEOLOGY



Source: Newton 1969, Ryu et al. 1996



FIGURE E-3. BASIN, PETROLEUM SYSTEMS, PLAYS, AND PROSPECTS



Sources: USDI BLM 2008, Olmstead et al. 1989, Niemi and Niemi 1990, Newton et al. 1980, Stewart and Newton 1954, Sidle 1981, Newton 1969, Kvenvolden et al. 1995, Mason and Erwin 1955



sedimentary rock). This break in the geologic column is considered the Eocene nonconformity and a focus of petroleum exploration. The Eocene rocks consist of marine sediments, with latter sedimentation creating coal beds in many areas (Newton 1969) (refer to *Figure E-2*).

The Tyee Basin structure is a result of compressional tectonics. However, rotation of tectonic forces produced differing orientations for the Umpqua Basin and the Tyee Forearc Basin (Ryu et al. 1996, Wells et al. 2000). In general, the projected conventional oil and gas systems result from organic rich source rock and coal from the Umpqua Basins being trapped by the rock of the overlying Tyee Forearc Basin (Ryu et al. 1996). The coal seams of the Coos Basin (Coos Bay District) are currently being investigated for coal bed natural gas. However, deeper source rocks may exist and contribute to the coal bed natural gas resource. These source rocks would be part of the underlying Tyee Basin (Pappajohn 2007, Newton et al. 1980).

Based on geologic interpretation and petroleum exploration, Ryu et al. (1996) identified petroleum systems, plays, and prospects within the Tyee Basin. An oil and/or gas play is an area, geologic formation, or geologic trend that has good potential for oil and/or gas development, or is generating a large amount of interest in leasing and drilling (USDI BLM 2001). As defined by Magoon (1988 as found in Ryu et al. 1996):


- A **Petroleum System** is a relationship of source rock and the resulting petroleum accumulation. This relationship contains a source rock for petroleum; migration paths; reservoir rock; seal; trap; and the appropriate geologic processes that form these hydrocarbon materials. The extent of the Petroleum System can be delineated as an area that contains both the mature source rock and oil or gas accumulations. The name of the Petroleum System would consist of the name of the source rocks, followed by the name of the reservoir rock, followed by the level of certainty for its occurrence.

There are three levels of certainty: known, hypothetical, and speculative. Known systems have a strong geochemical match between the source rocks and an existing petroleum accumulation. These are identified in the name by an exclamation point in parentheses: (!). Hypothetical systems have geochemical data that identify a source rock, but do not link the source rock to a known petroleum accumulation. These are identified in the name by a period in parentheses: (.). An example is the Mist Gas Field. The Speculative system has geological or geophysical evidence used to project the existence of a link between source rocks and potential petroleum accumulations. These are identified in the name by a question mark in parentheses: (?).

- A **Play** is the existence of a trap (a geologic structure that allows petroleum to accumulate) that is detectable with geological, geophysical, or geochemical technology. A play does not need all of the elements of a petroleum system.
- A **Prospect** is a drillable trap that is located within a play.

Ryu et al. (1996) identified three distinct speculative petroleum systems, five distinct plays, and three distinct gas prospects within the Tyee Basin (refer to *Figure E-3*). The identified petroleum systems include:

- *The Umpqua-Dothan-White Tail Ridge (?) Hybrid Petroleum System:* There is a potential of dry gas (methane) from buried coals and carbonaceous mudstone of the White Tail Ridge Formations, with migrations to traps of the Tyee Sandstones. Because there is no known connection between the potential source of petroleum and the potential traps and because there is no known commercial accumulations of natural gas, the system is considered speculative. According to BLM GIS-based estimates, the total acreage of this petroleum system is approximately 574,000 acres. Of this, approximately 215,000 acres are within the Coos Bay District, approximately 352,000 acres are within the Roseburg District, and approximately 8,000 acres are within the Medford District.



- The Umpqua-lower Tyee Mountain (?) Petroleum System; Basin Center Gas (?): This system may contain a tight-gas sandstone reservoir, collecting thermogenic (temperature-induced conversion to petroleum) wet-gas and oil derived from mudstone of the Umpqua Group. The model projects natural gas migrating along fractures to accumulate in Tyee Mountain turbidite sandstones. An unconventional mudstone reservoir is possible in the Umpqua Group. According to BLM GIS, the total acreage of this petroleum system is approximately 145,000 acres. Of this, approximately 116,000 are within the Coos Bay District and approximately 29,000 acres are within the Eugene District.
- The Spencer-White Tail Ridge-Western Cascade Arc (?) Petroleum System: The petroleum sources of this system are the coals and carbonaceous mudstone and sandstones of the Spencer Formation and White Tail Ridge Formation, generated by the deep burial and heating by the Western Cascades arc plutons. The reservoir rock would be the overlying sandstones and delta facies. According to BLM GIS, the approximate total acreage of this petroleum system is 119,000 acres. Of this, approximately 69,000 acres are within the Eugene District and approximately 50,000 acres are within the Roseburg District.

All of these systems are considered speculative. Additional drilling and exploration may alter that qualifier (or completely remove the potential). As an example, the Mist Gas Field was considered a speculative field until the discovery well was drilled in 1979, which led to its designation as a gas field (Ryu et al. 1996).

In addition to the three petroleum systems, Ryu et al. (1996) have identified five different plays described below in the *order of their potential to produce hydrocarbons*, as shown in *Figure E-3*:

1. The Williams River-Burnt Ridge anticlinal Plays: This is a complex domal structure in the Tyee Formation (Play 1 of 5). Natural gas might be found in the lower Umpqua strata in the footwall beneath Siletz River Volcanics. The White Tail Ridge sandstone could also serve as a trap. Isolated faults and thrust faults, as well as pinchouts and unconformities, also provide potential traps. A gas prospect may exist within this play. According to BLM GIS, the total acreage of this play is approximately 94,000 acres. Of this, approximately 20,000 acres are within the Roseburg District and approximately 74,000 acres are within the Coos Bay District.
2. Western Cascades plays and Bonanza thrust near Nonpareil: This system incorporates anticlines and faults, including the extension of the Bonanza Fault, at the contact of the Tyee Basin and the Western Cascades (Play 2 of 5). The potential reservoir rocks include the Spence and White Tail Ridge formations. Source rock includes several one- to six-foot thick coal beds, carbonaceous sandstone, and mudstone. Other plays may exist in the foothills of the Western Cascades, with the buried Spencer Formation being the structural or stratigraphic play. The Spencer Formation is exposed from Glide to Cottage Grove. A gas prospect is projected within the play. According to BLM GIS, the total approximate acreage of this play is 64,000 acres, all of which is contained within the Roseburg District.
3. Klamath Mountains sub-thrust play, Glide area: It is interpreted that the Klamath Mountains (Klamath Terrains) are thrust over the Coast Range rocks, burying parts of the Southern Tyee Basin. Possible plays may exist in the underlying Tyee Basin stratigraphy in the areas of the Wildlife Safari fault and southeast and southwest of Glide (Play 3 of 5). The White Tail Ridge Formation is the potential reservoir unit with source being derived from the Remote Member and Tenmile Formations. However, it is debated whether the Tyee stratigraphy (Siletz River Basalts) formed in place through an abandoned rift zone. This would mean that there is no overthrusting of the Klamath Terrains over the Tyee Basin, and therefore no associated traps or plays (Ryu et al. 1996). However, more recent geology mapping has indicated that the overthrusting does exist (Well et al. 2000, DuRoss et al. 2002, Wells 2008). Therefore, while unexplored, potential for petroleum traps along the Klamath Terrains/Tyee Basin boundaries may exist. According to BLM GIS, the total approximate acreage of this play is 96,000 acres, all of which is contained within the Roseburg District.



4. Tyee Mountain anticlinal plays: Several untested anticlines exist in the Tyee Mountain and Baughman members of the Tyee Formation beyond the Williams River-Burnt Ridge anticlinal plays (Play 4 of 5). Stratigraphic traps could exist along the flanks of the Siletz River Volcanics in the Umpqua Arch. A specific untested anticlinal structure exists at Stony Point. While these untested structures exist, the potential of the northern anticlines is low when compared to the southern anticline systems, due to the lack of maturation, organic-rich source rock, and reservoir rocks. However, a gas prospect may exist in the northern portion of the play. According to BLM GIS, the total approximate acreage of the play and prospect is 203,000 acres. Of this, approximately 25,000 acres are located within the Coos Bay District, approximately 91,000 acres are located within the Eugene District, and approximately 87,000 acres are located within the Roseburg District.
5. Anticlinal and subthrust plays in the Myrtle Point-Sutherlin Sub-Basin: These plays consist of thrust faults and anticlinal and synclinal folds of rock of the Umpqua Group, Bushnell, and White Tail Ridge formation in the Myrtle Point-Sutherlin Sub-Basins. The area of the play is the Roseburg-Sutherlin-Glide area (Play 5 of 5). Gas shows have been encountered in tight sandstones and methane emanations from water wells. However, there has been no commercial production. According to BLM GIS, the total approximate acreage of the play is 60,000 acres, all of which is contained within the Roseburg District.

Additionally, numerous exploration wells, seeps, and petroleum producing water wells exist within the districts. As shown in *Figure E-6*, an area of concentration of petroleum shows is located within the Umpqua-Dothan-White Tail Ridge (?) hybrid petroleum system. Although shows are found throughout the four districts, this concentration provides a concentrated area of petroleum shows. According to BLM GIS, the total acreage of this focus of petroleum shows is approximately 68,000 acres, of which all is contained within the Roseburg District.

All of these structures and systems completely or in part underlay the Eugene and Roseburg Districts. Areas of gas and oil exploration and shows also exist throughout the Districts (Olmstead et al. 1989, Niem and Niem 1990, Newton et al. 1980, Stewart and Newton 1954, Newton 1969, Sidle 1981, Kvenvolden et al. 1995) (refer to *Figure E-3*).


The Medford District is south and east of the Tertiary Basin System/Tyee Basin, incorporating Klamath accreted terrains in the west and the Cascade Volcanics and Basin and Range structures to the East. The Klamath Resource Area of the Lakeview District lies east of the Medford District and incorporates “Basin and Range” structures. The accreted Klamath terrains are bound by the Tyee Basin (The Tyee Basin is the southern portion of the Western Tertiary Basin System) to the North. They extend into northern California and are variously bounded on the east by Cascade Volcanics and rocks within the Basin and Range province. The Oregon portion of the Basin and Range province is a northern projection of the crustal extension that extends through the southwestern United States.

Coal exposures and basins exist throughout western Oregon (Mason and Erwin 1955) (refer to *Figure E-1*). One major coal basin has been identified in the Medford District within Jackson County (Sidle 1981; Jackson County, 1989, 2004, 2006; Weissenborn 1969). This coal field is known as the Rouge River Coal Field. The field extends southward from Evans Creek to a point about 10 miles south of the Oregon-California border (Weissenborn 1969) (see *Figure E-4*). According to BLM GIS, the total approximate acreage of the Rouge River Coal Field is 221,000 acres, all of which is contained within the Medford District boundaries (the portion in California is not analyzed).

All coal seams in western Oregon could produce coal bed natural gas. However, the true potential is unknown, as investigations for coal bed natural gas potential for these seams are just beginning (Wiley 2006, Pappajohn 2007, Meyer 2007). Potential could exist within the coal seams of the Umpqua Group, as well as with coeval formations north throughout the coast range. If coal bed natural gas is producible in the Coos Basin, exploration may extend to other speculative formations (May 2005, Pappajohn 2007).



FIGURE E-4. COAL BASINS



Sources: USDI BLM 2008, Olmstead et al. 1989; Niem and Niem 1990, Newton et al. 1980, Stewart and Newton 1954, Sidle 1981, Newton 1969, Kvenvolden et al. 1995, Mason and Erwin 1955





Current development of the coal bed natural gas resource is being conducted by the Methane Energy Corporation within the Coos Bay District. The company has completed numerous exploratory and production wells within the Coos Basin. Based on this exploration, the company has projected a defined area for coal bed natural gas development, described as an “Area of Mutual Interest” (AMI). This incorporates the Coos Basin (Torrent Energy Corporation 2008).

The following descriptions of oil and gas occurrence potential are projected for BLM-administered mineral rights within the western Oregon Districts. Prospects, Plays, Basins and other potentials overlap district boundaries. Therefore, a total system potential may incorporate more than one district.

### Eugene District

The Eugene District incorporates portions or all of Linn, Lane, and Douglas counties. At least one exploration well with shows of oil and gas (Fed-Mapleton 1) and two petroleum seeps are within the Eugene District boundary. Sedimentary basins underlying the Eugene District include both the Tyee Basin and the Willamette Valley Basin. Two Petroleum Systems extend into the district, as well as the Tyee Mountain anticlinal play and its associated Gas Prospect (see *Figure E-5*)


*Table E-4* represents the approximate acreage of the basins, systems, plays, and prospects located within the Eugene District:

**TABLE E-4. EUGENE DISTRICT ACREAGES**

System	Total Acreage Within the Eugene District	Total BLM-Managed Surface Acreage	Total BLM-Managed Sub-Surface Split-Estate Acreage
Tyee Basin	794,000	160,000	500
Willamette Sedimentary Basin	252,000	5,000	12,000
Spencer-White Tail Ridge-Western Cascade Arc (?) Petroleum System	69,000	13,000	100
Umpqua-lower Tyee Mountain (?) Petroleum System	29,000	4,000	0
Tyee Mountain anticlinal play and associated gas prospect (Play 4 of 5)	91,000	55,000	0



FIGURE E-5. EUGENE DISTRICT



Sources: USDI BLM 2008, Olmstead et al. 1989; Niem and Niem 1990, Newton et al. 1980, Stewart and Newton 1954, Sidle 1981, Newton 1969, Kvenvolden et al. 1995, Mason and Erwin 1955



### Roseburg District

The Roseburg District incorporates the major portion of Douglas County, with minor portions of Linn and Jackson Counties. The district has been the focus of historical exploration with at least 2 oil and gas exploration well shows, 7 exploration gas well shows, 3 exploration oil well shows, 5 petroleum seeps, 12 petroleum shows in water wells, and 12 coal exposures. Sedimentary basins underlying the Roseburg District include the Tyee Basin. Two petroleum systems extend into the Roseburg District, as well as five projected plays. One complete gas prospect and another partial gas prospect associated with two plays exist, as well as one focused area of petroleum exploration (see *Figure E-6*).


*Table E-5* represents the approximate acreage of the basins, systems, plays, and prospects within the Roseburg District:

**TABLE E-5. ROSEBURG DISTRICT ACREAGES**

System	Total Acreage Within the Roseburg District	Total BLM-Managed Surface Acreage	Total BLM-Managed Sub-Surface Split-Estate Acreage
Tyee Basin	889,000	207,000	300
Spencer-White Tail Ridge-Western Cascade Arc (?) Petroleum System	50,000	11,000	0
Umpqua-Dothan-White Tail Ridge (?) hybrid Petroleum System.	352,000	83,000	0
Williams River-Burnt Ridge Anticlinal Play and associated Gas Prospect (Play 1 of 5)	20,000	7,000	0
Western Cascades Plays and Bonanza Thrust near Nonpareil and associated Gas Prospect (Play 2 of 5)	64,000	10,000	0
Klamath Mountains Subthrust Play, Glide Area (Play 3 of 5)	96,000	18,000	0
Tyee Mountain Anticlinal play (Play 4 of 5)	87,000	41,000	0
Anticlinal and Subthrust Plays in the Myrtle Point-Sutherlin Subbasin (Play 5 of 5)	60,000	3,000	0
Area of Focused Petroleum Shows	68,000	2,000	0



FIGURE E-6. ROSEBURG DISTRICT



Sources: USDI BLM 2008, Olmstead et al. 1989, Niem and Niem 1990, Newton et al. 1980, Stewart and Newton 1954, Sidle 1981, Newton 1969, Kvenvolden et al. 1995, Mason and Erwin 1955)



### Medford District

The Medford District incorporates portions or all of Jackson, Josephine, Douglas, Curry and Coos Counties. At least two oil and gas exploration wells with shows, one petroleum seep, one oil shale prospect, and one coal field exist within the Medford District boundary. A small portion of the Tye Basin sedimentary basin and a petroleum system underlies the northwest part of the district. No plays or prospects have been mapped within the District (see *Figure E-7*).


*Table E-6* represents the approximate acreages of basins, petroleum systems, and coalfields located within the Medford District.

**TABLE E-6. MEDFORD DISTRICT ACREAGES**

System	Total Acreage Within the Medford District	Total BLM-Managed Surface Acreage	Total BLM-Managed Sub-Surface Split-Estate Acreage
Tye Basin	20,000	4,000	0
Umpqua-Dothan-White Tail Ridge (?) Hybrid Petroleum System	8,000	2,000	0
Rogue River Coal Field	221,000	33,000	3,000



FIGURE E-7. MEDFORD DISTRICT




Sources: USDI BLM 2008, Olmstead et al. 1989, Niemi and Niemi 1990, Newton et al. 1980, Stewart and Newton 1954, Sidle 1981, Newton 1969, Kvenvolden et al. 1995, Mason and Erwin 1955




**Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District**

The Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District incorporates Klamath County. No recorded exploration wells with shows, seeps, water wells with petroleum shows, or coal were found in the literature search or in agency communications (see *Figure E-8*). Most energy wells drilled have been in the search and delineation of geothermal energy. It should be noted that the lack of exploration does not indicate a lack of petroleum potential, but simply a lack of information. Therefore, future potential cannot be analyzed. Gas and oil production has been located in similar basin and range provinces, such as in the state of Nevada (Hess 2001).

**FIGURE E-8. KLAMATH FALLS RESOURCE AREA**



Sources: BLM 2008, Olmstead et al. 1989, Niemi and Niemi 1990, Newton et al. 1980; Stewart and Newton 1954, Sidle 1981, Newton, 1969, Kvenvolden et al. 1995; Mason and Erwin 1955



## Oil and Gas Production

### Conventional Oil & Gas Resources

There is no current petroleum production within the Eugene, Roseburg, or Medford Districts or the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District. The only commercial production within Western Oregon occurs in the Mist Gas Field, located within the Salem District.

The Mist Gas Field Designation (see *Figure E-9*) was initiated with the discovery of natural gas in 1979. The main target zone is the reservoir rock of the Clark and Wilson Sandstone (Olmstead and Alger 1985). As of 2007, there have been over 45 separate pools identified (Meyer 2007) with two gas storage reservoirs (DOGAMI 2003). Locations of additional pools are expected with the use of 3-D Survey (Meyer 2007). Current exploration is focused to the northwest of the Mist Gas Field (Houston 2007). However, this is due to economics as opposed to existence of resource. All areas north of Vernonia, Oregon could be considered possible extensions of the Mist Gas Field (Meyer 2007).

Annual production for 2005 from the Mist Gas Field was 305 million cubic feet (MMcf), with a total field production to date of 70 billion cubic feet (Bcf) (DOGAMI 2007). As of 2006, the Mist Field had produced approximately 68 Bcf, with a value of about \$140 million (DOGAMI 2007). The State of Oregon applies a severance tax of 6% on production, which goes to the common school fund. In total, over 500 oil and gas wells have been permitted in the field by 2003 (DOGAMI 2003). There are currently 18 actively producing wells, one water disposal well, 21 observation wells, and 20 gas injection and/or withdrawal wells operating on the site (DOGAMI 2007). Eight new Applications for Permit to Drill (APD) are being submitted to DOGAMI for additional exploration and production wells (Houston 2007).

An annual production history of the Mist Gas Field for the past 10 years is shown on *Table E-4* earlier in this appendix (DOGAMI 2003 and 2007).

### Non-Conventional Petroleum (Coal Bed Natural Gas):

There is currently no coal bed natural gas production in Oregon. However, the Coos Basin, located in Coos County, is being developed as a production resource. The current development of the coal bed natural gas resource is being conducted by the Methane Energy Corporation. The company has completed numerous exploratory and production wells within the Coos Basin. The Methane Energy Corporation has also received National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits for surface disposal of production water.

The DOGAMI has initiated a public meeting process to establish a Gas Field Designation for the Coos Basin. The first public meeting was conducted on January 29, 2007. There is only one other Gas Field Designation in Oregon, which is the Mist Gas Field. The Gas Field Designation is required to fulfill state requirements regarding well spacing designations, mineral rights, and control drainage.

Coal bed natural gas development is also beginning in southwest Washington, approximately 20 miles north of the Salem District. Exploration is being completed by the Methane Energy Corporation's sister company (a subsidiary of Torrent Energy Corporation), Cascade Energy Corporation (Torrent Energy Corporation 2008). There is also interest in the southwest Washington coal fields from Comet Ridge Limited (Meyer 2007).

### Potential for Resource Occurrence and Development


Potentials for resource occurrence and potentials for resource development (USDI BLM 1985) have been estimated for the districts. Definitions for potential for resource occurrence include:

- Low Potential - Hydrocarbon occurrence is unlikely.
- Moderate Potential - Conditions exist for hydrocarbons to occur.
- High Potential - Hydrocarbon shows have been documented or production has been established.






FIGURE E-9. MIST GAS FIELD, 1999 BOUNDARY



Source: DOGAMI 2003



Definitions for potential for resource development include:

- Low Potential - Economic or other conditions would likely preclude development.
- Moderate Potential - It is reasonable to conclude that development could occur.
- High Potential - Development is likely to occur within the life of the plan.

The districts contain two identified sediment basins, three petroleum systems, five plays, three prospects, one focused area of petroleum shows, and one identified coal field. However, according to Ryu et al.(1996), the southern Tye Basin (which incorporates the Eugene and Roseburg Districts) has a low to moderate petroleum potential. Yet, as shown by the potential systems, plays, and prospects, there are several areas that have not been investigated.

Ryu et al. (1996) have ranked the five plays in order of potential to produce hydrocarbons, with “1” being the greatest potential and “5” having the least potential. This is based on the size and closure of the structures; position of source, reservoir, and seals; and the timing of the play formation in relation to the timing of potential hydrocarbon migration to the play.

There has been little exploration of portions of the districts outside the Tye Basin (i.e., Medford District and Klamath Falls Resource Area). Therefore, future potential cannot be analyzed. However, gas and oil production has been located in similar basin and range provinces, such as in the State of Nevada (Hess 2001).

**Eugene District:                    Moderate Potential for Occurrence  
   Low Potential for Development**

Two sedimentary basins, two petroleum systems, one play, and one prospect have been projected for the Eugene District. The sedimentary basins have a low to moderate petroleum potential. The identified play is ranked as fourth of five plays in potential. The petroleum systems, plays, and prospect have potential for the existence of hydrocarbons (Ryu et al. 1996). Wells and seeps have confirmed the presence of hydrocarbons within the district. However, because production has not been established and the play has a low potential in its ranking compared to the five identified plays, the potential for occurrence is *moderate*.

There is no additional public record that indicates petroleum investigation of lands within the Eugene District has occurred since 1996 (Ryu et al. 1996). The last petroleum exploration well was drilled in 1955 (refer to *Figure E-17*) (Olmstead et al. 1989). There has been no commercial development of the systems. The identified play is ranked fourth of five. Petroleum accumulations would need to be confirmed and the petroleum system move to “known” status for resource development to occur. Therefore, the potential for development within the plan’s 10-year forecast is *low*.

The potential acreage of BLM-administered lands to have *moderate potential for occurrence* and *low potential for development* is approximately 72,000 acres.

**Roseburg District:                Moderate Potential for Occurrence  
   Moderate Potential for Development/Low Potential for Development**

One sedimentary basin, two petroleum systems, five plays, two prospects, and one concentration of petroleum shows have been projected for the Roseburg District. The sedimentary basin has a low to moderate petroleum potential. The identified plays rank from highest to lowest (1 to 5) in potential out of five plays. The petroleum systems, plays, and prospects have potential for existence of hydrocarbons (Ryu et al. 1996). Numerous wells and seeps have confirmed the presence of hydrocarbons within the district. However, because production has not been established, the petroleum systems are speculative, and the plays have not been confirmed, the potential for occurrence is moderate.



There is no additional public record that indicates petroleum investigation of the lands within the Roseburg District has occurred since before 1996 (Ryu et al. 1996). The last petroleum exploration well was drilled in 1990 (refer to *Figure E-18*) (Niem and Niem 1990). There has been no commercial development of the systems. However, the projected plays range in a ranking of one to five for potential and there has been a definable area of exploration and petroleum shows. Therefore, based on the ranking of the plays and their associated petroleum systems, the potential for development within the Plan's 10-year forecast is *low to moderate*.

The potential acreage of BLM-administered lands to have *moderate potential for occurrence* and *moderate potential for development* (Plays 1, 2, and 3 and the area of exploration and petroleum shows) is approximately 37,000 acres.

The potential acreage of BLM-administered lands to have *moderate potential for occurrence* and *low potential for development* (Plays 4 and 5 and petroleum systems outside of Plays 1, 2, and 3) is approximately 124,000 acres.

**Medford District:**            **Low Potential for Occurrence**  
**Low Potential for Development**

**Non-Conventional:**        **Moderate Potential for Occurrence**  
**Low/Moderate Potential for Development**

The Medford District contains petroleum shows, an oil shale prospect, a small portion of a petroleum system boundary, and an identified coal field. However, for conventional petroleum systems, there is insufficient information for the occurrence of commercial quantities of hydrocarbons. Therefore, the potential for occurrence is *low*.


Due to the lack of evidence for commercial petroleum accumulations, the potential for development within the plan's 10-year forecast is *low*.

Non-conventional petroleum development in the form of coal bed natural gas is occurring within the Coos Basin of Oregon and within southwest Washington. The Rogue River Coal Field exists within the Medford District. It is known by the nature of coal that methane is associated with the beds. Investigations of known coal exposures are currently being done. If coal bed natural gas becomes commercial in the developing fields, industry may look at the potential of developing other coal fields (Pappajohn 2007). In addition, a single identified Oil Shale prospect also exists. Therefore, the potential for nonconventional oil and gas resource occurrence in the Medford District is *moderate*.

Currently there is a lack of an existing commercial coal bed natural gas project. If coal bed natural gas becomes commercially successful in other districts, development potential of other coal systems could occur within the 10-year scenario (Pappajohn 2007). Resource development potential is dependent on the future of current enterprises. Although the Medford District does have an oil shale potential and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (U.S. 109<sup>th</sup> Congress 2005) emphasizes the development of oil shale, any potential for future development will be many years away, and the focus of development is on larger prospects within the United States. Therefore, the potential for nonconventional development within the plan's 10-year forecast is extremely *low*.

The potential acreage of BLM-administered lands to have *moderate potential for occurrence* and *low potential for development* is approximately 33,000 acres.

**Klamath Falls Resource Area:**    **Low Potential for Occurrence**  
**Low Potential for Development**



There are no petroleum seeps or exploration shows, identified sedimentary basins with petroleum potentials, petroleum systems, plays, or prospects located within the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District. While oil and gas potentials do exist in similar geologic provinces (Basin and Range), little to no investigation has been performed within this Resource Area. Energy exploration that has been conducted has focused on geothermal potential. Therefore, largely due to the lack of information, the potential for occurrence is *low*.

Likewise, due to the lack of information, the potential for development within the plan's 10-year forecast is *low*.

## Leasing

After initial field work, research, and subsurface mapping (which may include the acquisition of seismic data), leasing is often the next step in oil and gas development. Leasing may be based on speculation, with the riskiest leases usually purchased for the lowest prices.

Leases on lands where the Federal Government manages the oil and gas rights are offered via oral auction. Auctions typically occur at least quarterly. The maximum lease size is 2,560 acres, and the minimum bid is \$2.00 per acre. An administrative fee of \$75 per parcel is charged and each successful bidder must meet citizenship and legal requirements. Leases are issued for a 10-year term, and a 12.5% royalty rate on production is required to be paid. Federal Regulations pertaining to oil and gas leasing are located at 43 CFR 3100. All monies from lease and royalty receipts are payable to the Mineral Management Service. Leases which become productive are "held by production," and typically do not terminate until all wells on the lease have ceased production, with all of the wells plugged and abandoned, and the surface reclaimed to an acceptable condition.

The Oregon-Washington BLM lease sales are generally held on a quarterly basis, offering nominated and internally selected lands. Federal oil and gas leases sold within the Oregon/Washington BLM for 2006 have ranged from a high of 227,392 acres in the March sale, to a low of 20,919 acres in September. The total lease acreage sold from March to December (four sales) was approximately 308,610 acres. From those sales, the Oregon/Washington BLM received approximately \$5,467,720 in oil and gas lease revenues.

Non-federal leasing and APDs for production in the State of Oregon are currently focused in the vicinity of the Mist Gas Field, the Coos Basin, and Eastern Oregon. The Mist Gas Field currently maintains 16 production wells. The DOGAMI has recently (2006-2007) received eight APDs submitted for production (Houston, 2007). The Coos Basin currently has 115,000 acres of leased land, with three multi-well/single pad and single pad/single well production systems. Foreseeable development of the Mist Gas Field in the Salem District could result in potentially an additional 10,800 acres of BLM-administered lease offerings. If these offerings were sold for the 2006 average of \$17.71 per acre, the net receipts would be nearly \$191,268.

At this time, there has been no expressed interest in oil and gas leases in Western Oregon outside of the Salem and Coos Bay Districts.

## Future Trends and Assumptions

Based on history of past exploration; historic, current, and projected development of oil and gas in other BLM Districts; mapped geology; and foreseeable development potential in the planning area, activity over the next decade may be stable to increasing. Current petroleum developments and interest in other BLM Districts in Oregon, and the increasing value of petroleum products (Energy Information Administration 2007), indicates potential interest within the districts. The supply of natural gas in the region may be augmented by one or more proposed Liquefied Natural Gas terminals that may be sited within the districts' boundaries. Oil and gas activity on BLM-administered mineral rights within the Districts is expected to consist of competitive and over-the-counter leases, geophysical surveys, and processing of Applications for Permit to Drill.



Some exploration for coal bed natural gas in the form of coal seam investigation and mapping is also predicted, especially of the Rouge River Coal Field. However, development of coal bed natural gas in the district is not expected within the next 10 years. This is due to the length of research time needed to delineate a field and the current rate of advancement of the Coos Basins field. It should be noted that if commercial coal bed natural gas developments do occur within the State, other coal bed natural gas prospects could develop rapidly.

Of the districts analyzed, the Roseburg District maintains the highest potential, although moderate in classification. Three identified plays and area of exploration have a *moderate potential for occurrence* and a *moderate potential for development*. Therefore, it is projected that the acreages managed by the Roseburg BLM within these plays and area of exploration would have the greatest probability for exploration and development within the next 10 years. All of the other Districts analyzed in this study would have a *low probability* for development within the next 10 years. Therefore, acreages of impacts will only be analyzed for those BLM-administered *moderate potential* lands located within the Roseburg District.

Because the lands in the Roseburg District are considered *moderate in potential* (USDI BLM 1985) and due to the classification of low to moderate potential by Ryu et al. (1996), development of these lands could range from none to the maximum. Therefore, while there is no indication of eminent development, the following analysis will utilize the maximum potential. That potential is based on development of *moderate potential* lands at one well per 160-acre spacing (spacing currently employed at the Mist Gas Field). The total BLM-administered and non-BLM-administered acreage of this defined *moderate potential* is approximately 247,000 acres. The total acreage of BLM-administered *moderate potential* lands in the Roseburg District is approximately 37,000 acres or 15% of the area. Total well development of both BLM and non-BLM managed area would be 1,555 wells. Maximum development on BLM-administered lands would be 228 wells. However, as these are unproven potentials, and the reservoir will not be uniform, it is unlikely that more than 50% of total development will occur within the 10-year scenario. Therefore, given the *moderate potential* of the area, the range of development for BLM lands in the 10-year scenario is 0 to 114 wells.


## Geophysical Exploration

Geophysical exploration is conducted to try to determine the subsurface geologic structure of an area. The three geophysical survey techniques generally used to define subsurface characteristics are measurements of the gravitational field, magnetic field, and seismic reflections.

Gravity and magnetic field surveys usually involve the use of aerial surveillance, utilizing aircraft. There are usually no ground disturbing activities to the project areas associated with this analysis.

Seismic reflection surveys, which are the most common of the geophysical methods, produce the most detailed subsurface information. Seismic surveys are accomplished by sending shock waves, generally by a small explosion or mechanically vibrating the ground surface. Instruments measure the time and intensity with which the waves reflect off stratigraphic layers. This information can be used to depict the subsurface structure of the rock. Vibroseis (Thumper) methods vibrate the ground surface to create a shock wave. “Thumper” trucks are quite large and are equipped with “pads” that cover about four-feet square. The pads are lowered to the ground, and the vibrators are electronically triggered in close coordination with the technicians operating the recording equipment. After the signal is recorded, the trucks move forward a short distance and the process is repeated. Up to 50 square feet (five square meters) of surface area is required to operate the equipment at each recording site.

The small explosive method requires that charges be detonated on the surface or in a drill hole. Holes for the charges are drilled utilizing truck-mounted portable drills to create small-diameter (two or six-inch) holes, which are typically drilled to depths of between 50 and 100 feet. Generally 4 to 12 holes are drilled per mile of line and a 5 to 50-pound charge of explosives is placed in the hole, covered, and detonated. The created shock wave is recorded by geophones placed in a linear fashion on the surface. In rugged terrain, a portable



drill carried by helicopter can sometimes be used. A typical drilling seismic operation may utilize 10 to 15 men operating five to seven trucks, although portable “buggies” that can be hauled behind smaller four-wheel drive All Terrain Vehicles are also commonly used in more sensitive areas.

Advanced Three Dimensional Survey (3-D Survey) is utilized within the Mist Gas Field. This process analyzes five to six miles using lines with 1,700 shot holes at 70-foot spacing. The lines are spaced at 400 feet apart. The lines are hand brushed (no surface disturbance) for survey. The survey crews utilize an Inertial Survey System that allows for accurate surveying without the need to maintain a line of sight. This allows flexibility in brushing paths. The shot hole pad is three feet by four feet (3x4) in size. The pad is hand cleared to mineral soil with hand tools. The drill rig is then placed on the pad. If existing access to the pad is limited, the drill rig is placed and removed by helicopter. The holes are drilled to 15-foot depths. The charge is exploded subsurface, leaving no surface expression. Where there is surface expression, the damaged is mitigated with hand tools. In open valleys and areas with access, thumper rigs are used, as they disturb even less ground. These requirements are in place because the Mist Gas Field is located in Commercial Forest land and is required by the land manager to minimize disturbance to near non-existent (Meyer 2007).

## Surface Impacts of Geophysical Explorations

It is anticipated that the foreseeable geophysical activity in the identified Moderate Potential lands within the Roseburg District would consist of the currently used 3-D Seismic process. The total area of the identified BLM-administered potential expansion area is approximately 57 square miles (approximately 37,000 acres). Using the 3-D spacing of shots, it is anticipated that complete investigation of the area could utilize 16,150 shots. With pad ground disturbance of 12 square feet, the total disturbance on BLM-administered lands could be up to 4.5 acres. This disturbance is created using hand tools, no power tools other than those needed for brushing, and, based on experience in the Mist Gas Field, is completely reclaimed within five years or less (Meyer 2007). Disturbance will be less where pre-existing roads and/or landings can be used. Therefore, estimates to disturbance on non-BLM managed lands are indeterminate.

## Drilling and Production Phase

Notices of Staking may occur during the plan period. Companies usually submit an Application for Permit to Drill after the Notice of Staking is accepted. Private surface owner input, if a split estate is involved, would be actively solicited during this stage. After the Application for Permit to Drill is approved, the operator initiates construction activities in accordance with stipulations and Conditions of Approval (COAs). Access road lengths vary, but usually the shortest feasible route is selected to reduce the haul distance and construction costs. In some cases, environmental factors or landowner’s wishes may dictate a longer route. Drilling activity in the planning area is predicted to be done using existing roads and constructing short roads to access each drill site location. The district will utilize currently developed and utilized forest management Best Management Practices, in addition to the BLM’s “Gold Book” (USDI/USDA 2007), for surface disturbance in road construction and pad development similar to timber harvest landings.

Based on past oil and gas drilling in Oregon, it is projected that three conventional petroleum exploratory “wildcat” wells could be drilled within the Roseburg District. The estimated success rate of finding hydrocarbons is predicted to be no greater than 10 percent, based on the average U.S. wildcat well success rate. Future identification of additional structures would likely increase this estimate. Development within the identified *moderate potential* area would be directed by 3-D Survey as opposed to wildcatting (Meyer 2007).

Based on spacing units established within the Mist Gas Field, full production development of the projected approximate 37,000 acres of BLM-administered *moderate potential* lands within the Roseburg District would require a total of 228 wells. However, as these are unproven potentials, and the reservoir will not be uniform, it is unlikely that more than 50% of total development will occur within the 10-year scenario. Therefore, given the Moderate Potential of the area, the range of development for BLM-administered lands in the 10-year scenario is 0 to 114 wells.



## Surface Impacts of Drilling and Production

There are currently no production or exploration wells or pads within any of the districts' boundaries. Development of the *moderate potential* lands identified within the Roseburg District could require up to 114 wells on BLM-administered lands within the 10-year scenario. It is anticipated that all gas production would be carried by collector pipelines placed within road rights-of-way.

The identified plays range from 5 miles to 22 miles from the north-south Northwest Pipeline System that runs within the I-5 Corridor. A review of existing private and public roadways between the plays and the pipeline indicates an adequate transportation system of road rights-of-way to accommodate collector pipelines (USDI BLM 2008). The only additional pipeline right-of-way that would be required would be to connect new wells to existing roadways. These lines would be placed along rights-of-way for new road construction. Therefore, it is not anticipated that pipeline rights-of-way would create an additional disturbance beyond existing and new road rights-of-way.

Initially operators would move construction equipment over existing roads to the point where the new drill site access road begins. Based on existing road systems and access, the use of 3-D Survey, and directional drilling, it is anticipated that most well development will utilize existing road infrastructure to develop the resource. However, it may be necessary to construct up to a quarter mile of access for each pad to remove the facility from the active roadway. Based on the ability to cluster wells (assumed to be four wells per pad), it is estimated that no more than 97 miles total of new road construction would be required on both BLM-administered and non-BLM lands. No more than 7.0 miles of new road construction on BLM-administered lands would be needed in full development of 114 wells. Most would be moderate duty access roads with a travel surface 18 to 20 feet wide. The total surface disturbance width would average 40 feet including ditches, utilities, pipelines, cuts, and fills. The total acreage impacted by new road building for both BLM and non-BLM managed lands would be 470 acres. Total disturbance for new roads on BLM-administered land would be approximately 34 acres. Roads not subsequently needed for other resource management would be reclaimed at the end of the project (USDI/USDA 2007).

In the second part of the drilling phase, the operator would construct the drilling pad or platform, anticipated to involve approximately two acres per well site. Support facilities are anticipated to disturb about two acres per well site. Total disturbance could be up to four acres per pad, with each pad containing four or more wells. The likely duration of well development and testing is predicted to be approximately six months to one year for each drill site. Total disturbance to BLM-administered and non-BLM lands in the *moderate potential* area is estimated to not exceed 1,555 acres. Disturbance of BLM-administered lands within the Moderate Potential area is not to exceed 114 acres.

Total disturbance of both BLM-administered lands and other lands for wells, support services, pipeline and new road construction within the District is expected to be approximately 2,025 acres (1% of the total Roseburg District Moderate Potential acreage). Total disturbance for just BLM-administered land with development of 114 wells is expected to be approximately 153 acres (0.5% of projected BLM-administered within the Roseburg District Moderate Potential acreage).

Surface disturbance would be restricted, as much as possible, to previously disturbed areas such as logging roads and landings. Industry is currently utilizing a multi-well to single pad approach which minimizes impact.

Interim reclamation would reduce initial disturbance. After initial construction, unused portions of well site areas would be reclaimed while the wells are in production. Disturbance will be limited to areas within overwork foundation structures and necessary infrastructure, such as well heads, pipelines, and access roads, as described in federal reclamation guidance (USDI/USDA 2007).

Therefore, the maximum development disturbance for the *moderate potential* lands managed by the BLM assumed in this 10-year scenario would range from zero to the maximum disturbance of approximately 153 acres.



## **Plugging and Abandonment**

Wells that are completed as dry holes are plugged according to a plan designed specifically for the down-hole conditions of each well. Plugging is usually accomplished by placing cement plugs at strategic locations from the bottom of the well to the surface. Drilling mud is used as a spacer between plugs to prevent communication between fluid-bearing zones. The casing is cut off at least three feet below ground level and capped by welding a steel plate on the casing stub. Wells will be plugged and abandoned at the end of their production life, with the pad, support facilities, and road fully reclaimed.

## **Surface Impacts of Plugging and Abandonment**

After plugging, all equipment and debris would be removed and the drill site would be restored as near as reasonably possible to its original condition. If new roads constructed for drilling are not needed for future access to the area, the road would be reclaimed using Best Management Practices established for the District, with the road prism revegetated as required by the Authorized Officer. Pipelines will be removed or plugged and abandoned in place to minimize new surface disturbance (USDI/USDA 2007).

## **Limitations**

The acreage estimates used for BLM-administered surface estate are based upon current GIS layers, with acreage approximations to the nearest thousand. The accuracy of this information has not been verified against the Master Title Plats. The GIS coverage for subsurface estate within the district is incomplete. Therefore, the existence and location of BLM-administered subsurface estate within the district is not fully known.

A brief review of the Master Title Plats was completed within and near the Mist Gas Field, 1985 boundaries. Federal subsurface estate identified on the Master Title Plats was not recorded on the GIS layers. Most of the Master Title Plats that identified federal subsurface parcels were outside the Mist Gas Field boundaries. One parcel was identified within the Mist Gas Field boundary. Due to the incompleteness of the GIS layers, BLM-administered acreage of the surface and subsurface will need to be verified through review of Master Title Plats prior to exploration and development.





# Restrictions and Requirements on Mineral and Energy Exploration and Development Activity

## Introduction

This appendix discusses the leasing stipulations as they will be applied to BLM-administered lands in the Klamath Falls Resource Area. Operating standards pertinent to the locatable and salable minerals program are also described. Mineral exploration and development on Federal lands must also comply with laws and regulations administered by several agencies of the State of Oregon; however, these requirements are not discussed in this document.

## Leasable Mineral Resources

### Oil and Gas Leasing

The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (as amended) provides that all publicly owned oil and gas resources be open to leasing, unless a specific land order has been issued to close the area. Through the land use planning process, the availability of these resources for leasing is analyzed, taking into consideration development potential and surface resources. Constraints on oil and gas operations are identified and placed in the leases as notices and stipulations. Oil and gas leases are then issued from the BLM Oregon State Office in Portland. Specific proposed notices and stipulations are listed later in this appendix.


The issuance of a lease conveys to the lessee an authorization to actively explore and/or develop the lease, in accordance with the attached stipulations and the standard terms outlined in the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act (FOOGLRA). Restrictions on oil and gas activities in the planning area will take the form of timing limitations, controlled surface use, or no surface occupancy stipulations used at the discretion of the Authorized Officer to protect identified surface resources of special concern.

The field office which reviews the lease tract will attach stipulations to each lease before it is offered for bid. The review will be conducted by consulting the direction given in this Resource Management Plan. In addition, all lands administered by BLM within the planning area will be subject to the lease notices as shown on the following pages. All Federal lessees or operators are required to follow procedures set forth by: Onshore Oil and Gas Orders, Notices to Lessee (NTL), the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act (as amended), the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act, and Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 3100.

### Oil and Gas Operations

#### Geophysical Exploration

Geophysical operations may be conducted regardless of whether the land is leased or not. Notices to conduct geophysical operations on BLM surface are received by the resource area. Administration and surface protection are accomplished through close cooperation of the operator and the BLM. Seasonal restrictions may be imposed to reduce fire hazards, conflicts with wildlife, watershed damage, etc. An operator is required to file a "Notice of Intent to Conduct Oil and Gas Exploration Operations" for all geophysical activities on public land administered by the BLM. The notice should adequately show the location and access routes, anticipated surface damages, and time frame. The operator is required to comply with written instructions and orders given by the Authorized Officer, and must be bonded. Signing of the



Notice of Intent by the operator signifies agreement to comply with the terms and conditions of the notice, regulations, and other requirements prescribed by the Authorized Officer. A pre-work conference and/or site inspection may be required. Periodic checks during and upon completion of the operations will be conducted to ensure compliance with the terms of Notice of Intent, including reclamation.

### **Drilling Permit Process**

The federal lessee or operating company selects a drill site based on spacing requirements, subsurface and surface geology, geophysics, topography, and economic considerations. Well spacing is determined by topography, reservoir characteristics, protection of correlative rights, potential for well interference, interference with multiple-use of lands, and protection of the surface and subsurface environments. Close coordination with the State would take place. Written field spacing orders are issued for each field. Exceptions to spacing requirements involving Federal lands may be granted after joint State and BLM review.

### **Notice of Staking**

After the company makes the decision to drill, it must decide whether to submit a Notice of Staking or apply directly for a permit to drill. The Notice of Staking is an outline of what the company intends to do, including a location map and sketched site plan. The Notice of Staking is used to review any conflicts with known critical resource values and to identify the need for associated rights-of-way and special use permits. The BLM utilizes information contained in the Notice of Staking and obtained from the on-site inspection to develop conditions of approval to be incorporated into the application for permit to drill. Upon receipt of the Notice of Staking, the BLM posts the document and pertinent information about the proposed well in the District Office for a minimum of 30 days prior to approval, for review and comment by the public.

### **Application for Permit to Drill (APD)**

The operator may or may not choose to submit a Notice of Staking; in either case, an Application for Permit to Drill must be submitted prior to drilling. An Application for Permit to Drill consists of two main parts: a 12-point surface plan that describes any surface disturbances and is reviewed by resource specialists for adequacy with regard to lease stipulations designed to mitigate impacts to identified resource conflicts with the specific proposal, and an 8-point subsurface plan that details the drilling program and is reviewed by the staff petroleum engineer and geologist. This plan includes provisions for casing, cementing, well control, and other safety requirements. For the Application for Permit to Drill option, the onsite inspection is used to assess possible impacts and develop provisions to minimize these impacts.

### **Geothermal Leasing**

The Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (as amended) provides for the issuance of leases for the development and utilization of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources. Geothermal leasing and operational regulations are contained in Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 3200. Through the land use planning process the availability of the geothermal resources for leasing is analyzed, taking into consideration development potential and surface and subsurface resources. Constraints on geothermal operations are identified and placed in the leases as stipulations. Geothermal leases are then issued by the BLM Oregon State Office in Portland.

Geothermal resources are first offered by competitive sale. Prior to a competitive lease sale, or the issuance of a noncompetitive lease, each tract will be reviewed, and appropriate lease stipulations will be included. The review will be conducted by consulting the direction given in this resource management plan. The issuance of a lease conveys to the lessee authorization to actively explore and/or develop the lease in accordance with regulations and lease terms and attached stipulations. Subsequent lease operations must be



conducted in accordance with the regulations, Geothermal Resources Operational Orders, and any Conditions of Approval developed as a result of site-specific NEPA analysis. In the planning area, restrictions in some areas will include timing limitations, controlled surface use, or no surface occupancy stipulations used at the discretion of the Authorized Officer to protect identified surface resources of special concern.

In addition to restrictions related to the protection of surface resources, the various stipulations and conditions could contain requirements related to protection of subsurface resources. These may involve drainage protection of geothermal zones, protection of aquifers from contamination, or assumption of responsibility for any unplugged wells on the lease. Development of geothermal resources can be done only on approved leases. Orderly development of a geothermal resource, from exploration to production, involves several major phases that must be approved separately. Each phase must undergo the appropriate level of NEPA compliance before it is approved and subsequent authorizations are issued.

## Leasing Notice and Stipulation Summary

The mineral leasing notices and stipulations below are considered to be the minimum necessary to issue leases in the operating area. The standard and the special status species leasing stipulations will be utilized on most lands. The powersite stipulation (USDI BLM Form 3730-1, Powersite Stipulation) will be utilized on lands within powersite reservations.


Stipulations also include waiver, exception, and modification criteria. If the Authorized Officer determines that a stipulation involves an issue of major concern, waivers, exceptions, or modifications of the stipulation will be subject to at least a 30-day advance public review. Waiver, exception, and modification are defined as follows:

- ***Waiver*** - The lifting of a stipulation from a lease that constitutes a permanent revocation of the stipulation from that time forward. The stipulation no longer applies anywhere within the leasehold.
- ***Exception*** - This is a one time lifting of the stipulation to allow an activity for a specific proposal. This is a case-by-case exemption. The stipulation continues to apply to all other sites within the leasehold to which the restrictive criteria apply. It has no permanent effect on the lease stipulation.
- ***Modification*** - This is a change to a stipulation that either temporarily suspends the stipulation requirement or permanently lifts the application of the stipulation on a given portion of the lease. Depending on the specific modification, the stipulation may or may not apply to all other sites within the leasehold to which the restrictive criteria apply.

Whenever a special stipulation, such as No Surface Occupancy (NSO), Timing, or Controlled Surface Use (CSU) is used, the need for the special stipulation is described in the “Objective” that follows the stipulation. By imposing these special stipulations, it has been concluded that less restrictive stipulations would not be adequate to meet the stated objective.

## Leasing Notices

The following Notices are to be included in each lease for all lands administered by BLM within the planning area where the pertinent resource potential exists. Lease notices are attached to leases in the same manner as stipulations; however, there is an important distinction between lease notices and stipulations: lease notices do not involve new restrictions or requirements. Any requirements contained in a lease notice must be fully supported by either laws, regulations, policy, onshore oil and gas orders, or geothermal resources operational orders.



## Resource-Specific Leasing Notices

### Notice

#### Special Status Species Stipulation

Resources: Botany and Wildlife

Stipulation: (All the)/(Certain) lands within this lease are within the suitable habitat of the (identify all Federal Threatened (FT), Endangered (FE) or Proposed Threatened (PT) and Proposed Endangered (PE) species, including scientific names), (an officially listed)/(a proposed for listing) Threatened or Endangered species. The Authorized Officer, through an environmental review process, has determined that because of the habitat characteristics of this species, all future post-lease operations must be analyzed and subjected to a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Section 7 consultation or conference to ensure the action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

(All the)/(Certain) lands within this lease are known to bear the species listed (Insert list of species) which has (have) protected status as (State Threatened (ST); State Endangered (SE); Federal Candidate (FC); Bureau Sensitive (BS)); or are within the suitable habitat of (identify all State Threatened, State Endangered, Federal Candidate, or Bureau Sensitive species, including scientific names). These species are protected by BLM policy as described in Manual 6840. All future post-lease operations must be analyzed, utilizing recent field data collected at the proper time of year, to identify the presence of such species. If the field examination indicates that the proposed activity may adversely impact FC species, technical assistance will be obtained from FWS to ensure that actions will not contribute to the need to list a federal candidate as a federal threatened or endangered species. Technical assistance may be obtained from FWS to insure that actions will not contribute to the need to list a ST, SE, or BS species as a federal threatened or endangered species. Therefore, prior to any surface disturbing activities or the use of vehicles off existing roads on (this lease)/(the lands legally described as: \_\_\_\_\_). BLM approval is required. This restriction also applies to geophysical activities for which a permit is required. The approval is contingent upon the results of site specific inventories for any of the above mentioned species. The timing of these inventories is critical. They must be conducted at a time of year appropriate to determine the presence of the species or its habitat. The lessee is hereby notified that the process will take longer than the normal 30 days and that surface activity approval will be delayed.

If no FT, FE, PT, or PE species, or suitable habitat, are found during the inventories, then no formal Section 7 consultation with the USFWS will be necessary and the action will be processed using the procedures found in the applicable oil and gas Onshore Orders or geothermal resources operational orders. However, the lessee is hereby notified that, if any FT, FE, PT, PE, ST, SE, FC, or BS species are found during the inventories, or if the actions are proposed in designated or proposed critical habitat, then surface disturbing activities may be prohibited on portions of, or even all of the lease, unless an alternative is available that meets all of the following criteria: (a) The proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species; (b) the proposed action is not likely to destroy or adversely modify critical habitat for a threatened or endangered species; (c) the proposed action is consistent with the recovery needs in approved Fish and Wildlife Service recovery plans or BLM Habitat Management Plans for the threatened or endangered species; and (d) the proposed action will not contribute to the need to list species as federal threatened or endangered.

Objective: To protect officially listed or proposed threatened or endangered plant or wildlife species; and to insure that post leasing oil and gas or geothermal operations will not likely contribute to the need to list other special status species as threatened or endangered.



***Exception:*** An exception may be granted by the Authorized Officer, if review of the proposed plan submitted by the operator indicates that the proposed action will have no effect on the (common name of species).

***Modification:*** The boundaries of the stipulated area may be modified, by the Authorized Officer, if it is determined that portions of the area do not have any officially listed or proposed threatened or endangered species, federal candidate, state threatened or endangered species, or Bureau sensitive species, or their habitat.

***Waiver:*** This stipulation may be waived if the (common name) is declared recovered and is no longer protected under the Endangered Species Act, or if other species found within the lease are no longer considered to be in the federal candidate, state threatened or endangered, or Bureau sensitive categories.

### **Notice**

***Cultural Resources:*** An inventory of the leased lands may be required prior to surface disturbance to determine if cultural resources are present and to identify needed mitigation measures. Prior to undertaking any surface-disturbing activities on the lands covered by this lease, the lessee or operator shall:

1. Contact the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to determine if a cultural resource inventory is required. If an inventory is required, then;
2. The BLM will complete the required inventory; or the lessee or operator, at their option, may engage the services of a cultural resource consultant acceptable to the BLM to conduct a cultural resource inventory of the area of proposed surface disturbance. The operator may elect to inventory an area larger than the standard 10-acre minimum to cover possible site relocation, which may result from environmental or other considerations. An acceptable inventory report is to be submitted to the BLM for review and approval no later than that time when an otherwise complete application for approval of drilling or subsequent surface-disturbing operation is submitted.
3. Implement mitigation measures required by the BLM. Mitigation may include the relocation of proposed lease-related activities or other protective measures such as data recovery and extensive recordation. Where impacts to cultural resources cannot be mitigated to the satisfaction of the BLM, surface occupancy on that area must be prohibited. The lessee or operator shall immediately bring to the attention of the BLM any cultural resources discovered as a result of approved operations under this lease, and shall not disturb such discoveries until directed to proceed by the BLM.

***Authorities:*** Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is required for all actions that may affect cultural properties eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. Section 6 of the Oil and Gas Lease Terms (DOI BLM Form 3100-11, Offer to Lease and Lease for Oil and Gas) requires that operations be conducted in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts to cultural and other resources.

## **Special Leasing Stipulations**


The following special stipulations will be utilized on specifically designated tracts of land as described in the resource management plan.

### **Leasing Stipulations**

#### **No Surface Occupancy**

***Resource:*** Land Use Authorizations

***Stipulation:*** Surface occupancy and use is prohibited on Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) and FLPMA leases.



Objective: To protect uses on existing R&PP and FLPMA leases.

Exception: An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer, if the operator submits a plan demonstrating that impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.

Modification: The area affected by this stipulation may be modified by the Authorized Officer, if the land use authorization boundaries are modified.

Waiver: This stipulation may be waived by the Authorized Officer, if all land use authorizations within the leasehold have been terminated, canceled, or relinquished.

### **No Surface Occupancy**

Resource: Recreation Sites

Stipulation: Surface occupancy and use are prohibited within developed recreation areas.

Objective: To protect developed recreation areas.

Exception: An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer, if the operator submits a plan demonstrating that impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.

Modification: The boundaries of the stipulated area may be modified by the Authorized Officer, if the recreation area boundaries are changed.

Waiver: This stipulation may be waived, if the Authorized Officer determines that the entire leasehold no longer contains developed recreation areas.

### **No Surface Occupancy**

A 30-day public notice period will be required prior to modification or waiver of this stipulation.

Resource: Special Areas Stipulation: Surface occupancy and use are prohibited within Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).

Objective: To protect important historic, cultural, scenic values, natural resources, natural systems or processes, threatened and endangered plant species, and/or natural hazard areas of the ACEC.

Exception: An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer, if the operator submits a plan demonstrating that impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.

Modification: The boundaries of the stipulated area may be modified by the Authorized Officer, if the ACEC or Environmental Education Area (EEA) boundaries are changed.

Waiver: This stipulation may be waived, if the Authorized Officer determines that the entire leasehold no longer contains designated ACECs or EEAs.

### **No Surface Occupancy**

Resource: Progeny test sites.

Stipulation: Surface occupancy and use are prohibited within progeny test sites.



*Objective:* To protect progeny test sites.

*Exception:* None.

*Modification:* The boundaries of the stipulated area may be modified by the Authorized Officer, if the progeny test site boundaries are changed.

*Waiver:* This stipulation may be waived, if the Authorized Officer determines that the entire leasehold no longer contains progeny test sites.

### **No Surface Occupancy**

A 30-day public notice period will be required prior to modification or waiver of this stipulation.

*Resource:* Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class I

*Stipulation:* Surface occupancy and use are prohibited in VRM Class I areas.

*Objective:* To maintain soil productivity, provide necessary protection to prevent excessive soil erosion on steep slopes, and to avoid areas subject to slope failure, mass wasting, piping, or having excessive reclamation problems.

*Objective:* To preserve the existing character of the landscape. *Exception:* An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer, if the operator submits a plan demonstrating that impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.

*Modification:* The boundaries of the stipulated area may be modified by the Authorized Officer, if the boundaries of the VRM Class I area are changed.

*Waiver:* This stipulation may be waived by the Authorized Officer, if all VRM Class I areas within the leasehold are reduced to a lower VRM class. Areas reduced to VRM Class II will be subject to the Controlled Surface Use stipulation for visual resources, and areas reduced to VRM Class III will be subject to standard lease stipulations.

### **Controlled Surface Use**

*Resource:* Soils

*Stipulation:* Prior to disturbance of any suspected unstable slopes or slopes over 60 percent, an engineering/reclamation plan must be approved by the Authorized Officer. Such plan must demonstrate how the following will be accomplished:

- Site productivity will be restored.
- Surface runoff will be adequately controlled.
- Off-site areas will be protected from accelerated erosion, such as rilling, gully, piping, and mass wasting.
- Water quality and quantity will be in conformance with state and federal water quality laws.
- Surface-disturbing activities will not be conducted during extended wet periods.
- Construction will not be allowed when soils are frozen.

*Exception:* An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer if the operator submits a plan, which demonstrates that the impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.



Modification: The area affected by this stipulation may be modified by the Authorized Officer, if it is determined that portions of the area do not include suspected unstable slopes or slopes over 60 percent.

Waiver: This stipulation may be waived by the Authorized Officer if it is determined that the entire leasehold does not include any suspected unstable slopes or slopes over 60 percent.

#### **Controlled Surface Use**

A 30-day public notice period will be required prior to modification or waiver of this stipulation.

Resource: Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II.

Stipulation: All surface-disturbing activities, semi-permanent and permanent facilities in VRM Class II areas may require special design including location, painting and camouflage to blend with the natural surroundings and meet the visual quality objectives for the area.

Objective: To control the visual impacts of activities and facilities within acceptable levels.

Exception: None. Modification: None.

Waiver: This stipulation may be waived, if the Authorized Officer determines that there are no longer any VRM Class II areas in the leasehold.

#### **Controlled Surface Use**

Resource: Deferred Timber Management Areas

Stipulation: Unless otherwise authorized, drill site construction and access through Deferred Timber Management Areas within this leasehold will be limited to established roadways.

Objective: To substantially maintain the existing level of older and multi-layered conifer forest through year 2023.

Exception: An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer if the operator submits a plan demonstrating that impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.

Modification: The area affected by this stipulation may be modified by the Authorized Officer if it is determined that portions of the area do not include Deferred Timber Management Areas.

Waiver: This stipulation may be waived by the Authorized Officer if it is determined that the entire leasehold does not include Deferred Timber Management Areas.

#### **Controlled Surface Use**

Resource: Riparian Management Areas.

Stipulation: Unless otherwise authorized, drill site construction and access through Riparian Management Areas within this leasehold will be limited to established roadways.

Objective: To protect riparian vegetation and reduce sedimentation.

Exception: An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer, if the operator submits a plan which demonstrates that impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.





***Modification:*** The area affected by this stipulation may be modified by the Authorized Officer, if it is determined that portions of the area do not include riparian areas, floodplains, or water bodies.

***Waiver:*** This stipulation may be waived by the Authorized Officer, if it is determined that the entire leasehold no longer includes Riparian Management Areas.

### **Controlled Surface Use**

***Resource:*** Late-Successional Management Areas

***Stipulation:*** Unless otherwise authorized, drill site construction and access through Late-Successional Management Areas (LSMAs) within this leasehold will be limited to established roadways.

***Objective:*** To protect vegetation and to retain and/or restore old-growth forest characteristics.

***Exception:*** An exception to this stipulation may be granted by the Authorized Officer if the operator submits a plan which demonstrates that impacts from the proposed action are acceptable or can be adequately mitigated.

***Modification:*** The area affected by this stipulation may be modified by the Authorized Officer if it is determined that portions of the area do not include LSMAs.

***Waiver:*** This stipulation may be waived by the Authorized Officer if it is determined that the entire leasehold does not include LSMAs.

## **Locatable Minerals Surface Management Standards for Exploration, Mining, and Reclamation**

The following operational standards for mining activities have been compiled to facilitate compliance with the 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 3809 surface management regulations, which apply to all operations on mining claims located on BLM administered lands. It is the mining claimant's and operator's responsibility to avoid "unnecessary or undue degradation," and to perform all the necessary reclamation work.

All operators proposing occupancy, timber removal, road or trail construction, installation of structures of any kind, use of mechanized earth moving equipment, or suction dredges having hoses with an inside diameter greater than 4 inches must provide written notice to the District Office prior to the commencement of any mining related disturbance of the surface. If the mining or operation is in sensitive areas (not exploration work) a Plan of Operations will be required. Operations are not to proceed until the operator's bond or financial guarantee is accepted. Surface management performance standards include compliance with all pertinent State laws.


Operations ordinarily resulting in only negligible disturbance as defined in 43 CFR 3809.5(1) are considered to be casual use and no notification to or approval by the BLM is required. Likewise, use of a suction dredge in a stream having an intake nozzle of less than 4 inches in diameter, will not generally require the filing of a Notice or Plan of Operations. Such activity is generally considered casual use.

### **Vegetation/Timber Removal**

An application must be submitted to the Authorized Officer pursuant to 43 CFR 3821.4 describing the proposed use of timber from O&C lands for mining purposes. No trees may be cut until the application is approved and the trees are marked.

### **Firewood**

Merchantable timber may not be used for firewood. Firewood permits may be issued to the operator for use in conjunction with the mining operation but no wood may be used until a permit is obtained from the



BLM. Firewood authorized for use in conjunction with a mining operation is not to be removed from the mining claim.

### **Topsoil**

All excavations should have all the productive topsoil (usually the top 12 to 18 inches) first stripped, stockpiled, and protected from erosion for use in future reclamation. This also includes removal of topsoil before the establishment of mining waste dumps and tailings ponds, if the waste material will be left in place during reclamation.

### **Roads**

Existing roads and trails should be used as much as possible. Temporary roads are to be constructed to a minimum width and with minimum cuts and fills. All roads shall be constructed so as to minimize negative impacts to slope stability.

### **Water Quality**

All operations, including casual use, shall be conducted in a manner so as to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of surface and subsurface water resources and shall comply with all pertinent Federal and State water quality laws.

### **Claim Monuments**

State law prohibits the use of plastic pipe for claim staking in Oregon. The BLM policy requires all existing plastic pipe monuments to have all openings permanently closed. Upon loss or abandonment of the claim, all plastic pipe must be removed from the public lands. When old markers are replaced during normal claim maintenance, they shall be either wood posts or stone or earth mounds, constructed in accordance with the requirements of State law.

### **Drill Sites**

Exploratory drill sites should be located next to or within existing roads when possible without blocking public access. When drill sites must be constructed, the size of the disturbance shall be as small as possible.

### **Dust and Erosion Control**

While in operation, and during periods of shut-down, exposed ground surfaces susceptible to erosion will need to be protected. This can be accomplished with seeding, mulching, installation of water diversions, and routine watering of dust-producing surfaces.

### **Fire Safety**

All State fire regulations must be followed, including obtaining a campfire permit or blasting permit, if needed. All internal gas combustion engines must be equipped with approved spark arresters.

### **Safety and Public Access**

Mining claimants shall not exclude the public from mining claims with force, intimidation, or “no trespassing” signs. In the interest of safety, the general public may be restricted only from specific dangerous areas (e.g., underground mines, open pits, and heavy equipment operating and storage areas) by erecting fences, gates and warning signs, if they are included in the Mining Notice or Mining Plan and authorized by the BLM. It is the operator’s responsibility to protect the public from mining hazards. Gates, signs or road blocks may be installed only with BLM approval.



### **Sewage**

Self-contained or chemical toilets are generally to be used at exploration or mining operations and their contents shall be disposed of at approved dump stations.

### **Equipment**

The claimant must maintain the claim site, including structures and equipment, in a safe and orderly condition. Only equipment and supplies that are appropriate, reasonable, and regularly used for exploration or mining will be allowed on the claim.

### **Tailings Ponds**

Settling ponds must be used to contain sediment, and any discharge must meet state standards.

### **Solid and Hazardous Waste**

Trash, garbage, used oil, etc. must be removed from public land and disposed of properly. Trash, garbage or hazardous wastes must not be buried on public lands. The accumulation of trash, debris, or inoperable equipment on public lands is viewed as unnecessary degradation and will not be tolerated. Operators conducting illegal disposals shall be held financially responsible for the clean-up of such disposals.

### **Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

Operators shall not knowingly alter, injure, or destroy any scientifically important paleontological (fossil) remains or any historical or archaeological site, structure, or object on federal lands or any identified traditional use areas. The operator shall immediately bring to the attention of the Authorized Officer, any paleontological (fossil) remains or any historical or archaeological site, identified traditional cultural properties, structure, or object that might be altered or destroyed by exploration or mining operations, and shall leave such discovery intact until told to proceed by the Authorized Officer. The Authorized Officer shall evaluate the discovery, take action to protect or remove the resource, and allow operations to proceed.

### **Threatened and Endangered Species of Plants and Animals**


Operators shall take such action as may be needed to prevent adverse impacts to threatened or endangered species of plants and animals and their habitat that may be affected by operations, as stipulated in guidelines developed through consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

## **Occupancy at Mining Sites**

Occupancy means full or part-time residence on the public lands. It also pertains to barriers to access, fences, tents, trailers and the storage of equipment or materials. Living on the public land in excess of 14 days must be reasonably incident to and required for actual continuous mining or diligent exploration operations, and will require concurrence by the BLM. In general, operations at the casual use level are not sufficient to warrant occupancy. Occupancy may be allowed for mining operations if it is deemed reasonably incident to conducting the operations. To be reasonably incident, activities must constitute substantially regular work, lead to the extraction of minerals, involve observable on-the-ground activity that BLM may verify, and use appropriate equipment that is presently operable. Proposed occupancy or use must conform to the provisions in 43 CFR 3715 and such occupancy or use cannot commence until BLM has completed a review of the proposal. At the conclusion of the review BLM will make a written determination to be sent to the claimant/operator.

### **Security Guard**

In some cases, it may be reasonably incident for a security guard to live onsite to protect valuable property, equipment, or workings that are necessary for the mining operation, or to protect the public from site hazards.



## **Reclamation**

As per the 43 CFR 3809 regulations all Notices and Plans of Operation will have an approved reclamation bond.

Reclamation of all disturbed areas must be performed concurrently or as soon as possible after exploration or mining ceases and shall conform to the guidelines described in surface management regulations found in 43 CFR 3809.

Reclamation shall include, but shall not be limited to:

- 1) saving topsoil for final application after reshaping disturbed areas;
- 2) measures to control erosion, landslides, and water runoff;
- 3) measures to isolate, remove or control toxic materials;
- 4) reshaping the area disturbed, applying topsoil, and revegetating disturbed areas where reasonably practicable; and
- 5) rehabilitation of fisheries and wildlife habitat.

## **Equipment and Debris**

All mining equipment, vehicles, and structures must be removed from the public lands during extended periods of non-operation and/or at the conclusion of mining, unless authorization from the BLM is given to the operator or claimant in writing. Accumulations of debris and trash on mining claims are considered unnecessary and undue degradation and must be removed immediately regardless of the status of the operation. Failure to do so will result in the issuance of a notice of noncompliance.

## **Seeding**

The BLM approved seeding prescription must be used to provide adequate re-vegetation for erosion control, wildlife habitat, and productive secondary uses of public lands.

## **Mulch**

As directed by the BLM, during review of the Notice or Plan of Operations, the disturbed area may require mulching during interim or final reclamation procedures. Depending on site conditions, the mulch may need to be punched, netted, or blown on with a tackifier to hold it in place.

## **Roads**

After mining is completed, all new roads shall be reclaimed, per the claimants or operators reclamation plan.

## **Tailings Ponds**

The ponds should be allowed to dry out and the sediments removed and spread with the topsoil, unless the sediments contain toxic materials. If the ponds contain toxic materials, a plan will be developed to identify, dispose, and mitigate effects of the toxic materials. If necessary, a monitoring plan will also be implemented. The ponds should then be backfilled and reclaimed.



## Guidelines for Development of Salable Mineral Resources

### Proposed Operations

All salable mineral exploration and development, that involves surface disturbance, must have an operation and reclamation plan approved by the Authorized Officer. Extraction of mineral materials must be in accordance with a contract of sale or free use permit issued to qualifying organization by the Authorized Officer. All proposals will undergo the appropriate level of review and compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

### Quarry Design

In steep terrain, quarry developments may require a series of benches to effectively maximize the amount of mineral materials to be removed in a safe manner. In all cases, bench height shall not exceed 40 feet. If the bench would be used by bulldozers to access other parts of the quarry, the width of the bench should be at least 25 feet. If the bench won't be used by equipment, then this width can be reduced to approximately 10 feet.

Clearing of timber and brush should be planned at least 10 feet beyond the edge of the excavation limit. Most often the brush would be piled and burned at the site, or scattered nearby.


- All topsoil and overburden should be stockpiled and saved for eventual quarry site reclamation. These piles may need to be stabilized by mulching or seeding in order to minimize erosion during the winter months.

As a standard procedure, the excavation of the quarry floor should be designed with an outslope of approximately two percent to provide for adequate drainage.

### Operating Procedures

Where practicable, the following requirements will be made a part of every contract or permit providing for the use of mineral material:

- Oversize shall be treated according to the site specific plan.
- The operator shall comply with local and State safety codes covering quarry operations, warning signs and traffic control. All necessary permits must be obtained from State and County agencies.
- Use of the site for equipment storage and stockpiling rock material is allowed for the duration of the contract or permit. Use of the site beyond that time will be authorized, if warranted, under a temporary use permit.
- All topsoil shall be stockpiled or windrowed as appropriate, for use in reclamation.
- Prior to abandonment, all material sites will be graded to conform with the surrounding topography. Topsoil will be utilized to create a medium for re-vegetation. Reseeding and tree planting, if necessary, will be done as prescribed by the Authorized Officer. Access roads no longer needed by the BLM will be abandoned and reclaimed as directed by the Authorized Officer.



# Appendix F

## Lands




---

This appendix provides detailed data about lands, realty, and access in the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview BLM District.

### **In this appendix:**

Land Tenure Adjustment Criteria .....	F-3
Land Withdrawals and Land Tenure Zone 3 Lands .....	F-5
FERC Relicensing for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project .....	F-10
Inventory of Communication Sites .....	F-11







# Land Tenure Adjustment Criteria

In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and other laws, Executive Orders, and Departmental and Bureau policy, the following factors will be considered in evaluating opportunities for disposal or acquisition of lands or interests in lands. This list is not considered all inclusive, but represents the major factors to be considered.

## General Land Tenure Adjustment Evaluation Factors

- Improves manageability of specific areas.
- Maintains or enhances important public values and uses.
- Consolidates Federal mineral estate and/or reuniting split surface and mineral estates.
- Facilitates development of energy and mineral potential.
- Reduces difficulty or cost of public land administration.
- Provides accessibility to land for public recreation and other uses.
- Amount of public investments in facilities or improvements and the potential for recovering those investments.
- Suitability of land for management by another Federal agency.
- Significance of decision in stabilizing or enhancing business, social, and economic conditions, and/or lifestyles.
- Meets long-term public management goals as opposed to short term.
- Facilitates National, State, and local BLM priorities or mission statement needs.
- Consistency with cooperative agreements and plans or policies of other agencies.
- Facilitates implementation of other aspects of the approved resource management plans.

## Acquisition Criteria

- Facilitates access to public land and resources retained for long-term public use.
- Secures Threatened or Endangered or Sensitive plant and animal species habitat.
- Protects riparian areas and wetlands.
- Contributes to biodiversity.
- Protects high-quality scenery.
- Enhances the opportunity for new or emerging public land uses or values.
- Facilitates management practices, uses, scales of operation, or degrees of management intensity that are viable under economic program efficiency standards.
- Secure lands adjacent to other existing Zone 1 lands.
- Protects significant cultural resources and sites eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places
- Whether private sites exist for the proposed use.



## Disposal Criteria

The following criteria will be used to identify parcels in Land Tenure Zones 2 or 3 suitable for disposal:

- Suitability for purposes including but not limited to community expansion or economic development, such as industrial, residential, or agricultural development.
- Lands of limited public value.
- Lands that are difficult for the BLM to manage and unsuitable for transfer to other federal agencies or State and local governments.
- Lands that would aid in aggregating or repositioning other public lands or public land resource values where the public values to be acquired outweigh the values to be exchanged.

## O&C Land Exchange Criteria

An O&C land exchange is an exchange within the O&C area as delineated in Public Law 105-321. Forest management and related factors to consider when evaluating the feasibility of an O&C land exchange include the following:

- Land exchanges which maintain the existing balance between the various land use allocations will be considered favorably.
- Offered lands which are primarily suitable for agriculture, business, or home sites, or which would require extensive post-acquisition management will not be favorably considered. The O&C lands designated for timber production will generally not be exchanged for lands which will be managed solely for a single use, such as species protection.
- Generally, where cutting rights are reserved on existing and future timber stands by the proponent, the proposed exchange will not be considered favorably.
- Proposals which result in a material reduction in the number of acres of O&C land or Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) land or acres of harvestable timber should not be considered favorably. See I.M. No. OR-99-081, dated August 4, 1999, for an interpretation of Section 3 of Public Law 105-321, which established a requirement of “No Net Loss” of O&C and CBWR lands in western Oregon.
- The exchange of O&C and CBWR lands specifically for lands located outside of the 18 O&C counties is prohibited by regulations in 43 CFR 2200.0-6(e). This restriction applies to timber and other interests in lands as well.



# Land Withdrawals and Land Tenure Zone 3 Lands

Table F-1 contains detailed information about existing and proposed land withdrawals in the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview BLM District. Table F2 lists the Zone 3 lands, which are lands available for disposal.

**TABLE F-1. EXISTING LAND WITHDRAWALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUANCE IN THE KLAMATH FALLS RESOURCE AREA**

Serial Number	Order Number	Legal Description	Acres	Purpose/Name	Managing Agency	Segregation Effect	Recommendation (C/R)
ORE 05433	BO of 6/14/57	40S 10E Sec. 9	80	Air navigation/ ANS 57	FAA	A	Modify withdrawal, 80 acres continued,
ORE 05433	BO of 6/14/57	40S 10E Sec. 10	80	Air navigation/ ANS 57	FAA	A	80 acres revoked
<i>ORE 05433</i>	<i>BO of 6/14/57</i>	<i>Total acres</i>	<i>160</i>				
OR 36244	BO of 2/11/47	39S 9E Sec. 21	51.12	Kingsley Field	USAF	B	Modify withdrawal. Partial revocation/ continuation
OR19001	EO 5907	38S 13E Sec. 35	40	Public Water Reserve 146	BLM	E	Not evaluated
OR 20219	EO of 1/24/1914	41S 13E Sec. 6	52.14	Public Water Reserve 15	BLM	E	Not evaluated
OR 20219	EO of 1/24/1914	40S 13E Secs. 19,31	189.55	Public Water Reserve 15	BLM	E	Not evaluated
OR 20219	EO of 1/24/1914	41S 12E Sec. 1	40	Public Water Reserve 15	BLM	E	Not evaluated
OR 20219	EO of 1/24/1914	40S 12E Sec. 24	160	Public Water Reserve 15	BLM	E	Not evaluated
<i>OR 20219</i>	<i>EO of 1/24/1914</i>	<i>Total acres</i>	<i>441.69</i>				
OR 9041	EO 4/17/1926	41S 14.5E Sec. 1	40	Public Water Reserve 107	BLM	E	Not evaluated
ORE 0 16183E	PLO 3869	39S 13E Secs. 2,11	160	Gerber Reservoir recreation site.	BLM	B	C – Needed to protect the investment of federal
ORE 0 16183D	PLO 3869	38S 5E Sec. 21	40	Surveyor Mountain recreation site	BLM	B	C – Needed to protect the investment of federal
ORE 0 16183D	PLO 3869	40S 7E Sec. 6	14.35	Topsy recreation site	BLM	B	C – Needed to protect the investment of federal
ORE 012799	PLO 3274	39S 9E Sec. 21	10.04	Administrative site	FWS	B	R / Suitable for return to Public Domain
OR 20243	SO of 7/9/1904	39S 14E Secs. 5-8,16-22		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	R / Suitable for return to Public Domain
OR 20243	SO of 7/9/1904	38S 14E Secs. 31,32		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	R / Suitable for return to Public Domain




**Klamath Falls District ROD and RMP**

Serial Number	Order Number	Legal Description	Acres	Purpose/Name	Managing Agency	Segregation Effect	Recommendation (C/R)
OR 20243	SO of 7/9/1904	Total acres	3,585.82				
	SO of 7/27/1904	38S 13E Sec. 35	120	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	R –Wdl relinquished. Suitable for return to BLM.
	SO of 7/27/1904	39S 13E Secs. 1,2,11-14,23, 26,27,33,34	2,758.87	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	R –Wdl relinquished. Suitable for return to BLM.
	SO of 7/27/1904	Total acres	2,878.87				
OR 2870	PL 88-567	34S 6E Secs. 1, 12, 13, 25, 26, 35, 36		Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS		C
OR 2870	PL 88-567	35S 6E Secs. 1, 2, 12, 13, 24, 25,35,36,PB 37,38		Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS		C
OR 2870	PL 88-567	37S 8E Sec. 36		Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	Closed to Homestead Entrys	C
OR 4669	PLO 1512	37S 7.5E Secs. 9,10	6	Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, Addition	FWS		
OR-20587	EO 4851	35S 6E Secs. 1, 2, 12, 13,24, 25,35,36,PB 37,38		Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR-20587	EO 4851	36S 6E Secs. 2,3,11-14, PB 37-42		Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR 22625	EO 924	37S 8E Secs. 23-28,31-36		Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR 22625	EO 924	40S 8E Secs..1-16, 21-27, 34-36		Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR 22625	EO 924	40S 9E Secs. 6-8,17-21, 27-35		Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR 22625	EO 924	41S 10E Secs. 7,17,18		Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR 22625	EO 924	41S 9E Secs. 1-6,8-13		Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR 22625	EO 924	41S 8E Secs. 1-5,9-16		Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	B	C
OR 20246	SO of 1/28/1905	37S 8E Sec. 17	68.7	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR		R
OR 20249	SO of 1/20/1910	34S 6E Secs. 1, 12, 13, 25,26, 35,36		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project,	BR	B	R
OR 20249	SO of 1/20/1910	35S 6E Secs. 1, 2, 12, 13, 24, 25,35,36,PB 37,38		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20249	SO of 1/20/1910	36S 6E Secs. 2,3,11-14, PB 37-42		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C



Serial Number	Order Number	Legal Description	Acres	Purpose/Name	Managing Agency	Segregation Effect	Recommendation (C/R)
OR 20253	SO of 6/25/1919	41S 10E Secs. 15,16,		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20253	SO of 6/25/1919	41S 9E Secs. 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14-18		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20253	SO of 6/25/1919	41S 8E Secs. 1,4,9,11-16		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20253	SO of 6/25/1919	40S 8E Sec.25		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20244	SO of 7/19/1904	40S 9E Sec. 24		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20244	SO of 7/19/1904	41S 9E Secs. 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20246	SO of 1/28/1905	41S 9E Secs. 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20254	SO of 7/31/1919	39S 11E Sec. 19	80	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	R - Withdrawal relinquished ,suitable for return to Public Domain
OR 20240	SO of 6/20/1922	41S 14E Secs. 19,20	29.55	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	C
OR 20259	SO of 2/25/1939	39S 12E Secs. 22,26	120	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	R - Withdrawal relinquished ,suitable for return to Public Domain
OR 20261	SO of 4/21/1940	40S 14E Sec. 5	41.04	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	R - Withdrawal relinquished ,suitable for return to Public Domain
OR 20239	SO of 2/21/1946	41S 14E Secs. 15,20-23	1063.8	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	
OR 20264	BO of 2/11/1947	39S 9E Secs. 20-22,25,27, 28,31-34	60.14	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	
OR 20264	BO of 2/11/1947	40S 9E Sec 3		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	
OR 20263	SO of 1/6/1944	40S 9E Sec. 15		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BR	B	
OR 20262	SO of 6/18/1940	39S 12E Sec 28	40	Klamath Basin Reclamation Project	BLM	D	Not evaluated
	SO of 3/31/1939	40S 14E Secs. 5***,7***,17***		Klamath Basin Reclamation Project			
OR 19085	EO 2/1/1917	41S 6E Secs. 2,7,10,18	313.95	Water Power Potential / PSR 579	BLM	D	Not evaluated
OR 44762		40S 6E Secs.1,12-14,23,26, 34,35		Klamath Wild and Scenic River		various	
OR 44762		40S 7E Sec.6		Klamath Wild and Scenic River			
OR 19054	EO 4/13/1912	41S 6E Secs. 4,8,10		Water Power Potential / PSR 258	BLM	D	Not evaluated



**Klamath Falls District ROD and RMP**

Serial Number	Order Number	Legal Description	Acres	Purpose/Name	Managing Agency	Segregation Effect	Recommendation (C/R)
OR 19054	EO 4/13/1912	40S 6E Sec. 12,14,26,34		Water Power Potential / PSR 258	BLM	D	Not evaluated
OR 19054	EO 4/13/1912	41S 5E Sec. 13		Water Power Potential / PSR 258	BLM	D	Not evaluated
<i>OR 19054</i>	<i>EO 4/13/1912</i>	<i>Total acres</i>	<i>1611.34</i>				
OR 18974	FPC Order of 1/28/1954	39S 7E Secs. 26-29,35,36		Protection of J.C. Boyle Power Project/ Power project 2082	FERC		
OR 18974	FPC Order of 1/28/1954	40S 7E Sec. 6	14.47	Protection of J.C. Boyle Power Project/ Power project 2082	FERC	B	Not evaluated
OR 18974	FPC Order of 1/28/1954	40S 6E Secs. 1,12-14,23,26,27,34,35	23.41	Protection of J.C. Boyle Power Project/ Power project 2082	FERC	B	Not evaluated
OR 18974	FPC Order of 1/28/1954	41S 6E Secs. 3,5,6,10,		Protection of J.C. Boyle Power Project/ Power project 2082	FERC	B	Not evaluated
OR 19131	SO 5/19/1921	41S 5E Sec. 12	6.42	Protect water, power, and reservoir development Potential/ PSC 2	BLM	B	Not evaluated

<p>DO: Director Order          EO: Executive Order          SO: Secretarial Order          BO: Bureau Order          DO: Director Order          PL: Public Law          PLO: Public Land Order          PSR: Power Site Reserve          PSC: Power Site Classification          R&amp;PP: Recreation and Public Purposes          WPD: Water Power Designation          FPCO: Federal Power Commission          FO: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order</p>	<p><b>Segregation Effect:</b>          A: Withdrawn from operation of the general land laws, the Mining law, and the Mineral Leasing Act          B: Withdrawn from operations of the General Land and Mining Laws          C: Withdrawn from operation of the General Land Law          D: Withdrawn from operation of the General Land Law, open to mining subject to Public Law 359          E: Withdrawn from operation of the General Land Law, withdrawn from mining except metalliferous</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b>          C – Continue R - Revoke</p> <p>*** Opened to entry subject to Sec. 24 of the Federal Power Act.          **** Opened to entry in part subject to Sec. 24 of the Federal Power Act.</p>
--	---

*Notes:* Location description indicates sections within which withdrawn lands are located. Information on which portions of the cited sections are withdrawn is available at the District Office. Table does not include lands that have been completely transferred out of Federal ownership subsequent to withdrawal or lands within National Forest boundaries.

**TABLE F-2. LAND TENURE ZONE 3 LANDS IN THE KLAMATH FALLS RESOURCE AREA**

Township	Range	Section	Subdivision	Acres	Status	Location # on Map 3 in the RMP
37 S	14 E	10	W1/2NE	80.00	PD	253
38 S	8 E	31	LOT 4	10.30	PD	254
38 S	11 E	17	NWNE,	40.00	PD	255
			E1/2SE	80.00	PD	
38 S	11 E	32	NESW, NWSE	80.00	PD	256
39 S	8 E	6	LOT8	27.20	PD	257
39 S	8 E	7	LOT5	16.90	PD	258
39 S	11 E	2	LOT 1	40.24	PD	259
39 S	12 E	28	NESW	40.00	PD	260
40 S	8 E	17	SWSE	40.00	PD	261
40 S	9 E	23	SWNW	40.00	PD	262
40 S	11 E	9	N1/2NW, SENW,	120.00	PD	263
			SENE	40.00	PD	
40S	11E	10	SENE, S1/2NW, E1/2SW, W1/2SE	280.00	PD	264
40 S	11 E	14	NWNE, NENW, S1/2NW, N1/2SW	240.00	PD	265
40 S	12 E	10	SENW,	40.00	PD	266
			W1/2SE	80.00	PD	
40 S	12 E	14	SENW, N1/2SW, SWSW, NWSE	200.00	PD	267
40 S	12 E	15	N1/2NE,	80.00	PD	268
			SESW, N1/2SW	120.00	PD	
40 S	12 E	21	NESE	40.00	PD	269
40 S	12 E	22	SWNE, SENW,	80.00	PD	270
			SWSW	40.00	PD	
40 S	12 E	27	W1/2NE, SENE, N1/2NW, SENW	240.00	PD	271
40 S	13 E	35	SWNE	40.00	PD	272
41 S	7 E	13	NENE	40.00	PD	273
			LOT 4	24.69	PD	
41 S	11 E	8	LOT 6	7.12	PD	274
<b>Total Zone 3 Lands</b>				<b>2206.45</b>		

E = East  
 N = North  
 S = South  
 W = West  
 UN = Unnumbered  
 PD = Public Domain Land  
 OC = Oregon and California Railroad Land  
 Ot = Other

Sources: Western Oregon Digital Base and District realty records



# **FERC Relicensing for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project**

The BLM's section 4(e) conditions and other BLM decisions made in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) relicensing proceeding for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2082) are not affected by the decision regarding the revision of BLM resource management plans in western Oregon. The relicensing proceeding was initiated in 2000, well before the process for revising the existing resource management plans was initiated. The BLM's section 4(e) conditions and record of decision were developed under the guidance of the then existing management plan. The section 4(e) conditions have been subjected to extensive public review and comment, and a trial type hearing by an Administrative Law Judge under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 ("EP Act"). Additionally, the BLM received and analyzed alternatives submitted under the EP Act. These conditions ultimately became conditions of the Department of the Interior through a submission by the Department to FERC dated January 24, 2006, and no changes are being contemplated in the revision process that would be inconsistent with that submission.






# Inventory of Communication Sites

Table F-3 contains information on existing communication sites in the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview BLM District. The resource management plan contains management directions related to management of communication sites.

**TABLE F-3. INVENTORY OF COMMUNICATION SITES FOR THE KLAMATH FALLS**

Location # on Figure 7 in the RMP <sup>a</sup>	Site Name	Serial Number	T	R	S	Quarter Section	Latitude North	Longitude West
66	Stukel	OR 48956					42.1010	121.6342
		OR 35373						
		OR 46312						
		OR 52152						
67	Hamaker	OR 15231					42.0679	121.9699
		OR 36377						
		OR 36541						
		OR 36562						
		OR 37192						
		OR 45051						
		OR 46180						
		OR 56655						
		OR 56235						
		ORE 09843						
		ORE 10866						
		ORE 05614						
		ORE 10317						
ORE 15790								
68	Yaniax	OR 39227					42.3264	121.2684
69	Buck Butte	OR 55670					42.0921	121.4432
		OR 2231						
70	Brady Butte	OR 2087					42.0166	121.0340

<sup>a</sup>Figure numbers start at 66 because communication sites were numbered consecutively across the planning area in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.



# Appendix G

## Recreation




---

This appendix provides supplemental material for the recreational section of the Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan.

**In this appendix:**

Interim Off-Highway Vehicle Management Guidelines.....	G-3
Planning Frameworks for Special Recreation Management Areas.....	G-6





# Interim Off-Highway Vehicle Management Guidelines

This section provides interim off-highway vehicle (OHV) management guidelines that would be implemented until a transportation management plan is completed for the Klamath Falls Resource Area. These interim guidelines are for off-highway vehicle emphasis areas.

Maps associated with these interim off-highway vehicle management guidelines are available at the Klamath Falls Resource Area Office. The maps show OHV area designations, a preliminary road and trail network, and BLM-administered lands that have secured legal public access. See the resource management plan: *Table 24* for a list of individual closed areas, and *Table 25* for off-highway vehicle area designations.

The BLM road maintenance levels that pertain to limitations on types of off-highway vehicle use are described below.


- **Level 1** – This level is assigned to roads where minimum maintenance is required to protect adjacent lands and resource values. Emphasis is given to maintaining drainage and runoff patterns as needed to protect adjacent lands. Grading, brushing, or slide removal is not performed unless roadbed drainage is being adversely affected, causing erosion. Closure and traffic restrictive devices are maintained as needed.
- **Level 2** – This level is assigned to roads that are passable by high clearance vehicles. Drainage structures are to be inspected within a 3-year period and maintained as needed. Grading is conducted as necessary to correct drainage problems. Brushing is conducted as needed to allow access. These are typically low standard, low volume, single-lane, natural and aggregate surfaced roads, and are functionally classified as resource roads.
- **Level 3** – This level is assigned to roads where management objectives require the roads to be open seasonally or year-round for commercial, recreational, or administrative access. Typically, these roads are natural or aggregate surfaced, but may include low use bituminous surfaced roads. These roads have a defined cross section with drainage structures (e.g., rolling dips, culverts, or ditches). These roads may be negotiated by passenger cars traveling at prudent speeds. User comfort and convenience are not considered a high priority. Drainage structures are to be inspected at least annually and maintained as needed. Grading is conducted to provide a reasonable level of riding comfort at prudent speeds for the road conditions. Brushing is conducted as needed to improve sight distance.
- **Level 4** – This level is assigned to roads where management objectives require the roads to be open all year (except they may be closed or have limited access due to snow conditions) to connect major administrative features (recreational sites, local road systems, administrative sites, etc.) to county, state, or federal roads. Typically these roads are single or double lane, aggregate, or bituminous surface, with a higher volume of commercial and recreational traffic than administrative traffic.

## Klamath Falls Resource Area

### OHV Designations:

Limited to designated roads and trails: 214,010 acres

Closed: 10,971 acres



**Description:**

Includes all BLM-administered lands within the Klamath Falls Resource Area.

**Limited Area Management Guidelines**

- Limited OHV areas are managed in accordance with all applicable federal and state off-highway vehicle regulations.
- Motor vehicle use will be limited to administrative, commercial, and passenger vehicle traffic where the roads are not specifically signed or gated.
- Until road and trail designations are complete, all motorized vehicles will be limited to the interim road and trail network as mapped, unless closed or restricted under a previous planning effort or due to special circumstances as defined below.
- Routes may be closed or limited under seasonal or administrative restrictions. These restrictions may be imposed due to such conditions as fire danger, wet conditions, special requirements for wildlife species, protection of cultural resources, or for public safety.
- Vehicles may pull off roads or trails to park or allow others to pass, up to 25 feet from the centerline of roads or up to 15 feet from the centerline of trails.
- Limitations apply to all Class I (ATVs), Class II (4WDs), and Class III (motorcycles) vehicles; and to all activity types (recreational, commercial, etc.) unless authorized by the BLM for administrative purposes.

**Seasonal Restrictions**

- The Eastside seasonal OHV closure is in effect from November 1 to April 15. The closure applies to all BLM-administered lands within deer winter range cooperative wildlife areas, including the majority of Stukel and Bryant Mountain and portions of the Gerber block as mapped.
- The Pokegema wildlife area seasonal OHV closure is in effect from November 20 to April 1.
- For designated snowmobile trails, wheeled vehicles are prohibited when grooming of trails begins for winter season.
- The OHV use may be limited in other areas on a seasonal basis due to special conditions such as temporary fire restrictions and special wildlife requirements.

**Closed Area Management Guidelines**

All motorized vehicles are prohibited from entering closed OHV areas unless authorized by the BLM for administrative purposes.

**Process for Ongoing Public Collaboration/Outreach**

- The principal venue for public collaboration is through public outreach and scoping during future travel management planning efforts, special projects, and local partnership.
- Press releases will be sent out as needed to inform the public of OHV opportunities and restrictions. Signs will be posted where appropriate.
- After the transportation management plan is completed, maps and brochures illustrating designations, describing specific restrictions, and defining opportunities will be available at the Klamath Falls Resource Area Office.
- The BLM will continue to participate with other land managers in the cooperative management of the Pokegema wildlife area and deer winter range areas.



---

### **Process for Selecting a Final Road and Trail Network**

Final route designations for the Klamath Falls Resource Area will be accomplished in a comprehensive, interdisciplinary travel and transportation management plan scheduled to be complete no later than five years after completion of the RMP revision.

The BLM's geo-database will provide information for identifying roads and trails for both motorized and non-motorized activities. On-the-ground inventories will be conducted if a reasonable determination cannot be made using remote-sensing techniques. Proposed designations will be analyzed through public scoping and a NEPA analysis. Amendments to the designated system will be considered during the transportation management planning process.

### **Road and Trail Construction and Maintenance Standards**

Construction and maintenance will be done in accordance with the standards in BLM Manual H-9114-1 and other professional sources.



# Planning Frameworks for Special Recreation Management Areas

This section presents management guidelines for special recreation management areas in the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview BLM District.

## Gerber

### Primary Market Strategy: Community

Niche: Provide opportunities for roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation experiences.

Management Objectives: Manage Gerber Recreation site with camping units to accommodate overnight, day use, and mobility-impaired visitors; Frog camp day use area; and boat ramps. Manage several nearby semi-developed campsites to provide primitive camping and day use. Manage and maintain the Gerber Watchable Wildlife area tour. In addition, develop or enhance watchable wildlife and other interpretive sites to showcase resource management. Manage area for roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation opportunities.

### Targeted Outcomes

Activities: Camping, fishing, wildlife viewing, hunting, and OHV driving.

Experiences: Opportunities for solitude, achievement/stimulation, and enjoying nature.

Benefits: Greater self-reliance; improved outdoor skills; greater sense of adventure; and physical fitness.

### Prescribed Setting Character

Physical: Provide roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation experiences.

Social: Low (6 to 10 parties per day) to moderate (10 to 50 parties per day) recreation use levels (moderate near developed sites and roads, and low to moderate in other areas).

Administrative: Onsite regimentation and controls present, but are subtle. Camp hosts provided at Gerber Recreation site (fee site).

### Activity Planning Framework

Management: Facilities include developed and semi-developed campgrounds, day-use areas, boat ramps, hiking trail, watchable wildlife, and Klamath Basin Birding Trail viewing site. Seasonal road closure in Gerber Block from November 1 to April 15.

Marketing: New brochure has been developed. Area is identified on Klamath Basin Birding Trail map.

Possible enhancement measures include additional interpretive panels and sign.

Monitoring: Area is OHV limited to designated roads, with additional seasonal road closures in place. Miller Creek ACEC, Gerber Reservoir, Willow Valley Reservoir, and several streams are closed to off-highway vehicle use. Limited onsite administration (except at Gerber Recreation site where camp hosts are provided).





Administrative: Limited onsite administration, primarily at Gerber Recreation site and during regular patrols and law enforcement.

## Hamaker Mountain

### Primary Market Strategy: Community

Niche: Roaded natural recreation opportunities, including mountain biking, hiking, off-highway vehicle use, competitive hill climbs, and winter sports within the Klamath Falls urban area.

Management Objectives: Manage Hamaker Special Recreation Management Area for Roaded Natural recreation opportunities. Design timber management and other activities to enhance future trail and site development with an emphasis on winter sports and mountain biking. Examples of timber management activities that would enhance recreation would include the development of cleared trails suitable for downhill or cross country skiing. Trails will be replanted with vegetation to benefit wildlife and would be unavailable for future timber harvest. The identification and resolving of specific recreation management issues and prioritization of projects (developed parking areas, designated trails, etc.) will occur during watershed analysis (completed) or recreation area planning. Establish a BLM patrol during winter months to provide visitor assistance on Hamaker Mountain. Coordinate with Federal Aviation Administration on access road plowing, maintenance, improvements. Winter recreation opportunities limited if road is not regularly plowed by the Federal Aviation Administration.

### Targeted Outcomes

Activities: Winter sports, mountain biking, hiking, OHV trail riding, competitive events.

Experiences: Exercise; escape physical pressure; enjoy nature.

Benefits: Greater self-reliance; improved outdoor skills; greater sense of adventure; physical fitness. Close to urban area recreation opportunities.

### Prescribed Setting Character

Physical: Roaded natural opportunities.

Social: Equal opportunities for affiliation with other user groups and for isolation from sights and sounds of man. Concentrations of users are low to moderate.

Administrative: Onsite controls and restrictions offer a sense of security. Rustic facilities provided.

### Activity Planning Framework

Management: No facilities currently provided. New facilities to include trailheads, designated OHV routes, developed trails, group use areas, winter sports trails, and parking areas. Seasonal fire restrictions limit OHV use. Opportunity to tie-in with Klamath Sportsman's Park.

Marketing: New brochure to be developed after facilities are developed and needed easements are in place. Opportunities for concession for permitted travel/shuttle service.

Monitoring: Ongoing monitoring to be conducted during spring through fall months to monitor use and facility conditions, and to reduce user conflicts. Monitoring of winter use when snow is adequate for recreation activities.



Administrative: Off-highway vehicle use limited to existing roads (existing condition). The OHV use is to be limited to designated trails after the off-highway vehicle inventory is completed. Limited onsite administration, primarily patrols and law enforcement. The ATV allocation committee grants will be pursued for facility development and law enforcement.

## Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail

### **Primary Market Strategy: Destination.**

Niche: This half-mile portion of the trail offers high elevation hiking and outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive camping along the Cascade-Siskiyou Mountains.

Management Objectives: Protect and preserve the physical, aesthetic, social, and biological environments characteristic within the trail corridor. Provide interpretive information at all access points. Maintain trail conditions as prescribed by BLM standards. Cooperate with trail groups, other agencies, and private landowners in the overall management of the trail.

### **Targeted Outcomes**

Activities: Long distance and day hiking, equestrian use, photography, wildlife observation, sightseeing, camping, hunting, and cross-country jogging.

Experiences: Solitude and self reliance. Escape stress and pressure of the outside world. Enjoy physical exercise, challenge, and adventure of long distance wilderness hiking.

Benefits: Development of improved physical endurance. A restored mind from unwanted stress. Enhanced awareness of nature and natural processes.

### **Prescribed Setting Character**

Physical: The trail corridor is generally within a short distance of the ridge crest and proceeds below timberline through coniferous forest stands, abbreviated by occasional meadows. Water sources are generally uncommon. Frequent encounters with grazing livestock.

Social: Encounters with other hikers and equestrian riders are nominal away from trailheads.

Administrative: The trail passes through federal, state, county, and private lands. The BLM's dominant management role is apparent to hikers as all signage is BLM produced. Law enforcement presence is negligible with the exception of very infrequent patrols.

### **Activity Planning Framework**

Management: Maintenance for the Klamath Falls Resource Area section of the Pacific Crest Trail is coordinated by the Medford District BLM. Monitor use patterns to detect trends and predict changes. Practice adaptive management to react to changing conditions and user needs.

Marketing: Information provided at trailheads, road crossings, or at agency offices provides users with a description of features along the trail, adjacent recreation opportunities, and information on the differing types of uses a hiker may encounter. Maintain an updated agency webpage covering trail conditions, attractions, available resources and their location. Cooperate with trail groups, managing agencies, and landowners to promote proper use.



Monitoring: Use passive electronic trail counters for visitor use information. Provide comment and message journals at trailheads. Through the trail website, encourage and request users to contact BLM and offer assessments as to trail conditions or other observations. When possible, utilize BLM staff or volunteers to conduct foot patrols.

Administrative: Assume a proactive role in trail management, obviating any problems or conditions before any degradation of the recreation resource occurs. Use appropriate signage to alert hikers of land ownership, jurisdictional boundaries, use regulations, and emergency services.

## Stukel Mountain

### Primary Market Strategy: Community

Niche: Semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized trail opportunities within the Klamath Falls urban area. Includes proposed hiking, horseback, mountain biking, and OHV trail opportunities; and hang gliding launch area.

Management Objectives: Manage the Stukel Mountain Special Recreation Area for semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities. The identification and resolving of specific recreation management issues and prioritization of projects (designated off-highway vehicle trails, ease of public access, developed recreation sites, etc.) will occur during watershed analysis or recreation area planning. Improve main road access. Consider development of hang gliding and other facilities for day use and overnight camping. Improve legal access through easements.

### Targeted Outcomes

Activities: Hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, OHV tour routes.

Experiences: Exercise; escape physical pressure; enjoy nature.

Benefits: Greater self-reliance; improved outdoor skills; greater sense of adventure; physical fitness.

### Prescribed Setting Character

Physical: Semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized opportunities.

Social: Concentrations of users is low, except on weekends where it is moderate.

Administrative: Onsite regimentation and controls present, but are subtle.

### Activity Planning Framework

Management: No facilities currently provided. New facilities to include trailheads, designated OHV routes, developed trails, camping areas, and hang gliding. Seasonal road closure from November 1 to April 15.

Marketing: New brochure to be developed after facilities are developed and needed easements are in place.

Monitoring: Ongoing monitoring to be conducted during spring through fall months to monitor use and facility conditions, and to reduce user conflicts.

Administrative: Limited onsite administration, primarily patrols and law enforcement.



## Upper Klamath River

**Primary Market Strategy: Destination recreation tourism.**

Niche: Outstanding summer whitewater boating, fishing and camping opportunities.

Management Objectives: Manage for semi-primitive motorized recreation objectives. Manage the area to emphasize whitewater boating, fishing, and camping along the upper Klamath River. Improve and expand Stateline take-out and scouting trails for the Caldera and Hell's Corner rapids. Manage and maintain Topsy recreation site with camping units for overnight and day-use visitors, boat ramp, the Spring Island rafting launch site, and several primitive camping sites along the Klamath River. Continue to follow the cooperative management agreement with the Pacific Power and Light Company for coordinated recreation trail and facility development. Nominate Topsy Road to the National Backcountry Byway System. Maintain the Klamath River edge trail for non-motorized use.

### Targeted Outcomes

Activities: Whitewater boating, fishing, camping, off-highway vehicle driving, and sightseeing.

Experiences: Risk taking; opportunities for solitude; achievement/ stimulation; enjoying nature.

Benefits: Greater self-reliance; improved outdoor skills; greater sense of adventure.

### Prescribed Setting Character

Physical: Semi-primitive motorized.

Social: Low to moderate interaction, (less on weekdays, moderate on weekends).

Administrative: Onsite regimentation and controls present, but subtle.

### Activity Planning Framework

Management: Facility development includes existing facilities (Topsy, Spring Island, Klamath River campground, Stateline, and dispersed camps). Future facilities include Bypass reach parking areas, boat launch and access trails, additional trails connecting Topsy campground with Copco village, and Keno Dam area.

Marketing: New brochure to be developed in conjunction with statewide developed facility brochure marketing. Other marketing done by commercial outfitters.

Monitoring: Ongoing monitoring for the Wild and Scenic River and of outfitter/guides, to be done primarily during the summer whitewater boating season.

Administrative: Limited onsite administration, primarily at Topsy campground, Spring Island boat launch, and during regular seasonal patrols.

## Wood River Wetland

**Primary Market Strategy: Community**

Niche: Provide opportunities for roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation experiences.



**Management Objectives:** Provide opportunities for roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation experiences (opportunities to have a high degree of interaction with the natural environment; to have moderate challenge and risk; and to use outdoor skills). See Wood River RMP/Environmental Impact Statement for additional management objectives and detailed guidance.

### **Targeted Outcomes**

**Activities:** Wildlife viewing, hiking, fishing, hunting, boating, dog walking.

**Experiences:** Exercise; escape physical pressure; enjoyment of nature.

**Benefits:** Greater self-reliance; improved outdoor skills; greater sense of adventure; physical fitness; rural recreation.

### **Prescribed Setting Character**

**Physical:** Provide roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation experiences.

**Social:** Low (6 to 10 parties per day) to moderate (10 to 50 parties per day) recreation use levels (moderate near developed sites and roads, and low to moderate in other areas).

**Administrative:** Manage the area for day use only. Recreation use and facilities would be secondary to the overall objective of wetland restoration and water quality improvement.


### **Activity Planning Framework**

**Management:** Facilities include a paved parking area, canoe/small boat launch, vault toilets, hiking trail, interpretive panels. Area closed to motorized use; additional use restrictions (e.g., time of day and personal belongings).

**Marketing:** New brochure available. Day-use facilities and trail are developed, as well as interpretive panels. Future development includes additional wetland and nature trails and an environmental education gathering area. The area is identified as a site on the Klamath Basin Birding Trail map and is used for environmental and classroom education.

**Monitoring:** Area has a self-registration form, and additional monitoring occurs throughout the year by BLM staff and volunteers.

**Administrative:** Area is OHV closed (except for administrative uses), closed to overnight use, open to hunting. Limited onsite administration, primarily patrols and law enforcement.



# Appendix H


## Grazing



---

**In this appendix:**

Standard Procedures and Design Elements for Range Improvements within the Klamath Falls Resource Area .....	H-3
Grazing Allotments in the Klamath Falls Resource Area .....	H-9
Standards for Rangeland Health .....	H-17







# Standard Procedures and Design Elements for Range Improvements within the Klamath Falls Resource Area

The following standard procedures and design elements will be adhered to in implementation of the proposed construction of range improvements within the Klamath Falls Resource Area:

- Inventories and surveys for cultural resources, threatened and endangered species, and special status species will be conducted prior to authorization of any project construction, and appropriate mitigation implemented to reduce or eliminate potential effects.
- Surface disturbance at all project sites will be held to a minimum. Disturbed soil will be rehabilitated to blend into surrounding soil surface and reseeded as needed with a mixture of native grasses, forbs, shrubs, and trees as applicable to replace ground cover, reduce soil loss from wind and water erosion, and discourage the potential establishment of any invasive, non-native plant species.
- Where possible, existing roads and trails will provide access for range improvement construction. If needed, unimproved trails and tracks will be created to reach construction sites and provide access for future maintenance of the improvements. Locate unimproved trails or tracks outside Riparian Management Areas where workable.

All range improvements will be constructed in accordance with USDI BLM Manual 1741-1 (Fencing), USDI BLM Manual 1741-2 (Water Developments) and Oregon Water Resources Department for water developments.

Additional design features specific to the individual types of improvements are described below.

## Reservoirs

- Development of reservoirs will involve the construction of pits and dams to impound water for livestock and wildlife use as shown in *Figure H-1*.
- Pits will be in dry lake beds or other natural depressions. Dams will be constructed in drainages; or to one side of a drainage, with a diversion ditch constructed into the impoundment area.
- Water right applications will be coordinated as needed with applicable agencies, irrigation districts, and other interested parties.
- A water right permit will be obtained from the Oregon Water Resources Department prior to construction.
- Water storage capacity will not exceed 3.0 acre-feet.
- Dams will be located, if possible, to take advantage of natural spillway sites; otherwise a spillway will be constructed around the dam for the reservoir. The slopes of the dam must be a minimum 3 to 1 on the upstream face and minimum of 2 to 1 on the downstream face. Minimum width of the top of all dams will be 12 feet.
- The spillway will be designed to withstand the 50-year flood flow without overtopping the dam. It should also direct the pass flow downstream to prevent erosion of the embankment.
- Fill material, if needed, will come from the impoundment area and/or a borrow area for dams.
- Excavated material from pits will be piled adjacent to the pit. The potential for erosion of the excavated material into the pit will be eliminated. Topsoil will be stockpiled and used to rehabilitate the borrow areas.
- All brush, stumps, roots, and organic matter will be cleared from the borrow area and beneath the dam. Only fill materials consisting of non-organic and cohesive soils adjusted in moisture to optimum water content will be used for construction of the dam. Individual layers will not exceed 8 inches in thickness and will be compacted with a sheepsfoot roller or similar equipment. Fill material should be placed in thin layers parallel with the long axis of the dam.




FIGURE H-1. RESERVOIR STANDARDS

Illustration 2

H-1741-2 - WATER DEVELOPMENTS

Chapter V

Stockwater Reservoir





## Spring Developments

- The spring source will be fenced to prevent livestock grazing and trampling.
- Escape ramps will be installed in all water troughs to allow wildlife to escape.
- Overflow from troughs will be piped away from the developed source area.

## Fencing

- Fences will be designed to prevent the passage of livestock without stopping the movement of wildlife as shown in *Figure H-2*.
- Wire spacing will follow the specifications found in *Figure H-3*. The majority of fences will be constructed as follows: four wire with the bottom wire 16-18 inches off the ground with the sequence of the remaining three wires above this being 6 inches, 6 inches, and 12 inches; the maximum height of the fence (ground to top wire) will be 42 inches.
- The bottom wire on all fencing will be two-strand smooth wire, not barbed, to facilitate antelope crossings.
- Steel “t-post” spacing will be between 16 feet and 24 feet, depending on local conditions.
- Brace posts, tree scabs, and/or rock jacks (rock cribs) will be constructed to enhance fence integrity with one at least every 0.25 mile.
- No woven wire “sheep” fences will be constructed on public lands.
- Brushing and tree limb removal will be limited to only that necessary for surveying, placement, and construction of a fence.
- Where fences cross existing roads, either gates or cattleguards will be installed.
- Where workable, fence construction will be located outside Riparian Management Areas.

*Table H-1* lists the proposed range improvements in the Klamath Falls Resource Area.



FIGURE H-2. FENCE STANDARDS

REGISTRATION 1  
(40)

H-1741-1 - FENCING

BLM Fence Standards for Livestock and Wildlife

<u>Kind of Use Combination</u>						
<u>Kind of Livestock and Wild Herd</u>	<u>Prevalent Big Game Wildlife Species</u>	<u>Number Wires</u>	<u>Max. Fence Height in Inches</u>	<u>Wire Spacing (From Ground Up, in Inches)</u>	<u>Wire Type</u>	<u>No. Strays Between Line Posts w/Spacing of 16.5' - 30'</u>
<u>STANDARD MEXICAN FENCES:</u>						
Cattle	None	4	42	16, 6, 6, 12	Barbed.	1 to 4
Sheep	None	-	36	2, 24 (Waves) 2, 8	Woven, barbed.	
<u>STANDARD MEXICAN MODIFICATIONS TO MEET MULTIPLE-USE NEEDS:</u>						
Cattle (only)	Antelope, Javelina, or Deer and Antelope.	3	30	16, 10, 12	Bottom strand smooth, others barbed.	One w/post spacing of 16.5' - 1 or 2 w/post spacing of 30'.
Sheep (only)	Antelope, Javelina or Deer	4	36	12, 4, 4, 6 16.5' - 1 or 2	Bottom strand smooth, others barbed.	One w/post spacing of 16.5' - 1 to 3 w/post spacing of 30'.
Cattle and Sheep (Use only where sheep control is necessary.)	Antelope, Javelina or Deer	4	30	15, 7, 8, 8	Bottom strand smooth, others barbed.	One w/post spacing of 16.5' - 1 to 3 w/post spacing of 30'.
Cattle and Sheep (normal conditions)	Deer, Elk, Moose, or Antelope.	3	36	18, 10, 12	Bottom strand smooth, others barbed.	1 to 4
Cattle and sheep (Requires greater restriction of livestock movement.)	Deer, Elk, Moose, or Antelope.	4	40	16, 8, 8, 12	Barbed.	1 to 4
Cattle	Big Horn Sheep*	3	39	20, 15, 4	Barbed.	1 to 4
Cattle, Wild Herd	Big Horn Sheep* (Use around watering area)	-	42	15 to bottom rail; 36 and 42 to top of middle and top rails.	Rails 2"-3" diameter.	Line Post spacing 20 feet
Cattle, Wild Herd	Big Horn Sheep*	4	36	16, 4, 4, 4 4, 4	Bottom strand smooth, others barbed.	1 to 2

\*When fences also meet antelope, and deer standards.




FIGURE H-3. WIRE SPACING

Illustration 2  
(40)


H-1741-1 - FENCING

Chapter 4



BLM MANUAL  
Supersedes Rel. 1-1452

Rel. 1-1577  
12/6/05



**TABLE H-1. PROPOSED KLAMATH FALLS RANGE IMPROVEMENTS BY ALLOTMENT**

Allotment	Allotment Number	Type of Improvement	Number	Approximate Location
		Reservoirs	2 each	T41S, R5E, S.11; T40S, R5E, S.35
Edge Creek*	00102	Fencing	3 miles	T41S, R5E, S.11,12; T41S, R6E, S.4,5,6,7,8
Buck Mountain	00103	Fencing	2 miles	T39S, R5E, S.11,13
Buck Lake	00104	Fencing	2 miles	T38S, R5E, S.15,28,29; T38S, R6E, S.20
Dixie*	00107	Fencing	2 miles	T41S, R5E, S.5,7; T41S, R4E, S.1,2,12
Grubb Springs	00147	Reservoirs	2 each	T39S, R6E, S.7,15
Stock Drive	00802	Fencing	1 mile	T39S, R11E, S.31
J Spring	00803	Fencing	1 mile	T38S, R14E, S.32
Barnwell	00807	Reservoirs	2 each	T39S, R11.5E, S.4,8
		Reservoir	1 each	T38S, R11.5E, S.5
Drew	00817	Fencing	2 miles	T38S, R11.5E, S.5,6; T37S, R11.5E, S.31,32
North Horsefly	00821	Reservoir	1 each	T37S, R14E, S.16
Stukel-O'Neill	00822	Fencing	3 miles	T39S, R10E, S.25,26; T40S, R10E, S.1,2
		Reservoir	1 each	T37S, R14E, S.4,9
North Horsefly	00823	Fencing	2 miles	T37S, R14E, S.4,9
Haskins	00826	Fencing	1 mile	T38S, R11.5E, S.29,30
Stukel-High	00827	Reservoir	1 each	T39S, R11.5E, S.30,31
Horton	00829	Reservoir	1 each	T39S, R11.5E, S.15
Ketcham	00835	Fencing	1 mile	T39S, R11E, S.19
		Reservoir	1 each	T39S, R11E, S.21,27,28
Harpold Chaining	00836	Fencing	2 mile	T39S, R11E, S.21,27,28
Windy Ridge	00838	Reservoirs	2 each	T39S, R11.5E, S.24,25
Bryant-Loveness	00839	Fencing	2 miles	T41S, R13E, S.5,6,7,8,17
Short Lake	00842	Fencing	2 miles	T39S, R11E, S.27,28
		Reservoirs	2 each	T40S, R9E, S.15,21,22
OK	00846	Fencing	2 miles	T40S, R9E, S.15,21,22,27,28
Swede Cabin	00847	Fencing	2 miles	T36S, R15E, S.28,30,32
		Reservoirs	2 each	T39S, R11E, S.29,30,31,32
Harpold Ridge	00851	Fencing	2 miles	T39S, R11E, S.29,30,31,32
		Reservoirs	2 each	T40S, R11E, S.5,6,7,8
Rodgers	00852	Fencing	3 miles	T40S, R11E, S.5,6,7,8,9,10
		Fencing	1 mile	T38S, R11E, S.26,35
McCartie	00860	Reservoir	1 each	T38S, R11E, S.26,35
Yainax	00861	Fencing	1 mile	T38S, R11E, S.1,12,13
		Reservoir	1 each	T41S, R13E, S.7
Mills Creek	00865	Fencing	2 miles	T41S, R13E, S.7
		Reservoir	1 each	T40S, R15E, S.17,18
Bear Valley	00876	Fencing	2 miles	T40S, R14.5E, S.24,25; T40S, R15E, S.19,30,31
DeVaul	00879	Fencing	1 mile	T39S, R13E, S.10,11,15
Goodlow	00881	Fencing	1 mile	T39S, R13E, S.9,10,15
Horton	00883	Reservoir	1 each	T39S, R12E, S.22
		Reservoir	1 each	T39S, R13E, S.27,28
Panky Basin	00884	Fencing	1 mile	T39S, R13E, S.27,28
Dry Prairie	00885	Reservoirs	2 each	T38S, R13E, S.27,34,36
Rock Creek	00888	Fencing	2 miles	T41S, R15E, S.9,17
Timber Hill	00889	Reservoirs	2 each	T41S, R14.5E, S.11,12,14,23
Williams	00892	Fencing	2 miles	T39S, R12E, S.10,15

\*Located Within the Pokegama Herd Management Area



---

## Grazing Allotments in the Klamath Falls Resource Area

The resource management plan provides a summary of the number and acres of grazing allotments for the Klamath Falls Resource Area. See *Table H-2* for detailed information about the grazing allotments that are authorized in the Klamath Falls Resource Area. See *Table H-3* for the grazing allotments that are not available for livestock grazing under the Taylor Grazing Act.



**TABLE H-2. KLAMATH FALLS RESOURCE AREA GRAZING ALLOTMENTS**

Allotment Name	Allotment Number	BLM Acres	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs) <sup>2</sup>	Suspended Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Season-of-Use	Selective Management Category <sup>3</sup>	Rangeland Health Assessment Completed	Rangeland Health Assessment Finding	Grazing System	Other Information
Chase Mountain	00101	8,823	195	0	5/15-8/13	C	2001	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	None
Edge Creek	00102	8,860	207	0	5/1-9/1	I	2000	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Deferred-Rotation	Proposed Range Improvement, Common Allotment, Exlosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing, Portion Proposed for Closure
Buck Mountain <sup>1</sup>	00103	7,022	204	0	5/15-9/1	I	2000	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Buck Lake	00104	11,971	280	0	6/15-10/15	C	2000	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement, Common Allotment, Exlosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
Johnson Prairie	00105	120	12	0	5/1-10/1	C	2000	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	None
Dixie <sup>1</sup>	00107	2,287	320	100	5/1-8/15	I	2002	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is a factor.	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement Exlosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
Dry Lake	00140	145	10	0	5/1-6/30	C	2001	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	None
Chicken Hills	00141	3,422	80	0	5/15-9/15	C	2001	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	None
Long Lake	00142	363	18	0	6/16-9/30	C	2000	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Grubb Springs	00147	3,524	130	0	5/1-9/30	C	2000	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement





Allotment Name	Allotment Number	BLM Acres	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs) <sup>2</sup>	Suspended Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Season-of-Use	Selective Management Category <sup>3</sup>	Rangeland Health Assessment Completed	Rangeland Health Assessment Finding	Grazing System	Other Information
Adams	00800	40	6	0	4/15-7/15	C	2005	Not Meeting Standards, Grazing is a factor	Yearly	None
Haught	00801	400	27	0	5/1-7/31	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Stock Drive	00802	40	2	0	5/1-6/30	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
J Spring	00803	320	7	0	5/1-6/30	C	2003	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Bar CL	00804	480	20	22	5/1-5/31	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
SE 80	00805	80	8	0	5/1-10/31	C	2006	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Two Mile	00806	577	56	0	5/1-9/30	C	2006	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor.	Yearly	None
Barnwell	00807	1,708	75	0	5/1-6/15	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Lee	00808	40	10	0	6/1-8/15	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Brown	00809	80	30	0	6/1-8/30	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Brenda	00810	185	18	0	5/16-6/30	C	2006	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Cheyne	00811	875	51	0	5/1-6/15	C	2004	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Stukel-Coffin	00812	760	55	0	5/1-7/1	C	2002	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Cunningham	00814	840	108	0	5/1-6/15	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Stukel-Dehlinger C.	00815	1,680	240	0	4/15-8/8	I	2002	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Stukel-Dehlinger H.	00816	440	30	0	5/10-8/10	C	2002	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Drew	00817	720	72	0	5/1-6/30	C	2005	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Dupont	00819	79	7	0	4/15-6/1	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
North Horsefly	00821	988	68	0	5/1-6/15	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement



Klamath Falls District ROD and RMP

Allotment Name	Allotment Number	BLM Acres	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs) <sup>2</sup>	Suspended Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Season-of-Use	Selective Management Category <sup>3</sup>	Rangeland Health Assessment Completed	Rangeland Health Assessment Finding	Grazing System	Other Information
Stukel-O'Neill	00822	3,122	210	0	5/1-7/15	I	2002	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement Enclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
North Horsefly	00823	920	60	0	6/16-8/1	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Jeld-Wen	00824	240	36	0	6/1-7/15	C	2006	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Naylox	00825	760	76	0	5/1-6/30	C	2005	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Haskins	00826	560	80	0	5/1-7/15	C	2004	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Stukel-High	00827	239	17	0	5/1-6/15	C	2003	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Stukel-Hill	00828	960	60	0	5/1-6/15	C	2002	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Horton	00829	760	26	0	4/21-6/30	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Hungry Hollow	00830	280	40/H	0	6/1-8/30	C	2005	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed for Conversion from Horse to Cattle
Warlow	00831	460	50	0	5/1-9/30	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Jespersion	00832	1578	158	0	5/1-7/1	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Kellison	00834	335	19	0	5/1-6/13	C	2004	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is a factor.	Yearly	None
Ketcham	00835	320	20	0	5/1-6/15	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Harpold Chaining	00836	900	96	0	5/1-5/30	C	2007	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is a factor.	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Bryant-Horton	00837	1,249	130	0	6/1-7/9	C	2006	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Windy Ridge	00838	600	52	0	5/1-5/31	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Bryant-Loveness	00839	3,440	490	0	5/1-6/30	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Bryant-Lyon	00840	565	38	0	5/1-9/30	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None



Allotment Name	Allotment Number	BLM Acres	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs) <sup>2</sup>	Suspended Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Season-of-Use	Selective Management Category <sup>3</sup>	Rangeland Health Assessment Completed	Rangeland Health Assessment Finding	Grazing System	Other Information
Marshall	00841	348	14	0	4/21-5/30	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Short Lake	00842	440	40	0	5/1-6/30	C	2005	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is a factor.	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
McAuliffe	00843	80	10	0	4/16-6/15	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Paddock	00844	440	31	0	5/1-6/30	M	2003	Meeting All Standards	Deferred-Rotation	None
Klamath Hills	00845	500	55	0	4/1-5/31	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
OK	00846	1,260	105	35	5/1-6/15	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Swede Cabin	00847	1,921	108	0	5/1-6/15	I	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Pope	00848	724	48	0	5/1-7/31	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Rajnus Bros.	00849	240	16	0	5/1-6/17	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Wilkinson	00850	400	18	0	5/1-6/5	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Harpold Ridge	00851	1,043	108	0	4/21-6/30	M	2006	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Rodgers	00852	2,355	235	0	5/1-7/1	I	2003	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement Enclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
7C	00853	688	104	0	5/1-6/30	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Jump	00854	200	20	0	5/1-5/30	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Bryant-Smith	00855	1,140	109	0	5/15-8/31	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Bryant-Stastry	00856	440	70	0	5/10-9/30	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Bryant-Taylor	00857	1,080	74	0	4/15-9/30	C	2007	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Swan Lake Rim	00858	6,448	300	0	5/1-6/30	M	2006	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation	Common Allotment
Cunard	00859	370	60/H	0	5/1-7/31	C	2002	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation	Proposed for Conversion from Horse to Cattle
McCartie	00860	545	83	0	5/1-5/30	C	2004	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation	Proposed Range Improvement



Klamath Falls District ROD and RMP

Allotment Name	Allotment Number	BLM Acres	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs) <sup>2</sup>	Suspended Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Season-of-Use	Selective Management Category <sup>3</sup>	Rangeland Health Assessment Completed	Rangeland Health Assessment Finding	Grazing System	Other Information
Yainax Butte	00861	2,520	120	0	7/1-9/30	M	2005	Meeting All Standards	Deferred-Rotation	Proposed Range Improvement Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
Klamath Forest Estates	00862	2,520	47	0	5/1-5/31	M	2005	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
	00863	1,200	100	0	4/15-10/15	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Rajnus & Son	00864	1,440	110	0	5/1-6/30	C	2007	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is a factor.	Yearly	None
Mills Creek	00865	280	40	0	5/1-6/14	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Bear Valley	00876	5,018	415	0	7/1-8/9	I	2000/2003	Meeting All Standards	Deferred-Rotation	Proposed Range Improvement, Common Allotment, Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
Bumpheads	00877	9,220	420	265	4/21-6/30	I	2003	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is a factor.	Deferred-Rotation	Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
Campbell	00878	1,465	47/H	13	5/1-10/26	C	2002	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed for Conversion from Horse to Cattle
DeVaul	00879	240	12	15	5/1-8/30	C	2003	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Goodlow	00881	285	32	52	5/1-8/31	C	2003	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Horsefly	00882	26,356	2656	2075	4/15-6/30, 10/1-11/15	I	1999/2003	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation/High Intensity-Short Duration	Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing, Common Allotment
Horton	00883	800	58	211	4/21-5/20	C	2002	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Pankey Basin	00884	282	43	38	5/15-8/31	C	2003	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is a factor.	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
Dry Prairie	00885	7,231	642	358	5/1-9/30	I	1999/2003	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation	Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing, Common Allotment, Proposed Range Improvement
Horse Camp Rim	00886	9,180	445	281	5/1-7/31	I	2003	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation	Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing



Allotment Name	Allotment Number	BLM Acres	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs) <sup>2</sup>	Suspended Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Season-of-Use	Selective Management Category <sup>3</sup>	Rangeland Health Assessment Completed	Rangeland Health Assessment Finding	Grazing System	Other Information
Pitchlog	00887	9,280	434	796	5/10-6/30	I	1999/2003	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation/High Intensity-Short Duration	Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
Rock Creek	00888	2,750	216	639	5/1-5/31	I	2003	Meeting All Standards	Rest-Rotation	Proposed Range Improvement
Timber Hill	00889	2,937	270	134	6/21-7/31	I	1999/2003	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Willow Valley	00890	20,460	1225	506	4/15-6/30	I	2000/2003	Not Meeting Standards, Grazing is a factor	Rest-Rotation	Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing, Common Allotment
Williams	00892	1,790	75	0	5/1-5/31	M	2004	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Proposed Range Improvement
Fields	00893	180	6	0	4/21-5/20	C	2005	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Voight	00894	112	8	0	5/1-6/15	C	2003	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
Harpold Canyon	00895	760	76	0	5/1-9/30	C	2006	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	None
McFall	00896	600	60	0	5/1-6/30	C	2006	Meeting All Standards	Yearly	Common Allotment
Bly Mountain	01800	120	9	0	6/1-8/31	C	Not Completed	Not Completed	Yearly	None
Wood River	30855	2,970	0	0	N/A	N/A	2000	Not Meeting Standards; Grazing is not a factor	N/A	Exclosures or Other Areas Closed to Grazing
		204,815	13,178	5,540						

<sup>1</sup>All or a portion of the allotment is located within the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument

<sup>2</sup>Active Preference is cattle AUMs, unless specified as H for domestic horse use.

<sup>3</sup>Selective Management Categories: Improve (I)-managed to resolve a high level of resource conflicts and concerns and receive the highest priority for funding and management actions; Maintain (M)-managed to maintain satisfactory resource conditions and will be actively managed to ensure that resource values do not decline; Custodial (C)-managed custodially to protect resource conditions and values.



**TABLE H-3. ALLOTMENTS NOT AVAILABLE FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING UNDER THE TAYLOR GRAZING ACT IN THE KLAMATH FALLS RESOURCE AREA**

Allotment Name	Allotment Number	Acres	Forage Allocation (AUMs) <sup>a</sup>
Edge Creek <sup>b</sup>	00102	5,950	---
Plum Hills	00813	160	20
Total Acres and AUMs		6,110	20

<sup>a</sup>AUM (Animal Unit Month) - Amount of forage necessary to sustain one cow (or its equivalent) for one month.

<sup>b</sup>The portion of the Upper Klamath Scenic River within the Edge Creek Allotment will be closed to grazing. This portion of the allotment was not allocated any AUMs. The remainder of the allotment will be available for grazing as described in *Table H-2*.



# Standards for Rangeland Health

The following section contains the *Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management for Public Lands in Oregon and Washington*. These standards and guidelines are referenced in the resource management plan. Livestock grazing will be managed in accordance with these standards and guidelines.

## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH

### **STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH**

**AND**

### **GUIDELINES FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT**

**FOR**

### **PUBLIC LANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE STATES OF OREGON AND**

**WASHINGTON**

**AUGUST 12, 1997**

---

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction	1
Fundamentals of Rangeland Health	1
Standards for Rangeland Health	2
Standards and Guidelines in Relation to the Planning Process	3
Indicators of Rangeland Health	4
Assessments and Monitoring	5
Measurability	5
Implementation	6
Standards for Rangeland Health	7



STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

Standard 1 Watershed Function – Uplands	7
Standard 2 Watershed Function - Riparian/Wetland Areas	9
Standard 3 Ecological Processes	11
Standard 4 Water Quality	13
Standard 5 Native, T&E, and Locally Important Species	14
Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management	15
General Guidelines	15
Livestock Grazing Management	15
Facilitating the Management of Livestock Grazing	17
Accelerating Rangeland Recovery	17
Glossary	19

---

**Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines  
for Livestock Grazing Management for Public Lands  
in Oregon and Washington**

**Introduction**

These Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management for Public Lands in Oregon and Washington were developed in consultation with Resource Advisory Councils and Provincial Advisory Committees, tribes and others. These standards and guidelines meet the requirements and intent of 43 Code of Federal Regulations, Subpart 4180 (Rangeland Health) and are to be used as presented, in their entirety. These standards and guidelines are intended to provide a clear statement of agency policy and direction for those who use public lands for livestock grazing, and for those who are responsible for their management and accountable for their condition. Nothing in this document should be interpreted as an abrogation of Federal trust responsibilities in protection of treaty rights of Indian tribes or any other statutory responsibilities including, but not limited to, the Taylor Grazing Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

**Fundamentals of Rangeland Health**

The objectives of the rangeland health regulations referred to above are: "to promote healthy sustainable rangeland ecosystems; to accelerate restoration and improvement of public rangelands to properly functioning conditions; . . . and to provide for the sustainability of the western livestock industry and communities that are dependent upon productive, healthy public rangelands."





## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

To help meet these objectives, the regulations on rangeland health identify fundamental principles providing direction to the States, districts, and on-the-ground public land managers and users in the management and use of rangeland ecosystems.

A hierarchy, or order, of ecological function and process exists within each ecosystem. The rangeland ecosystem consists of four primary, interactive components: a physical component, a biological component, a social component, and an economic component. This perspective implies that the physical function of an ecosystem supports the biological health, diversity and productivity of that system. In turn, the interaction of the physical and biological components of the ecosystem provides the basic needs of society and supports economic use and potential.

The Fundamentals of Rangeland Health stated in 43 CFR 4180 are:

1. Watersheds are in, or are making significant progress toward, properly functioning physical condition, including their upland, riparian-wetland, and aquatic components; soil and plant conditions support infiltration, soil moisture storage and the release of water that are in balance with climate and landform and maintain or improve water quality, water quantity and the timing and duration of flow.
2. Ecological processes, including the hydrologic cycle, nutrient cycle and energy flow, are maintained, or there is significant progress toward their attainment, in order to support healthy biotic populations and communities.
3. Water quality complies with State water quality standards and achieves, or is making significant progress toward achieving, established Bureau of Land Management objectives such as meeting wildlife needs.
4. Habitats are, or are making significant progress toward being, restored or maintained for Federal threatened and endangered species, Federal Proposed, Category 1 and 2 Federal candidate and other special status species.

The fundamentals of rangeland health combine the basic precepts of physical function and biological health with elements of law relating to water quality, and plant and animal populations and communities. They provide direction in the development and implementation of the standards for rangeland health.

### **Standards for Rangeland Health**

The standards for rangeland health (standards), based on the above fundamentals, are expressions of the physical and biological condition or degree of function necessary to sustain healthy rangeland ecosystems. Although the focus of these standards is on domestic livestock grazing on Bureau of Land Management lands, on-the-ground decisions must consider the effects and impacts of all uses.

Standards that address the physical components of rangeland ecosystems focus on the roles and interactions of geology and landform, soil, climate and water as they govern watershed function



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

and soil stability. The biological components addressed in the standards focus on the roles and interactions of plants, animals and microbes (producers, consumers and decomposers), and their habitats in the ecosystem. The biological component of rangeland ecosystems is supported by physical function of the system, and it is recognized that biological activity also influences and supports many of the ecosystem's physical functions.

Guidance contained in 43 CFR 4180 of the regulations directs management toward the maintenance or restoration of the physical function and biological health of rangeland ecosystems. Focusing on the basic ecological health and function of rangelands is expected to provide for the maintenance, enhancement, or creation of future social and economic options.

The standards are based upon the ecological potential and capability of each site. In assessing a site's condition or degree of function, it must be understood that the evaluation compares each site to its own potential or capability. Potential and capability are defined as follows:

**Potential**-The highest level of condition or degree of function a site can attain given no political, social or economic constraints.

**Capability**-The highest level of condition or degree of function a site can attain given certain political, social or economic constraints. For example, these constraints might include riparian areas permanently occupied by a highway or railroad bed that prevent the stream's full access to its original flood plain. If such constraints are removed, the site may be able to move toward its potential.

In designing and implementing management strategies to meet the standards of rangeland health, the potential of the site must be identified, and any constraints recognized, in order that plan goals and objectives are realistic and physically and economically achievable.

### **Standards and Guidelines in Relation to the Planning Process**

The standards apply to the goals of land use plans, activity plans, and project plans (Allotment Management Plans, Annual Operating Plans, Habitat Management Plans, etc.). They establish the physical and biological conditions or degree of function toward which management of publicly-owned rangeland is to be directed. In the development of a plan, direction provided by the standards and the social and economic needs expressed by local communities and individuals are brought together in formulating the goal(s) of that plan.

When the standards and the social and economic goals of the planning participants are woven together in the plan goal(s), the quantifiable, time specific objective(s) of the plan are then developed. Objectives describe and quantify the desired future conditions to be achieved within a specified timeframe. Each plan objective should address the physical, biological, social and economic elements identified in the plan goal.



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

Standards apply to all ecological sites and land forms on public rangelands throughout Oregon and Washington. The standards require site-specific information for full on-ground usability. For each standard, a set of indicators is identified for use in tailoring the standards to site-specific situations. These indicators are used for rangeland ecosystem assessments and monitoring and for developing terms and conditions for permits and leases that achieve the plan goal.

Guidelines for livestock grazing management offer guidance in achieving the plan goal and objectives. The guidelines outline practices, methods, techniques and considerations used to ensure that progress is achieved in a way, and at a rate, that meets the plan goal and objectives.

### **Indicators of Rangeland Health**

The condition or degree of function of a site in relation to the standards and its trend toward or away from any standard is determined through the use of reliable and scientifically sound indicators. The consistent application of such indicators can provide an objective view of the condition and trend of a site when used by trained observers.

For example, the amount and distribution of ground cover can be used to indicate that infiltration at the soil surface can take place as described in the standard relating to upland watershed function. In applying this indicator, the specific levels of plant cover necessary to support infiltration in a particular soil should be identified using currently available information from reference areas, if they exist; from technical sources like soil survey reports, Ecological Site Inventories, and Ecological Site Descriptions, or from other existing reference materials. Reference areas are lands that best represent the potential of a specific ecological site in both physical function and biological health. In many instances potential reference areas are identified in Ecological Site Descriptions and are referred to as "type locations." In the absence of suitable reference areas, the selection of indicators to be used in measuring or judging condition or function should be made by an interdisciplinary team of experienced professionals and other trained individuals.

Not all indicators identified for each standard are expected to be employed in every situation. Criteria for selecting appropriate indicators and methods of measurement and observation include, but are not limited to: 1. the relationship between the attribute(s) being measured or observed and the desired outcome; 2. the relationship between the activity (e.g., livestock grazing) and the attribute(s) being measured or observed; and 3. funds and workforce available to conduct the measurements or observations.

### **Assessments and Monitoring**

The standards are the basis for assessing and monitoring rangeland condition and trend. Carrying out well-designed assessment and monitoring is critical to restoring or maintaining healthy rangelands and determining trends and conditions.

Assessments are a cursory form of evaluation based on the standards that can be used at different landscape scales. Assessments, conducted by qualified interdisciplinary teams (which may



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

include but are not limited to physical, biological and social specialists, and interagency personnel) with participation from permittees and other interested parties, are appropriate at the watershed and sub-watershed levels, at the allotment and pasture levels and on individual ecological sites or groups of sites. Assessments identify the condition or degree of function within the rangeland ecosystem and indicate resource problems and issues that should be monitored or studied in more detail. The results of assessments are a valuable tool for managers in assigning priorities within an administrative area and the subsequent allocation of personnel, money and time in resource monitoring and treatment. The results of assessments may also be used in making management decisions where an obvious problem exists.

Monitoring, which is the well documented and orderly collection, analysis and interpretation of resource data, serves as the basis for determining trends in the condition or degree of function of rangeland resources and for making management decisions. Monitoring should be designed and carried out to identify trends in resource conditions, to point out resource problems, to help indicate the cause of such problems, to point out solutions, and/or to contribute to adaptive management decisions. In cases where monitoring data do not exist, professional judgment, supported by interdisciplinary team recommendation, may be relied upon by the authorized officer in order to take necessary action. Review and evaluation of new information must be an ongoing activity.

To be effective, monitoring must be consistent over time, throughout administrative areas, and in the methods of measurement and observation of selected indicators. Those doing the monitoring must have the knowledge and skill required by the level or intensity of the monitoring being done, as well as the experience to properly interpret the results. Technical support for training must be made available.

### **Measurability**

It is recognized that not every area will immediately meet the standards and that it will sometimes be a long-term process to restore some rangelands to properly functioning condition. It is intended that in cases where standards are not being met, measurable progress should be made toward achieving those standards, and significant progress should be made toward fulfilling the fundamentals of rangeland health. Measurability is defined on a case-specific basis based upon the stated planning objectives (i.e., quantifiable, time specific), taking into account economic and social goals along with the biological and ecological capability of the area. To the extent that a rate of recovery conforms with the planning objectives, the area is allowed the time to meet the standard under the selected management regime.

### **Implementation**

The material contained in this document will be incorporated into existing Land Use Plans and used in the development of new Land Use Plans. According to 43 CFR 4130.3-1, permits and leases shall incorporate terms and conditions that ensure conformance with 43 CFR 4180. Terms and conditions of existing permits and leases will be modified to reflect standards and guidelines at the earliest possible date with priority for modification being at the discretion of the authorized



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

officer. Terms and conditions of new permits and leases will reflect standards and guidelines in their development.

Indicators identified in this document will serve as a focus of interpretation of existing monitoring data and will provide the basis of design for monitoring and assessment techniques, and in the development of monitoring and assessment plans.

The authorized officer shall take appropriate action as soon as practicable but not later than the start of the next grazing year upon determining, through assessment or monitoring by experienced professionals and interdisciplinary teams, that a standard is not being achieved and that livestock are a significant contributing factor to the failure to achieve the standards and conform with the guidelines.

---

### **Standards for Rangeland Health**

#### **Standard 1 Watershed Function – Uplands**

**Upland soils exhibit infiltration and permeability rates, moisture storage and stability that are appropriate to soil, climate and landform.**

##### **Rationale and Intent**

This standard focuses on the basic physical functions of upland soils that support plant growth, the maintenance or development of plant populations and communities, and promote dependable flows of quality water from the watershed.

To achieve and sustain rangeland health, watersheds must function properly. Watersheds consist of three principle components: the uplands, riparian/wetland areas and the aquatic zone. This standard addresses the upland component of the watershed. When functioning properly, within its potential, a watershed captures, stores and safely releases the moisture associated with normal precipitation events (equal to or less than the 25 year, 5 hour event) that falls within its boundaries. Uplands make up the largest part of the watershed and are where most of the moisture received during precipitation events is captured and stored.

While all watersheds consist of similar components and processes, each is unique in its individual makeup. Each watershed displays its own pattern of landform and soil, its unique climate and weather patterns, and its own history of use and current condition. In directing management toward achieving this standard, it is essential to treat each unit of the landscape (soil, ecological site, and watershed) according to its own capability and how it fits with both smaller and larger units of the landscape.



---

STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

A set of potential indicators has been identified for which site-specific criteria will be used to determine if this standard is being met. The appropriate indicators to be used in determining attainment of the standard should be drawn from the following list.

**Potential Indicators**

Protection of the soil surface from raindrop impact; detention of overland flow; maintenance of infiltration and permeability, and protection of the soil surface from erosion, consistent with the potential/capability of the site, as evidenced by the:

- amount and distribution of plant cover (including forest canopy cover);
- amount and distribution of plant litter;
- accumulation/incorporation of organic matter;
- amount and distribution of bare ground;
- amount and distribution of rock, stone, and gravel;
- plant composition and community structure;
- thickness and continuity of A horizon;
- character of micro-relief;
- presence and integrity of biotic crusts;
- root occupancy of the soil profile;
- biological activity (plant, animal, and insect); and
- absence of accelerated erosion and overland flow.

Soil and plant conditions promote moisture storage as evidenced by:

- amount and distribution of plant cover (including forest canopy cover);
- amount and distribution of plant litter;
- plant composition and community structure; and
- accumulation/incorporation of organic matter.

---

**Standard 2 Watershed Function - Riparian/Wetland Areas**

**Riparian-wetland areas are in properly functioning physical condition appropriate to soil, climate, and landform.**

**Rationale and Intent**

Riparian-wetland areas are grouped into two major categories: 1. lentic, or standing water systems such as lakes, ponds, seeps, bogs, and meadows; and 2. lotic, or moving water systems such as rivers, streams, and springs. Wetlands are areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration to support, and which under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted to life in saturated soil conditions. Riparian areas commonly occupy the transition zone between the uplands and surface water bodies (the aquatic zone) or permanently saturated wetlands.



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

Properly functioning condition of riparian and wetland areas describes the degree of physical function of these components of the watershed. Their functionality is important to water quality in the capture and retention of sediment and debris, the detention and detoxification of pollutants, and in moderating seasonal extremes of water temperature. Properly functioning riparian areas and wetlands enhance the timing and duration of streamflow through dissipation of flood energy, improved bank storage, and ground water recharge. Properly functioning condition should not be confused with the Desired Plant Community (DPC) or the Desired Future Condition (DFC) since, in most cases, it is the precursor to these levels of resource condition and is required for their attainment.

A set of indicators has been identified for which site-specific criteria will be used to determine if this standard is being met. The criteria are based upon the potential (or upon the capability where potential cannot be achieved) of individual sites or land forms.

### **Potential Indicators**

Hydrologic, vegetative, and erosional/depositional processes interact in supporting physical function, consistent with the potential or capability of the site, as evidenced by:

- frequency of floodplain/wetland inundation;
- plant composition, age class distribution, and community structure;
- root mass;
- point bars revegetating;
- streambank/shoreline stability;
- riparian area width;
- sediment deposition;
- active/stable beaver dams;
- coarse/large woody debris;
- upland watershed conditions;
- frequency/duration of soil saturation; and
- water table fluctuation.

Stream channel characteristics are appropriate for landscape position as evidenced by:

- channel width/depth ratio;
- channel sinuosity;
- gradient;
- rocks and coarse and/or large woody debris;
- overhanging banks;
- pool/riffle ratio;
- pool size and frequency; and
- stream embeddedness.

---

### **Standard 3 Ecological Processes**



STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

**Healthy, productive and diverse plant and animal populations and communities appropriate to soil, climate and landform are supported by ecological processes of nutrient cycling, energy flow and the hydrologic cycle.**

**Rationale and Intent**

This standard addresses the ecological processes of energy flow and nutrient cycling as influenced by existing and desired plant and animal communities without establishing the kinds, amounts or proportions of plant and animal community compositions. While emphasis may be on native species, an ecological site may be capable of supporting a number of different native and introduced plant and animal populations and communities while meeting this standard. This standard also addresses the hydrologic cycle which is essential for plant growth and appropriate levels of energy flow and nutrient cycling. Standards 1 and 2 address the watershed aspects of the hydrologic cycle.

With few exceptions, all life on earth is supported by the energy supplied by the sun and captured by plants in the process of photosynthesis. This energy enters the food chain when plants are consumed by insects and herbivores and passes upward through the food chain to the carnivores. Eventually, the energy reaches the decomposers and is released as the thermal output of decomposition or through oxidation.

The ability of plants to capture sunlight energy, to grow and develop, to play a role in soil development and watershed function, to provide habitat for wildlife and to support economic uses depends on the availability of nutrients and moisture. Nutrients necessary for plant growth are made available to plants through the decomposition and metabolization of organic matter by insects, bacteria and fungi, the weathering of rocks and extraction from the atmosphere. Nutrients are transported through the soil by plant uptake, leaching and by rodent, insect and microbial activity. They follow cyclical patterns as they are used and reused by living organisms.

The ability of rangelands to supply resources and satisfy social and economic needs depends on the buildup and cycling of nutrients over time. Interrupting or slowing nutrient cycling can lead to site degradation, as these lands become increasingly deficient in the nutrients plants require.

Some plant communities, because of past use, frequent fire or other histories of extreme or continued disturbance, are incapable of meeting this standard. For example, shallow-rooted winter-annual grasses that completely dominate some sites do not fully occupy the potential rooting depth of some soils, thereby reducing nutrient cycling well below optimum levels. In addition, these plants have a relatively short growth period and thus capture less sunlight than more diverse plant communities. Plant communities like those cited in this example are considered to have crossed the threshold of recovery and often require great expense to be recovered. The cost of recovery must be weighed against the site's potential ecological/economic value in establishing treatment priorities.

The role of fire in natural ecosystems should be considered, whether it acts as a primary driver or only as one of many factors. It may play a significant role in both nutrient cycling and energy flows.





## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

A set of indicators has been identified for which site-specific criteria will be used to determine if this standard is being met.

### **Potential Indicators**

Photosynthesis is effectively occurring throughout the potential growing season, consistent with the potential/capability of the site, as evidenced by plant composition and community structure.

Nutrient cycling is occurring effectively, consistent with the potential/capability of the site, as evidenced by:

- plant composition and community structure;
- accumulation, distribution, incorporation of plant litter and organic matter into the soil;
- animal community structure and composition;
- root occupancy in the soil profile; and
- biological activity including plant growth, herbivory, and rodent, insect and microbial activity.

---

### **Standard 4 Water Quality**

**Surface water and groundwater quality, influenced by agency actions, complies with State water quality standards.**

#### **Rationale and Intent**

The quality of the water yielded by a watershed is determined by the physical and chemical properties of the geology and soils unique to the watershed, the prevailing climate and weather patterns, current resource conditions, the uses to which the land is put and the quality of the management of those uses. Standards 1, 2 and 3 contribute to attaining this standard.

States are legally required to establish water quality standards and Federal land management agencies are to comply with those standards. In mixed ownership watersheds, agencies, like any other land owners, have limited influence on the quality of the water yielded by the watershed. The actions taken by the agency will contribute to meeting State water quality standards during the period that water crosses agency administered holdings.

#### **Potential Indicators**

Water quality meets applicable water quality standards as evidenced by:

- water temperature;
- dissolved oxygen;
- fecal coliform;
- turbidity;
- pH;



---

STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

- populations of aquatic organisms; and
- effects on beneficial uses (i.e., effects of management activities on beneficial uses as defined under the Clean Water Act and State implementing regulations).

---

**Standard 5 Native, T&E, and Locally Important Species**

**Habitats support healthy, productive and diverse populations and communities of native plants and animals (including special status species and species of local importance) appropriate to soil, climate and landform.**

**Rationale and Intent**

Federal agencies are mandated to protect threatened and endangered species and will take appropriate action to avoid the listing of any species. This standard focuses on retaining and restoring native plant and animal (including fish) species, populations and communities (including threatened, endangered and other special status species and species of local importance). In meeting the standard, native plant communities and animal habitats would be spatially distributed across the landscape with a density and frequency of species suitable to ensure reproductive capability and sustainability. Plant populations and communities would exhibit a range of age classes necessary to sustain recruitment and mortality fluctuations.

Potential Indicators

Essential habitat elements for species, populations and communities are present and available, consistent with the potential/capability of the landscape, as evidenced by:

- plant community composition, age class distribution, productivity;
- animal community composition, productivity;
- habitat elements;
- spatial distribution of habitat;
- habitat connectivity; and
- population stability/resilience

**Sage-Grouse Management Guidelines**

---

**Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management**

Guidelines for livestock grazing management offer guidance in achieving plan goals, meeting standards for rangeland health and fulfilling the fundamentals of rangeland health. Guidelines are applied in accordance with the capabilities of the resource in consultation, cooperation, and coordination with permittees/lessees and the interested public. Guidelines enable managers to



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

adjust grazing management on public lands to meet current and anticipated climatic and biological conditions.

### **General Guidelines**

1. Involve diverse interests in rangeland assessment, planning and monitoring.
2. Assessment and monitoring are essential to the management of rangelands, especially in areas where resource problems exist or issues arise. Monitoring should proceed using a qualitative method of assessment to identify critical, site-specific problems or issues using interdisciplinary teams of specialists, managers, and knowledgeable land users.

Once identified, critical, site-specific problems or issues should be targeted for more intensive, quantitative monitoring or investigation. Priority for monitoring and treatment should be given to those areas that are ecologically at-risk where benefits can be maximized given existing budgets and other resources.

### **Livestock Grazing Management**

1. The season, timing, frequency, duration and intensity of livestock grazing use should be based on the physical and biological characteristics of the site and the management unit in order to:
  - a. provide adequate cover (live plants, plant litter and residue) to promote infiltration, conserve soil moisture and to maintain soil stability in upland areas;
  - b. provide adequate cover and plant community structure to promote streambank stability, debris and sediment capture, and floodwater energy dissipation in riparian areas.
  - c. promote soil surface conditions that support infiltration;
  - d. avoid sub-surface soil compaction that retards the movement of water in the soil profile;
  - e. help prevent the increase and spread of noxious weeds;
  - f. maintain or restore diverse plant populations and communities that fully occupy the potential rooting volume of the soil;
  - g. maintain or restore plant communities to promote photosynthesis throughout the potential growing season;
  - h. promote soil and site conditions that provide the opportunity for the



STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

- establishment of desirable plants;
  - i. protect or restore water quality; and
  - j. provide for the life cycle requirements, and maintain or restore the habitat elements of native (including T&E, special status, and locally important species) and desired plants and animals.
2. Grazing management plans should be tailored to site-specific conditions and plan objectives. Livestock grazing should be coordinated with the timing of precipitation, plant growth and plant form. Soil moisture, plant growth stage and the timing of peak stream flows are key factors in determining when to graze. Response to different grazing strategies varies with differing ecological sites.
  3. Grazing management systems should consider nutritional and herd health requirements of the livestock.
  4. Integrate grazing management systems into the year-round management strategy and resources of the permittee(s) or lessee(s). Consider the use of collaborative approaches (e.g., Coordinated Resource Management, Working Groups) in this integration.
  5. Consider competition for forage and browse among livestock, big game animals, and wild horses in designing and implementing a grazing plan.
  6. Provide periodic rest from grazing for rangeland vegetation during critical growth periods to promote plant vigor, reproduction and productivity.
  7. Range improvement practices should be prioritized to promote rehabilitation and resolve grazing concerns on transitory grazing land.
  8. Consider the potential for conflict between grazing use on public land and adjoining land uses in the design and implementation of a grazing management plan.

**Facilitating the Management of Livestock Grazing**

1. The use of practices to facilitate the implementation of grazing systems should consider the kind and class of animals managed, indigenous wildlife, wild horses, the terrain and the availability of water. Practices such as fencing, herding, water development, and the placement of salt and supplements (where authorized) are used where appropriate to:
  - a. promote livestock distribution;



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

- b. encourage a uniform level of proper grazing use throughout the grazing unit;
  - c. avoid unwanted or damaging concentrations of livestock on streambanks, in riparian areas and other sensitive areas such as highly erodible soils, unique wildlife habitats and plant communities; and
  - d. protect water quality.
2. Roads and trails used to facilitate livestock grazing are constructed and maintained in a manner that minimizes the effects on landscape hydrology; concentration of overland flow, erosion and sediment transport are prevented; and subsurface flows are retained.

### **Accelerating Rangeland Recovery**

1. Upland treatments that alter the vegetative composition of a site, like prescribed burning, juniper management and seedings or plantings must be based on the potential of the site and should:
  - a. retain or promote infiltration, permeability, and soil moisture storage;
  - b. contribute to nutrient cycling and energy flow;
  - c. protect water quality;
  - d. help prevent the increase and spread of noxious weeds;
  - e. contribute to the diversity of plant communities, and plant community composition and structure;
  - f. support the conservation of T&E, other special status species and species of local importance; and
  - g. be followed up with grazing management and other treatments that extend the life of the treatment and address the cause of the original treatment need.
2. Seedings and plantings of non-native vegetation should only be used in those cases where native species are not available in sufficient quantities; where native species are incapable of maintaining or achieving the standards; or where non-native species are essential to the functional integrity of the site.
3. Structural and vegetative treatments and animal introductions in riparian and wetland areas must be compatible with the capability of the site, including the system's hydrologic regime, and contribute to the maintenance or restoration of



STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

properly functioning condition.

---

## Glossary

**Appropriate action**-implementing actions pursuant to subparts 4110, 4120, 4130 and 4160 of the regulations that will result in significant progress toward fulfillment of the standards and significant progress toward conformance with the guidelines. (see **Significant progress**)

**Assessment**-a form of evaluation based on the standards of rangeland health, conducted by an interdisciplinary team at the appropriate landscape scale (pasture, allotment, sub-watershed, watershed, etc.) to determine conditions relative to standards.

**Compaction layer**-a layer within the soil profile in which the soil particles have been rearranged to decrease void space, thereby increasing soil bulk density and often reducing permeability.

**Crust, Abiotic**-(physical crust) a surface layer on soils, ranging in thickness from a few millimeters to a few centimeters, that is much more compact, hard and brittle, when dry, than the material immediately beneath it.

**Crust, Biotic**-(microbiotic or cryptogamic crust) a layer of living organisms (mosses, lichens, liverworts, algae, fungi, bacteria, and/or cyanobacteria) occurring on, or near the soil surface.

**Degree of function**-a level of physical function relative to properly functioning condition commonly expressed as: properly functioning, functioning-at-risk, or non-functional.

**Diversity**-the aggregate of species assemblages (communities), individual species, and the genetic variation within species and the processes by which these components interact within and among themselves. The elements of diversity are: 1. community diversity (habitat, ecosystem), 2. species diversity; and 3. genetic diversity within a species; all three of which change over time.

**Energy flow**-the processes in which solar energy is converted to chemical energy through photosynthesis and passed through the food chain until it is eventually dispersed through respiration and decomposition.

**Groundwater**-water in the ground that is in the zone of saturation; water in the ground that exists at, or below the water table.

**Guideline**-practices, methods, techniques and considerations used to ensure that progress is made in a way and at a rate that achieves the standard(s).



## STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

**Gully**-a channel resulting from erosion and caused by the concentrated but intermittent flow of water usually during and immediately following heavy rains.

**Hydrologic cycle**-the process in which water enters the atmosphere through evaporation, transpiration, or sublimation from the oceans, other surface water bodies, or from the land and vegetation, and through condensation and precipitation returns to the earth's surface. The precipitation then occurring as overland flow, stream flow, or percolating underground flow to the oceans or other surface water bodies or to other sites of evapo-transpiration and recirculation to the atmosphere.

**Indicators**-parameters of ecosystem function that are observed, assessed, measured, or monitored to directly or indirectly determine attainment of a standard(s).

**Infiltration**-the downward entry of water into the soil.

**Infiltration rate**-the rate at which water enters the soil.

**Nutrient cycling**-the movement of essential elements and inorganic compounds between the reservoir pool (soil, for example) and the cycling pool (organisms) in the rapid exchange (i.e., moving back and forth) between organisms and their immediate environment.

**Organic matter**-plant and animal residues accumulated or deposited at the soil surface; the organic fraction of the soil that includes plant and animal residues at various stages of decomposition; cells and tissues of soil organisms, and the substances synthesized by the soil population.

**Permeability**-the ease with which gases, liquids or plant roots penetrate or pass through a bulk mass of soil or a layer of soil.

**Properly functioning condition**-Riparian-wetland: adequate vegetation, landform, or large (coarse) woody debris is present to dissipate stream energy associated with high water flows, thereby reducing erosion and improving water quality; filter sediment, capture bedload, and aid in flood plain development; improve flood-water retention and ground water recharge; develop root masses that stabilize streambanks against cutting action; develop diverse channel and ponding characteristics to provide the habitat and water depth, duration and temperature necessary for fish production, waterfowl breeding, and other uses; and support greater biodiversity. The result of interaction among geology, soil, water, and vegetation.

Uplands: soil and plant conditions support the physical processes of infiltration and moisture storage and promote soil stability (as appropriate to site potential); includes the production of plant cover and the accumulation of plant residue that protect the soil surface from raindrop impact, moderate soil temperature in minimizing frozen soil conditions (frequency, depth, and duration), and the loss of soil moisture to evaporation; root growth and development in the support of permeability and soil aeration. The result of interaction among geology, climate, landform, soil, and organisms.



STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

**Proper grazing use**-grazing that, through the control of timing, frequency, intensity and duration of use, meets the physiological needs of the desirable vegetation, provides for the establishment of desirable plants and is in accord with the physical function and stability of soil and landform (properly functioning condition).

**Reference area**-sites that, because of their condition and degree of function, represent the ecological potential or capability of similar sites in an area or region (ecological province); serve as a benchmark in determining the ecological potential of sites with similar soil, climatic, and landscape characteristics.

**Rill**-a small, intermittent water course with steep sides; usually only a few inches deep.

**Riparian area**-a form of wetland transition between permanently saturated wetlands and upland areas. These areas exhibit vegetation or physical characteristics reflective of permanent surface or subsurface water influence. Lands along, adjacent to, or contiguous with perennially and intermittently flowing rivers and stream, glacial potholes, and shores of lakes and reservoirs with stable water levels are typical riparian areas. Excluded are such sites as ephemeral streams or washes that do not exhibit the presence of vegetation dependent upon free water in the soil. Includes, but is not limited to, jurisdictional wetlands.

**Significant progress**-when used in reference to achieving a standard: (actions), the necessary land treatments, practices and/or changes to management have been applied or are in effect; (rate), a rate of progress that is consistent with the anticipated recovery rate described in plan objectives, with due recognition of the effects of climatic extremes (drought, flooding, etc.), fire, and other unforeseen naturally occurring events or disturbances. Monitoring reference areas that are ungrazed and properly grazed may provide evidence of appropriate recovery rates. (See Proper Grazing Use)

**Soil density**-(bulk density)-the mass of dry soil per unit bulk volume.

**Soil moisture**-water contained in the soil; commonly used to describe water in the soil above the water table.

**Special status species**-species proposed for listing, officially listed (T/E), or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the Endangered Species Act; those listed or proposed for listing by the State in a category implying potential endangerment or extinction; those designated by each Bureau of Land Management State Director as sensitive.

**Species of local importance**-species of significant importance to Native American populations (e.g., medicinal and food plants).

**Standard**-an expression of the physical and biological condition or degree of function necessary to sustain healthy rangeland ecosystems.





---


STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH (CONTINUED)

**Uplands**-lands that exist above the riparian/wetland area, or active flood plains of rivers and streams; those lands not influenced by the water table or by free or unbound water; commonly represented by toe slopes, alluvial fans, and side slopes, shoulders and ridges of mountains and hills.

**Watershed**-an area of land that contributes to the surface flow of water past a given point. The watershed dimensions are determined by the point past, or through which, runoff flows.

**Watershed function**-the principal functions of a watershed include the capture of moisture contributed by precipitation; the storage of moisture within the soil profile, and the release of moisture through subsurface flow, deep percolation to groundwater, evaporation from the soil, and transpiration by live vegetation.

**Wetland**-areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and which under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.



# Appendix I

## Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan




---

This appendix includes the record of decision and resource management plan for the Upper Klamath River and Wood River Wetland, which is in the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview BLM District.

**In this appendix:**

Wood River Wetland Plan ..... I-3





---

# Wood River Wetland Plan

The following pages contain a consolidated document (including the record of decision and resource management plan) of the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland. The document is tiered to and references the Klamath Falls Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS), which is available from:

BLM Klamath Falls Resource Area Office  
2795 Anderson Ave., Bldg. #25  
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

The Klamath Falls Proposed Resource Management Plan was approved by the Oregon/Washington State Director in November 1995. The Record of Decision approves the BLM decisions for managing 3,220 acres in Klamath County, Oregon.

The Record of Decision conforms with 40 CFR 1505.2, which requires a concise document linking the manager's decision to the analysis presented in the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), dated July 1995.



# Record of Decision for the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan

Prepared by the Bureau of Land Management  
Klamath Falls Resource Area  
Lakeview District, Oregon  
February 1996

## Introduction

In this Record of Decision we adopt and approve for immediate implementation the following Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan, based on the combination of this office's March 1994 draft environmental impact statement and the July 1995 final environmental impact statement. The resource management plan addresses resource management on approximately 3,220 acres of federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) located within Klamath County, Oregon.

The approved resource management plan responds to the need for a healthy aquatic ecosystem associated with the Upper Klamath Basin that will contribute toward improved water quality and support stable populations of native species, particularly those associated with wetland and riparian communities. It also responds to the need for monitoring the results of implementing the plan and the use of adaptive management based on those monitoring results.

## Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives for management of the BLM-administered lands and resources on the Wood River property were analyzed in the final environmental impact statement. A brief description of each alternative analyzed in the final environmental impact statement follows below.

**Alternative A (No Action).** This alternative would emphasize a continuation of the management direction in place at the time of the BLM's purchase of the Wood River property. The management objective would be to maintain irrigated pastureland for livestock grazing.

**Alternative B.** This alternative would emphasize restoring the property to a functioning wetland with diverse and healthy plant communities. This would be accomplished by restoring historic stream channel meanders on the property. Few water control structures, minimal hydrologic control, long-term low maintenance, and no livestock grazing are features of this alternative.

**Alternative C.** This alternative would emphasize the restoration of a functioning wetland through the use of highly engineered techniques, complex designs, and/or numerous research pilot projects to meet the long-term goal of improving water quality entering Agency Lake from the property. Research would be emphasized in this alternative. Vegetation management could be done through the use of water level and flow manipulations, livestock grazing, prescribed fire, mechanical and chemical treatments. Recreation use would be maximized, with an emphasis on outdoor education and interpretation.

**Alternative D (Proposed Action).** This alternative would restore the property to its previous function as a wetland community. Emphasis would be given to long-term improvement in the quality of water entering Agency Lake from the property. In addition, improving and increasing the wetland and riparian habitat for federally listed fish and other wildlife species would be emphasized. Vegetation management could be accomplished through the use of water level and flow fluctuations, livestock grazing, fire, chemical and



mechanical treatments. A combination of new structures to improve hydrologic control, and utilization of natural processes would be emphasized in this alternative. Adaptive management, the process of changing land management as a result of monitoring or research, would be used. Recreation resources would be managed for low to moderate use levels, with non-motorized access being featured.

## Rationale for Decision

The Congressionally directed purposes for managing the Bureau of Land Management-administered lands include both conserving the ecosystems upon which plant and wildlife species depend, and at the same time providing raw materials and other resources that are needed to sustain the health and economic well-being of the people of this country. The Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative best meets these criteria.

We have reviewed the alternatives discussed in the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement and their predicted environmental, economic, and social consequences, and the risks and safeguards inherent in them. The Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative in the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement is the best alternative for providing a sustainable level of human use of the aquatic/wetland resource while still meeting the need to restore and maintain the wetland ecosystem. We therefore select the Proposed Management Plan alternative as the management direction that best responds to the purpose and need for the proposed action as expressed in the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement.

We base our conclusion on a number of factors. Management under Alternative A (No Action), would provide the least amount of water quality, water retention, and endangered species habitat improvements. Management under Alternative B would provide the least amount of hydrologic control, and the lowest long-term maintenance costs. It would likely provide the least improvement in water quality of the action alternatives, the fewest acres of emergent marsh habitat, and the most water retention capability. Management under Alternative C would provide the most hydrologic control, the most potential for improved water quality, the greatest construction and long-term maintenance costs. It would provide greater capability for water storage than Alternative A, but less than Alternative B. Management under Alternative D (the Proposed Resource Management Plan) would provide more hydrologic control and potential water quality improvements than Alternatives A and B, but less than C. This alternative would provide more potential water retention than alternatives A and C but less than B. This alternative would require more initial and long term maintenance costs than alternatives A and B, but less than C. Alternatives B, C, and D (the Proposed Resource Management Plan) would all have beneficial effects on Lost River and Shortnose sucker habitat. The Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative has the greatest potential to provide improved habitat for these species. The Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative would have a beneficial impact on more Special Status Animal Species than any other alternative. See Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement.

All alternatives follow current BLM policies, initiatives, and emphasis on restoration and maintenance of wetland resource conditions, including riparian and aquatic conditions, that perpetuate fully functioning ecosystems while still providing for societal needs. The primary goals of water quality improvement, increased water retention and improved habitat for the Lost River and Shortnose suckers were used to develop all action alternatives. Alternatives A (No Action), and B would make achieving these objectives more difficult. Alternatives C and D (the Proposed Resource Management Plan) make it easier to accomplish.

The No Action alternative is based on the previous use of this property for irrigated pasture land that existed prior to acquisition. In addition, it does not emphasize the primary goals stated for the management of this property.

The impacts to many species, and groups of species, of fish, wildlife, and plants are complex and difficult to summarize in this Record of Decision. They are described in detail in the Proposed Resource Management



Plant Final Environmental Impact Statement. Based upon the Proposed Resource Management Plan/ Final Environmental Impact Statement and all of the information in the record, we have determined that Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative will continue to meet the needs of species influenced by federal land management activities. We find it meets the requirements of the Endangered Species Act for the conservation of listed species. Moreover, it meets the requirements of acts that protect elements of the environment, and requirements for coordinated planning and consultation.

## Environmental Preferability of the Alternatives

Environmental preferability is judged using the criteria suggested in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), which is guided by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The CEQ has stated that "The environmentally preferable alternative is the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA's Section 101. Generally this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources." (Council on Environmental Quality, "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations [40 CFR 1500-1598], Federal Register Vol. 46, No. 55, 18026-18038, March 23, 1981: Question 6a.)

NEPA's Section 101 establishes the following goals:

- Fulfills the responsibility of this generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations (NEPA 101[b][1]),
- Assures for all Americans productive and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings (NEPA 101[b][2]),
- Attains the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation or other undesirable and unintended consequences (NEPA 101[b][3]),
- Preserves important natural aspects of our national heritage and maintains an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice (NEPA 101[b][4]),
- Achieves a balance between population and resource use, which permits high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities (NEPA 101[b][5]), and
- Enhances the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources (NEPA 101[b][6]).

The Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative allows for the hydrologic control necessary to restore the property to a fully functioning wetland ecosystem. Hydrologic control will also allow for recovery of the site from subsidence at an accelerated rate.

Recovery from subsidence is necessary before a wetland driven by natural processes and requiring little maintenance is possible. This alternative would also allow more acres of woody riparian habitat and flood plain to be restored along the Wood River. Because of this, the Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative affords the most potential for improved habitat conditions for the Lost River and Shortnose suckers. Based on these factors, we conclude that the Proposed Resource Management Plan alternative is the "environmentally preferable alternative."

## Implementation

Decisions in this plan will be implemented over a period of years. The rate of implementation is tied to the BLM's budgeting process. General priorities for overall management will be developed through long-term budgeting processes and in consultation with other agencies, tribes, and government units. Those priorities will be reviewed annually to help develop work plan commitments for the coming years. Although the Resource Management Plan implementing actions are described by individual resources, most activities will be consolidated and considered in an interdisciplinary, multi-resource process.





## Valid Existing Rights

This plan will not repeal valid existing rights on public lands. Valid existing rights are those rights or claims to rights that take precedence over the actions contained in this plan. Valid existing rights may be held by other federal, state or local government agencies or by private individuals or companies. Valid existing rights may pertain to reserved mineral rights mining claims; mineral or energy leases; and easements or rights-of-way; reciprocal rights-of-way and water rights.

## Administrative Actions

Various types of administrative actions will require special attention beyond the scope of this plan. Administrative actions are the day-to-day transactions required to serve the public and to provide optimum use of the resources. These actions are in conformance with the plan. They include, but are not limited to; permits or sales for traditional or special forest products; competitive and commercial recreation activities; lands and realty actions, including issuance of grants, leases, and permits and resolution of trespass; facility maintenance; law enforcement and hazardous material removal or mitigation; enforcement and monitoring of permit stipulations; cadastral surveys to determine legal land or mineral estate ownership; and engineering support to assist in mapping, designing, and implementing projects. These and other administrative actions will be conducted at the resource area, district or state level, sometimes in partnership with other landowner or agencies or entities. The degree to which these actions are carried out will depend upon BLM policies, available personnel, funding levels, and further environmental analysis and decision making, as appropriate.


## Mitigation and Monitoring

All protective measures and other management direction identified in the plan will be taken to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts. These measures will be taken throughout implementation. All practical means to avoid or reduce environmental harm will be adopted, monitored, and evaluated, as appropriate.

Monitoring will be conducted, as identified in the approved plan. Monitoring and evaluations will be utilized to ensure that decisions and priorities conveyed by the plan are being implemented, that progress toward identified resource objectives is occurring, that mitigating measures and other management direction are effective in avoiding or reducing adverse environmental impacts, and that the plan is maintained and consistent with the ongoing development of BLM state office, regional, and national guidance.

## Public Involvement

Scoping of the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement began in January 1993, with a public meeting and the formation of the Wood River Wetland Team. Anyone who participated in the development of the plan was considered a team member. Active public involvement has been stressed throughout the plan development process. Public involvement has included information mailers, public meetings, field trips, distribution of planning documents, document review, comment periods, informal contacts, and group presentations to share information. The Wood River Wetland Team had 18 meetings open to the public between January 1993 and May 1995. The team reviewed all portions of the draft and final Resource Management Plan /EIS, and provided comments that were considered throughout the development of these documents. The Bureau of Land Management has been careful to inform this group that all management decisions for this property will be made by the Bureau. The team will continue to meet and provide comments on project implementation and monitoring.



On March 11, 1994, a Notice of Availability of the Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register by the BLM, in addition to a Notice of Availability by the Environmental Protection Agency. Newspaper and other media were also notified of the document availability, the length of the comment period, and the dates, times, and locations of public meetings. The Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was sent to a list of approximately 250 individuals, organizations, and agencies.

On July 28, 1995, the Environmental Protection Agency published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register, which initiated the official protest and public comment period for the Upper Klamath Basin Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement. In addition, on July 18, 1995, a Notice of Availability was also published in the Federal Register by the BLM. Newspaper and other media were also notified of the document availability, the length of the protest period, and the date, time, and location of public meetings. The Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement or summary were sent to a list of approximately 300 individuals, organizations, and agencies. Approximately 20 people attended meetings. The district manager received no comment letters. There were no objections or recommendations by the Governor on behalf of any state or local government entity. There are no known inconsistencies with officially approved or adopted natural resource related plans, policies, or programs of applicable state or local governments or Indian tribes.

The official period to protest the proposed plan closed on September 18, 1995. No valid protests were received. A few non-substantive changes have been made in the text of the approved plan to reflect typographical corrections, improve clarity, or demonstrate consistency with various regulatory procedures or policies.



## Recommendation

With full knowledge of the commitment to resource and ecosystem management represented by the plan, I recommend the adoption of the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan.

/s/ Edwin J. Singleton

10/25/95

Date

Edwin J. Singleton  
District Manager, Lakeview District, Lakeview, Oregon

## State Director Approval

I approve the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan as recommended.

This document meets the requirements for a Record of Decision as provided in 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1505.2.

/s/ William L. Bradley

11/21/95

Date

for  
Elaine Zielinski  
State Director, Oregon/Washington  
Bureau of Land Management



**TABLE I-1. SUMMARY OF EFFECTS TABLE – COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	RMP (Alt. D)
Air Quality	No significant long-term effects.	Same as A.	Same as A.	Same as A.
Effects on Water Resources	Water quality would continue to deteriorate from sediment input and nutrient loading.	Modest improvement in water quality	Greatest improvement in water quality.	Slightly less water quality improvement than under C, but more than B.
	Sedimentation and fecal pollution from livestock would continue to degrade water quality	Significant decrease in livestock-related impacts on water quality compared to A	Same as B.	Same as B.
	Insignificant effects (sedimentation) from recreation activities. -	Minor effects from recreation activities.	Greatest effects from recreation activities.	Effects would be greater than B and less than C.
	Increase in water storage would not be realized.	Greatest increase in water storage and net decrease in water use from creation of wetlands is possible.	Moderate increase in water storage and net decrease in water use is possible.	Same as C.
Stream Channel Restoration	Wood River and Sevenmile Creek would remain channeled and sedimentation would continue. Continued dredging would negatively affect channel and riparian function.	Short-term sedimentation and nutrient impacts from stream channel restoration options.	Same as B, except less severe impact because less area would be disturbed.	Same as C.
	Groundwater recharge and flood flow retention would remain the same.	Groundwater recharge and flood flow retention would improve.	Same as B, except to a lesser extent.	Same as B.
Wetland Restoration	Benefits from wetland restoration would not be realized	Short-term nutrient reduction would occur.	Same as B.	Same as B.
	Amount of shallow water wetland habitat would remain constant.	Moderate increase in shallow water wetland habitat (compared to A).	Greatest increase in shallow water wetland habitat.	Moderate increase in shallow water wetland habitat (more than B, less than C).
Effects on Wetland Vegetation	Proportion of wetland and upland vegetation would remain constant. Main property's interior would remain dominated by pasture grasses, annual forbs, and weedy species.	There would be an increase in the abundance and diversity of native wetland species, and a decrease in the levels of introduced and native upland species.	Greatest diversity in wetland vegetation.	Greater diversity in wetland vegetation than under A and B, but less than under C.



Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	RMP (Alt. D)
Effects on Soils	Soil would continue to subside and leach organics and nutrients into Agency Lake, causing long-term decrease in soil productivity.	Soil productivity would increase compared to A.	Same as B.	Same as B.
	Grazing would continue to cause minor sedimentation and compaction effects.	There would be short-term compaction, displacement, and sedimentation from construction activities.	Same as B, except more severe effects.	Same as B.
Effects on Fish And Wildlife Habitat (Including Special Status Species)	Continued periodic dredging on the Wood River would continue to degrade fish habitat components, such as for spawning.	Restoration of natural stream channels would result in a significant increase in quantity and quality of habitat.	Restoration of natural stream channels would result in a moderate increase in quantity and quality of habitat.	Same as B.
	Habitat diversity would be the lowest under this alternative.	Habitat diversity would be greater than A.	The greatest level of habitat diversity would result.	Level of habitat diversity would be more than B, less than C.
	Meadow communities with short and tall vegetation would continue to dominate the area favoring wildlife species that prefer these types of habitat.	Species that prefer meadow communities, and their predators, would be adversely affected by a decrease in percentage of this type of habitat.	Effects on wildlife species would be moderated due to the variety of habitats.	Same as B.
	Habitat diversity would remain the same as wetland habitat would not be created.	Establishment of deep water marsh habitat would have a positive effect on species that prefer this type of habitat.	Same as B.	Same as B.
Effects on Recreation Resources	The amount of neotropical migrant bird habitat would remain the same as planting of shrubs and trees on dikes would not occur.	Planting of shrubs and trees On dikes would benefit neotropical migrant birds.	Same as B. A great number and variety of habitat developments are proposed resulting in greater benefits than Alternative B.	The widened riparian Zones/ floodplains along with the creation of new levees provide the greatest increase in neotropical migrant bird habitat.
	Increased recreation would have the greatest adverse impact on neotropical birds.	Increased recreation use and motorized vehicle traffic would have some impact to wildlife through disturbance.	The greatest recreation use is anticipated under this alternative, causing the most impact to wildlife through disturbance.	Wildlife disturbances from recreation use would be greater than B, but less than C.
	Habitat diversity would remain the same as prescribed fire would not be used.	Use of prescribed fire could benefit wildlife species by providing more natural ecosystem processes and habitat diversity.	Same as B, except fire would be used more intensely.	Same as B.
Effects on Recreation Resources	Small increase in number of visitors due to public ownership.	More visitors than under A due to the development of facilities and opening the property to vehicle use.	Greatest amount of visitors due to the level of facilities development and improved roads.	Similar to A. Amount and type of facilities provided will be limited.
	Area restricted to non-motorized recreation would benefit those people seeking more primitive opportunities, but would adversely affect those people seeking motorized opportunities. Conflicts between hunters with easements and those without are occurring.	Some motorized access would have a negative effect on those people seeking primitive opportunities, but would benefit those people seeking motorized opportunities.	Motorized vehicle opportunities would be the greatest under this alternative and would benefit those people seeking motorized opportunities. Greatest adverse effect on those seeking primitive opportunities.	Similar to A. Amount of access and effect on users will depend on the results of use levels.



Klamath Falls District ROD and RMP

Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	RMP (Alt. D)
Effects on Visual Resources	<p>No speed restrictions would be sought for boats, so the least adverse effects on boaters would occur under this alternative.</p> <p>Visual resources would remain highly modified, and would not improve.</p>	<p>Creation of meanders in Wood River would affect boaters by decreasing their speed and increasing the length of river to boats. Speed and wake limits could be imposed.</p> <p>Greatest level of long-term improvement to visual resources.</p> <p>Moderate levels of short-term adverse effects on visual resources from restoration activities.</p>	<p>Same as B. Speed and wake limits would not be imposed.</p> <p>Moderate level of long-term improvement to visual resources.</p> <p>Greatest level of short-term adverse effects from restoration activities.</p>	<p>Same as B.</p> <p>Higher level of long term improvement than C, but less than B. Short-term adverse effects would be less significant than B or C.</p>
Effects on Cultural Resources	<p>Least potential negative effect on cultural resources.</p>	<p>Moderate potential negative effect on cultural resources resulting from proposed projects.</p> <p>Discovery of new sites would enhance knowledge base of regional cultural resources.</p>	<p>Highest potential negative effect on cultural resources resulting from proposed projects.</p> <p>Same as B, but potential for discovery would be greater.</p>	<p>Low potential negative effects resulting from proposed projects.</p> <p>Same as B.</p>
Effects on Livestock Grazing	<p>Continuation of livestock grazing would have a positive effect on revenues to the government and livestock producers.</p> <p>Grazing use at a maximum of 3,600 AUMs per year.</p>	<p>There would be a decrease in revenue to the government and livestock producers from the elimination of livestock grazing.</p> <p>No livestock grazing would occur on the property consequently there would be no economic contribution from livestock grazing.</p>	<p>There would be a decrease in revenues to the government and to livestock producers from using livestock grazing as a vegetation management tool and restricting grazing use to a maximum of 750 AUMs in any year that grazing is allowed.</p>	<p>There would be a decrease in revenues to the government and to livestock producers from using livestock grazing as a vegetation management tool and restricting grazing use to a maximum of 1,500 AUMs in any year that grazing is allowed.</p>
Effects on Socioeconomics	<p>Grazing use would be a maximum of 6,500 AUMs per year. The level of grazing use would generate approximately \$94,000 of gross agricultural sales, 1.5 jobs, and \$19,250 of personal income.</p> <p>Recreations contribution to the local economy would be the lowest under this alternative.</p>	<p>Recreations contribution to the local economy would be higher than Alternative A, but lower than Alternative C.</p> <p>The need for 1 to 2 additional full time employees to manage the property would be created under this alternative. Annual salaries would be approximately \$35,000 each.</p> <p>Approximately \$750,000 would be spent to accomplish identified stream and wetland restoration activities.</p>	<p>The level of grazing use could generate up to approximately \$19,000 of gross agricultural sales and \$4,000 of personal income.</p> <p>The economic contribution from recreational activities would be the greatest under this alternative.</p> <p>Additional employment and wetland restoration expenditures are the same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>The level of grazing use could generate up to approximately \$38,000 of gross agricultural sales and \$8,000 of personal income.</p> <p>Recreation's contribution to local economy would be about the same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Additional employment and wetland restoration expenditures are the same as Alternative B.</p>



# The Resource Management Plan

## Introduction

This document contains the basic information needed to implement the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Approved Resource Management Plan. The text included in this Approved Resource Management Plan replaces the text of Alternative D of the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS). However, this document should be used in conjunction with that PRMP/FEIS for topics such as a discussion of the Planning Area; Purpose and Need for the Action; Relationship of the RMP to BLM Policies, Programs, and Other Plans; Coordination and Consultation; Use of the Completed Plan; Adaptive Management; Requirement for Further Environmental Analysis; The Budget Link; and Research. The appendices of that PRMP/FEIS have not been reprinted here and also apply to this plan.

There were no changes made between the proposed plan and the approval of this plan as a result of protests since no protests were received. Some minor changes were made as a result of on-going internal review to adjust the language of the plan to fit its approved status.

The appendices contained in the PRMP/FEIS contain detail that was deemed non-essential for the purposes of this document. Based on the lack of changes needed it was felt that a portable approved plan usable by the public while actually on the property would be better than reprinting all of the details. This is particularly true for the appendices covering wetland and stream restoration options and the monitoring plan. Those appendices contain details that will be considered during implementation of this plan. This plan is expected to be implemented over a period of years. Readers should keep both this document and the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement for future reference.

The text and maps included with this document are sufficient to give the average reader a good idea of what will happen on the property. For those readers interested in more details, using this document in conjunction with the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement will give a complete picture of what is expected to occur on the property.

## Plan Objectives

Restore the Wood River property to its previous function as a wetland community, within unalterable constraints (such as water rights, land ownership patterns, and available funding). Long-term improvement in water quality entering Agency Lake is a goal; however, localized decreases in water quality could occur in the short term. Emphasize improving and increasing wetland and riparian habitats for federally listed fish and other wildlife. Allow labor-intensive, highly engineered wetland restoration methods using complex designs; however, the preference would be to use wetland restoration systems and methods that were designed with less labor-intensive practices using the existing landscape features (such as topography) and natural energies (such as stream flows) of the property. Use vegetation management (including water level and flow fluctuations, livestock grazing, fire, chemical and mechanical manipulation) to develop desired plant communities. Allow pilot studies for research purposes. Use adaptive management, the process of changing land management as a result of monitoring or research. Manage recreation resources for low to moderate use levels.



## Water Resources

**Objective:** Improve the quality and quantity of water entering Agency Lake from this property. Restore the majority of the property to a wetland community dominated by native species to the extent that it would not adversely impact adjacent landowners. Improvement in water quality entering Agency and Klamath Lakes would occur through changes in current management practices and passive filtration. The current drainage/irrigation system could be used or modified to manipulate water levels and/or soil moisture conditions to maintain a wetland in properly functioning condition. The BLM will cooperate in studies to determine the effectiveness of the wetland system(s) in improving water quality and storage. The BLM will comply with all applicable Oregon State water laws and cooperate with the Meadows Drainage District in its operation and use of the Wood River property's irrigation system.

The techniques used for wetland restoration will be a combination of existing and constructed water control structures (berms, ditches, screwgates, and flashboard darns), and the encouragement of natural processes (plant succession, channel meandering). Several likely restoration scenarios are summarized in Table 6 of the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS, see also Appendix F of the PRMP/FEIS for a more detailed description). Actual wetland restoration methods would not vary significantly from methods described in the PRMP/FEIS. A site specific engineering design will be completed prior to construction. The BLM will coordinate with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers (among others) to obtain any permits necessary prior to constructing stream channel or wetland restoration projects.

## Stream Channel Restoration Options

**Objective:** Provide a wider riparian area and floodplain along Wood River and Sevenmile Creek to allow meandering flow patterns to develop. Encourage vegetation diversity, channel sinuosity, and complexity. This restoration will only occur within BLM- administered lands, will be consistent with Oregon State water laws, and will be designed to not adversely affect water use or rights of other landowners.

Stream channel restoration will be accomplished initially as described in the Summary of Channel and Wetland Restoration Actions Table, *located at the end of this appendix* (see also Table 6 of the PRMP/FEIS). New levees will be constructed 50 to 400 meters toward the interior of the property from the current locations. New channel meanders could be constructed between the new levee and the old levee along the west side of the Wood River. Restoration of meandering flow patterns would then be accomplished by removing portions of the existing levees along the streams. Other portions of the existing levees could be left in place or used to encourage meanders in the existing dredged channels. A wider riparian area and floodplain will be created along these streams. Natural processes would then be relied on to establish overflow channels, backwater areas, and to increase the sinuosity and complexity of the Wood River and Sevenmile Creek. This approach will allow the streams to establish their own courses across the floodplains over time. The long-term goal is to have narrower, deeper, and more sinuous channels within wider riparian areas. Because the Wood River channel has been less altered, and has the greatest potential to respond to restoration activities in the shortest period of time, restoration of the Wood River channel will be a higher priority than Sevenmile Creek. Therefore, restoration activities will be implemented first along the Wood River.

## Wetland Restoration

**Objective:** Restore the majority of the Wood River property to a wetland in properly functioning condition dominated by a native plant community. Vegetation management could occur using several methods, including but not limited to water level fluctuations, livestock grazing, haying, planting and seeding, prescribed fire, and mechanical or chemical methods. Vegetation manipulation will be designed to develop





species diversity and to maintain healthy and productive communities of native riparian and wetland vegetation. One or two small-scale, reversible pilot projects could be constructed to provide additional information on effects on water quality, effects on wetland habitat, or for other research purposes; however these projects will only take up a very small portion (less than 5 acres) of the property.

Wetland restoration will be accomplished as described in the Summary of Channel and Wetland Restoration Actions Table, *located at the end of this appendix* (see also Table 6 of the PRMP/FEIS). Option I will be applied to the restoration of the entire property. Internal wetland cells will be designed in such a way that Option 2 could be incorporated on a portion of the south half of the property.

Wetland restoration through the use of a system of 4 to 8 cells, water control structures, and pumps will allow hydrologic control to be maintained on the property. This hydrologic control will allow for greater biological diversity to develop. This system of cells and structures will facilitate a wide array of management options (for example maintaining different water levels in different cells), including periodic aeration of the soil surface. Intermixing of waters from the wetland with those of Agency Lake could still be incorporated using this approach on a portion of the wetland.

## Special Status Species Habitat

**Objective:** Manage for a diversity of habitats for special status species (see Table 3 of the PRMP/FEIS). Maintain a viable population of spotted frogs on the property. Protect habitats of federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species; to avoid contributing to the need to list category I and 2 federal candidate, state listed, and Bureau sensitive species.

Management of special status species habitats will also be consistent with the Klamath Falls Resource Area's Approved RMP. If any special status species (federally or state listed as threatened or endangered, federally proposed as threatened or endangered, category I and 2 federal candidate, and Bureau sensitive) are suspected in an area proposed for a management activity, field surveys would focus on those species. If populations of these species are found, then the plants or animals and their habitats will be protected through modification or abandonment of management actions as appropriate to eliminate impacts to federally listed or proposed species and to not contribute to the need to list category I and 2 federal candidate, state listed, or Bureau sensitive species.

If a project could not be altered or abandoned to eliminate a potential effect on a federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species, then consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be initiated under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

For state listed and state proposed species, the BLM will coordinate with the appropriate state agency to develop policies that would assist the state in achieving its management objectives for those species.

**Fish and Wildlife.** Management actions for special status fish species will include removal and movement of portions of existing levees and dikes. Encourage natural processes to form a more sinuous channel with greater habitat complexity in the Wood River and in portions of Sevenmile Creek. The placement of natural structures such as logs and boulders will be considered to achieve desired channel conditions and increase the amount of cover for fish.

**Plants.** Inventories will be conducted if appropriate habitat is identified. Coordinate and cooperate with the Oregon Department of Agriculture regarding management activities with potentially adverse effects on a state listed or proposed plant species.



## Fish and Wildlife Habitat

**Objective:** Improve habitat conditions for suckers and salmonids; improve habitat for raptors and neotropical migratory birds; and optimize waterfowl habitat within the constraints of other resource objectives.

Native tree species will be planted in clumps along major dikes for cover and future nest and perch sites, as well as to mitigate dike erosion. Portions of levees will be planted with native shrubs to provide nesting and roosting areas for neotropical migrant birds. Vegetation management (using water fluctuations, livestock grazing, prescribed fires, mechanical or chemical manipulation, or other methods) could be used to maintain, enhance, or create diverse habitats within the wetland. Riparian habitat along the Wood River and Sevenmile Creek will be restored and maintained by planting riparian vegetation and protection from grazing. River meanders will be encouraged to improve fisheries habitat. Channel morphology and substrate will be studied as they relate to factors limiting fish production, and will be modified as necessary to encourage natural sinuosity and narrow, deep channels.

Nest islands, upland areas, and other structures could be developed to provide wildlife habitat.

## Vegetation

### Fire Management

**Objective:** Suppress all wildfires, and reintroduce fire as an ecosystem process by using prescribed burning as a management tool to support the primary goal of wetland restoration.

An initial attack agreement for suppression of wildfires will be established with the Winema National Forest, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and/or the Oregon Department of Forestry. Parameters will be developed under which fire could be introduced as an ecosystem process to achieve resource management objectives. Prescribed burning could be implemented through planned ignition, as determined by wetland restoration methods; by meeting the other objectives of improving water quality and quantity, and restoring wetland habitat for endangered suckers and waterfowl; and to further research objectives. To mitigate air quality problems, all burning will be conducted during unstable atmospheric conditions and with favorable transport winds.

### Noxious Weed Management

**Objective:** Manage noxious weed species to facilitate restoration and maintenance of desirable plant communities and healthy ecosystems; prevent introduction, reproduction, and spread of noxious weeds into and within the property; and manage existing populations of noxious weeds to levels that minimize the negative impacts of noxious weed invasions.

Federal agencies are directed to control noxious weeds on federal lands by the Carlson-Foley Act (Public Law [PL] 90-583) and the Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 (PL 93-629). Noxious weed management on the Wood River property will be part of an integrated noxious weed management program as described in the Integrated Weed Control Plan and Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Klamath Falls Resource Area (OR-014-93-09). An appropriate combination of manual, mechanical, chemical, and biological methods, and water level manipulation will be used to control noxious weed species. Seasonal timing will be considered in any control program. Herbicide use will be in accordance with the program design features outlined in the KFRA Integrated Weed Control Plan and EA.



All chemical and some mechanical treatments for noxious weeds will be accomplished through a contract with Klamath County or other appropriate contractors, if populations of these species are identified for control. Appropriate herbicides will be used for treatment of noxious weeds in or adjacent to wetlands. Biological control organisms are supplied and/or distributed by the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) through a memorandum of understanding between the ODA and the BLM's Oregon State Office.

## Livestock Grazing

**Objective:** If and where appropriate, use livestock grazing as a vegetation management tool to support the primary goal of wetland restoration.

Use livestock grazing mainly as a management tool to support the primary goal of wetland restoration. Livestock grazing could be allowed if needed to create or maintain wildlife habitat. No long term grazing lease will be issued. Levels and duration of grazing, as well as maintenance and construction of range improvement projects, will be dependent on the need to meet management objectives. It is expected that the amount of grazing will be significantly less than that allowed under Alternative A of the PRMP/FEIS, and it is possible that no grazing will occur. It is estimated that grazing use will not exceed 1,500 animal unit months in any given year. Any livestock use could be authorized and allowed via a competitive bid contract for the purposes of vegetative management and evaluated on a year by year basis. In lieu of or in addition to livestock grazing, haying of portions of the property will be considered as an alternative if vegetative removal was necessary to meet the wetland restoration goals. The allotment is initially categorized as an "M" or maintain category allotment. The same planning (RMP/EIS) constraints and direction listed under Alternative A of the PRMP/FEIS would also apply to this alternative.

## Cultural Resources


**Objective:** Protect known cultural resources (including both historic and prehistoric resources). A class 1 inventory will be conducted on the property. A class 1 inventory is a comprehensive literature search to determine the existence of cultural remains within the project area. A class 3 survey, which is an intensive survey of the ground to identify and record all cultural resource sites within a specific location, will be completed prior to commencing any surface-disturbing activities. An archaeologist (from the BLM and/or Klamath Tribes) will be on-site during these activities to monitor the site. Testing for artifacts could be done, based on surface or stream bank indicators.

Consultation with the Klamath Tribes will occur during the regular monthly BLM\Klamath Tribes meetings on cultural resources, or at other times, if deemed necessary. This consultation will include updates on existing projects and discussion on new projects anticipated on the Wood River property. Consensus will be sought on all projects.

## Recreation

**Objectives:** Provide opportunities for roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation experiences (opportunities to have a high degree of interaction with the natural environment, to have moderate challenge and risk and to use outdoor skills). Manage the area for low (6 to 10 parties per day) to moderate (10 to 50 parties per day) recreation use levels (moderate near developed sites and roads, and low to moderate in other areas). Manage for day use only.

Recreation use and facilities will be secondary to the overall objective of wetland restoration and water quality improvement. Based on informal recreation use monitoring during calendar year 1994, some trends in recreation use levels have been identified (See Chapter 2, Recreation section of the PRMP/FEIS). The



property has been designated closed to off-highway vehicles, except for designated roads and trails and for administrative use. An improved parking area (graveled or paved) at or near the entrance to the Wood River property, sufficient to hold 20 to 25 vehicles (for peak use periods) will be provided. The facilities provided will meet the roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation opportunity objectives.

In addition to use levels, the BLM will consider user convenience, safety, and resource protection when determining what recreation facilities to provide. Such facilities could include, but are not limited to, improved (graveled or paved) parking areas and roads, toilets, interpretive signing, nature trails (canoe, foot, mountain bike, horseback, and/or ski trails), and a boat ramp to access Wood River (see Map 7 of the PRMP/FEIS). The BLM will coordinate construction activities with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers (among others) when designing and constructing recreation facilities.

Maintain current recreation use levels during waterfowl hunting season and allow for greater motorized access and increased use levels during the rest of the year. A likely development scenario includes the previously mentioned improved parking area at or near the entrance to the Wood River property, sufficient to hold 20 to 25 cars. A toilet, 1 to 2 picnic tables, garbage cans, and interpretive signs could also be provided at the parking area.

During the non-hunting season, better access to the property could be permitted. An improved (graveled) parking area (approximately one quarter acre in size) near the Wood River bridge, along with a primitive boat ramp (suitable for launching a small boat or canoe) and toilet could be provided. Nature trails could be provided in the vicinity of the Wood River bridge (including canoe trails, interpretive trails along the dikes and newly constructed trails using construction techniques similar to dikes).

The area is closed to overnight use. No campfires, fireworks, or smoking will be permitted. Off-highway vehicles will be limited to designated, signed roads (this will also include seasonal closures), as determined by use levels and needs.

The location and type of facilities, as well as which roads will be open or closed to motorized vehicles, will be determined as recreation use levels are established and the design and location of stream and wetland restoration projects are defined. Because of the increased recreation management and investment, the area is identified as a special recreation management area, as required in BLM Manual 1623. Hunting, fishing, sightseeing, and wildlife viewing will be supported by providing facilities. Hunting regulations on motorized vehicles, such as motorboats, and fishing use will be monitored and coordinated with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW); hunting and fishing policies could be developed and/or adjusted based on results of the monitoring data. Safety zones will be established if needed for user safety and wildlife viewing, and shooting will be prohibited in these zones. Jet boats and air boats will be prohibited in the existing Wood River Marsh and in other wetland areas as they are constructed. Limits on speed and wakes will be coordinated with the Oregon State Marine Board and could be recommended to mitigate environmental degradation. Small motorized boats could be allowed to enter the wetland areas, during times when waterfowl nesting is not occurring. The area will be identified as a Watchable Wildlife site in cooperation with the ODFW.

## Visual Resources

**Objective:** Ensure management actions meet VRM Class II objectives.

The property will be managed to meet Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II objectives, which is to retain the natural character of the landscape, which is a wetland. Changes in any of the basic elements (form, line, color, texture) caused by a management activity should be low. Contrasts are seen, but must not attract attention of the casual observer. Changes must repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape. Projects or management actions will be evaluated using the BLM's contrast rating system to measure the degree of contrast between the proposed activity and the natural features of the landscape, and will meet or exceed VRM Class II objectives (BLM Manual Handbook H-8431-1).



## Special Areas

**Objective:** Manage the property as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC); and protect and restore the area's relevant and important values, which are cultural, fish and wildlife values, and natural processes and systems.

The Wood River property has been designated an ACEC (through this plan process). The Wood River property was evaluated for designation as an ACEC and found to meet the relevance and importance criteria and evaluation process as described in Appendix G in the PRMP/FEIS. This approved Upper Klamath Basin Resource Management Plan/Record of Decision serves as the management plan for the area.

## Mineral and Energy Resources

**Objective:** Ensure mineral and other activities do not conflict with other management goals, the lands will be withdrawn from (closed to) settlement, sale, location, and entry under the general land laws, including the United States Mining Laws (30 USC Ch. 2 [1988]), but not the mineral leasing laws, subject to valid existing rights. Energy and mineral leases will be subject to a "no surface occupancy" stipulation. The "no surface occupancy" stipulation could be waived if it was demonstrated that the mineral activity was consistent with other management goals. Mineral or energy activity also would be subject to other federal and state regulations, such as the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, etc.

## Soil Resources

**Objective:** Ensure that undue degradation of soils does not occur. Encourage and/or allow the natural accumulation of peat.

Management activities will be designed and monitored to meet the soils objective. Studies that determine the potential of peat and peaty soils as pollutant and nutrient filters will be encouraged.

## Air Resources


**Objective:** Meet the goals of the Federal Clean Air Act, as amended; the Oregon Implementation Plan; the Oregon Smoke Management Plan; and prevent the deterioration of air quality within the Klamath Falls Special Protection Zone (described in the Oregon Smoke Management Plan).

Monitoring of air quality will be conducted as required by regulation and peer practice. Emissions of fugitive dust and smoke will be limited to operations associated with maintenance and restoration activities.

## Roads and Facilities

**Objective:** Provide adequate roads and facilities (quality and quantity) to support management objectives.

Existing easements with adjacent property owners are recognized and the BLM will follow the terms and conditions of those easements. Roads could be improved (graveled or paved), consistent with overall objectives of this alternative and as determined by use levels and needs. Motorized vehicle use is limited to improved, designated, and signed roads (this could also include seasonal closures; see Map 7 of the PRMP/FEIS and the recreation section for more details). Exceptions to this will be for people with administrative access or existing easements. Dike maintenance (such as rip-rapping, and planting trees and shrubs) will



be accomplished to provide safety to vehicle users and to maintain the integrity of the dikes. The bridge over Wood River will be inspected and maintained according to BLM bridge maintenance schedules (BLM Manual 9112.4).

If necessary to be consistent with overall management objectives, existing facilities, including cattle guards, fences, gates, ditches, bunkhouse shack, corral, and livestock handling facilities could be removed and disposed of in accordance with BLM property procedures (BLM Manual 1527.2 and 1533.2). The pumps and pump house will be maintained, and improved if necessary (see Map 7 of the PRMP/FEIS).

## Plan Monitoring

The BLM planning regulations (43 CFR 1610.4-9) call for monitoring and evaluating resource management plans at appropriate intervals. The purposes of monitoring and evaluating the Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) are to:

- Track progress of RMP implementation and assure that activities are occurring in conformance with the plan (implementation monitoring);
- Determine if activities are producing the expected results and meeting stated objectives (effectiveness monitoring); and
- Determine if activities are causing the effects identified in the EIS (validation).
- Insure that research results are well documented and shared with the community.

Implementation of the RMP will be monitored to ensure that management actions are being implemented and are meeting their intended purposes. Specific management actions will be compared with RMP objectives to ensure consistency with the intent of the plan.

Monitoring will be conducted as specified in the following sections, and the results will be reported in an Annual Program Summary, along with monitoring results from the RMP for the rest of the Klamath Falls Resource Area. This annual summary will be published starting the second year following initial implementation of the RMP. The Annual Program Summary will serve as a report to the public, track and assess the progress of plan implementation, and state the findings made through monitoring. For the Upper Klamath Basin portion of the program summary, the BLM will determine if:

- Management actions are resulting in satisfactory progress toward achieving RMP objectives.
- Management actions are consistent with current policy.
- Original assumptions are valid and impacts are within the range predicted, given the reliability of the predictions.
- Mitigation and corrective measures are satisfactory and serving their purposes.
- The RMP is still consistent with the plans and policies of state or local government, other federal agencies and the Klamath Tribes.
- New data are available that could result in alteration or amendment of the plan.
- Requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act are being met.
- Compliance is being achieved on actions authorized by the BLM.



Monitoring will occur for the following resources:


- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources, Including American Indian Values
- Water Resources
- Vegetation
- Riparian Areas
- Wildlife Habitat
- Fish Habitat
- Special Status Species
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
- Visual Resources
- Recreation
- Grazing Management

The Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement contains the complete details on when and how monitoring will take place.

SUMMARY OF STREAM CHANNEL AND WETLAND RESTORATION ACTIONS TABLE*
<p>Stream Channel Restoration:</p> <p><b>Restore meandering flow patterns for the Wood River and Sevenmile Creek by relocating portions of the existing levees</b> along these streams. Prior to relocating the existing levees, new channel meanders could be constructed along the west bank of the Wood River. New levees would be constructed 50 to 400 meters interior to the existing levees. Portions of the existing levees could be left in place as islands or used to construct point bars. Natural hydrologic processes would then be allowed to establish wider riparian areas, and to enhance channel sinuosity.</p> <p>Wetland Restoration:</p> <p>Restore wetland by operating the existing canal and pump system. The wetland would be restored and maintained by manipulating water levels within a system of berms and water control structures. Water levels would be manipulated to manage wetland vegetation within 4 to 8 created cells. This system would be designed so that option 2 could be incorporated at some point in the future.</p> <p>Restore wetland by re-establishing the lake-wetland interface (opening the property's interior to prevailing water levels in Agency Lake). This could be accomplished by installing pipes or culverts through the dike along the north shore of Agency Lake, allowing lake water passage between the lake and the south half of the property. Culverts or other water-control structures could also be installed in the east and west dikes, and in the interior containment dike separating the north and south halves of the property. This would allow for movement of fish, wildlife, and plant species between Agency Lake, Wood River, Sevenmile Creek, and the main property, as well as restoring wetland habitat to the majority of the Wood River parcel.</p> <p><small>*See Table 6 of the 1995 Klamath Falls PRMP/FEIS for a comparison of these actions against the other alternatives analyzed in that EIS. See also Appendix F of the 1995 Klamath Falls PRMP/FEIS for a more complete description of these options.</small></p>




MAP I-1. VICINITY AND PROJECT LOCATION MAP, KLAMATH RIVER WATERSHED







MAP I-2. EXISTING CONDITIONS AS OF 11/95





MAP I-3. CONCEPTUAL VIEW OF FULLY IMPLEMENTED PLAN







FIGURE I-1. WILDLIFE SPECIES CHECKLIST


# Wildlife Species Checklist


<p><b>Herpetiles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Long-toed Salamander</li> <li>2. Rough-skinned Newt</li> <li>3. Pacific Chorus Frog</li> <li>4. Bullfrog</li> <li>5. Spotted Frog</li> <li>6. Western Toad</li> <li>7. Western Pond Turtle</li> <li>8. Short-horned Lizard</li> <li>9. Sagebrush Lizard</li> <li>10. Western Fence Lizard</li> <li>11. Western Skink</li> <li>12. Kingneck Snake</li> <li>13. Yellow-bellied Racer</li> <li>14. Gopher Snake</li> <li>15. Common Garter Snake</li> <li>16. Western Terrestrial Garter Snake</li> <li>17. Western Rattlesnake</li> <li>18. Rubber Boa</li> </ol> <p><b>Mammals</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19. Vagrant Shrew</li> <li>20. Trowbridge Shrew</li> <li>21. Northern Water Shrew</li> <li>22. Water Shrew</li> <li>23. Merriam Shrew</li> <li>24. Broad-footed Mole</li> <li>25. Yuma Myotis</li> <li>26. Fringed Myotis</li> <li>27. California Myotis</li> <li>28. Little Brown Myotis</li> <li>29. Hoary Bat</li> <li>30. Pallid Bat</li> <li>31. Townsend's Big-eared Bat</li> <li>32. Big Brown Bat</li> <li>33. Snowshoe Hare</li> <li>34. White-tailed Jackrabbit</li> <li>35. Black-tailed Jackrabbit</li> <li>36. Nuttall's Cottontail</li> <li>37. Least Chipmunk</li> <li>38. Yellow Pine Chipmunk</li> <li>39. Belding Ground Squirrel</li> <li>40. California Ground Squirrel</li> <li>41. Western Gray Squirrel</li> <li>42. Yellow-bellied Marmot</li> <li>43. Northern Pocket Gopher</li> <li>44. Mazama Pocket Gopher</li> <li>45. Western Harvest Mouse</li> <li>46. Deer Mouse</li> <li>47. Bushy-tailed Woodrat</li> <li>48. Dusky-footed Woodrat</li> <li>49. Heather Vole</li> <li>50. Mountain Vole</li> <li>51. California Vole</li> <li>52. Long-tailed Vole</li> <li>53. Townsend's Vole</li> <li>54. Muskrat</li> <li>55. Beaver</li> <li>56. House Mouse</li> <li>57. Western Jumping Mouse</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>58. Porcupine</li> <li>59. Coyote</li> <li>60. Black Bear</li> <li>61. Ringtail</li> <li>62. Raccoon</li> <li>63. Mink</li> <li>64. Long-tailed Weasel</li> <li>65. Short-tailed Weasel</li> <li>66. Norway Rat</li> <li>67. Spotted Skunk</li> <li>68. Striped Skunk</li> <li>69. River Otter</li> <li>70. Badger</li> <li>71. Mountain Lion</li> <li>72. Bobcat</li> <li>73. Grey Fox</li> <li>73. Red Fox</li> <li>75. Elk</li> <li>76. Mule Deer</li> </ol> <p><b>Birds</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>77. Eared Grebe</li> <li>78. Pied-billed Grebe</li> <li>79. Horned Grebe</li> <li>80. Clark's Grebe</li> <li>81. Western Grebe</li> <li>82. American White Pelican</li> <li>83. Double-crested Cormorant</li> <li>84. American Bittern</li> <li>85. Least Bittern</li> <li>86. Black-crowned Night Heron</li> <li>87. Great Egret</li> <li>88. Snowy Egret</li> <li>89. Great Blue Heron</li> <li>90. White-faced Ibis</li> <li>91. Sandhill Crane</li> <li>92. Tundra Swan</li> <li>93. Greater White-fronted Goose</li> <li>94. Snow Goose</li> <li>95. Ross' Goose</li> <li>96. Canada Goose</li> <li>97. Common Loon</li> <li>98. Mallard</li> <li>99. Green-winged Teal</li> <li>100. American Wigeon</li> <li>101. Northern Pintail</li> <li>102. Northern Shoveler</li> <li>103. Blue-winged Teal</li> <li>104. Cinnamon Teal</li> <li>105. Ruddy Duck</li> <li>106. Wood duck</li> <li>107. Canvasback</li> <li>108. Redhead</li> <li>109. Ring-necked Duck</li> <li>110. Lesser Scaup</li> <li>111. Barrow's Goldeneye</li> <li>112. Common Goldeneye</li> <li>113. Bufflehead</li> <li>114. Common Merganser</li> <li>115. Hooded Merganser</li> <li>116. Gadwall</li> <li>117. Virginia Rail</li> <li>118. Yellow Rail</li> <li>119. Sora Rail</li> <li>120. American Avocet</li> <li>121. Black-necked Stilt</li> <li>122. Long-billed Dowitcher</li> <li>123. Killdeer</li> <li>124. Willet</li> <li>125. Greater Yellowlegs</li> <li>126. Lesser Yellowlegs</li> <li>127. Long-billed Curlew</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>128. Spotted Sandpiper</li> <li>129. Least Sandpiper</li> <li>130. Wilson's Phalarope</li> <li>131. Common Snipe</li> <li>132. Dunlin</li> <li>133. American Coot</li> <li>134. Ring-billed Gull</li> <li>135. California Gull</li> <li>136. Bonaparte's Gull</li> <li>137. Forster's Tern</li> <li>138. Black Tern</li> <li>139. Caspian Tern</li> <li>140. Golden Eagle</li> <li>141. Bald Eagle</li> <li>142. Northern Harrier</li> <li>143. Sharp-shinned Hawk</li> <li>144. Cooper's Hawk</li> <li>145. Red-tailed Hawk</li> <li>146. Rough-legged Hawk</li> <li>147. Osprey</li> <li>148. American Kestrel</li> <li>149. Prairie Falcon</li> <li>150. Peregrine Falcon</li> <li>151. Turkey Vulture</li> <li>152. California Quail</li> <li>153. Ring-necked Pheasant</li> <li>154. Rock Dove</li> <li>155. Mourning Dove</li> <li>156. Short-eared Owl</li> <li>157. Long-eared Owl</li> <li>158. Great-horned Owl</li> <li>159. Western Screech Owl</li> <li>160. Northern Saw-whet Owl</li> <li>161. Common Barn Owl</li> <li>162. Vaux's Swift</li> <li>163. Common Nighthawk</li> <li>164. Anna's Hummingbird</li> <li>165. Calliope Hummingbird</li> <li>166. Rufous Hummingbird</li> <li>167. Northern Flicker</li> <li>168. Red-naped Sapsucker</li> <li>169. Red-breasted Sapsucker</li> <li>170. Downy Woodpecker</li> <li>171. Hairy Woodpecker</li> <li>172. Western Kingbird</li> <li>173. Ash-throated Flycatcher</li> <li>174. Olive-sided Flycatcher</li> <li>175. Western Wood-pewee</li> <li>176. Say's Phoebe</li> <li>177. Cordilleran Flycatcher</li> <li>178. Willow Flycatcher</li> <li>179. Horned Lark</li> <li>180. Tree Swallow</li> <li>181. Violet-green Swallow</li> <li>182. Cliff Swallow</li> <li>183. Bank Swallow</li> <li>184. Northern Rough-winged Swallow</li> <li>185. Barn Swallow</li> <li>186. Belted Kingfisher</li> <li>187. Scrub Jay</li> <li>188. Black-billed Magpie</li> <li>189. Common Raven</li> <li>190. American Crow</li> <li>191. Black-capped Chickadee</li> <li>192. Mountain Chickadee</li> <li>193. Bushitit</li> <li>194. House Wren</li> <li>195. Marsh Wren</li> <li>196. Bewick's Wren</li> <li>197. Winter Wren</li> <li>198. Ruby-crowned Kinglet</li> <li>199. Golden-crowned Kinglet</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>200. Blue-gray Gnatcatcher</li> <li>201. American Robin</li> <li>202. Varied Thrush</li> <li>203. Western Bluebird</li> <li>204. Loggerhead Shrike</li> <li>205. Northern Shrike</li> <li>206. Cedar Waxwing</li> <li>207. Solitary Vireo</li> <li>208. European Starling</li> <li>209. Warbling Vireo</li> <li>210. Orange-crowned Warbler</li> <li>211. Nashville Warbler</li> <li>212. Yellow-rumped Warbler</li> <li>213. Yellow Warbler</li> <li>214. MacGillivray's Warbler</li> <li>215. Wilson's Warbler</li> <li>216. Common Yellowthroat</li> <li>217. Black-headed Grosbeak</li> <li>218. Lazuli Bunting</li> <li>219. Green-tailed Towhee</li> <li>220. Rufous-sided Towhee</li> <li>221. California Towhee</li> <li>222. Vesper Sparrow</li> <li>223. Brewer's Sparrow</li> <li>224. Savannah Sparrow</li> <li>225. Song Sparrow</li> <li>226. Chipping Sparrow</li> <li>227. White-crowned Sparrow</li> <li>228. Golden-crowned Sparrow</li> <li>229. Fox Sparrow</li> <li>230. Dark-eyed Junco</li> <li>231. Lincoln's Sparrow</li> <li>232. Lark Sparrow</li> <li>233. Western Meadowlark</li> <li>234. Yellow-headed Blackbird</li> <li>235. Brewer's Blackbird</li> <li>236. Red-winged Blackbird</li> <li>237. Tri-colored Blackbird</li> <li>238. Brown-headed Cowbird</li> <li>239. Northern Oriole</li> <li>240. Western Tanager</li> <li>241. House Sparrow</li> <li>242. Pine Siskin</li> <li>243. American Goldfinch</li> <li>244. Lesser Goldfinch</li> <li>245. Purple Finch</li> <li>246. Cassin's Finch</li> <li>247. House Finch</li> <li>248. Evening Grosbeak</li> <li>249. New _____</li> <li>250. New _____</li> </ol>
---	---	---	---

Help us keep an accurate list of species on the Wood River property. For any new species identified, please note the place, time, and location on the property and report the siting to the BLM office in Klamath Falls at (503) 883-6916. Thank You.



# Glossary







- 3P fall, buck, and scale sampling. . . . . A sampling method that determines the volume and value of merchantable timber. The method starts with visual estimation of a stand using the 3P sampling method (i.e., PPP, or, probability proportional to prediction), which operates under the assumption that the probability of a tree being sampled is proportional to its predicted occurrence in a stand. The estimation is verified by cutting down a sampled tree (fall), cutting it into merchantable log lengths (buck), and measuring the logs (scale) noting indicators for defects and log grades. For managed second-growth stands, 3P sampling is generally used to develop volume tables from which stand volumes may be extrapolated. For uneven-aged stands, typically containing larger and often more defective timber, 3P sampling is useful in determining the net volume (recovery).
- 303(d) Water Quality Listing. . . . . Impaired waters that do not meet water quality standards, identified by DEQ, as required by the Clean Water Act.
- acre . . . . . A measure of surface land area in U.S. customary units that is 43,560 square feet, which is 1/640 of a square mile (or approximately 0.4 hectares). If square, it is nearly 209 feet on each side.
- active stream channel . . . . . The inundated area of bed and banks of a stream, from larger streamflow of one to two years.
- activity fuel . . . . . Debris (wood chips, bark, branches, limbs, logs, or stumps) left on the ground after management actions, such as logging, pruning, thinning, or brush cutting, versus debris left after storms or fires.
- adaptive management. . . . . A forest management methodology that continually monitors, evaluates, and adjusts decisions and management actions to improve implementation and to ensure that the goals and objectives of resource management plans are being met.
- Adaptive Management Area . . . . . A Northwest Forest Plan term that denotes a land use allocation (or landscape unit) whose lands are designated for development and for testing technical and social approaches for achieving desired ecological, economic, and other social objectives.
- adverse modification. . . . . An Endangered Species Act term that is not specifically defined by the act but is generally accepted to denote a direct or indirect alteration of habitat that appreciably diminishes the value of an area with respect to the survival, or in some instances the recovery, of a listed species. In most instances, this standard is considered the same as, or is nearly identical, to the jeopardy standard.
- age classification . . . . . A system that categorizes trees, forests, stands, or forest types by intervals of years. Age classifications differ around the U.S. by forest type (wet, dry, evergreen, deciduous, or succulent). For this analysis, the interval is usually 10-year increments.
- aggregated retention . . . . . See variable-retention harvest system.



- allowable sale quantity/annual productive capacity . . . . . These terms are synonymous. The timber yield that a forest can produce continuously under the intensity of management outlined in the RMP from those lands allocated for permanent forest production.
- alternative . . . . . One of several proposed management actions that have been studied and found to meet the goals and objectives of a project's purpose and need and, as a result, is suitable to aid decision-making.
- anadromous fish . . . . . Fish that are born and reared in freshwater, move to the ocean to grow and mature, and return to freshwater to reproduce. Includes species such as salmon and steelhead. Also see salmonid.
- analysis . . . . . The scientific evaluation of the environmental impacts of proposed planning decisions. The BLM employs many types of analysis (e.g., surface, linear, raster, contiguity, and topological overlay) with a variety of data sets (e.g., inventory and GIS) and tools (e.g., physical, quantitative, data, and spatial modeling).
- analytical assumption . . . . . A judgmental decision that is based on the science and relationships of natural systems assumed to be true and from which conclusions can be drawn to supply the missing values, relationships, or societal preferences needed for proceeding with an analysis of alternatives.
- angular canopy density . . . . . A measure of shade provided by riparian vegetation. It is the density of the canopy, expressed as a percent, measured along the path of incoming solar radiation between the sun and a stream.
- animal unit month (AUM) . . . . . The amount of forage necessary to sustain one cow (or its equivalent) for one month.
- annual productive capacity . . . . . An O&C Act term denoting the volume of timber that is determined will grow in one year in a given area. Also see allowable sale quantity (ASQ), offer, and sustained yield capacity.
- Aquatic Conservation Strategy . . . . . A Northwest Forest Plan methodology designed to restore and maintain the ecological health of watersheds and aquatic ecosystems, consisting of four components: riparian reserves, key watersheds, watershed analysis, and watershed restoration.
- aquatic habitat . . . . . Habitat for vertebrate and invertebrate wildlife species and vascular and non-vascular plants occurring in free water (e.g. lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, springs and seeps).
- area . . . . . A generic forestry term that refers to the surface land included within specific boundaries and usually allocated for a specific purpose, such as a late-successional management area, a timber management area, a traditional use area, a recreational use area, or a wilderness area. Contrast with block.
- Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) . . . . . Land where special management attention is needed to protect life, to provide safety from natural hazards, or to prevent irreparable damage to important values (historic, cultural, or scenic), resources (fish and wildlife), or processes (natural systems).





Area of Mutual Interest. . . . .	A defined mapped area, identified by industry, of potential petroleum development.
assessment area . . . . .	A subdivision of a sustained yield unit (BLM district) that has been divided by physiographic provinces.
at-risk species. . . . .	Species that are determined by a detailed assessment to be in danger of becoming locally or completely extinct.
at-risk community. . . . .	A group of homes or structures that exist within the vicinity of federal lands or a wildland/urban interface for which a significant threat to human life or property exists as a result of a wildland fire.
authority . . . . .	The right and power to make decisions and give orders such as the United States Congress exerts when passing legislation (e.g. the O&C Act and the Endangered Species Act).
awarded timber sales. . . . .	A sale where the government has accepted a bid from a qualified high bidder, thereby binding the government and granting specific rights to the purchaser.
backcountry byways . . . . .	A road segment designated as part of the National Scenic Byway System.
basal area . . . . .	The cross-sectional area of a single stem, of all stems of a species in a stand, or of all plants in a stand (including the bark) that is measured at breast height (about 4.5 feet up from the ground) for larger plants (like trees) or measured at ground level for smaller plants.
baseline . . . . .	The starting point for the analysis of environmental consequences, often referred to as the Affected Environment. This starting point may be the condition at a point in time (e.g., when inventory data is collected) or the average of a set of data collected over a specified number of years. Also see analysis, environmental consequences, and inventory data.
beneficial use . . . . .	In general, any reasonable use of a resource for a purpose consistent with the laws and best interests of the people of a state. In water use law, such uses include, but are not limited to: instream, out of stream, and ground water uses; domestic, municipal, and industrial water supplies; mining, irrigation, and livestock watering; fish and aquatic life; wildlife watering; fishing and water contact recreation; aesthetics and scenic attraction; hydropower; and commercial navigation.
Best Management Practices (BMPs). . . . .	BMPs are defined as methods, measures, or practices selected on the basis of site-specific conditions to ensure that water quality will be maintained at its highest practicable level. BMPs include, but are not limited to, structural and nonstructural controls, operations, and maintenance procedures. BMPs can be applied before, during, and after pollution-producing activities to reduce or eliminate the introduction of pollutants into receiving waters (40 CFR 130.2, EPA Water Quality Standards Regulation).



- biological assessment . . . . . A biological assessment is a document that evaluates potential effects of a proposed action to listed and proposed species and designated and proposed critical habitat and determines whether any such species or habitats are likely to be adversely affected by the action. It is used in determining whether formal consultation or conferencing with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service is necessary (50 CFR 402.12[a] )
- biological opinion . . . . . An opinion by the U. S, Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service as to whether or not a federal action is likely or not to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species, or would result in the destruction of or adverse modification of critical habitat. The opinion may contain reasonable and prudent alternatives, a statement of anticipated take of listed animals, and conservation recommendations for listed plants.
- biomass . . . . . Unmerchantable and waste plant materials used as a source of renewable combustible fuel. Also includes non-sawlog material ground up into fiber and used in secondary wood products.
- block . . . . . A term that denotes an area of land that has been approved for special management, such as a northern spotted owl reserve or a fire suppression area. Contrast with area.
- board foot . . . . . A unit of measure for unfinished solid wood used by the lumber industry that is typically expressed as bf or bd. ft. and equals the volume contained in a 1-inch thick, 12-inch long, and 12-inch wide board.
- Bureau Strategic Species . . . . . A special status species category established by the Oregon/ Washington BLM that includes animal, plant and fungi species that are of concern in the two states. The special status species policy (BLM 6840) does not apply to these species, and no analysis of them is required in NEPA documents. Field units are required to collect occurrence field data and maintain records. Also see Bureau sensitive species.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM) . . . . . A federal agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior that is responsible for administering 261 million surface acres of federally owned lands in accordance with all applicable laws to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of those lands. Most of the acreage is in Alaska and the western states.
- Bureau Sensitive Species . . . . . A special status species category established by the BLM that includes those plant and animal species eligible for status as federally listed, federal candidate, state listed, or state candidate (plant) species; on List 1 of the Oregon Natural Heritage Database or approved for this category by the BLM state director; or included under agency species conservation policies. Also see Bureau strategic species.
- candidate species . . . . . Plants and animals for which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has sufficient information on their biological status and threats to propose them as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but for which development of a proposed listing regulation is precluded by other higher priority listing activities.



- canopy . . . . . The more or less continuous cover of branches and foliage formed collectively by adjacent trees and other woody species in a forest stand. Where significant height differences occur between trees within a stand, formation of a multiple canopy (multi-layered) condition can result.
- canopy closure . . . . . The ground area covered by the crowns of trees or woody vegetation as delimited by the vertical projection of crown perimeter and commonly expressed as a percent of total ground area.
- catchment . . . . . An area drained by a stream. For research, a very small experimental watershed, often times less than 100 acres.
- channel migration zone . . . . . The extent of lateral movement of a river across a floodplain toward the convex side of an original curve.
- checkerboard land ownership pattern . . . . . A land ownership pattern in which square-mile sections of federal lands are typically intermixed, on the basis of alternating sections, with adjoining private lands. The O&C lands of western Oregon are an example of checkerboard ownership. This ownership pattern resulted from the revestment back to the federal government of lands granted by the federal government to early railroad companies. The checkerboard ownership pattern of the O&C lands creates additional access, management, and perception issues. Also see O&C Act.
- clearcut . . . . . A timber harvesting method that removes essentially all trees in an area, whether merchantable or not, producing a fully exposed microclimate for development of a new age class.
- coarse woody debris . . . . . That portion of trees that has naturally fallen or been cut and left in the woods. Usually refers to pieces at least 20 inches in diameter. Also see coarse woody debris classes.
- coarse woody debris classes . . . . . There are four classes used to describe coarse woody debris. The classes range from Class I (which has the least decay, intact bark, and a hard log) to Class IV (i.e., the coarse woody debris has decayed to the point of nearly being incorporated into the forest floor).
- commercial forest land base . . . . . Forest lands declared suitable for producing timber and having a minimum level of productivity of 20 cubic feet/acre/year. Contrast with harvest land base.
- commercial thinning . . . . . Any type of thinning producing merchantable material at least equal to the value of the direct cost of harvesting. See thinning.
- Congressionally Reserved Areas  
(Congressional Reserves) . . . . . Areas established by an Act of Congress or Executive Order, such as national parks, wild and scenic rivers, national recreation areas, wilderness, and national monuments.
- connectivity block . . . . . A Northwest Forest Plan term denoting a corridor that links areas of northern spotted owl habitat. Contrast with connectivity/diversity block.



- connectivity / diversity block. . . . . A subdivision of the matrix land use allocation in the current Resource Management Plans that serves as a corridor for linking late-successional and old-growth forests to facilitate the movement, feeding, and breeding of late-successional and old-growth species. These blocks are managed to maintain between 25 and 30 percent of late-successional forest within them. Contrast with connectivity block.
- conservation. . . . . Conservation, when applied to special status species, is the methods and procedures used to improve the plant and animal species biology, improve their habitat condition, and reduce threats to their continued existence.
- conservation agreement . . . . . A non-binding document of agreement between agencies that outlines conservation goals necessary to reduce, eliminate, or mitigate specific threats to species at risk, and provides general guidance on species management.
- conservation strategy . . . . . A management plan for a species, group of species, or ecosystem that prescribes standards and guidelines that if implemented provide a high likelihood that the species, groups of species, or ecosystem, with its full complement of species and processes, will continue to exist well-distributed throughout a planning area.
- Consultation. . . . . A formal review between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine fisheries Service and another federal agency when it is determined that an action by the agency may affect critical habitat or a species that has been listed as threatened or endangered to ensure that the agency’s action does not jeopardize a listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat.
- cooperators and cooperating agencies . . . . . Those individuals and agencies that provide qualified information to a federal agency, such as the BLM, to use in formulating resource management actions and analyzing environmental consequences. The Council on Environmental Quality regulations that implement requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act define a cooperating agency as any agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise for proposals that are covered by the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1501.6). BLM planning regulations [43 CFR 1610.3-15(b)] further provide that eligible Federal agencies, state and local governments, and federally recognized Indian tribes may also participate as cooperating agencies.
- Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) lands. . . . . The public lands that were granted to the Southern Oregon Company for construction of a military road, but subsequently reverted by the United States and later incorporated into the O&C Act.
- corridor. . . . . A strip of land that links areas in a fragmented landscape to facilitate the passage of animals, plants, people, energy, or materials between habitat or service areas. Examples are biological, recreation, transportation, and utility corridors. Biological corridors are reserved from substantial disturbance. Also see connectivity block and connectivity/ diversity block.



- critical habitat . . . . . An Endangered Species Act term denoting a specified geographic area occupied by a federally listed species, and on which the physical and biological features are found that are essential to the conservation and recovery of that species and that may require special management or protection.
- crown. . . . . The upper part of a tree that has live branches and foliage.
- crown bulk density . . . . . A measure of the fuel in a forest's canopy that is usually calculated by dividing the canopy volume by the weight of the needles, leaves, and smaller branches (or calculated using the height-to-crown base, tree height, and basal area values). Contrast with crown density.
- crown density. . . . . A measure of the density of a tree's crown that is calculated from the amount, compactness, and depth of the foliage in the tree's crown. Contrast with crown bulk density.
- crown fire . . . . . Fire that moves through the crowns of adjacent trees independent of any surface fire. Crown fires can often move faster and ahead of ground fires.
- culmination of mean annual increment (CMAI) . . . . . The age in the growth cycle of a tree or stand at which the mean annual increment (MAI) for volume is at its maximum. At culmination, MAI equals the periodic annual increment (PAI).
- cumulative effect . . . . . The impact on the environment that results from incremental impacts of an action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of which agency or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, actions taking place over a period of time.
- decompaction . . . . . Mechanical ripping and/or tillage of roadbeds, landings and other compacted areas for the purposes of increasing infiltration and aeration.
- density management . . . . . The cutting or killing of trees to increase spacing for promoting the acceleration of the growth of remaining trees, improvement of stand vigor, or attainment of late-successional characteristics. Also see thinning, precommercial thinning, and commercial thinning.
- determination of NEPA adequacy (DNA) . . . . . An interim step in BLM's internal analysis process, which documents that a proposed action is adequately analyzed in an existing environmental impact statement [EIS] or environmental assessment [EA]. Where applicable, the determination also documents conformance with an approved land use plan. (BLM NEPA Handbook, 516 DM 11).
- diameter at breast height . . . . . The diameter of the stem of a tree measured at 4.5 feet above the ground level on the uphill side of the stem. Also see quadratic mean diameter.



- dispersal habitat (spotted owl) . . . . . Forest habitat that allows northern spotted owls to move (disperse) across the landscape; typically characterized by forest stands with average tree diameters of greater than 11 inches, and conifer overstory trees having closed canopies (greater than 40 percent canopy closure) with open space beneath the canopy to allow owls to fly.
- dispersed retention . . . . . See variable-retention harvest system.
- disturbance (natural) . . . . . A force that causes significant change in structure and/or composition through natural events such as fire, flood, wind, and earthquake, or through mortality caused by insect or disease outbreaks.
- disturbance, stand replacement. . . . . A force that removes most or all existing trees in a forest stand through natural events such as fire, flood, earthquake, or mortality caused by insect or disease outbreaks.
- dominant use . . . . . A land use that is the primary purpose for the land use designation; for instance, wildlife habitat on National Wildlife Refuges or timber production on O&C lands. Contrast with multiple use.
- effective shade . . . . . The proportion of direct beam solar radiation reaching a stream surface to total daily solar radiation.
- envelope curve. . . . . A line drawn on a figure with dependent and independent variables for a collection of hydrologic studies, showing the best fit of the extent of maximum response.
- environmental consequences. . . . . The direct, indirect and cumulative effects of a proposed action or alternative on existing conditions in the environment in which the action(s) would occur. Also see baseline.
- environmental impact statement . . . . . A detailed document, required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, of a federal project's environmental consequences, including adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided, alternatives to the proposed action, the relationship between local short-term uses and long-term productivity, and any irreversibly or ir retrievable commitment of resource.
- equivalent clearcut area . . . . . Method of estimating changes in streamflow response from the amount and distribution of forest cover in a watershed.
- even-aged management . . . . . A silvicultural system that creates forest stands primarily comprised of a single age or having a very narrow range of ages.
- even-aged stand. . . . . A stand of trees comprised of a single age class in which the range of tree ages is usually  $\pm 20\%$  of rotation.
- evolutionary significant unit . . . . . A population or group of populations considered "distinct," and hence a "species" for purposes of the Endangered Species Act, representing an evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) of the biological species. A population must satisfy two criteria to be considered an ESU. It must be reproductively isolated from other conspecific population units, and it must represent an important component in the evolutionary legacy of the species. Isolation does not have to be absolute, but must



- be strong enough to permit evolutionarily important differences to accrue in different population units. The second criterion is met if the population contributes substantially to the ecological/genetic diversity of the species as a whole. (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/NWC-194).
- facies ..... A characteristic of a rock unit that reflects a common origin or time.
- fifth-field watershed ..... One of the classifications of watersheds used by the United States Geological Survey that identifies some of the smallest watersheds and is useful for assessing water-related issues; generally 20 to 200 square miles in size. For details about the classification of drainage areas, see <http://water.usgs.gov/GIS/huc.html>. Also see watershed.
- fine sediment ..... Fine-grained soil material, less than 2mm in size, normally deposited by water, but in some cases by wind (aeolian) or gravity (dry ravel).
- fire control, direct ..... Any treatment applied directly to burning fuel, such as wetting, smothering, or chemically quenching the fire or by physically separating the burning from unburned fuel.
- fire control, prescribed. .... Any fire ignited by management actions to meet specific objectives. A written, approved prescribed fire plan must exist, and NEPA requirements (where applicable) must be met prior to ignition.
- forest ..... An ecosystem characterized by stands of trees varying in characteristics such as species composition, structure, age class, and associated processes, and commonly including meadows, streams, fish, and wildlife.
- flood ..... Streamflow overtopping streambanks, or rising water that covers land not normally under water.
- floodplain ..... Level lowland bordering a stream or river onto which the flow spreads at flood stage.
- forage. .... All browse and herbaceous matter available to grazing animals, including wildlife and domestic livestock.
- Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT) ..... The 1993 presidentially assigned team of scientists, researchers, and technicians from seven federal agencies that created the report that was used as the basis for the Northwest Forest Plan.
- forest land. .... Land at least 10 percent stocked by forest trees of any size, and including land that formerly had such tree cover and that will be naturally or artificially regenerated.
- Forest Operations Inventory (FOI). .... An intensive inventory that provides managers with information regarding the age, species, stand location, size, silvicultural needs, and recommended treatment of stands based on individual stand conditions and productivity.



- fuel loading . . . . . The dry weight of all accumulated live and dead woody and herbaceous material on the forest floor that is available for combustion, and which poses a fire hazard.
- genetic gain . . . . . Average improvement of a specific trait in a population of progeny over the average of the parental population (for example, height growth increase).
- green tree . . . . . A live tree.
- green tree retention. . . . . A stand management practice in which live trees are left within harvest units to provide a legacy of habitat components over the next management cycle.
- group selection harvest. . . . . See selection cutting.
- growth and yield modeling . . . . . Simulated projections of forest stand growth and development, from which timber volume estimates and other stand attributes expected to be produced per unit area under a certain set of conditions are derived. Also see modeling.
- forest habitat . . . . . An area containing the forest vegetation with the age class, species composition, structure, sufficient area, and adequate food source to meet some or all of the life needs (such as foraging, roosting, nesting, breeding habitat for northern spotted owls) of specific species.
- habitat-capable forests (spotted owl) . . . . . Forested stands that are capable of developing into suitable habitat specifically for the northern spotted owl.
- harvesting. . . . . The process of onsite cutting and removing of merchantable trees from a forested area.
- harvest land base . . . . . Those lands that are available for timber harvesting on a programmed sustained basis. Generally, a harvest land base does not include managed or other reserved lands, nonforested lands, or areas that the timber production capability classification inventory has determined are not capable of sustaining timber production. Also see timber production capability classification.
- hydrophilic vegetation . . . . . Vegetation having a strong affinity for water.
- hydroregion . . . . . An area of similar climate and stream runoff processes.
- incidental take . . . . . An Endangered Species Act term denoting the taking of a species that is listed as threatened or endangered inadvertently, rather than purposely, while carrying out otherwise lawful activity. Also see take.
- incorporated by reference . . . . . Documents referenced in the final environmental impact statement that are provided by the individual subject matter experts, are maintained as a part of the administrative record housed at a centralized location, and are available upon request.





intensively managed timber stands. . . . .	Forest stands that are managed to obtain a high level of timber volume and quality per unit area by using growth-enhancing practices, such as precommercial thinning, commercial thinning, and fertilization.
intrinsic potential . . . . .	A stream's inherent ability to provide high-quality habitat for salmonids.
inventory data . . . . .	Information collected by the use of objective sampling methods designed to quantify the spatial distribution, composition, and rates of change of forest parameters within specified levels of precision. <b>Note:</b> Inventories may be made of all forest resources including trees and other vegetation, fish and wildlife, etc. Also see baseline.
jeopardy . . . . .	The endangerment of the continued existence of a species that is listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Also a finding made through consultation by a federal agency under the Endangered Species Act regarding an action proposed by the agency that may cause such endangerment.
key watershed. . . . .	A Northwest Forest Plan term that denotes a watershed that contains habitat for potentially threatened species, stocks of anadromous salmonids, or other potentially threatened fish, or is an area of high-quality water and fish habitat. Also see watershed.
land use allocation. . . . .	A designation for a use that is allowed, restricted, or prohibited for a particular area of land, such as the matrix, adaptive management, late-successional reserve, or critical habitat land use allocations.
landscape . . . . .	A broad expanse of terrain, up to the watershed scale of 10,000 to 20,000 acres, which spans several ecosystems irrespective of ownership or other political boundaries.
late-successional forest . . . . .	A forest that is in its mature stage and contains a diversity of structural characteristics, such as live trees, snags, woody debris, and a patchy, multi-layered canopy.
Late-Successional Management Area . . . . .	A designated area outside of the harvest land base that is actively managed to protect or enhance conditions of late-successional forest base.
Late-Successional Reserve . . . . .	A Northwest Forest Plan term that denotes a land use allocation and has been reserved from programmed timber harvesting and designated to maintain existing or future mature old-growth, or late-successional habitat.
load . . . . .	The amount of material entering a system, such as point source and nonpoint source pollutants. Typically measured as pounds per day and significant in relation to the volume and circulation of the water or air mass in question. Also see point source and nonpoint source.
long term . . . . .	A period of time used as an analytical timeframe; starts more than 10 years after implementation of a resource management plan, depending on the resource being analyzed. Also see short term.



- mass wasting ..... The sudden or slow dislodgement and downslope movement of rock, soil, and organic materials.
- Matrix ..... A Northwest Forest Plan term that denotes a land use allocation for federal lands located outside of reserves, withdrawn areas, and late-successional areas. For the purpose of this final environmental impact statement, this term applies only to the No Action Alternative.
- mature stage ..... Generally begins as tree growth rates stop increasing (after culmination of mean annual increment), and as tree mortality shifts from density-dependent mortality to density-independent mortality.
- mean annual increment (MAI) ..... The total cumulative quantity produced over time of some attribute of a tree or stand growth (for example, wood volume divided by the total age of the tree or stand).
- merchantable ..... Trees or stands having the size, quality and condition suitable for marketing under a given economic condition, even if not immediately accessible for logging
- minerals, leasable ..... Generally found in bedded deposits and include oil, gas, coal, chlorides, sulfates, carbonates, borates, silicates, and nitrates of potassium (potash) or sodium and related products; sulfur; phosphate and its associated and related minerals; asphalt; and gilsonite.
- minerals, locatable. .... Includes both metallic minerals (gold, silver, lead, copper, zinc, nickel, etc.) and nonmetallic minerals (fluorspar, mica, certain limestone and gypsum, tantalum, heavy minerals in placer form and gemstones) in land belonging to the United States that are open to citizens of the United States for exploration, discovery, and location which conveys the exclusive right to extract the locatable minerals upon receiving all required authorizations in accordance with regulations at 43 CFR 3802 for lands in wilderness review and 3809 for other public lands.
- minerals, salable ..... Include but are not limited to: petrified wood and common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, cinder, clay, and rock.
- modeling. .... A scientific method that operates by a structured set of rules and procedures to simulate current conditions and predict future conditions. Also see analysis.
- multi-layered canopy ..... Forest stands with two or more distinct tree layers in the canopy.
- multiple use ..... A Federal Land Policy and Management Act term that denotes "... the management of the public lands and their various resource values so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; the use of some land for less than all of the resources; a combination of balanced and diverse resource uses that takes into account the long-term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources, including, but not limited to, recreation, range, timber,



	minerals, watershed, wildlife and fish, and natural scenic, scientific and historical values; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources without permanent impairment of the productivity of the land and the quality of the environment with consideration being given to the relative values of the resources and not necessarily to the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or the greatest unit output.” (U.S. Code, Title 43, Chapter 35, Subchapter I, § 1702 (c)) Contrast with dominant use.
National Marine Fisheries Service . . . . .	A federal agency under the United States Department of Commerce that is responsible for working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance anadromous fish and their habitats.
natural fire regime class . . . . .	A general classification of how fire would behave over time in the absence of human intervention.
nonconformity . . . . .	A physical expression of a period of time of non-deposition between rock units, usually indicated by erosion characteristics, bed tilting, or missing strata of an intervening time period.
nonpoint source pollution . . . . .	Water or air pollutants where the source of the pollutant is not readily identified and is diffuse, such as the runoff from urban areas, agricultural lands, or forest lands. Also see point source.
Northwest Forest Plan . . . . .	A 1994 common management approach for the 19 national forests and 7 BLM districts located in the Pacific Northwest ecological region and jointly approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior.
nutrient cycling . . . . .	Circulation of elements (such as carbon or nitrogen) between vegetation/organic material and soil, water and air.
ordinary high water line . . . . .	Fluctuations of water in a stream or waterbody, from higher runoff of one or two years, that establish a line on the shore which is typically identified by physical characteristics.
overstory . . . . .	That portion of trees forming the uppermost canopy layer in a forest stand and that consists of more than one distinct layer.
partial harvest . . . . .	For the purpose of defining management action in Alternative 3, partial harvest is a timber harvesting method that removes a substantial portion of the stand basal area (50-70%) on a harvest interval that mimics the historic average return interval for a moderate or mixed-severity fire.
periodic annual increment (PAI) . . . . .	The difference in stand volume at two successive measurements, divided by the number of years between measurements. PAI is an approximation to current annual increment, which is not directly measurable.
petroleum shows . . . . .	A visual appearance of hydrocarbon (gas, oil, asphalt, etc.) in an exploration well, water well, coal prospect, natural spring, or seep.
petroleum system . . . . .	A relationship of source rock and the resulting petroleum accumulation.



- physiographic province . . . . . A region of the landscape with distinctive geographical and biological features. When physiographic provinces subdivide sustained yield units (i.e., BLM districts), assessment areas are created.
- plan conformance . . . . . The determination that a management action is consistent with the terms, conditions, decisions, and is within the anticipated environmental consequences, of an approved resource management plan.
- plant communities. . . . . A group of populations that coexist in space and time and interact with one another (conifer and hardwood forest lands, oak woodlands, juniper woodlands and rangelands, chaparral, shrub-steppe lands, grasslands, serpentine, riparian vegetation, cliffs, rock outcrops, talus and overslopes, dune systems, meadows, wetlands, springs, fens, ponds, and vernal pools).
- play . . . . . The existence of a trap that is detectable with geological, geophysical, or geochemical technology.
- point source . . . . . An origin of water or air pollutants that is readily identified, such as the discharge or runoff from an individual industrial plant or cattle feedlot. Also see nonpoint source.
- precommercial thinning (PCT). . . . . The practice of reducing the density of trees within a stand by manual cutting, girdling, or herbicides to promote growth increases or maintain growth rates of desirable tree species. The trees killed are generally unmerchantable and retained on the treated area.
- preferred alternative . . . . . A National Environmental Policy Act term that denotes the alternative in a draft Environmental Impact Statement that is preferred by the proposing agency.
- progeny test site. . . . . A test area for evaluating parent seed trees by comparing the growth of their offspring seedlings.
- proper functioning condition . . . . . The state of a riparian wetland area having the vegetation, landform, and large woody debris that are necessary for the species, habitat, and natural processes of an area.
- prospect . . . . . A drillable trap that is located within a play.
- public domain lands . . . . . Original holdings of the United States that were never granted or conveyed to other jurisdictions or never reacquired by exchange for other public domain lands.
- public land . . . . . Land that is owned and controlled by some governmental entity (federal, state, county, or other municipality).
- quadratic mean diameter . . . . . The average diameter, at breast height, of the tree that is of average basal area in a stand. Also see basal area and diameter breast height.
- reclamation. . . . . Land treatment to “bring back” vegetation or functions of the land that minimize water degradation, damage to aquatic life or wildlife, flooding, erosion, and other adverse effects from surface mining operations. The process may involve backfilling, grading, resoiling, revegetation, decompaction, stabilization, or other measures.



- record of decision (ROD) . . . . . A document required by the National Environmental Policy Act, that is separate from, but associated with, an environmental impact statement. The ROD publicly and officially discloses the responsible official's decision on which alternative assessed in the EIS will be implemented.
- recovery plan . . . . . A plan for the conservation and survival of an endangered species or a threatened species listed under the Endangered Species Act for the purpose of improving the status of the species to the point where listing is no longer required.
- recruitment habitat . . . . . A stand that is capable of becoming habitat for a designated species within a designated period of time.
- regeneration . . . . . (n.) Tree seedlings or saplings existing in a stand. (v.) The process of re-establishing trees on a tract of forest land where harvest or some natural event has removed the existing trees.
- regeneration harvesting . . . . . Any removal of trees intended to assist regeneration already present or make regeneration possible.
- relative density . . . . . A means of describing the level of competition among trees or site occupancy in a stand, relative to some theoretical maximum that is based on tree size and species composition. Relative density is determined mathematically by dividing the stand basal area by the square root of the quadratic mean diameter. Also see basal area and quadratic mean diameter.
- replacement habitat . . . . . A stand of equivalent habitat value to a designated species that is made available as a replacement for habitat that is lost within the same population boundary.
- resource management plan (RMP) . . . . . A BLM planning document, prepared in accordance with Section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act that presents systematic guidelines for making resource management decisions for a resource area. An RMP is based on an analysis of an area's resources, their existing management, and their capability for alternative uses. RMPs are issue oriented and developed by an interdisciplinary team with public participation. Also see adaptive management.
- restoration . . . . . Land treatments intended to bring back a former condition or function.
- riparian area . . . . . A geographic area containing an aquatic ecosystem and adjacent upland areas that directly affect it. This includes floodplains, woodlands, and all areas within a horizontal distance of approximately 100 feet from the normal line of high water of a stream channel or from the shoreline of a standing body of water.
- road decommissioning . . . . . Stabilization of unneeded or low use roads. Depending on the restoration objective, the series of actions may involve one or several of the following: closure, restoring natural stream crossings and self-maintaining road surface drainage, erosion control, and vegetative treatments (planting), surface decompaction, and sidecast pullback or road obliteration.



road improvement	Activities on an existing road that improves its original design standard. A typical improvement would add culverts and/or crushed aggregate to a natural dirt surface road.
road obliteration	Removing a roadbed back from the landscape and restoring the natural topography.
road pullback	Removal of unstable fill materials placed on the outside edge of the road prism.
road stormproofing	Road surface work that upgrades drainage condition on roads that will remain open for travel, but will receive infrequent maintenance. Measures intended to prevent and control erosion and sediment delivery into stream channels, and reduce risk of road failure.
rotation	The planned number of years between establishment of a forest stand and its regeneration harvest.
salmonid	Fish that are born and reared in freshwater, move to the ocean to grow and mature, and return to freshwater to reproduce. Includes species such as salmon and steelhead. Also see anadromous fish.
salvage cutting	Removal of dead trees or of trees damaged or dying because of injurious agents other than competition, to recover economic value that would otherwise be lost.
seed orchard	A plantation of clones or seedlings from selected trees; isolated to reduce pollination from outside sources, weeded of undesirables, and cultured for early and abundant production of seed.
sedimentary basin	A geologic structural downwarp that has been filled with eroded rock from surrounding uplands. Both marine (filled with sediment deposited in oceans) and terrestrial (filled with inflowing rivers) basins exist.
selection cutting	A method of uneven-aged management involving the harvesting of single trees from stands (single-tree selection) or in groups up to four (4) acres in size (group selection) without harvesting the entire stand at any one time.
shelterwood cutting	A regeneration method under an even-aged silvicultural system. With this method a portion of the mature stand is retained as a source of seed and/or protection during the regeneration period. The retained trees are usually removed in one or more cuttings.
short term	A period of time used as an analytical timeframe and that is within the first 10 years of the implementation of a resource management plan. Also see long term.
silvicultural prescription	A planned series of treatments designed to change current stand structure to one that meets management goals.



- silvicultural system . . . . . A planned series of treatments for tending, harvesting, and re-establishing a stand. The system name is based on the number of age classes managed within a stand (e.g., even- aged, two-aged, uneven-aged).
- single-tree selection harvest. . . . . See selection cutting.
- site class. . . . . A classification of an area's relative productive capacity for tree growth; commonly expressed in terms of the heights of the largest trees in a stand at a common "index" age, usually 50 or 100 years-old. Site classes are numbered from 1 (most productive) to 5 (least productive).
- site potential tree height. . . . . The average maximum height of the tallest dominant trees (200 years or older) for a given site class. Also see site class.
- snag . . . . . Any standing (upright) dead tree.
- sold timber sale . . . . . A timber sale for which a qualified purchaser has been established, through auction or negotiation, but where the BLM has yet to approve and consummate the timber sale contract. See awarded timber sales.
- source water watershed. . . . . A watershed area providing untreated water, used for drinking water.
- special forest products . . . . . Those plant and fungi resources that are harvested, gathered, or collected by permit, and have social, economical, or spiritual value. Common examples include mushrooms, firewood, Christmas trees, tree burls, edibles and medicinals, mosses and lichens, floral and greenery, and seeds and cones, but not soil, rocks, fossils, insects, animal parts, or any timber products of commercial value.
- special status species . . . . . Those species that are listed under the Endangered Species Act as threatened or endangered (including proposed and candidate species); listed by a state as threatened, endangered or candidate species; and listed by the BLM as sensitive species. Under the BLM Special Status Species policy (BLM 6840), the BLM State Director has created an additional category called Bureau Strategic Species (see glossary Bureau strategic species).
- stand . . . . . An aggregation of trees occupying a specific area and sufficiently uniform in composition, age, arrangement, and condition so that it is distinguishable from the forest in adjoining areas.
- stand establishment stage. . . . . The developmental stage extending from stand initiation until stands have reached canopy closure and density-dependent tree mortality begins.
- standards and guidelines . . . . . Northwest Forest Plan rules for managing the different land use allocations. For the purpose of the final environmental impact statement, this term applies only to the No Action Alternative.
- stream, intermittent . . . . . Drainage feature with a dry period, normally for three months or more, where the action of flowing water forms a channel with well-defined bed and banks, supporting bed-forms showing annual scour or deposition, within a continuous channel network.



- stream order . . . . . A classification system used to define stream size; based on the hierarchy of tributaries principle. Working downstream from the upper extent of stream channels in a watershed, two unbranched first-order stream channels join to form a second order, and two like second orders join to form a third order, and so on.
- stream, perennial . . . . . Permanent channel drainage feature with varying but continuous year-round discharge, where the base level is at or below the water table.
- structurally complex stage . . . . . Stage at which stands develop characteristics approximating “old-growth” stands described in many analyses associated with the Northwest Forest Plan.
- structural legacies . . . . . The large trees, down logs, snags, and other components of a forest stand that are left after harvesting for the purpose of maintaining site productivity and providing structures and ecological functions in subsequent stands.
- structural stage classifications of forests . . . . . A scheme used to define the structural stages of forests. It uses four broad classifications (stand establishment, young, mature, and structurally complex) and multiple subclassifications to distinguish differences within classifications.
- stumpage . . . . . The price paid for timber on the stump. A timber purchaser pays stumpage to the BLM and then incurs the cost of logging and hauling the logs to the mill.
- suitable habitat . . . . . A stand that has the structures (physical and biological features) necessary to meet the biological requirements of a particular species.
- sustainability . . . . . Sustainability can be defined as using, developing, and protecting resources in a manner that enables people to meet current needs and provides that future generations can also meet future needs, from the joint perspective of environmental, economic and community objectives.
- sustained yield . . . . . The volume of timber that a forest can produce continuously at a given intensity of management; the achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of a high-level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources without impairment of the productivity of the land.
- sustained yield capacity . . . . . The volume of timber that can be offered for sale each year from an area based upon the consistent volume of timber that a forest can produce continuously. Also see annual productive capacity.
- sustained yield unit . . . . . A BLM district.
- take . . . . . An Endangered Species Act term that denotes the act of or the attempt to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect a species listed as threatened or endangered. Also see incidental take.






- terrain . . . . . A tract or region of the earth's surface or grouping of rock considered as a separate physical feature.
- thinning . . . . . A silvicultural treatment made to reduce the density of trees primarily to improve tree/stand growth and vigor, and/or recover potential mortality of trees, generally for commodity use. Also see density management, precommercial thinning, and commercial thinning.
- timber . . . . . Forest crops or stands, or wood that is harvested from forests and is of a character and quality suitable for manufacture into lumber and other wood products rather than for use as fuel.
- timberland . . . . . Forested land capable of producing crops of industrial wood at a rate of at least 20 cubic feet/acre per year and is not withdrawn from timber production. (Some forest lands are not classified by the FIA [U.S. Forest Service Inventory and Analysis] as timberland because they are either unproductive or by law are off limits to harvesting [e.g., national parks and wildernesses]).
- timber production capability classification (TPCC) . . . . . An analytical tool that inventories and identifies sites as capable of sustaining intensive timber management without it degrading their productive capacity. This tool evaluates a site's soil depth, available moisture, slope, drainage, and stability to determine site capacity for timber management activity. Sites that prove incapable of sustaining intensive timber management are typically not included in the harvest land base. Also see harvest land base.
- trap . . . . . A geologic structure that allows petroleum to accumulate and be preserved.
- two-aged stand. . . . . A stand of trees comprised of two distinct age classes separated in age by more than  $\pm 20\%$  of rotation.
- two-aged system . . . . . A silvicultural system that regenerates and maintains stands with two age classes. The resulting stand may be two-aged, or trend towards an uneven-aged condition as a consequence of both an extended period of regeneration establishment and the retention of reserve (green live) trees that may represent one or more age classes.
- understory . . . . . Portion of trees or other woody vegetation that forms the lower layer in a forest stand, and that consists of more than one distinct layer.
- uneven-aged management . . . . . A combination of actions that simultaneously maintains continuous tall forest cover, recurring regeneration of desirable species, and the orderly growth and development of trees through a range of diameter or age classes.
- uneven-aged stand . . . . . A stand with three or more distinct age classes, either intimately mixed or in small groups.
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) . . . . . A federal agency under the United States Department of the Interior that is responsible for working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats.





- United States Forest Service (USFS) . . . . . A federal agency under the United States Department of Agriculture that is responsible for administration of the nation's national forests.
- variable-density thinning (VDT) . . . . . A thinning method where two or more densities of retained trees are used to promote stand heterogeneity through the development of multi-layered canopies. Provision of conditions conducive to the initiation and growth of regeneration is often an objective of VDT to encourage understory development.
- variable-retention harvest system . . . . . An approach to harvesting that is based on retaining structural elements or biological legacies (trees, snags, logs, etc.) from the harvested stand for integration into the new stand to achieve various ecological objectives. **Note:** The major variables in variable retention harvest systems are types, densities, and spatial arrangement of retained structures: 1) aggregated retention is retention of structures as (typically) small intact forest patches within the harvest unit; 2) dispersed retention is retention of structures or biological legacies in a dispersed or uniform manner.
- watershed . . . . . All of the land and water within the boundaries of a drainage area that are separated by land ridges from other drainage areas. Larger watersheds can contain smaller watersheds that all ultimately flow their surface water to a common point. Also see fifth- field watershed and key watershed.
- wetland (jurisdictional) . . . . . A wetland determination, using the Army Corps of Engineers current interagency rules, based on presence of defined wetland vegetation, soils and hydrology.
- wetland (natural) . . . . . Unaltered land with natural presence and duration of water, sufficient to support wetland vegetation
- wildfire . . . . . Any nonstructural fire, other than prescribed burns, that occurs on wildland.
- wildfire, uncharacteristic . . . . . A wildfire that burns with unusual intensity and size. They are a particular concern in drier ecosystems such as sagebrush-grasslands, dry Douglas-fir, dry grand fir and ponderosa pine forests in the West where combustible fuels have accumulated.
- wildland . . . . . Lands that are not dedicated to such uses as agricultural, urban, mining, or parks.
- wildland/urban interface . . . . . The area in which structures and other human development meet or intermingle with undeveloped wildland.
- windthrow . . . . . A tree or trees uprooted or felled by the wind.
- young stage . . . . . Characterized by the predominance of density-dependent tree mortality and, in high density stands, a small range of tree diameters.





# Index








<b>A</b>	Adaptive management	19, 20, B-5, B-6, G-8, H-22, I-4, I-5, I-13
	Air quality	7, 41, B-10, I-10, I-16, I-19, I-21
	Allowable sale quantity	7, 9, 12, 14, 23, 38, A-5, B-10
	Annual program summary	B-3, I-20
<b>B</b>	Bald eagle	7, 32, 64, 65, D-4
	Best Management Practices	7, 37, 62, B-8, C-1, E-30, E-32
	Biomass	39, 40, 44, 45, 60, B-10, B-17, C-25
<b>C</b>	Clean Water Act	3, 8, 10, 11, 21, C-3, H-18, H-28, I-19
	Communication sites	51, 52, F-1, F-11
	Critical habitat	5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 42, 50, 51, 63, B-11, B-15, E-36
<b>D</b>	Deferred Timber Management Area	5, 7, 14, 29, 37, 45, 60, B-10, E-40
	Deer Management Areas	64, B-15, G-4
<b>E</b>	Eastside Forest Management Area	29, 39, 61, 62, B-9, B-10, B-16
	Endangered Species Act	3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20, 22, 42, 63, B-11, B-15, E-37, H-18, H-34, I-6, I-15, I-19
<b>F</b>	Fire regime	45, 46
	Fire resiliency	17, 18, 39, 40
	Fire severity	11, 18
<b>G</b>	Geothermal energy	44, E-3, E-8, E-23, E-28, E-34, E-35, E-36
<b>H</b>	Hardwood stands	39, 40
	Harvest land base	7, 14, 32
	High intrinsic potential	36, 37, B-16
<b>I</b>	Instream restoration	36, 37, B-16, C-23, C-49, C-49, C-50, I-10, I-11, I-12, I-13, I-14, I-18, I-21
<b>J</b>	Juniper	42, 47, 65, B-13, B-19, D-4, H-31
<b>L</b>	Land tenure zones	50, F-1, F-4, F-5, F-9
	Land use allocations	3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 14, 15, 29, 32, 35, 36, 37, 41, 65, A-3, B-8, F-4
	Large wood	9, 17, 35, 36, 37, B-16, C-28, H-25
	Late-Successional Management Area	5, 16, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, B-7, B-16, E-41
<b>M</b>	Monitoring	3, 7, 19, 20, 21, 29, 63, A-3, A-4, B-1, C-4, E-44, G-6, H-17, H-21, H-22, H-29, H-34, I-7, I-17, I-18, I-19, I-20, I-21
<b>N</b>	National Landscape Conservation System	16, 29, 31, 50
	Northern spotted owl	9, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 32, 33, 63, 64, B-7
<b>O</b>	O&C Act	3, 8, 11, 20, 22, 28, 64
	Off-highway vehicles	11, 22, 58, 59, 64, 65, B-15, B-18, C-18, C-36, C-37, D-3, G-3, I-18
	Oregon Smoke Management Plan	41, I-19



<b>P</b>	Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail	31, 53, 54, 58, 61, G-8
	Peak flow	9, 10, C-32
	Pokegama herd	12, 62, 63, 65, B-14, H-8
<b>R</b>	Rangeland health	44, 46, 47, 63, B-17, H-1
	Reasonably Foreseeable Mineral Development	E-3
	Research natural area	32, 41, 50, 51, B-11, D-3
	Rights-of-way	50, 51, 65, A-5, E-31, E-34, I-7
	Riparian Management Areas	7, 16, 22, 29, 35, 36, 37, 46, B-7, B-8, B-16, C-5, E-40, E-41, H-3, H-5
<b>S</b>	Salvage harvest	34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, B-7, C-32
	Source water watersheds	21, C-3, C-32, C-34, C-35, C-47
	Special status species	7, 12, 13, 17, 32, 35, 37, 42, 63, 65, B-11, D-4, E-35, E-36, H-3, H-19, H-28, H-30, H-31, H-34, I-5, I-11, I-15, I-21
	Stand replacement disturbance	32, 34, 35, 38
	Stream temperature	9, 10, 20, C-5, C-20, H-25, H-27, H-33
<b>T</b>	Temporary use permits	51, E-45
	Timber Production Capability Classification (TPCC)	32
	Traditional use sites	44, E-43
	Travel management plans	58, B-18, G-4
<b>U</b>	Uneven-Age Timber Management Areas	17, 29, 37, 38, 39, 60, B-10, B-17
	Utility corridors	51, 52
<b>V</b>	Visual resource management classes	17, 51, 60, 61, 62, B-14, E-39, E-40, I-18
<b>W</b>	Water quality	11, 15, 17, 20, 21, 37, 62, B-7, C-3, E-39, E-42, G-11, H-18, H-19, H-25, H-27, H-30, H-31, H-33, I-4, I-5, I-10, I-13, I-14, I-15, I-16, I-17
	Wildland urban interface	36, 45, B-12
	Wind energy	44
	Wood River Wetland	32, 41, 48, 53, 54, 58, D-3, D-4, G-10, G-11, H-15, I-1







A  
New Map of  
**TEXAS OREGON**  
AND  
**CALIFORNIA**

WITH THE REGIONS ADJACENT  
DESCRIBED  
GIVEN THE MOST ACCURATE INFORMATION  
**PHILADELPHIA**  
Published by S. Augustus Mitchell  
SUCCESSORS OF SAMUEL JOHNSON & CO. 1846

United States Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Klamath Falls Resource Area  
2795 Anderson Avenue, Bldg. #25  
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300



BLM/OR/WA/PL-09/014+1792

PRIORITY MAIL  
POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
Bureau of Land Management  
Permit No. G-76

A detailed topographic map of a mountainous region, likely the Klamath Falls area, showing contour lines, roads, and geographical features. The map is oriented vertically on the page.

# **Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan**

## **Bureau of Land Management - Klamath Falls Resource Area**

SPINE TEXT