

Conditions for implementing a common pool allocation are:

- Such a system is successfully phased in on at least one segment of the Deschutes River.
- An independent evaluation of the successfully phased in Deschutes River allocation system, including a survey of Deschutes River boaters (non-guided users, guided users, and commercial guides and outfitters), and agency personnel including field staff and managers, must indicate the allocation system implemented on the Deschutes River has proven workable for each of these groups.
- If a common pool system on the Deschutes River has not been successfully phased in, an historical split allocation method will be implemented on the John Day, on an interim basis, if a limited entry permit system is needed. (The effects of an historical split allocation method were presented and analyzed as Alternative B in the FEIS.)
- If the independent evaluation and internal review indicate the common pool system implemented on the Deschutes River does not meet public and administrative needs while protecting the ORVs, and cannot be adjusted to do so on the John Day River, the BLM in cooperation with the planning partners will reconsider a range of alternatives for allocating use on the John Day River, through a plan amendment.

Motorized Boating

Issue #12c - How should motorized boating be managed to minimize social conflicts and protect river values?

Decisions: Existing state regulations will continue to prohibit the use of personal watercraft upstream of Tumwater Falls.

We have decided to take no action in Segment 1. Existing state regulations will continue to seasonally close Segment 1 to motorized boating from May 1 to October 1.

We have decided to close Segment 3 to motorized boating between May 1 and October 1, except use of one small electric motor (40 lbs. thrust or less) per boat will be permitted during this period.

We have decided to close Segments 2, 10 and 11 to motorized boating year-round.

The BLM will publish supplemental rules for motorized boating in the Federal Register to implement the decisions described above.

Dispersed and Developed Recreation

Issue #12d - How should camping be managed to protect resource and social conditions, and if visitor facilities are developed, where and what type of facilities should be developed?

Dispersed Recreation

Decision: To protect river values we have decided to manage dispersed use in areas that can best sustain impacts of camping.

Future actions (not described in this document) designed to protect dispersed river campsites will be based on recommendations of an LAC study.

We have decided to create a map to identify river campsites in Segments 2 and 3 that can best handle human use, identify preferred dispersed camping areas in Segments 10 and 11, and install signs and parking barriers to protect riparian vegetation.

We have decided to identify an area suitable for camping on the west bank of the river near Clarno. Actions to protect resources, such as campsite rehabilitation or closure, may be taken in any segment at any time, if necessary.

The ODFW will participate in locating vehicle barriers.

Developed Recreation

Decision: We have decided to improve or upgrade existing facilities where needed to protect resources.

We have decided to improve or upgrade existing facilities, where needed, or to replace those that are permanently closed (but not develop additional recreation sites) to better meet the needs of the recreational user. Included in our decision:

- Segment 1: The BLM will: 1. Improve parking facilities, add a primitive boat ramp, and a boater registration station at Rock Creek; 2. Add picnic tables, plant shade trees, and provide water for dump station at Cottonwood; and 3. Pursue a Cooperative Management Agreement (CMA) with the Sherman County Historical Society to manage and maintain the Oregon Trail interpretive site, John Day Crossing (west side); develop a small parking area; install access signing; and implement regular maintenance at this interpretive site.
- Segment 2: The BLM will add additional launch lanes, a pay phone, and provide water for the dump station at Clarno.
- Segment 3: The BLM will develop a primitive boat ramp and boater registration station at a site downstream from the existing Burnt Ranch dispersed site; and develop a public site at Twickenham with parking, primitive boat ramp, boater registration station, and toilet to replace the existing Twickenham (private) site. The BLM will also install a vault toilet at Priest Hole.
- Segment 10: Approximately 10 years after initiation of this plan, the BLM will develop a campground near Ellingson Mill including a vault toilet, tables, information board, signs, and parking barriers.

Prior to implementation of these actions, the BLM will coordinate with Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) to ensure that proposed projects are consistent with State Scenic Waterway regulations, where applicable. Further coordination with OPRD will take place prior to implementation of actions on state land (Clarno and Cottonwood). Coordination will also take place with ODFW, Division of State Lands, Army Corp of Engineers, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, affected counties, and others depending on permit requirements and interest. The BLM will reestablish communications concerning maintenance of historical sites with the Sherman County Historical Society. Prior to developing a campground near Ellingson Mill, the appropriate level of NEPA analysis will be completed and necessary permits obtained.

Public Access

Issue #12e - How much, and where should, public access be provided to the John Day River, and how should trespass problems be addressed?

Decision: We have decided to maintain public access at existing levels, except as noted below. The BLM will:

- Grade, surface, or widen roads as needed, including the BLM road on the west bank from Clarno to Clarno Homestead and the road to Priest Hole.

- Improve ditches, culverts, and apply gravel to surface of the South Fork Road.
- Clarify the status of access to the Oregon Trail interpretive site (west side) and McDonald Crossing, and mark public access to these sites.
- Close the existing Burnt Ranch site to motor vehicles and maintain a trail for foot access.
- Improve access to Lower Burnt Ranch dispersed use area.
- Seasonally close the BLM road to the north of Clarno Homestead during the first 10 days of pheasant season.

We have decided to consolidate public land ownership patterns through purchase or exchange, acquisition of easements, and through partnership agreements with willing landowners to resolve public access issues and provide access to high value recreation opportunities (See decision for Issue 14 and Appendix F, Lands Suitable for Acquisition). Seek to acquire a river access point at Twickenham from a willing seller to replace the current private access.

The BLM will consult with ODFW about road maintenance procedures and the placement of ditches and culverts along the South Fork Road, prior to beginning this work. The BLM will coordinate with local governments and landowners to clarify legal public access to the Oregon Trail interpretive site (west side) and McDonald Crossing, prior to placing signs that identify legal access routes and parking areas associated with these sites. The BLM will coordinate with Oregon Parks and Recreation Department to ensure that road and access improvements are consistent with State Scenic Waterway regulations, where applicable.

Commercial Uses

Issue #12f - How much, and what type of, commercial recreation use should be permitted on the John Day River?

Decision: In order to protect and enhance river values and to provide safe, reliable service to the outfitted public, the BLM will continue to adhere to Bureau policy when determining whether to award commercial permits. This policy includes the following criteria:

- Type of public service to be provided by the permittee or applicant and consistency with management goals and objectives.
- Ability of that person to provide the service and make a business profit
- Safety of commercial customers.
- BLM workload in administering and monitoring permits.
- Other ramifications of that decision.

Until the LAC study on Segments 2 and 3 is completed, within three years of this ROD, the current moratorium on new permits for all river segments will be continued and no permit transfers will be allowed. Following completion of the LAC study, the BLM will complete a needs assessment for commercial services that considers BLM mission, existing opportunities, land capability, demand/supply, and input from others.

Additional measures to be taken by BLM in administering John Day River permits are listed below:

- The requirements for permits and permit transfers will be increased to include training in river rescue, Leave No Trace skills, and interpretive techniques.
- New applicants will pay a non-refundable application fee to cover the cost of verifying that application requirements are met.
- The BLM will conduct independent random audits of permit records.
- The BLM may issue new permits at the discretion of the Authorized Officer, if a needs assessment identifies a need for a particular service. After a specific need is identified, permits will be issued by competitive prospectus among those applicants

- meeting specific criteria identified by the needs assessment.
- After the initial moratorium, transfers will be allowed in accordance with BLM transfer policies.

Concession permits will be considered based on the results of a needs assessment. Shuttle service providers will be subject to the BLM permitting process. Minimum use requirements for commercial permits will be increased to 20 paying client user days during any consecutive, overlapping two-year period, commencing with the year 2002. The first two-year period for calculating this minimum use will be 2002-2003, followed by 2003-2004, 2004-2005, etc.

The Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs have indicated an interest in providing input into the needs assessment process.

Energy and Mineral Resources

Issue #13 - How will BLM manage mineral and energy resource exploration and development while protecting and enhancing river values?

Decision: We have decided to withdraw recreation sites from all mineral entry to protect and enhance recreational values (See Appendix J for list of sites.)

Leasable Minerals

Decision: We have decided to require no surface occupancy within the river corridor for exploration and extraction of leasable minerals. (This decision continues existing management under the Two Rivers RMP for leasable minerals in the lower John Day basin and amends the Baker (1989) and John Day (1986) RMPs for leasable minerals in the upper John Day basin.)

Locatable Minerals

Decision: We have decided to require that, in areas not specifically withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under the Mining Law of 1872, as amended, locatable mineral entry be subject to stipulations that protect water quality and native vegetation. Stipulations include, but are not limited to, those for screening and road building restrictions in State Scenic Waterways as published in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. (If the State subsequently revises these rules the BLM will adopt such changes only if the changes provide more protection for river values than existing rules.)

Salable Minerals:

Decision: To protect river values we have decided not to permit new sites for production of salable minerals on public lands within the River corridor. Existing permits will either not be renewed when they expire or will be renegotiated.

Land Ownership, Classifications, and Use Authorizations

Issue #14 - What type and where should new utility or transportation facilities be permitted, or land acquisitions, exchanges, or disposals be authorized along and across the John Day River?

Decision: We have decided to continue to follow the direction of the Two Rivers, John Day, and Baker RMPs, as amended, when processing requests for utility and transportation rights-of-way and for land acquisitions, exchanges, and disposals.

The BLM has identified land parcels for acquisition that meet the needs of the plan (see Appendix F).

Land use authorization of newly acquired lands adjacent to the Northpole Ridge in Segment 2 and the Sutton Mountain and Pats's Cabin WSAs adjacent to Segment 3 will be amended to WSA status in the Two Rivers RMP. (See FEIS, Vol. 1, pg. 191).

The Oregon Land Exchange Act of 2000 has affected, or will affect, the public-private land ownership pattern within the river corridor, particularly Segment 7. Management of newly acquired public lands within the North Fork of the John Day subwatershed will be addressed in a future land use planning process.

Reasons for Decisions

The decisions made in this document resulted from careful analysis of available data. These decisions respond to issues raised during scoping and to public comments on the Final EIS.

We have considered all issues, competing interests, opinions, and values of the public. There were divergent opinions expressed during this project. This decision will likely not completely satisfy any particular group or individual. However, after giving consideration to all views, we believe the decision is reasonable and provides the best balance of protecting and enhancing river values and consideration of community needs. The decisions provide a beneficial mix of values for the public within a framework of the existing laws, regulations, policies, public needs and desires, and capabilities of the land, while meeting the stated purpose and need for this river plan.

The John Day River basin is recognized as one of two remaining core areas containing wild populations of salmon and steelhead in the Columbia Basin (*An Assessment of Ecosystem Components in the Interior Columbia Basin and Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins, Volume III, pp. 1223 and 1226*). The ICBEMP *Eastside Draft Environmental Impact Statement*, volume 1, notes that "in areas where present habitat is degraded and hydropower effects are smaller, such as the John Day and Deschutes Rivers, habitat improvements could result in immediate increases in numbers of fish (Chapter 2, p. 158). The ICBEMP identifies both the lower and upper John Day Subbasins as High Priority Subbasins for Restoration. We believe that, the decisions we are making for agricultural lands, grazing management and forests are the primary actions that will affect river values and habitat restoration. The direct actions called for to restore riparian and aquatic habitat, rangeland, fisheries, wildlife, and water quantity and quality protection have secondary benefits. The decisions in this document will provide the opportunity to improve upland, riparian and aquatic habitat adjacent to the river to benefit salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. The decisions in this document are consistent with and in some cases directed by: Implementation of Interim Strategies for Managing Anadromous Fish-producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and Portions of California EA (PACFISH), Inland Fish EA, and Rangeland Standards and Guidelines EIS.

Comparing our decisions with the other alternatives disclosed the following benefits and risks:

Riparian and Aquatic Restoration

Our decision allows the BLM to respond to site specific problems in and adjacent to the river. Other alternatives were not considered. The emphasis, however is protecting and enhancing these values through land management decisions concerning grazing, agriculture, mining, and recreation.

Rangeland Restoration

Where there is a high risk of noxious weed invasion active rangeland restoration is necessary to prevent the establishment of monocultures of noxious weeds. No other alternative was considered.

Forestlands

Our decision is to allow timber removal only to protect forest health and to otherwise continue existing management, except to extend existing protective standards for riparian areas to upland areas within the planning area will ensure that management will protect and enhance river values compared to existing management.

Grazing

The proposed decision selected for grazing is Alternative B. This alternative is an improvement over Alternative A (No Action), because some allotments under existing management do not have managed grazing consistent with protecting and enhancing ORVs. Because of the mixture of managed grazing and physical exclusion from riparian areas with managed grazing under Alternative B, we are able to restore riparian vegetation as well would occur under Alternatives C (riparian exclusion through fences and natural barricades on BLM managed lands) and D (corridor exclusion). However, this same benefit will occur at lower cost to taxpayers, because less fence and fewer water developments will be constructed and maintained than under Alternatives C and D. Where riparian-oriented grazing has been implemented on the John Day River, we have documented improvement in vegetative conditions (FEIS, Vol 1, p.60) As this continues to occur and riparian oriented-grazing is implemented on additional allotments, we expect that monitoring associated with our Water Quality Restoration Plan will find that inputs into the John Day River off BLM-managed lands will improve.

There are other problems associated with Alternatives C and D. Alternative D has the additional cost of slightly reducing cattle production in counties with depressed economies. We have also concluded that, in at least one sense, riparian areas will have a greater level of protection under the proposed decision than with either Alternative C or D. Because C and D are much more likely to involve grazing on uplands and private lands adjacent to riparian areas, and because of their dependence on fences, implementation of these alternatives would be more subject to breaks in fences and cattle circumventing fences by entering the river during low water periods than under the proposed decision. Riparian oriented grazing greatly reduces that possibility of inadvertent trespass throughout the year.

Our grazing management decisions affect several key concerns that are related to protecting and enhancing outstandingly remarkable values. The following describes how our grazing decisions will affect those concerns.

In many cases, the current authorized grazing season is winter and/or spring. The associated action will be limited to adjusting grazing leases in order to formalize the current arrangement. These actions will establish a relatively standard grazing period for the public lands along the river. A uniform season, during which river flow levels are sufficient to permit the river to be used as a barrier to livestock movement, reduces the incidence of trespass from livestock which, during low flows, are able to travel up and down the river banks and freely cross the river (see FEIS, Vol. 2, Appendix M, photos 11-14).

Discussions are provided below about implementation of grazing in relation to various resource values, including water quality, riparian condition, special status plants, fish listed under the ESA, noxious weeds, some early seral status lands and biodiversity, erosion and soils, and campsites.

Water Quality: Our decision is a first step in improving water quality because it will protect and or restore vegetation on public lands within the planning unit. The key to better water quality is improving the health of its watershed, that is, the ability of the land to capture, store and beneficially release water (see FEIS, Vol.1, pages 241-246). Upland soil cover prevents a rain drop from striking and dislodging soil particles. Soil cover slows the movement of water and enables infiltration. Riparian soils act like a sponge which absorb excess water and release water as the water table drops. Water released from riparian soils are typically cooler and cleaner than the water found in the river on hot summer days. In order to improve upland and riparian conditions, grazing management must encourage the livestock to spend less time in riparian ecosystems and allow upland plants to grow and reproduce. The grazing systems used in this plan have been shown to facilitate rapid recovery of upland and riparian vegetation (see FEIS, Vol.1, pages 274-281). Because of the function of vegetation, the recovery provided by the grazing systems will directly promote improved water quality.

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Water quality is the basis of high quality recreation experience and fish ORVs.

Riparian Condition: Our decision protects riparian vegetation by managing grazing in a manner that serves as a defacto exclusion, employs fences and natural barriers to exclude livestock, or rets entire pastures for a period of 3 to 5 years. Livestock prefer riparian areas during periods of high temperature and dry upland feed because of their need to drink and desire to rest in shade and eat green vegetation. Livestock use of riparian areas can be controlled by fencing, or by grazing a pasture containing riparian areas when temperatures are cool, upland vegetation is green, or when riparian vegetation is inundated by high flow levels. When relieved from constant pressures of livestock use, riparian areas recover rapidly to the point that differences are undetectable between areas with limited livestock use and areas with no livestock use (see FEIS, Vol.1, pages 274-278). Because our decision provides for grazing that meets these criteria, riparian vegetation will be protected and permitted to recover where recovery is needed.

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values:

- Several of the ORVs of the JDWSR are indirectly related to the condition of riparian areas. Many species included in the wildlife ORV depend more heavily on riparian areas than other types of habitat.
- The ORV of fish, as well as fish and wildlife habitat, require water of high quality and vegetation for cover.
- Fish and wildlife are related to the recreation opportunity ORV.
- The ORV of scenery is enhanced by the contrast between dry upland vegetation and green riparian vegetation.

Special Status Plants: Our decision protects and enhances special statue plants by providing the basis for restoration of native vegetation. (FEIS, Vol. 1, pages 281-282). By increasing the proportion of native plants in the ecosystem, conditions are created which are similar to the competitive environment under which the rare plant evolved. Grazing management which allows native species to grow and reproduce contributes to improving the proportion of native species to non native species. Grazing systems used in the plan permit rapid recovery of native species.

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Botanical value is an ORV for the mainstem JDWSR. Also, rare or unique plant species provide a recreational opportunity.

Fish Listed Under Endangered Species Act: The status of steelhead and bull trout in the John Day basin is tied to dams on the Columbia River, ocean conditions and international harvests as well as conditions in the basin. These fish require clean cold water habitat. Grazing management systems resulting from our decisions will promote healthy uplands and riparian areas. These healthy plant communities in turn will contribute to fisheries values by improving infiltration of water on the uplands, increasing storage capacity of riparian areas, buffering of high summer water temperatures through water release from storage and shading of tributaries, increasing root masses which stabilize river banks, and protecting fish from high water velocities during high flows with submerged riparian vegetation (see FEIS, Vol. 1, pages 220-221).

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Fish are listed as an ORV. Fish are indirectly related to the recreational opportunities ORV.

Noxious Weeds: Our decision reduces the spread of noxious weeds by livestock by employing grazing during a period which transport of seeds is unlikely or by excluding livestock from certain areas. The possibility of seed transport is reduced by grazing a weed-infested pasture prior to seed production and when weed seeds from the previous year have already fallen. There are well documented cases of devastating weed infestations occurring in areas free from grazing for long periods of time, which illustrate that weeds do not need livestock for spread. The river and its tributaries are the two most common pathways for weed transport into the Wild and Scenic River (see FEIS, Vol. 3, page 133). Healthy plant communities have not been a barrier to weed invasion. To date, the best approach developed for controlling noxious weeds is an integrated approach of public education, prevention, continual inventory, and rapid response.

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Reductions in noxious weeds will increase native vegetation vigor and diversity, which in turn will enhance wildlife habitat, watershed health, and recreation experience (see FEIS, Vol. 3, page 136).

Some Early-Seral Status Lands and Biodiversity: Our decision is a first step in improving seral status of vegetative communities because it will protect and or restore vegetation on public lands within the planning unit. Please refer to the discussion under riparian conditions, special status plants and noxious weeds. As explained in the FEIS, Vol. 1 page 60, the early-seral status of a site does not necessarily imply opportunities exist for improving the site to mid-seral or late-seral through changes in grazing management alone. In those instances where improvement could be achieved by implementing changes in grazing, systems that provide for the physiological needs of native perennial species (and favor defoliation of undesirable annual species) will encourage improvement (see FEIS, Vol. 1, pages 278-281).

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values:

- Protecting and or enhancing vegetative communities will restore the watershed function of early-seral status lands has been compromised, affecting the land's ability to capture and store water and, indirectly, affecting water quality and fish habitat.
- Protecting and or enhancing vegetative communities will restore Botanical diversity which affects the ability of native and special status species to occupy the site, which affects botanical and ecological values.

Erosion and Soils: Our decision will reduce erosion by protecting and or restoring upland and riparian vegetation. Upland soil cover prevents a rain drop from striking and

dislodging soil particles. Soil cover slows the movement of water and enables infiltration. Less water moving across the soil surface decreases the opportunity for soil movement off of a site. Riparian soils act like a sponge which absorb excess water and release water as the water table drops, evening out the flows and encouraging the persistence of root masses which stabilize the river banks. To improve upland and riparian conditions, grazing management must encourage livestock to spend less time in riparian ecosystems and allow upland plants to grow and reproduce. The grazing systems used in this plan have been shown to permit rapid recovery (see FEIS, Vol. 1, pages 274-281).

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Proper functioning of watersheds is indirectly related to water quality and fish habitat.

Campsites: Our decision protects campsites by excluding livestock from sites with identified conflicts. The LAC process will provide the opportunity to identify additional sites from which livestock should be excluded.

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values:

- Recreation opportunities is an ORV that is affected by the conditions at camp sites.
- Fences will be designed to be unobtrusive, by blending in with the line, form and color of the natural landscape to minimize the impact on the scenery ORV (FEIS, Vol. 1, page 267).

Biological Soil Crusts: Our decision protects biological soil crusts by limiting grazing to a season when soil crusts are hydrated or frozen. The degree that biological soil crusts are impacted by trampling varies according to soil texture and water content of the crusts (FEIS, Vol. 1, pages 279-281). Grazing during periods when livestock tend to disperse evenly across the landscape and when the crusts are hydrated and tolerant of some disturbance allows the crusts to grow and reproduce.

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values:

Biological soil crusts are among the soil cover elements that provide for proper functioning of the watershed and improving water quality and fish habitat.

Protection of Cultural Resources: Our decision for grazing protects cultural resources by protecting and restoring vegetation. The most accessible or sensitive cultural resources were impacted prior to Wild and Scenic River designation through vandalism, farming, erosion, fire and trampling. The current level of livestock trampling is likely to have an impact similar to erosive forces (such as freeze-thaw soil action and river flooding) and far less of an impact than biological disturbance such as rodent burrowing. By managing livestock use in a manner that allows native plants to grow and reproduce, the soil surface will be protected and erosion will not be exacerbated.

Consistency with protecting and enhancing Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Cultural resources are among ORVs.

Noxious Weed Control

We have decided to continue the existing weed management program because it has been recently developed with full knowledge of the special status of the John Day River. A range of alternatives were examined both in documents of the weed management program and the documents to which they are tied. We are confident of our decision because all facets of our integrated weed management program have been subject to public and court review as described in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

The Prineville District's primary weed management document is the Prineville District Integrated Weed Management EA (OR-053-3-062). This district-wide EA analyzed two alternatives. Alternative 1, a full IWM program for all BLM-administered lands (including herbicide use), had provisions for more detailed weed management EAs for Wilderness Study Areas (such as the Lower John Day River IWM EA). Alternative 2 was the same as Alternative 1, except that herbicide use would not be permitted within Wilderness Study Areas or potential future Wilderness Areas. Three other alternatives (No Use of Herbicides, No Aerial Herbicide Application, and No Action) were considered, but not analyzed in this EA because these alternatives were all analyzed in the Vegetative Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States FEIS 1991 and the Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Final EIS 1985 and Supplemental FEIS 1987 and their respective RODs. No further analysis of these alternatives was included in the EA, because analysis in the FEISs and RODs were considered applicable to the district level. Alternative 1 was selected. The analysis and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for EA # OR-053-3-062 and its tiered documents (Vegetative Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States FEIS 1991; Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Program Supplemental FEIS 1987; and Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Program FEIS 1985) were affirmed in IBLA 94-692, 94-726, 94-727, decided July 7, 1997.

The Prineville District's most recent document pertaining to weed control (Lower John Day River Integrated Weed Management EA #OR-054-3-063) analyzed two alternatives as a result of the provisions for more detailed planning needs for Special Emphasis Areas outlined in the district-wide IWM EA: Alternative 1, a full Integrated Weed Management (IWM) program including the use of herbicides within the river corridor's four Wilderness Study Areas; and Alternative 2, the same program as Alternative 1, except for no use of herbicides in Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas. The Proposed Decision (Alternative 1) included all weed management practices (preventive [cultural], manual, mechanical, prescribed fire, biological, and chemical) on BLM-managed lands along the Lower River (RM 10 to 122) in four Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs); potential future WSAs along the lower John Day River; and the designated Wild and Scenic River. As in the Prineville District IWM EA, the alternatives of No Use of Herbicides, No Aerial Herbicide Application, and No Action were considered but not analyzed, because these alternatives were all analyzed in the Vegetative Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States FEIS 1991 and the Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Final EIS 1985 and Supplemental FEIS 1987 and their respective RODs. No further analysis of these alternatives was included in the EA, because the analysis in the FEISs and RODs was considered applicable to the district level. Alternative 1 was selected for implementation on the lower John Day River and the four WSAs within this corridor.

Fire Management

The Prineville District Fire Management Plan is based on interdisciplinary land use decisions. Its goal is to provide fire management services that minimize the total cost (suppression cost plus net value change of affected resources) of suppressing a fire. The above mentioned concept requires flexibility in the use of suppression resources and methods of fire attack and use of prescribed fire. No other alternatives were considered

Agricultural Lands

Our decision selects Alternative C for management of BLM-managed Agricultural Lands. This alternative will provide more native wildlife habitat than existing management (Alternative A) and Alternative B. Our decision provides the opportunity to provide much of the water now diverted for irrigation on public lands for instream uses. Alternative D is the same as the proposed decision, except that after the agricultural land is restored to

natural vegetation, irrigation would no longer be permitted and all water would be converted to instream beneficial use. Compared to our decision, Alternative D would provide the opportunity to keep slightly more water for instream use but would eliminate the opportunity to provide supplemental food and cover plots for wildlife or the opportunity grow hardwood stock for rehabilitation adjacent to the river. Our decision to dispose of 26 acres of land that are intrinsic parts of private agricultural fields (a common part of Alternatives B, C, and D) will eliminate an inconsistent use of BLM lands and provide a partial basis for acquisition of lands that would serve to protect and enhance river values.

This decision supports management of these lands to provide wildlife habitat, food and cover for wildlife, or to provide cottonwood stock for reintroduction of cottonwoods to riparian areas. This decision also will slightly reduce water consumption from the John Day River and consequently provide an opportunity to dedicate some additional water to instream flow.

A phased process is required because of expected funding levels for implementation and to continue weed control during the process. This schedule is considered a realistic and cost-efficient strategy; however, it may be accelerated by availability of additional funds, contributions, cooperative agreements or termination and/or abandonment of leases by lessees ahead of the BLM schedule.

Fish

This decision will help protect and enhance fisheries values in the John Day River. Other decisions for managing grazing, forestlands, weeds, fire, agricultural lands, mining, and recreation, along with the ability to implement fish habitat enhancement projects when determined appropriate, are the best means to protect and enhance fisheries values in the John Day River System. These decisions focus on developing natural, native vegetation to protect and enhance watershed conditions.

Wildlife

This decision will help protect and enhance diversity of wildlife habitat and the resulting wildlife species diversity, which includes special status species. Our decisions for managing grazing, forestlands, weeds, fire, agricultural lands, mining, and recreation are the best means to protect and enhance wildlife values in the John Day River System, because they focus on management and habitat improvements to meet wildlife species needs.

Native American Trust Responsibilities

Though Native Trust Responsibilities were treated as an issue throughout the planning process there is no decision to be made in this document because trust responsibilities are a matter of law and BLM policy.

Water Quantity and Quality

Our decisions for managing grazing, forestlands, weeds, fire, agricultural lands, mining, and recreation, coupled with cooperative management, are the best means to protect and enhance water quantity and quality. These actions support river values by focusing on development of natural, native vegetation to protect and enhance watershed conditions. Adopting the flows identified in the John Day River Scenic Waterway as provisional instream flow goals provides a target for judging the progress of

management actions toward flow goals. The development of a Water Quality Restoration Plan (see Appendix G) will provide standards and a monitoring plan for determining progress toward meeting Clean Water Act Standards.

We are mindful, however, that our management decisions in this plan cover about 2 percent of the land in the John Day Basin. It is for this reason that cooperative planning and management is emphasized to protect and enhance water quantity and quality. We must encourage cooperation and work with land managers of the 93 percent of the John Day Basin not managed by the BLM to manage their lands in a manner that promotes good instream habitat and, consequently, will continue to support river values including endangered fish and wildlife.

Paleontological Resources

Decisions protecting and enhancing paleontological resources are based on existing laws, Bureau policy and existing agreements, but are characterized by a more proactive approach that encourages cooperation, partnership, funding and implementation opportunities.

Cultural Resources

Decisions protecting and enhancing historic and archaeological (cultural) resources are based on existing laws and Bureau policy, but are characterized by a more proactive approach that encourages cooperation, partnership, funding and implementation opportunities.

Public Information and Education

We believe that a well informed public is more likely to follow rules and regulations, practice Leave No Trace outdoor skills, be less likely to trespass on private property, and generally take better care of the public lands.

Law Enforcement and Emergency Services

To protect and enhance river values and improve public safety, it is imperative that local, state, and federal agencies work together to set and accomplish common goals.

Scenery

The VRM classification of WSAs to VRM Class I is consistent with BLM policy; the amendment to the VRM classification of Segment 7 to VRM Class III will provide greater VRM protection to these lands; and identifying VRM Class III "islands" will allow continued use, upkeep and expansion of recreational facilities within the corridor.

Limits of Acceptable Change Study

Existing policy directs BLM to establish appropriate carrying capacity in all areas where visitor use has potential to adversely impact significant resource values and/or the quality of visitor experience. The LAC study is a basis for making informed, defensible recreation management decisions that are based on physical and social monitoring data. The LAC methodology is well respected and commonly used among land managing agencies.

Boating Use Levels

Our decision to establish interim targets of launches for overnight use in Segments 2 and 3 equal to 70 percent of campsites within 15 miles of launch points (Alternative C) is designed to provide adequate recreational opportunities, preserve the recreational experience by avoiding overcrowding, and protect riparian vegetation from over use. Existing management in these segments would result in unlimited recreational opportunity but would allow overcrowding and would not protect resources from overuse. By targeting 1998 daily use levels, Alternative B would permit increases in off peak use. As a result, recreational opportunities would be maintained but recreational experience during off peak periods would change as use shifts to these periods. Increases in overall use would likely increase impacts to river values in and near existing sites. Alternative D would provide an uncrowded recreational experience and protect resources, but would reduce recreational opportunities. Alternative E would have the same launch target as our decision, except that in Segments 1 and 2 within the limits prescribed, motorized boating would have a target of one motorized boat launched per day in March and two motorized boats launched per day in April. Our decision to rely on a Limits of Acceptable Change study to determine if and when formal limits for boating should be required (common to Alternatives B-E) will provide specific criteria for limits and an opportunity for public review.

Establishing interim launch targets for overnight use in Segments 2 and 3 equal to 70 percent of campsites within 15 miles of launch points is designed to reduce the number of boating parties on peak use days so that it does not exceed the number of available public land campsites, forcing boaters to camp on private lands. Non-permit measures will be used to encourage boaters to voluntarily shift their use to non-peak periods, as it is BLM policy to implement the least restrictive management actions needed to accomplish the objective.

Boating Use Allocation System

Our decision to implement a common pool, first-come first served allocation system (Alternative D), if such a system is needed, will allow all users equal access to the river. We are concerned that implementation of such a system may make it difficult for commercial use permittees to provide their services to the outfitted public. As a result, we have chosen to make selection of the common pool system contingent on successful implementation of a similar system on the Deschutes River where a common pool system is now being developed. A common system on both rivers will result in less confusion for the users. If such a system is not successfully developed before the need to allocate use, we will implement an allocation system that is based on historical proportions of commercial and non-commercial use because it is a proven system. Specifying an interim allocation method would ensure the BLM the opportunity to evaluate information derived from a phased in Deschutes allocation system, even if it means waiting for this information prior to implementation of a common pool system on the John Day.

Alternative B would result in an allocation system based on historical proportions of commercial and non-commercial use. Although the historical proportion (split allocation system) would proportionally serve the existing demand, it would not respond to changes in demands for commercial or non-commercial access to the river. A common pool lottery system, as required by Alternative C, would provide equal access to commercial and non-commercial users but would make it difficult for boaters to initiate trips on peak use days on short notice.

If and when LAC monitoring indicates that a limited entry permit system is necessary, requiring advance permits on peak use days only will ensure that permitted days are kept to the minimum necessary to meet LAC standards.

Motorized Boating

Our decision implements several different alternatives, depending on the river segment. When viewed as a whole, the proposed decision meets the Desired Future Condition for the Recreation Opportunity ORV by providing an opportunity for a variety of on-river recreation experiences within the John Day River system, including motorized and non-motorized boating on specific segments. In Segment 1, where there is currently very limited opportunity for the public to access the river below Rock Creek by any means other than a motorized boat, Alternative A (closed to motorized boating from May 1 to October 1) was selected to allow the current level of public access to continue with no further restrictions. In Segment 2, Alternative D (closed to motorized boating all year) was chosen to provide an opportunity for a more primitive recreational experience for boaters within the river system as a whole, because this is the most primitive segment along the John Day River. In Segment 3, Alternative E (closed to motorized boating May 1 to October 1) was chosen to promote public safety and to minimize conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users during peak use periods. The closed season does not apply to small electric motors with a 40 lb thrust or less because use of such motors would not likely result in conflicts between users or cause safety concerns, and would not negatively affect the Desired Future Condition for recreation experience identified for the majority of Segment 3 (FEIS, Vol. 1, pages 137-138. Segments 10 and 11 were closed to motorized boating because these segments seldom, if ever, have sufficient flows for safe boating.

As a result of these decisions the opportunity for a motorized recreation experience would be available seasonally in Segments 1 and 3 and year-round in Segment 4. The opportunity for a non-motorized experience would be available seasonally in Segments 1 and 3 and year round in Segment 2. While opportunities for motorized boating would be reduced by this decision, opportunities for this activity would remain available all year in Segments 4, 5, 6 and 7 depending on flow level. If these restrictions for motorized had been established in 1999, there would have been 42 recorded motorized use days lost out of a total of 16,215 recorded boating use days (motorized and non-motorized) in Segments 1, 2, and 3.

Dispersed Recreation

We have decided to use LAC monitoring to alert the manager to areas where dispersed recreation is affecting physical resources and/or recreation experience. This will permit managers to make informed, defensible recreation management decisions. This decision also identifies specific actions that will be taken to protect areas where known problems exist:

- Creating a user map for Segments 2 and 3 to identify public/private land boundaries and campsites that can best sustain impacts of camping will allow dispersed camping to continue, but will encourage boaters away from both private lands and sensitive sites.
- Identifying an area for dispersed camping on the west side of the river near Clarno will protect sensitive resources by channeling use to a more suitable camping area.
- Installing signs and parking barriers to identify suitable parking and camping areas in Segments 10 and 11 will allow dispersed use and protect riparian vegetation.
- Rehabilitating damaged sites will correct resource impacts.

Developed Recreation

Our decision for Developed Recreation implements Alternative B in Segments 1, 2 and 3, Alternative C in Segment 10, and continues existing management in Segment 11. Overall our decision is designed to manage for the Recreation Opportunity ORV while protecting resources and ensuring that recreation development is consistent with the

Desired Future Condition for specific river segments as well as future funding and maintenance capabilities. Improving facilities at Cottonwood, Clarno and Rock Creek will improve the recreational experience for visitors. Developing two new sites in Segment 3; a primitive site at Lower Burnt Ranch, and a developed site at Twickenham (contingent upon acquiring land from a willing seller) will shift use from an existing sensitive site and a current private land site, respectively. Installing a toilet at Priest Hole will improve the recreational experience, help to prevent unsanitary conditions, and protect water quality. Improving river toilet dump stations will aid boaters in complying with regulations requiring the use of portable toilets and installing additional boater registration stations will supplement current monitoring efforts. Improving access signing, parking, and maintenance of the Oregon Trail interpretive site will promote local involvement and stewardship in managing this historical site and help reduce private land trespass. Developing a new campground with toilet facilities near Ellingson Mill in approximately 10 years (Alternative C) will improve the recreational experience, help to prevent unsanitary conditions, and protect water quality when it is estimated that increased use levels will necessitate such action. In Alternative D, reducing facilities, closing sites, and/or discouraging use would shift resource impacts from developed sites to dispersed sites, which are more difficult to monitor and less able to handle the impacts of recreation use.

Public Access

Maintaining current BLM access routes in all segments, while upgrading the quality of some routes, will allow public access to continue at existing locations, with the exception of a 10 day seasonal road closure near Clarno Homestead which will provide the opportunity for a non-motorized pheasant hunting experience. Improving the quality of several existing BLM routes with culverts, ditches or surfacing material, and improving directional and informational signing on others, will enhance fish protection efforts by reducing surface runoff and improve safety and convenience for users. Clarifying the status of public access routes and signing these routes for public use will reduce confusion for users. Continuing to consolidate public land ownership patterns through exchanges with willing landowners for state and private lands, through an active easement acquisition program and through partnership agreements, will help to resolve public access issues and provide address to high value recreation opportunities. Continuing to seek a river access point on public land at Twickenham to replace the current private access, will assure that historical river access in this area is maintained. Redirecting vehicle access to a new site in the Burnt Ranch area will protect fragile resources at the existing site. Providing additional access to the river via roads and trails, as described in Alternative C, would in some cases be inconsistent with the Desired Future Condition identified for specific river segments, and where it would be consistent, exchange or purchase of land from a willing seller is unlikely at this time. Reducing the current level of public access to the river, as described in Alternative D, would protect and enhance other ORVs, but would neglect to balance protection of other ORVs with that of the Recreation Opportunity ORV.

Commercial Use

Completing a needs assessment process prior to considering whether to issue any new commercial permits will insure that new permits will be issued only if there will be a benefit to the public and to river values. Using a competitive prospectus process to award permits, if and when they are available, will ensure that available permits are awarded to the most qualified applicants who meet an pre-identified public need. Placing a temporary moratorium on new permits and permit transfers until after the LAC study determines appropriate boating use levels (within three years of this ROD), will provide a prospective applicant with information necessary to evaluate the probable success of a business venture. Charging a fee to cover application costs, expanding

application requirements, and increasing minimum use requirements will discourage the incidence of speculative permits. Determining a minimum level of training or knowledge required of permittees such as training in river rescue/first aid, Leave No Trace skills, and interpretive techniques will help to promote a safe, quality experience for the outfitted public and increase compliance with permit stipulations. While Alternative C would also use a needs assessment process to identify a public need prior to issuing permits by competitive prospectus, it would not increase training requirements designed to improve the quality of services provided by permittees. In addition, Alternative C would significantly limit the opportunity for permit transfers by allowing transfers to only those service providers who could meet a newly identified need, rather than those who would continue to provide the type of service authorized by the existing permit. Maintaining the level of commercial permits at 34, as described in Alternative D, would define a permit quantity which may not correlate with the public demand for services. In addition, discontinuing the opportunity to seek a permit transfer would be inconsistent with BLM policy.

Energy and Mineral Resources

The decision to implement Alternative B was chosen as the best balance between the existing management (Alternative A) and complete closure of the public lands within the WSR corridor (Alternative D). Our decision provides virtually the same protection of river values as Alternative D but would be easier to implement and would not preclude development that would not affect river values.

Our decision to amend the John Day and Baker RMPs by requiring No Surface Occupancy stipulations on oil and gas and geothermal leases protects and enhances river values and provides consistency among the three plans.

Our decision to withdraw Recreational sites from mineral entry will protect other resources and the recreational experience. Our decision to not withdraw the public lands within the Wild and Scenic River corridor from locatable mineral entry will have a minimum effect compared to Alternative D (withdrawal of Wild and Scenic River and State Scenic Waterway Segments from mineral entry) on the environmental and aesthetic integrity of the river corridor. Adoption of the State Scenic Waterway Rules which include screening, road building, and dredging restrictions as rules for the Federal WSR, will protect the ORVs of the corridor. There are currently no mining claims on the federal lands within the corridor and there is low potential for the development of locatable mineral resources within the corridor.

Our decision to eliminate new permits for salable mineral sites (rock or sand pits) and not renewing or renegotiating existing permits will protect views, prevent unnecessary sedimentation, and introduction of weeds into the riparian communities.

Under Alternative A the John Day and Baker RMPs would not be amended to include the "no surface occupancy" stipulation contained in the Two Rivers RMP, which limits leasable mineral development. Our decision and alternative B would prevent the extraction of Salable minerals while the limited extraction of such materials could continue to be taken from the corridor as long as the operations met the State regulations for dredging and screening and the policies of the Prineville District BLM. In contrast, Alternative D would close the WSR corridor to all mineral entry and would exclude the possibility of developing any commercial deposit of leasable or locatable minerals under any circumstance.

The No Surface Occupancy stipulations on oil and gas and geothermal leases add more protection to river values. This rule is already in place in the Two Rivers RMP but would amend the John Day and Baker RMPs

Land Ownership, Classification, and Use Authorizations

The direction of the existing RMPs will allow BLM to make decisions concerning right-of-way locations and land acquisitions consistent with protecting and enhancing the river values. Further protecting some lands adjacent to the Wild and Scenic River corridor by giving them WSA status will protect and enhance the ORVs and resources within the corridor.

Consistency with ICBEMP

The decisions in this document are consistent with the Scientific Assessment of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP). The ICBEMP Scientific Assessment provides a multi-state context to view this plan. Among the trends noted in the assessment is a decline in the “system integrity” of forest and range lands, as well as a reduction in both biological and social resilience. A contributing factor to these trends has been a lack of integration between resource disciplines and a lack of coordination between management regions (for instance, the assessment noted a lack of connected ownerships and administrative areas), which precludes achieving a landscape perspective. Although a final decision has not been made for ICBEMP, the goals outlined in the scientific assessment are the foundation for any selected alternative.

Our decision is consistent with the following goals:

- Maintain evolutionary and ecological process.
- Manage with an understanding of multiple ecological domains and evolutionary time frames.
- Maintain viable populations of native and desired non-native species.
- Encourage social and economic resiliency.
- Manage for places with definable value.
- Manage to maintain the mix of ecosystem goods, functions and conditions that society wants.

Achieving these goals will ensure that our decision will meet the requirements of the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act (43 USC 1732) and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (43 CFR 1271-1281).

Description of Alternatives Considered in Detail

Many decisions in this document are simply to follow existing RMP guidance. Other decisions are to follow RMP guidance, but to emphasize activities that are consistent with existing guidance but are not now being undertaken as frequently as they might be to promote conditions that protect and enhance river values. When incorporating existing guidance as the key to responding to issues, the BLM's interdisciplinary planning team and the Interagency/ Intergovernmental Core Team did not develop new alternatives. The following table compares the key elements of the alternatives where alternatives were considered for resolving significant issues.

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Scenery					
VRM Classification	Manage Scenery consistent with VRM classifications identified in current RMPs: Class II within all W&S segments, most non-designated segments, and portions of some tributaries.	Manage Scenery consistent with VRM classifications in current RMPs (Class II within all Wild and Scenic segments, most non-designated segments, and portions of some tributaries), except change classification in WSAs to VRM I to be consistent with updated BLM guidance.	Allow continued use, maintenance, and expansion of existing BLM recreational facilities within the river corridor, including boat ramps and parking lots. Such facilities will be designated and managed as VRM Class III islands within the river corridor VRM Class II designation. New campgrounds within the corridor will be designated and managed consistent with the VRM Class III.	VRM classifications in Grant County (under the John Day RMP) for portions of Segments 6 and 7, on the North Fork John Day River, will be reclassified from VRM IV to VRM III to provide greater VRM protection. This will apply to current BLM lands, as well as any acquired lands until the John Day RMP is amended or revised.	No Alternative
Vegetation					
Special Status plants	Continue existing management				
Weeds	Continue existing management				
Fire	Continue existing management				
Forestlands	Continue existing management				Continue existing management, plus substitute John Day RMP guidelines for management of riparian areas for existing management guidelines for upland areas within the planning area in Segments 7 and 10.

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold) (continued)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Grazing	Continue existing management by applying varying management practices that emphasize riparian oriented management that protects and enhances river values. Some allotments do not meet this goal. (See Table 3-E, FEIS)	<p>Manage grazing to protect and enhance ORVs.</p> <p>105 Bank miles managed grazing. Season not to exceed 2 months, primarily late winter early spring. In pastures with riparian areas within designated corridor that are currently grazed in spring, grazing authorized only when flows exceed 2,000cfs to aid in protection of riparian vegetation. For such pastures that are currently winter grazed, the 2000 cfs restriction is an interim measure(see Monitoring in Chapter 3). Establish compliance, utilization and trend standards for continued grazing. If grazed riparian areas within designated corridor are not improving at same rate as similar ungrazed areas within 10-15 years, exclude grazing permanently.</p> <p>72 Bank miles riparian exclusion (fence or natural barriers)</p> <p>18 Bank miles rest at least 3 years.</p>	Restrict grazing to outside of riparian areas to protect and enhance ORVs.	Restrict grazing to outside of Wild and Scenic River Boundary to protect and enhance ORVs.	No Alternative

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold) (continued)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Agricultural Lands	Continue Existing Management	Modify existing management as necessary to protect and enhance river values.	Manage land with emphasis on protecting and enhancing terrestrial wildlife values and restore native vegetation. Phase out commercial agriculture on BLM lands	Manage land with emphasis on protecting and enhancing instream values and restoring native vegetation. Phase out irrigation of BLM-managed lands.	No Alternative
Acres Irrigated for Commodity Use	221-385±	195±	0 in 10 years	0 in 20 years	
Acres Potentially Irrigated for Non-Commodity Use	0-164± *Not all acres will be irrigated every year	164± *Not all acres will be irrigated every year	359± Acres irrigated as needed to establish perennial vegetation. Number of acres irrigated will be reduced by stage of restoration and need for hardwood stock or wildlife food and cover.	0 in 20 years	
Acres Restored to Native Vegetation	0-164	0-164	Approximately 300-359 (long-term goal). Approx. 60 acres of agricultural lands will be kept in wildlife food and cover crops.	359± *All acres would be restored to native vegetation.	
Acres disposed	0				
Recreation					
Boating Use Levels					
Monitoring	Continue existing LAC monitoring to inform future decision making				
Interim	Use non-permit measures to encourage launches during off-peak periods.	Segment 1: Same as A Segments 2 and 3: Same as A but target Launches at 1998 levels.	Segment 1: Use non-permit measures to encourage launches during off-peak periods. Segments 2 and 3: Same as Segment 1, but target launches equal to 70% of campsites within 15 miles of launch points.	Segment 1: Same as A Segments 2 and 3: Same as A but target launches to equal historical average of peak period daily launches.	Launch target same as C except: Segments 1 and 2: March: Target of 1 motorized boat launched per day. April: Target of 2 motorized boats launched per day.
Long Term	No restrictions planned.				
Allocation System	Allocation not needed.	Historical proportions	Future decisions based on LAC study, mandatory launch limits may be imposed.		No Alternative.
			Annual common pool lottery system	Common pool; first-come first served (see text).	

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold) (continued)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Motorized Boating	Continue existing LAC monitoring to inform future decision making				
Segment 1	Closed to motorized use May 1 to October 1.	Closed March 1 to December 1	Closed April 1 to December 1	Closed to motorized boating.	Segments 1 and 2 : Motorized boating permitted only December 1 to end of April.
Segment 2	Closed to motorized use May 1 to October 1.	Closed March 1 to December 1. Recommend to Congress that motorized boats be excluded in WSAs if designated Wilderness.	Closed April 1 to October 1 between Clarno and Clarno Rapids (electric motors < 40 lb. thrust permitted) Closed year round below Clarno Rapids	Closed to motorized boating	Recommend closure to motorized travel in Segment 2 below Clarno rapids if WSAs become designated wilderness
Segment 3	Open to motorized river travel all year	Except for small electric motors (40 pound thrust or less), closed April 1 to October 1.	Segment 3: Closed April 1 to October 1.		Segment 3: Closed to motorized travel May 1 to October 1 (Except for 40 pound thrust or less electric motors.
Segments 10 and 11	Open				
Dispersed Recreation	Manage dispersed use in areas that can sustain impacts of camping. Future Management decisions will be based on LAC study.				
	Decisions made on case-by-case basis.	Segments 1 and 3: No actions. Segments 2 & 3: Create user map identifying campsites that best sustain impacts of camping			
	Segment 2: Identify a designated area on west bank near Clarno for dispersed camping. Segments 10-11: Identify preferred camping areas and install signs and parking barriers to protect vegetation.				

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold) (continued)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Developed Recreation	Based on public need	Improve or upgrade existing facilities when needed to protect resources			
Segment 1	Maintain Cottonwood and Rock Creek facilities. No scheduled maintenance for Oregon Trail interpretive site (west side).	Maintain Cottonwood & Rock Creek facilities. No scheduled maintenance for Oregon Trail interpretive site (west side). Also add boat ramp and boater registration station at Rock Creek and provide picnic tables, plant trees, and provide water for dump station at Cottonwood. Provide parking and signs and maintain Oregon Trail interpretive site (west side).	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A, except close existing facilities at Rock Creek.	
Segment 2	Maintain Clarno.	Expand launch capability, provide water for dump station, and add pay phone at Clarno		Same as A	
Segment 3	Maintain Service Creek and Priest Hole facilities.	Maintain Service Creek & Priest Hole facilities. Also install toilet at Priest Hole. Replace existing Burnt Ranch site with primitive launch at Lower Burnt Ranch. Replace existing private Twickenham launch with new developed site.	Same as Alternative B, plus make improvements to Clarno East, develop Lower Burnt Ranch into camping area with signs, information board, parking barriers, and toilet.	Same as Alternative A except discourage use at Clarno East. and close the existing Burnt Ranch site to vehicles	
Segment 10	No developed sites.	Same as Alternative A.	Approximately 10 years after ROD, create campground near Ellingson Mill with toilet, tables, information board, signs, and parking barriers.	Same as Alternative A	
Segment 11	No developed sites.				

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold) (continued)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Public Access	Segment 1: Clarify status of access to Oregon Trail Monument (west side). Segment 3: Acquire public access to river near Twickenham. Segments 10 and 11: Improve ditches and culverts on the South Fork Road.				No Alternative
Segment 1	Continue existing management.	Eliminate motorized access to existing Burnt Ranch site; maintain trail for foot access.		Eliminate Rock Creek road access.	No Alternative
Segment 2	Continue existing management.	Continue existing management, except improve BLM road on west bank of the river from Clarno to Clarno Homestead.	Same as Alternative B, plus seek to acquire public access to Tumwater Falls and the confluence of Hay Creek and the John Day River Same as Alternative B, plus seek public access easement to the river via Butte Creek Road. Seek to acquire public access on East bank from Clarno to Clarno Rapid.	Seasonally close BLM road on the west bank to vehicle traffic past the Clarno Homestead.	
Segment 3	Continue existing management.	Provide access to Lower Burnt Ranch dispersed use area.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as B, except do not provide motor vehicle access to Lower Burnt Ranch.	
Segments 10 and 11	Continue existing management.	Continue existing management, plus apply gravel surface of South Fork Road.	Same as Alternative B, plus widen South Fork Road.	Same as Alternative A.	

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold) (continued)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Commercial Use	Continue existing Management Case by case review. No limit on number of permits and permits are transferrable.	Decisions concerning commercial services will fully consider type of service, consistency with management goals and objectives, the ability of applicants to provide service, opportunity to make a profit, public safety, and BLM workload. Determinations made through a needs assessment process and issued by competitive prospectus. Moratorium on new permits and transfers until launch numbers are finalized in approximately 3 years. Increase minimum use requirements. Require shuttle services to obtain Special Recreation Permits.	Permit numbers adjusted on basis of needs assessment. Transfer of Permits allowed in accordance with BLM transfer policies.	Limit number of permits to 34. Permits not transferrable. Available permits granted based on needs assessment and competitive prospectus. Concession permits based on needs assessment may be issued and would be in addition to 34 permits	
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase permit requirements for training in river rescue, Leave No Trace, and Interpretation. 2. Charge a non-refundable application fee to cover costs of verifying that application requirements are met. 3. Conduct independent random audits of permit records. 4. Issue new permits at discretion of authorized officer. 5. After initial moratorium, Permits transferable 			

Table 2. Issues Addressed by Multiple Action Alternatives (Decision in Bold) (continued)

Issue	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Minerals	Continue Existing Management	Continue existing management, except:	<p>1. No surface occupancy restriction for Leasable Minerals in Grant and Umatilla County within Planning area.</p> <p>2. Adopt State Scenic Waterway rules (Ch. 4). Where permitted, mining will be subject to stipulations to protect river values.</p> <p>3. On BLM lands, new sites for production of salable minerals will not be permitted within State Scenic Waterways or Wild and Scenic Rivers.</p> <p>4. Facilities such as established campgrounds and launches will be closed to leasing and salable minerals, and also withdrawn from entry under the Mining Law of 1872 for locatable minerals.</p>	Close BLM-managed lands in Wild and Scenic River Segments and State Scenic Waterway segments to leasing and saleable mineral activity and withdraw locatable minerals from entry under the Mining Law of 1872.	
Land Ownership, Classifications, and Use Authorizations	Continue Existing Management	Continue existing management, plus identify parcels for acquisition to protect and enhance river values and to facilitate administration. Amend land use authorization of newly acquired WSA lands in Segments 2 and 3 to WSA status.		Same as B and C, plus seek to acquire additional lands in order to facilitate Alternative D for grazing.	

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Environmental preferability is judged using the criteria expressed in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). Title 1, Section 101(b) of NEPA establishes the following goals:

- Fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- Assure for all Americans safe, healthful productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
- Preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, whenever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice;
- Achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities;
- Enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

Our decisions in this ROD comprise the selected alternative, which is actually a composite of various elements of the five alternatives (A to E) considered and analyzed in the EIS (See Table 2). The mix of alternative solutions to issues involves land use allocations and management directions which are compatible with one another and blends the best solutions for overall river environment management. We find our composite preferred alternative ranked first in overall environmental preferability, because it best meets the six broad policy NEPA goals. Although no single factor can be used to determine which alternative best meets these goals, our decisions will provide the opportunity to provide better habitat for wildlife and aquatic species over the long term and maintain public access to publicly owned lands, and to more efficiently manage public lands consistent with public interests compared to the other alternatives.

For each of the significant issues the Alternatives considered were in varying degrees of compliance with the goals. Overall as the selected alternative was considered to have the highest compliance with the goals. For example, for leased agricultural lands alternative A was less likely to fully meet goals 2, 3 and 4 and continued use of some areas and resources was more likely to lead to resource degradation or less likely to lead to resource protection and restoration than any of the action alternatives. While each action alternative provided for progressively more restoration of natural conditions, our decision, Alternative C, exceeds Alternative D for every goal because it provides the basis for ongoing restoration and the protection and enhancement of diversity within the river corridor. For grazing, our decision provides virtually the same levels of protection as Alternatives C and D and meets all of the goals. But Alternatives C and D contained elements, such as substantial fencing of livestock exclusion areas that would have created adverse impacts to other resources, such as wildlife passage and visual resources. Substantial exclusion of livestock also would not fully meet NEPA goals 5 and 6. In a similar manner closure of mineral and energy opportunities in Alternative D, did not provide significantly greater protection of river values than the protections provided in Alternative B which we have decided to adopt. However Alternative D did preclude development that would not affect river values and also precluded future development via new technology that would not affect river values. Consequently while our decision and Alternative D are virtually equal concerning criteria 1,2,4, and 6 our decision better meets criteria 3 and 5. Based on the comparison of the Alternatives in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS, our decision will best protect, preserve, and enhance historic, cultural, and natural resources for future generations while providing increased choice of recreational opportunities for all Americans, and therefore is the environmentally preferred alternative.