PART I

RECORD OF DECISION

INTRODUCTION

This record of decision (ROD) documents approval of the Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP). The Jarbidge RMP is a land use plan that will guide resource management in the Jarbidge Resource Area for the next 15 to 20 years.

The Jarbidge Resource Area encompasses 2,100,519 acres of land in south-central Idaho and northern Nevada. Within this area, 81% (1,690,473 acres) are public lands administered by the BLM, 5% (102,509 acres) are state lands and 14% (307,537 acres) are private lands. The public lands are located in Elmore, Owyhee, and Twin Falls Counties in Idaho and in Elko County, Nevada.

The final environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Jarbidge RMP was filed with the Environmental Protection Agency on September 16, 1985. This record of decision meets the requirements of 40 CFR Part 1505.2 pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

DECISION

The decision is to select the majority of Alternative C of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, as the approved Jarbidge Resource Management Plan. Actions relating to vegetative treatments and rangeland improvement projects (i.e., fencing and water development) for livestock grazing have been reduced from those levels described in Alternative C of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The selected levels of vegetative treatment and rangeland improvement projects correspond to the levels of treatment and projects that were addressed in Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS. The plan, as approved, is detailed in Part II of this document.

Decision Summary

The following section summarizes the approved plan.

Under the approved plan, the BLM will consider for transfer from federal ownership 1,240 acres of public lands through sales, 9,605 acres through sales or exchange, 6,080 acres through exchange only and 73,481 acres for potential agricultural development through the Desert Land Act and Carey Act. All land that is being considered for transfer will receive further site specific evaluation and will be retained in federal ownership if important wildlife, cultural, paleontologic or other resource values are present. Soil capability, economic efficiency and water availability criteria must also be evaluated and satisfied prior to any transfers for agricultural development.

Eighty-seven percent of the area will remain open for energy mineral exploration and development and 86% of the area will be kept open for

nonenergy mineral exploration and development. Utility lines and linear rights-of-way will be restricted on 13% of the area.

Subject to additional monitoring studies, livestock grazing could increase from 165,006 AUMs to 176,976 AUMs over a five year implementation period and to 280,501 AUMs by the end of 20 years. Sufficient habitat is provided and managed to allow big game numbers to increase and attain identified wildlife population goals. Special management actions are proposed to improve fisheries and riparian habitat on 70 stream miles. Land treatments are proposed on approximately 132,620 acres to improve rangelands for wildlife and livestock. An additional 18,200 acres of land treatment will be conducted to improve habitat primarily for wildlife. One hundred thirty miles of pipeline, 2 reservoirs/wells and 163 miles of fence will be installed.

Off-road vehicle use will be unrestricted on 70% of the area, limited on 22% of the area and closed on 8% of the area. Special designations will protect the Oregon Trail, the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers, Salmon Falls Creek and other areas having unique scenic, cultural and recreational values.

Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation is established for the Hagerman Fossil Beds, the Sand Point paleontological area and the Bruneau/Jarbidge River Area. The entire resource area will be managed under full fire suppression.

The approved plan recommends 20,800 acres of the Bruneau River - Sheep Creek WSA (5,600 acres in the Jarbidge RA and 15,200 acres in the Bruneau RA) and 16,740 acres of the Jarbidge River WSA (13,760 acres in the Jarbidge RA and 2,980 acres in the Bruneau RA) as suitable for wilderness designation. The plan recommends the remaining 171,293 acres of WSA land as nonsuitable for wilderness designation. Decisions on wilderness suitability will be made by Congress.

Modifications Between the Proposed RMP and the Approved RMP

Modifications between the proposed RMP and the approved RMP have been made to correct data and figures that were presented in the proposed plan and final EIS; provide additional protection for wildlife habitat, Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive plant species or other resource values; or to respond to protests received on the proposed RMP/final EIS. The environmental consequences of the approved RMP were documented in the draft and final EIS. The following discussion describes the changes that have been incorporated into the RMP:

Vegetative Treatment and Project Development

Several protests were received on the proposed RMP/final EIS which disagreed with the large acreages of land treatment proposed and the amount of rangeland improvement projects proposed. They asserted that the public had not had adequate opportunity to review and provide comments on the increased levels proposed. As a result of these protests we have selected the levels that were proposed and addressed in Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS. We have removed the provision that would allow chemical control of sagebrush. These changes are summarized below:

	Proposed Plan/Final EIS	Final Decision
Brush Control	142,085 acres	36,880 acres
Brush Control & Seeding	121,749 acres	15,600 acres
Seeding Only	40,156 acres	80,140 acres
Total Land Treatment	303,990 acres	132,620 acres
Fences	195 miles	163 miles*
Pipelines	194 miles	130 miles*
Wells/Reservoirs	4	2

* The miles of fence and pipelines correspond to the numbers proposed for individual multiple use areas (Appendix Table B-5, Draft RMP/EIS). The total figures for the resource area were incorrectly added in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Livestock Use Levels

The proposed level of livestock use has been reduced from 178,319 AUMs to 176,976 AUMs to provide additional forage for wildlife. This modification is made because the levels of livestock use, in conjunction with wildlife use, would have exceeded the current vegetative production. Because of this modification, the proposed level of livestock use for many of the multiple use areas (MUAs) and individual allotments (Appendix Table D-1) has been reduced. The proposed level of livestock use indicates the estimated level of livestock use that can be allowed while providing forage for watershed protection, plant maintenance requirements and wildlife needs. However, this proposed level of use is based primarily on a one-point-in-time inventory and it is against Bureau policy to base stocking levels on a one time inventory. Therefore, the actual level of use that is authorized will be based on additional data collected through monitoring and evaluation studies. Initially, permittees will be allowed to graze allotments at their grazing preference level, or the past five year average use level, whichever is greater. This provision for initial livestock use has not changed from that which was described in the proposed RMP/final EIS.

The potential livestock use level that could occur in 20 years has been reduced from 285,150 AUMs to 280,501 AUMs. The 20 year level has been reduced because the reduced level of vegetative treatments and project development create less additional forage. The provision in the proposed RMP which limited livestock use to 25% of the additional forage produced has been eliminated because the level of treatment has been reduced significantly. The RMP provides that wildlife goals and watershed needs will be satisfied prior to allowing increases in livestock use.

Management of Curlew Habitat

A provision has been added to the management prescription for MUA 7 which would prohibit the transfer of land within curlew habitat until an agreement between the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Idaho Department of Water Resources is reached, which adequately mitigates impacts to curlews.

Management of Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Plant Species

The provisions for protecting these species has been expanded in the Resource Management Guideline section. The description of Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive species in the Bruneau/Jarbidge River ACEC has been modified to identify species present and to provide for their protection.

Minerals Management

The acres restricted or withdrawn from mineral entry in MUAs 2, 4, 7, 11 and 15 have been modified slightly to reflect corrected figures. Resource area acreage totals (Appendix Table B-3) have also been corrected.

Lands and Realty Management

The criteria used to determine the suitability classification of potential agricultural lands (Resource Management Guidelines section) has been modified to reflect current Bureau policy. The acreage totals for utility avoidance and areas closed to agricultural entry (Appendix Table B-3) have been modified to reflect corrected totals.

Off-Road Vehicles

The Off-Road Vehicle Designation map has been modified to reflect the ORV designations that were identified in the text portion of the RMP. The area limited to ORV use in MUA 10 has been reduced by 3,738 acres and the area closed to ORV use has been increased by 3,738 acres to reflect changes made in the acreage calculations for the wilderness suitability recommendations.

Wilderness

The acreage recommended as suitable for wilderness has been increased from 13,481 acres suitable to 16,740 acres suitable in the Jarbidge River WSA and increased from 17,929 acres suitable to 20,800 acres suitable in the Bruneau River/Sheep Creek WSA. The modification in the areas recommended as suitable is the result of refinement in acreage calculations and boundary definitions that surfaced during the preparation of the separate final wilderness EIS.

The recommendations concerning the amount of land treatment that could occur within the WSAs if Congress does not designate the areas as wilderness has been increased. In the Jarbidge River and Bruneau River/Sheep Creek WSAs the following development is recommended: 14,600 acres of prescribed burning and drill seeding or interseeding specifically for wildlife; 1,500 acres of brush control and seeding; 4.3 miles of pasture fence; one spring development; two reservoir developments and 1.4 miles of pipeline. In the King Hill WSA, the following development is recommended if Congress does not designate the area as wilderness: 2,200 acres of brush control; 1,010 acres of seeding and two spring developments.

The modification in the potential land treatments and project developments resulted from additional site specific evaluation of the improvement potential of the areas. The environmental impacts of this level of development are documented in the final Jarbidge Wilderness EIS. A final decision on the development within the WSAs will be made following Congress's action on the areas.

PROTESTS/RATIONALE FOR MODIFICATIONS

Following the release of the proposed RMP and final EIS, a protest period, extending from September 16, 1985 to November 4, 1985 was provided. During this period, eight protests were received on the proposed plan. Upon review of the protest letters and the planning records, it was concluded that the proposed RMP relating to livestock use levels, vegetative treatment, project development and the management of threatened, endangered and sensitive species should be modified as previously discussed.

One of the protest points was that the proposed RMP did not provide adequate rationale for changes in management proposals between the draft and proposed RMPs and that the public was not afforded adequate opportunity to review and comment on these changes. Changes were made between the draft and proposed plan for various reasons. The main reason is that the changes were responding to public comments on the draft plan. Changes were also made to correct data or material presented in the draft RMP/EIS. On those elements that the public felt they did not have the opportunity to review and comment on (land treatment and project development), the levels proposed have been reduced to levels that were addressed in Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Because there was concern regarding the changes between the Draft and Proposed plans, we have included the rationale for these changes in this document as well as the changes made between the proposed RMP and the approved plan. The following discussion provides the rationale for the changes made in management proposals relating to vegetative treatments, initial livestock use, long term livestock use, pipelines and fences, fire suppression, wilderness suitability recommendations and the management of Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive plant species.

Vegetative Treatment (Brush Control, Brush Control & Seeding, Seeding)

Many individuals who commented on the draft plan felt that the amount of range improvement was inadequate and that there was an unacceptable amount of range remaining in poor condition after 20 years. Reducing grazing use levels was considered in Alternative D as an alternate method of achieving additional range improvement. However, because of the lack of desirable perennial understory species, large areas of cheatgrass, harsh climatic factors and the low productivity of many sites, little additional improvement (above levels projected for the proposed action in the draft plan) was projected. Because additional improvement was not anticipated through grazing reductions we included additional land treatments in the proposed plan as a means to improve range conditions.

During the protest period, several individuals expressed concern that the public had not had the opportunity to review and comment on these increased levels. Consequently the level of treatment in the approved RMP has been reduced to correspond to the level of Alternative B in the draft RMP/EIS which was available for review and comment by the public. The reduced levels of treatment still allow for considerable improvement in poor condition rangeland throughout the area.

Initial Livestock Use

The initial forage level increased from 172,493 AUMs to 178,319 AUMs between the draft plan and the proposed plan to correct data presentation and because of additional evaluation and modification of allotment carrying capacities. The draft plan contained several inconsistencies in data compilation, data presentation, and allotment boundary descriptions. Part of the inconsistencies were identified by the public during the public review period and part were discovered internally by BLM during the preparation of Appendix Table F-4 for the proposed plan.

The AUM changes resulting from the modification of allotment carrying capacities were initiated by comments received from livestock operators during the public comment period as well as from informal discussions with the livestock operators. The carrying capacity of allotments in question were evaluated and the initial stocking levels increased if the actual grazing use (5 year average use) was resulting in low utilization levels, adverse impacts were not occurring or the majority of the range was in satisfactory condition.

On AMP and CRMP allotments, carrying capacities were evaluated and the initial stocking levels were adjusted to equal the active grazing preference or the five year average actual use, whichever was greater. These adjustments were made because these allotments are currently under grazing systems and appear capable of supporting the proposed level of grazing use. The adjustments on AMP and CRMP allotments resulted in grazing increases on six allotments, decreases on three allotments and no change on two allotments. These changes were initiated because of public comments received from the livestock operators.

Since the release of the proposed RMP/final EIS, proposed livestock use has been reduced from the 178,319 AUM figure to 176,976 AUMs. These adjustments were made to ensure sufficient forage is available for wildlife. These adjustments are described in the previous decision section.

Long Term Livestock Use

Changes between the draft and proposed plan in the forage use levels projected in 20 years resulted from the reevaluation and changes in the estimated carrying capacity of some allotments and because of the large increase in forage that would be available from increased land treatments. On an average, for every acre of land treated, the forage production was projected to increase by approximately .25 AUMs. However, a decision was made to allocate only 25% of the AUMs created from the additional land treatments to livestock. The remainder of the AUMs were made available for wildlife, watershed protection and other nonconsumptive uses.

The livestock use levels have been reduced from 285,150 AUMs in the proposed RMP to 280,501 AUMs in the approved RMP because the level of vegetative treatment has been reduced. The level of livestock use has not been reduced in proportion to the reduction in vegetative treatment because some areas contain excess forage and the restriction that allowed livestock to use only 25% of the increased forage has been removed.

The available use levels are within the estimated carrying capacity of the rangeland. Wildlife, watershed, and other resource needs have also been met within these use levels. There is currently excess forage available for livestock use on some areas and additional forage will be produced over the 20 year period because of 1) improvement in rangeland condition and production as a result of implementing grazing management systems, 2) water developments and fencing, which will make forage currently being produced available for livestock, and 3) the development of additional seedings and the removal of sagebrush through various treatment methods. Increased use would not be authorized unless monitoring studies indicate that the basic soil, vegetation and wildlife resources are being protected and additional forage is available.

Pipelines, Reservoirs/Wells and Fences

Additional miles of pipeline, reservoirs/wells and fences were included in the proposed RMP to respond to public comments and because of the need to implement effective grazing management on the additional acres of land treatment. These levels have been reduced in the approved RMP (to levels addressed in Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS) because some protestants felt that the public did not have adequate opportunity to comment on the increased levels.

Fire Suppression

The acreage managed under full fire suppression was increased from 1,301,743 acres to 1,690,743 acres between the draft and proposed RMP.

The rationale for managing the entire resource area under full fire suppression in the proposed RMP is that it would reduce the acreage burned each year and provide maximum protection for sage grouse, antelope and mule deer habitat. The Idaho Fish and Game Department expressed concern in their public comment letter on the Draft RMP/EIS regarding the large acreage of wildfire that has burned over the past several years and the resultant reduction in sagebrush habitat that is crucial to wildlife species. The Fish and Game Department felt that wildfires should be rehabilitated with species mixes and techniques that would benefit wildlife. Current BLM policy precludes rehabilitation measures on wildfires that burn in limited suppression areas. On full suppression areas, a mixture of grasses, forbs and shrubs can be used to rehabilitate resource values.

To respond to this concern, the entire resource area was placed under full suppression management. Under full suppression, a 5-10% reduction in the acreage burned is anticipated and the areas that burn can be considered for rehabilitation efforts.

Wilderness Suitability Recommendations

The change in the acres recommended as suitable for wilderness designation was the result of reevaluating WSAs in relation to the wilderness planning criteria and quality standards that are contained in the Bureau's Wilderness Study Policy.

In summary, the reason the King Hill Creek WSA recommendation was changed from 26,389 acres suitable to zero acres suitable is that the WSA was judged to be more valuable for optimizing other multiple uses, including semi-primitive motorized recreation and livestock grazing. It was felt that inclusion of the WSA in the Wilderness Preservation System would not add significantly to the quality of the ecosystem representation. Four wilderness areas currently designated contain the same physical aspect (vegetation/landform). Also, the WSA would not add significantly to preserving opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation in close proximity to Boise. The Jarbidge Wilderness Area in northern Nevada and other WSAs recommended as suitable for wilderness designation in southwest Idaho have desert and semi-desert type opportunities of equal or greater quality.

The recommendation for the Jarbidge River WSA was changed from 49,881 acres suitable to 13,481 acres suitable in the proposed RMP because the entire plateau portion of the WSA was judged to be more valuable for other multiple uses, including semi-primitive motorized recreation and livestock grazing. It was felt that the plateau area would not add to the quality of ecosystem representation in the National Wilderness Preservation System. The Sagebrush Steppe ecosystem present on the plateaus, is being recommended suitable for wilderness designation on eleven other WSAs in southwest Idaho. The ecosystem representation of these WSAs is of equal or greater quality than that of the Jarbidge River WSA. Also, the plateau areas of WSAs already recommended for wilderness designation in southwest Idaho have desert type opportunities of equal or greater quality. Likewise, these WSAs already add sufficiently to the geographic distribution of desert type wilderness areas in the northern Intermountain Basin.

Since the release of the proposed RMP the suitable acreage for the Jarbidge River WSA has been increased from 13,481 to 16,740 acres. The suitable acreage for the Bruneau River/Sheep Creek WSA has been increased from 17,929 to 20,800 acres. The changes since the proposed RMP are the result of refinements in acreage calculations and boundary delineations.

Threatened and Endangered Species

Information pertaining to threatened, endangered, and sensitive species was inadvertently left out of the draft RMP. In response to comments by several members of the public, the proposed plan and final EIS identified species present, management restrictions and projected impacts. As described previously in the decision section of this document, the management proposals for the protection of these species has been emphasized in the Resource Management Guideline section and the writeup for the Bruneau-Jarbidge River ACEC, which contains one Federal "Category 2" plant, one sensitive plant, and two uncommon plant species, has been modified to reflect the presence of, and management proposals for, these species.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Four alternatives and two sub-alternatives were developed for consideration in the selection of the Resource Management Plan for the Jarbidge Resource Area. Each alternative addressed the planning issues in a different way and was developed to cover a range of possible resource uses. The predicted environmental consequences of each alternative were available for consideration in selecting the RMP.

Alternative A

The "No Action" alternative would continue present management direction. Resource use levels would generally remain the same as present levels. Land could be considered for agricultural development on those areas where applications currently exist. Minor changes from the present uses could occur and management actions required to implement existing activity plans could be accomplished. New uses could occur subject to environmental review.

Alternative B

This alternative would favor production and use of commodity resources and commercial use authorization. Management direction would favor higher livestock stocking levels, land disposal for agricultural development, and transfer of isolated or difficult-to-manage parcels out of federal ownership. Restrictions on mining, mineral leasing, mineral material removal, and off-road vehicle (ORV) use would be minimized. The level of land treatments and project developments addressed in the Draft RMP/EIS were selected in the approved plan.

Alternative C

The majority of this alternative was selected as the approved RMP. It is summarized previously in the discussion section.

Sub-Alternative C (Alternative C_1)

This alternative would be the same as Alternative C except that 26,389 acres in the King Hill Creek WSA, 75,118 acres in the Jarbidge River WSA and 17,929 acres in the Bruneau River/Sheep Creek WSA would be recommended as suitable for wilderness designation.

Alternative D

In this alternative, protection of fragile resources and wildlife habitat, preservation of natural systems and cultural values, and nonconsumptive resource uses would be favored. Management direction would favor habitat management to increase wildlife populations, protection of cultural resources, protection of wilderness qualities, and opportunities for general dispersed recreation.

Sub-Alternative D (Alternative D_1)

Proposed resource uses in Sub-Alternative D would be the same as for Alternative D in all respects except that there would be no livestock grazing. Therefore, no grazing preference would be proposed, no allotment management plans would be prepared, and no range improvements for livestock grazing would be accomplished.

ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE

The alternatives considered in the EIS would all achieve the requirements of sections 101 and 102(1) of NEPA and other environmental laws and policies. Each alternative is environmentally acceptable. Each of the alternatives is designed to use practicable means to create and maintain conditions under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony, but the emphasis is different in each alternative.

In terms of effects on many of the biological and physical components of the environment, Alternative D_1 would be the environmentally preferable alternative. Alternative D_1 would preserve the most wilderness values, natural history values, and special values in ACECs. It would result in the greatest increase in wildlife populations. It would result in the most vegetation in good ecological condition and the greatest improvement in riparian and aquatic habitat conditions.

In terms of economic benefits, Alternative B would be the preferable alternative. It would generate the greatest increase in income and jobs for the Jarbidge Planning Area. It would make the most land available for transfer to private ownership and development for agriculture. The average erosion rate would be highest and wildlife populations would decrease.

In terms of social benefits, no alternative is clearly preferable to another. Alternative D_1 would protect the most high-density cultural resource occurrence areas from surface disturbance. Alternative B would have the highest level of grazing, but would also adversely affect the largest number of permittees by allowing transfer of significant portions of grazing allotments to private ownership for agricultural development.

Alternative C in conjunction with the levels of land treatment addressed in Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS, is the approved Jarbidge RMP. In comparison with the other alternatives considered, it would attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment while preserving important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage. The effects on the various resource uses and values would generally be between those of the other alternatives. Considering the effects of the alternative, including effects on biological and physical components of the environment, economic effects, and social effects, Alternative C as modified is the environmentally preferable alternative in terms of the overall human environment.

CONSISTENCY, CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

BLM's Resource Management Plans must agree with and support officially approved and adopted resource-related plans (or in their absence, policies or programs) of other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and Indian tribes, so long as BLM's plans also agree with and support Federal law and regulations applicable to public lands. A special effort has been made to ensure that the proposed RMP is consistent with approved plans. No inconsistencies have been identified by the Governor of the State of Idaho, other agencies, governments, or Indian tribes.

MITIGATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design specifications of individual management actions and resource management guidelines for the resource management plan. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from implementation of the plan have been adopted.

The decisions outlined in the Jarbidge RMP will be implemented over a period of ten to twenty years or more, depending on the availability of funding and manpower. The effects of implementation will be monitored and evaluated on a periodic basis over the life of the plan. The general purposes of this monitoring and evaluation are:

(1) To determine if an action is fulfilling the purpose and need for which it was designed, or if there is a need for modification or termination of an action.

(2) To determine if plan objectives are being achieved.

(3) To discover unanticipated and/or unpredictable effects.

(4) To determine if mitigation measures are working as prescribed.

(5) To ensure that decisions are being implemented as scheduled.

(6) To provide continuing evaluation of consistency with state and local plans and programs.

(7) To identify new data of significance to the plan.

A specific monitoring plan will be written for the wildlife, watershed, and range programs. This plan will provide a framework for choosing the study methods that will provide the information needed to issue and implement specific management decisions which effect watershed, wildlife, and range. Monitoring efforts will focus on allotments in the Improve category. For the range program, methodologies are available for monitoring vegetative trend, forage utilization, actual use (livestock numbers and periods of grazing), and climate. The data collected from these studies

will be used to evaluate current stocking rates, to schedule pasture moves by livestock, to determine levels of forage competition, to detect changes in plant communities, and to identify patterns of forage use. If monitoring studies indicate that allotment or multiple use area objectives are not being met then management actions will be adjusted accordingly. For the grazing program, this may include adjusting livestock seasons of use, livestock stocking levels or the grazing system being used.

Minimum monitoring standards have been adopted by the State of Idaho, Bureau of Land Management. They are included in the Minimum Monitoring Standards for BLM-Administered Rangelands in Idaho. Appendix Table A-1 lists minimum data elements to be monitored for various resource values as described in the Handbook. New studies will be consistent with the minimum standards recommendations. More intensive or specialized studies may be utilized if a management need exists and funding is available.

Priorities for monitoring grazing allotments are identified in Appendix Table D-1. The methodology and intensity of study that is chosen for a particular allotment will be determined by the nature and severity of the resource conflicts that are present in that allotment.

For the wildlife program, monitoring will be directed at the biotic resource components using both temporary and permanent studies. The findings from these studies will be used to monitor responses in habitat condition and trend; forage availability, composition, and vigor; changes in cover and habitat effectiveness; and habitat management objectives.

Monitoring for the watershed program will mainly involve monitoring soil erosion, although trend in stream bank stability and water quality will be monitored for mining, forestry activities, and grazing activities.

Water quality constituents to be monitored will be determined at the activity planning level on a case by case basis by an interdisciplinary team.

Specific monitoring plans for other programs will be developed as the need arises.

The data collected from the monitoring and evaluation process will be analyzed and fed back into the decision making process. This will provide information regarding the effects of the land use decisions, the adequacy of mitigation methods, etc. If monitoring indicates that significant unexpected adverse impacts are occurring or the mitigating measures are not working as predicted, it may be necessary to amend or revise the RMP.