

# Environmental Assessment

for

## Priest Hole Site Plan

DOI-BLM-OR-P040-2011-0022-EA

July 2012

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Prineville District  
3050 NE Third Street, Prineville OR 97754

*This Environmental Assessment (EA) considers the environmental consequences of a proposed action or alternatives to the proposed action, to determine if there would be potentially significant impacts. Potentially significant effects would preclude issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and require preparation of an environmental impact statement. "Significance" is defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and is found in regulation 40 CFR 1508.27. If a FONSI can be issued after this EA, it may be followed by a decision record (with public appeal period) and implementation of the project.*

***Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment – including your personal identifying information – may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.***

*In keeping with Bureau of Land Management policy, the Prineville District posts Environmental Assessments, Findings of No Significant Impact, and Decision Records on the district web page under Plans & Projects at <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/prineville/plans/index.php>. Individuals desiring a paper copy of such documents will be provided one upon request.*

# Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Location and proposed action.....	2
Need.....	2
Purpose .....	3
Issues.....	3
Decision criteria .....	4
<b>Chapter 2 – Proposed Action and Alternatives</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Introduction .....	5
Alternative descriptions .....	5
Alternatives considered but not analyzed in detail .....	11
Conformance with BLM land use plans and other agency direction .....	11
<b>Chapter 3 – Affected Environment &amp; Environmental Effects</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Introduction .....	12
Recreation and scenery.....	13
Water quality and quantity .....	15
Wildlife .....	17
Cumulative effects .....	19
<b>Chapter 4   Public and other involvement</b> .....	<b>20</b>
Tribes, individuals, organizations, and agencies consulted .....	20
Preparers and reviewers .....	20
<b>Appendix 1   Issues not analyzed in detail</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix 2   References</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix 3   Maps</b> .....	<b>24</b>

# Chapter 1

## Location and proposed action

This Environmental Assessment (EA) looks at the potential effects of a proposed project on public land in the Priest Hole area on the John Day Wild & Scenic River, 12 air miles northwest of Mitchell, Oregon (see Appendix 3, Maps):

1. Install camping and day-use facilities, including two parking areas, up to 15 campsites, and a vault toilet.
2. Permanently close about two miles of road, and convert about  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile of closed road to a hiking/biking/equestrian trail.
3. Convert two fields (70 acres total) currently used for commercial agriculture to wildlife food and cover plots; periodically replant these fields.
4. Switch from the existing flood irrigation on the two fields to a more efficient sprinkler irrigation system.
5. Plant up to 100 acres of grass, shrubs and/or trees in areas damaged by off road vehicle use or otherwise susceptible to weed invasion, and for shade around proposed campsites.

## Need

The Priest Hole area is in a stretch of the John Day River designated Wild & Scenic for values including recreation, scenery, fish and wildlife. The BLM is obligated to protect these “outstandingly remarkable values” (ORV).

The area is popular for **recreation** activities including camping, fishing, boating, floating, hiking, sightseeing, wildlife viewing and hunting. However, there are no campsite amenities (e.g., parking pads, picnic tables) and no hiking trails. Litter (trash and human waste) along the river banks is sometimes prevalent enough to affect the quality of the recreation experience. **Scenery** or visual resource values are an important part of the quality recreational experience in the area.

**Water quality** in this segment of the John Day River is compromised by low flows. There are two fields covering about 70 acres on BLM managed public land in the Priest Hole area. For the past 20 years or more, these fields have been planted with alfalfa or row crops, flood irrigated through the summer, and commercially harvested in the fall. Fertilizer runoff from these fields can affect water quality in the adjacent John Day River. Low water flows in the river during the summer also contribute to reduced water quality.

The area is important for **wildlife**. Concentrated human activity along the river is impacting riparian vegetation important to neotropical birds. Habitat for these birds has been declining across their range, making the remaining areas more important. Mule deer and elk frequent the area, and have benefitted from the high protein forage available in the irrigated fields.

## Purpose

The purpose of the proposed action is to improve camping and day use opportunities, improve water quality, and improve neotropical bird breeding habitat conditions and deer and elk forage in the Priest Hole area.

The purpose is derived from the Prineville District BLM's Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD) (BLM 1986) and amendments to that plan contained in the Prineville District BLM's John Day River Management Plan/ROD (BLM 2001). The project was designed to meet and be consistent with the goals and objectives of these plans:

- "Protect and enhance the identified Outstandingly Remarkable...Values (ORV) within the designated Wild and Scenic segments of the John Day River..." – Page 1, BLM 2001. This segment's ORVs include, "scenic, recreation, fish, wildlife, geological, paleontological, and archaeological and historic values...Botanical and ecological values are significant." – Page 3, BLM 2001.
- "Protect and enhance river values by utilizing these [agricultural] lands to provide wildlife habitat, food and cover for wildlife, or to provide cottonwood stock for reintroduction of hardwoods to riparian area." – Page 11 BLM 2001.
- "Manage lands adjacent to the river to meet state water quality requirements, satisfy obligations of the Clean Water Act, and protect and enhance outstandingly remarkable values..." – Page 14, BLM 2001.
- "...mitigate impacts of human activities on important seasonal wildlife habitat." – Page 13, BLM 2001 and Page 11, BLM 1986.
- "Vegetative manipulation projects will be designed to ...improve habitat..." – page 11, BLM 1986.
- "...improve or upgrade existing facilities...to better meet the needs of the recreational user." – Page 20, BLM 2001.

## Issues

An issue is a point of disagreement, debate, or dispute with an action based on an anticipated effect. While many issues may be identified during scoping, only some are analyzed in the EA. The BLM analyzes issues in an EA when analysis is necessary to make a reasoned choice between alternatives, or where analysis is necessary to determine the significance of impacts. To warrant detailed analysis, the issue must also be within the scope of the analysis, be amenable to scientific analysis rather than conjecture, and not have already been decided by law, regulation, or previous decision. Significant effects are those that occur in several contexts (e.g., local and regional) and are intense (e.g., have impacts on public health or unique areas).

In 2010 the BLM conducted a user survey to determine user patterns and types of uses in the Priest Hole area. A summary of the findings is available for review at the Prineville BLM District Office. In addition, the BLM met with individuals with extensive historical knowledge of the area and a continuing interest in the management of this area. A scoping letter presenting the proposed action was mailed to 257 individuals and groups in May 2011. The BLM received twenty one comment letters during the scoping period. The letters were primarily from individuals that use the area to camp or fish. In many cases, the comments led to the incorporation of design features into the action alternatives. See Chapter 4 of this EA for additional information on public involvement.

**The following issues were raised by the public, other agencies, tribes or BLM staff, and are considered in detail in this EA:**

1. How would the recreational experience (including scenery) and opportunities be affected by road closures, irrigation equipment, a new vault toilet, garbage receptacles, the addition of campsites, and boat ramp upgrades?
2. What would be the effect on water quality from ceasing irrigation, or switching from flood irrigation to a different irrigation method?
3. How would mule deer and elk be affected by converting agricultural crops to perennial native vegetation or wildlife food and cover crops?
4. How would neotropical bird breeding habitat be affected by road closures?

Several issues were considered but are not analyzed in detail in this EA. See Appendix 1 for an explanation of these issues.

## **Decision criteria**

After considering public input on this EA, the BLM will decide whether or not to install additional recreational facilities and campsites, close roads, provide garbage service, improve the boat launch, continue or change irrigation method, or plant vegetation. The decision may select one alternative in its entirety, or combine parts of several different alternatives. For example, the decision may be to allow dispersed camping (not in a designated campsite) in some of the project area (as is currently permitted throughout the area), while requiring use of designated campsites in other parts of the project area (a component of Alternatives 3 and 4).

The BLM's decision will be based on how well the selected alternative addresses the purpose, need and issues. For example, the decision will be based on how well the alternative improves the recreational experience and opportunities, protects or enhances wildlife habitat, or improves water quality.

The decision will also consider the agency (public) cost to implement and maintain the selected alternative, the risk of long term investment in infrastructure, and the potential for the actions to be successful. An alternative that includes long term irrigation at the site, for example, would be most successful with continued partnerships that provide assistance with irrigation operations. The BLM will also consider the likelihood of irrigation equipment being stolen or vandalized, and the costs to replace it.

## Chapter 2 – Proposed Action and Alternatives

### Introduction

This chapter describes a no action alternative (Alternative 1) that would continue existing management, and three different action alternatives. All but the no action alternative would meet, to varying degrees, the purpose and need described in Chapter 1. Alternative 3 is the BLM's proposed action. The alternatives are summarized in Table 1. Appendix 3 includes a vicinity map and maps showing the open and closed road for each alternative.

A number of uses and actions would continue in the area regardless of the alternative selected, including:

- Day use (e.g., boating, fishing, hunting).
- Overnight camping.
- Motorized access on the main road and down to the existing parking area and vault toilet at east end of Priest Hole field, and to the boat launch area. Motorized use would continue to be prohibited off of designated roads on BLM administered public land.
- Administrative access as needed, including on roads closed to the general public. Such use would be for BLM, ODFW, law enforcement, other partners and agencies, and others with prior written approval from BLM.
- Road maintenance.
- Law enforcement and other BLM staff patrols to reduce illegal activities including littering and resource damage. If current level of patrols and "peer pressure" don't reduce problems, BLM may increase patrols and begin charging fees for overnight use at the site to help offset costs.
- BLM may place a portapotty in the project area temporarily (during heavy recreational use periods).
- Weedy vegetation treatments with herbicides or other methods as provided for in existing direction (Prineville District Integrated Weed Management Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-OR-P000-1993-0062) or new guidance.
- Maps, interpretive materials and "leave no trace" information would continue to be available at bulletin boards.
- Irrigation would continue to be terminated August 15 each year to protect steelhead, though exceptions would occasionally be made for the cottonwood grove or newly established shade trees or other plantings.

### Alternative descriptions

#### Alternative 1, No Action

This alternative would allow the continuation of existing activities and uses currently taking place, including motor vehicle access to the river bank in some areas<sup>1</sup>, and continued flood irrigation and commercial planting and harvest of about 70 acres, generally with alfalfa (46.5 acres in the Priest Hole field and 23.5 acres in the John Day field).

## **Alternative 2**

Alternative 2 would involve the least change to recreation activities, closing only about ½ mile around the Priest Hole field and ½ mile along the north and west sides of the John Day field. A one-acre parking area would be added on the south side of the John Day field. A new vault toilet and one-acre parking area would be installed at the west end of the Priest Hole field, of similar size and appearance to the existing facility at the east end of the field. The existing parking area and toilet at the east end of the Priest Hole field would remain where they are, or they may be moved down the road 1,000 feet or so to be closer to the heavily used camping area along the river.

Continued littering may necessitate increased clean-up and enforcement patrols of the area, and potentially the placement of garbage receptacles and institution of garbage removal service. This would be a last resort if voluntary improvements don't occur. This is the only alternative that includes this action.

Irrigation would be the biggest change, with the phasing out of all 70 acres of irrigation within five years, and discontinuation of commercial harvest starting in 2013 or 2014. The 70 acres currently planted to alfalfa would be planted to a mix of plants that would not need irrigation after establishment. Planting guidelines are described later in this chapter, but exact seeding location, method and seed mixes would be determined during implementation. The flood irrigation may be changed to sprinkler irrigation to facilitate watering and establishment of newly planted vegetation. The pump, pipes and other irrigation equipment would be removed after the plants are established. Water previously used for irrigation would be returned to the river for instream use.

## **Alternative 3 Proposed Action**

This alternative would close about 1½ miles of road. This would be more closures than Alternative 1 and 2, but less than Alternative 4. Closures would include most roads on the peninsula north of the Priest Hole field, as well as the same roads closed around the John Day field in Alternative 2. It would still allow vehicle access to the river banks east and northeast of the Priest Hole field. Of these closed roads, ¾ mile would be converted to nonmotorized trails (gated and occasionally used for administrative use).

As in Alternative 2, a new toilet and parking area would be installed west of the Priest Hole field, the existing toilet and parking would remain or potentially be moved to be closer to the heavily used camping area to the northwest, and a one-acre parking area would be added on the south side of the John Day field.

---

<sup>1</sup> Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL) regulates uses and activities on areas below the normal high water mark. While the BLM may allow motorized access on the road to the gravel bar, it is DSL's decision whether people can continue to drive or camp on the river banks below the normal high water mark. This is the case in all alternatives.

The most noticeable addition in Alternative 3 is that BLM would establish up to 15 campsites around the Priest Hole field. Some information on campsite design is provided later in this chapter, but most details would be worked out after site-specific surveys. Depending on final campsite layout, some roads may be re-routed to improve traffic flow, access the individual camping sites, or to avoid critical resources. In this alternative, overnight camping on BLM administered public land would be allowed only in designated campsites. Dispersed camping would continue to be allowed until the campsites are established.

During the busiest times of the year (the Thursday before Memorial Day through the Tuesday after Labor Day), vehicle use would be prohibited on the spur road west of the new vault toilet at the west end of the Priest Hole field, except for watercraft pick-up and drop-off. This action would help keep the limited river access in this area available to all rather than just the first few that park and camp at the take-out spot.

Alternative 3 would switch from flood to sprinkler irrigation, and convert the two fields from commercial crops to vegetation designed to benefit wildlife (seed method and mix described later in this chapter). Up to 45 acres total in the two fields would be irrigated in the long term to water plants (possibly alfalfa) designed to benefit wildlife including wintering deer and elk. The other 37 acres would be planted to vegetation that would not need irrigation once established or will be the previous year's planted crop left fallow for wildlife cover. A portion of the water previously used for irrigation would be returned to the river for instream use.

#### **Alternative 4**

Alternative 4 would close three miles of road. In addition to closing the roads around the north and west sides of the John Day field and roads north of Priest Hole it would also close the road on the northeast side of the Priest Hole field just past the boat ramp (before the gravel bar). Up to 15 campsites would be installed around the Priest Hole field, and about ½ mile of new road would be added to create a loop for campsite development on the east side of the field. Depending on final campsite layout, some roads may be re-routed to improve traffic flow, access the individual camping sites, or to avoid critical resources.

Dispersed camping (outside of designated sites) would continue to be allowed throughout the project area, even after campsites are established. The BLM would enlarge the current parking area near the vault toilet to accommodate parking for walk-in camping, but would not install a new toilet or parking area on the west end of the field. The boat ramp would be improved to more easily accommodate trailers.

The agricultural fields would be converted from commercial crops to vegetation designed to benefit wildlife, in the same manner as described above for Alternative 3. A portion of the water previously used for irrigation would be returned to the river for instream use.

**Table 1. Comparison of alternatives.**

	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Develop campsites	0 sites	0 sites	≤ 15 sites; camping only in sites	≤ 15 sites; can camp outside sites
Install toilet and parking	No	Yes	Yes	No
Provide garbage receptacles and service	No	Yes	No	No
Upgrade boat ramp	No	No	No	Yes
Close roads	0 miles	1 miles	1.5 miles	3 miles
Build new road	0 miles	0 miles	0 miles	.5 mile
Create hiking trail	0 miles	0 miles	.5 mile	.75 mile
Plant vegetation (initial planting)	70 acres in fields	70 acres in fields; up to 100 acres not in fields	70 acres in fields; up to 100 acres not in fields	70 acres in fields; up to 100 acres not in fields
Plant vegetation (after initial, above)	Replant 70 acres each year in fields	None	Replant up to 45 acres each year in fields	Replant up to 45 acres each year in fields
Irrigate (acres)	70 acres	70 acres for 5 years; then 0 acres	70 acres for 5 years; then up to 45 acres	70 acres for 5 years; then up to 45 acres
Irrigate (method)	Flood	Flood and/or sprinkler for 5 years then none	Sprinkler	Sprinkler
Allow commercial harvest of crops	Yes	No	No	No

**Actions that would occur in several alternatives**

Each action alternative (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4) would also involve planting 100 acres around the fields, around campsites (shade trees in Alternatives 3 and 4), in riparian areas and in the uplands. This is in addition to the 70 acres of planting in the fields that is described above under each action alternative. In all action alternatives the BLM would remove old barbed wire fences and the cattleguard in the road near the existing toilet, since cattle no longer graze in the area.

The following provides additional information on actions that occur in one or more of the action alternatives. These design features would be part of the selected alternative.

**Roads and parking areas**

Roads closed to motor vehicles and not converted to trails would be recountoured and planted, using guidelines above for vegetative plantings. The BLM would install barriers (e.g., gates, fence segments, rocks, shrubs) and

signs as needed to block vehicle use off road and on closed roads. Roads and parking areas would be native surface or aggregate. Miles of new and closed road listed in EA are approximate and would vary depending on final site design.

Parking areas next to vault toilet(s) would be native surface, gravel or a combination of the two. They would be designed to allow several pull through spots for trailers. They would be about one acre, except the parking area on the east side of the Priest Hole field would be up to two acres in Alternative 4 if monitoring indicates more parking is needed for walk-in campers. All materials would be certified weed-free.

### ***Campsites***

Campsites (Alternatives 3 and 4) would be about ¼ acre each, and some would have native surface or gravel parking pads (some large enough to accommodate small trailers or motorhomes) and/or shade trees. Two of the campsites would be group use sites, with room for multiple vehicles and tents. Picnic tables and fire rings would be installed at some campsites, depending on use levels and public request. All materials would be certified weed-free.

### ***Boat ramp***

The BLM would coordinate with others as needed (e.g., DSL, ODFW, USFWS, Marine Board) design the boat launch upgrades (Alternative 4), including, . A likely design would involve placing and compacting gravel from below summer low flow water levels. The ramp would be designed to accommodate boat trailer access. All materials would be certified weed-free.

### ***Irrigation***

Irrigation would be for the acres and duration described above under the specific alternatives. Flood irrigation includes pumping water from the river into ditches around the fields. Sprinkler irrigation would involve pumping water from the river into pipes and distributing it on fields or other areas via short-stature center pivots, wheel line and/or solid set hand line. Regardless of method, irrigation would be terminated August 15 each year, though exceptions would occasionally be made for the cottonwood gallery, shade trees, and perennial vegetation that have not yet become established. The fields would no longer be fertilized or commercially harvested. Irrigation equipment would be removed in alternatives where irrigation is phased out.

### ***Vegetative plantings and rehabilitation***

Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 involve seeding or planting vegetation. The number of acres involved is described in the alternatives. However, the exact areas and species mixes would be determined during implementation and would depend on the amount of weeds present, the amount of rock in the soil, estimated success of various species, and other factors. Some areas would be re-treated (planted or seeded) if the first treatment was unsuccessful due to inadequate rainfall or other factors.

Use of native plant would be emphasized, however, non-natives would be considered (generally not more than 50 percent of the mix) when trying to restore degraded sites (e.g., rangeland infested with weeds or annual grasses, abandoned agriculture fields, areas with high probability of weed infestation after some form of disturbance, and areas where noxious weed infestations are being treated and competitive species are needed to aid in restoration/rehabilitation). Ideally, seeding with non-natives would be a short-term measure to protect

resource values until natives can re-establish. Riparian vegetation would be planted as a means to help restore plant species composition and structure that would occur under natural disturbance regimes.

Equipment used for seeding and planting would include rangeland drill, excavator, backhoe, power auger, manual tools, or other means. Some plantings would be irrigated (e.g., fields and shade trees around campgrounds), under the acreage and time limits described in the alternatives.

During restoration of disturbed sites, BLM would use the guidance from BLM Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2001-014, Policy on the Use of Native Species Plant Material, or most recent guidance.

Rehabilitation of disturbed riparian areas would be done in a manner that results in similar or better than pre-work conditions through spreading of stockpiled materials, seeding, and/or planting. In riparian areas, planting shall be completed no later than late winter planting season of the year following end of disturbance. Short-term stabilization measures would be maintained until permanent erosion control measures are effective. Stabilization measures would be instigated within three days of construction completion or disturbance.

#### ***Other***

- Conduct surveys for cultural resources prior to implementation and modify project layout (e.g., campsite location) to avoid any impact to cultural resources. If cultural resources are found during implementation, suspend project activities until completion of assessment and coordination to avoid impacts. Designated campsites would not be located next to the potential buried cultural resource.
- Monitoring of use in the vicinity of the cultural site would be conducted several times throughout the year to ensure that inadvertent disturbance isn't occurring. If such disturbance does begin to occur on the cultural site then protective measures (such as barrier boulders) would be implemented.
- Conduct botanical inventory for the presence/absence of special status plants prior to all project implementation. Conduct inventory during the season appropriate for species identification, allowing for occupied plant habitat to be protected as needed. Individual special status plants would be flagged or carefully mapped prior to project implementation. If strategic and/or sensitive plant species are found within the proposed project area, measures would be taken to preserve these species. One option is that surface-disturbing activities would be located outside special status plant habitat. Another is that special status plant species would be removed from the project area prior to implementation and preserved for replanting after the project has been completed. These plants would then be replanted in proper locations at the end of the project.
- Prior to construction or use of heavy equipment in and around Riparian Management Areas, flag riparian vegetation areas, wetlands, and other sensitive sites to prevent ground disturbance in these areas.
- All contractors and land-use operators with vehicles or surface-disturbing equipment, while operating in or out of weed infested areas would clean their equipment before and after use on public land.
- Locate ground disturbing activities and facilities away from hydric soils and wetlands, such that the actions would not degrade conditions beyond which five or more years would be necessary to recover soil compaction and restore the local native vegetation and sediment regime.

- Establish staging areas (used for construction equipment storage, vehicle storage, fueling, servicing, hazardous material storage, etc.) beyond the 100-year floodplain in a location and manner that would preclude erosion into or contamination of the stream or floodplain and preferably outside of the riparian area.

## **Alternatives considered but not analyzed in detail**

### ***Re-establish the flood plain so that the agricultural fields can be converted to nonirrigated native vegetation.***

Re-establishing the floodplain would involve raising the water level in the river, or removing several feet of soil across the entire area. Neither action is technically feasible; therefore this alternative is not considered further in this EA.

***Develop disc golf course in portion of Priest Hole field.*** This proposal would not address the purpose and need for action. Therefore it is not analyzed in detail in this EA.

## **Conformance with BLM land use plans and other agency direction**

All action alternatives are consistent with the Two Rivers RMP (BLM 1986) as amended by the John Day River Management Plan (BLM 2001). They are also in conformance with direction provided in the John Day Basin Proposed RMP and Final EIS (JDBRMP/FEIS March 2012, ROD expected fall 2012).

“...return water not needed for managing these [agricultural] lands to instream use....phase out from commercial agriculture production...within ten years... [at] River Mile 136 – 23.4 acres [in John Day field] ... [and] River Mile 137 – 46 acres [in Priest Hole field]...Some agricultural lands will continue to be irrigated to: 1. Provide for tree and shrub propagation (such as cottonwood, willow, aspen), 2. Provide short term water for the reestablishment of perennial vegetation...that will not require irrigation after establishment, 3. Establish wildlife food and cover plots.” – Page 12, BLM 2001.

“Allocate 359 acres of public lands (historically used for irrigated agriculture) to non-commodity uses, including wildlife food and cover crops or restoration of natural vegetation. Cooperate to dedicate associated water rights to instream uses.” -- Page xi, BLM 2001.

“The BLM will continue to encourage and participate in independent and cooperative efforts by doing the following:...Irrigation efficiency projects, for example, conversion from flood to sprinkler or irrigated pipe...wildlife food and cover seeding...” – Page 14, BLM 2001.

“When conditions permit, small portions of . . . [agricultural] field[s] will be converted to perennial vegetation in order to open sites for dispersed camping and increase recreational opportunities.” – Page 12, BLM 2001.

“Upgrade existing [recreation] facilities where needed to protect resources...install a vault toilet at Priest Hole.” – Page 20, BLM 2001.

“...create a map to identify river campsites that can best handle human use...and install signs and parking barriers to protect riparian vegetation.” – Page 19, BLM 2001.

“Seasonal restrictions will continue to be applied to mitigate impacts of human activities on important seasonal wildlife habitat.” – Page 13, BLM 2001.

“Grade, surface, or widen roads as needed, including the BLM road ...to Priest Hole.” – Page 20, BLM 2001.

“...manage existing recreational developments located in river segments with VRM Class II designation as VRM Class III ‘islands’. New recreational development under this plan would be required to meet VRM Class III standards.” The Class III objective is to, “partially retain the existing character of the landscape. Changes to the basic elements caused by a management activity are evident, but should remain subordinate to the existing landscape and should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should be moderate and repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the landscape.” – Page 17, BLM 2001.

The Wild & Scenic Rivers Act (PL 90-542) gives BLM the authority to regulate recreation use along the river to protect and enhance river values.

The proposed action is consistent with actions identified in the Aquatic Restoration Biological Opinion. Both US Fish & Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service have provided letters stating that the proposed project would result in a No Effect or May Effect Not Likely to Adversely Effect.

The project is within a State Scenic Waterway. Local and state agencies must comply with the scenic waterway law and rules, and coordinate with the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) to insure their own land management actions will not substantially impair the natural beauty of the scenic waterway. Improvements needed for public recreation use or resource protection may be visible from the river, but shall be primitive in character and designed to blend with the natural character of the landscape.

## Chapter 3 – Affected Environment & Environmental Effects

### Introduction

The **affected environment** describes the present condition and trend of issue-related elements of the human environment that may be affected by implementing the proposed action or an alternative. It describes past and ongoing actions that contribute to present conditions, and provides a baseline for analyzing effects described in Chapter 4.

The **environmental effects** are the known and predicted effects from implementation of the actions, limited to the identified issues. Direct effects are those caused by the action and occurring at the same time and place.

Indirect effects are those caused by the action but occurring later or in a different location. Cumulative effects result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The cumulative effects analysis includes other BLM actions, other Federal actions, and non-Federal (including private) actions. Reasonably foreseeable future actions are those for which there are existing decisions, funding, formal proposals, or which are highly probable, based on known opportunities or trends.

This EA focusses on the **issues** presented in Chapter 1. Each of the issues relates to an outstandingly remarkable value (ORV) of the Wild & Scenic River. The ORV goals are described on pages 134-138 in the John Day River Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (BLM 2000), and briefly excerpted below.

**Recreation opportunities:** A variety of boat-in, drive-in and walk-in recreation experiences are provided.

**Scenery:** Natural landscapes are preserved and maintained.

**Water quantity and quality:** Instream flows meet interim minimum flow goals or a level sufficient to support ORVs and accommodate beneficial uses.

**Wildlife:** The diversity of wildlife habitat and the resulting wildlife species diversity...are protected and enhanced.

## **Recreation and scenery**

### **Affected environment**

Vehicle-based camping is popular at Priest Hole, especially during the summer months. While there are no designated or improved campsites, dispersed camping is allowed throughout the area. Most use occurs within the floodplain where there is close access to the river and some available shade from juniper trees and riparian vegetation. The gravel bar on the northeast side of the Priest Hole has room for a half dozen or so groups, and there is room for one or two groups at a spot at the end of the road on the north end, and at a similar spot on the river off the west end of the field. Most campers use tents but a few use campers or small trailers or motorhomes. Occasionally people arrive via boat rather than motor vehicle.

Monitoring by BLM recreation staff indicates that an average of four groups use the Priest Hole project area for camping regularly during the spring and summer. During peak use periods (such as holiday weekends) as many as 12 separate groups have been observed camped in the area at the same time.

Priest Hole recreationists often bring various types of small watercraft (mostly small inflatable rafts and inner tubes but also canoes) to use on the river. A common scenario for these boaters is to set up a camp from which they stage multiple short floats, using vehicles to shuttle floaters and their craft on the short drive from the lower Priest Hole takeout back to the launch point near the main parking area. Some shuttle to the Twickenham Bridge and then float back to the Priest Hole area.

In addition to short floats within the Priest Hole area, the river stretch between Service Creek and Clarno is also popular for longer floats. There are public access roads at several locations within the 48-mile section, which

boaters use to launch a variety of one, two and three-day boating trips. Boaters who launch upstream at Service Creek or Twickenham may take out at Priest Hole. Boaters may also launch at Priest Hole and take out at another location downstream such as Lower Burnt Ranch or Clarno. Other boaters may launch upstream, float through the Priest Hole area, and then takeout somewhere downstream.

Recreational boating is heavily concentrated during spring and early summer when river flows are usually high enough to allow use of larger inflatable rafts and hard hulled drift boats. The primary season for boating is roughly May 20 to July 10 but this varies from year to year depending on the amount of snowpack and timing of spring runoff. Though less common, some boating continues during late summer and fall when boaters use low water craft such as float tubes, inflatable kayaks and canoes for fishing and hunting access. The area is frequented by bird hunters in early September and by occasional deer, elk and duck hunters later in the fall.

Recreational development in the project area is mostly adjacent to the Priest Hole field, and currently consists of a native surface parking area, an information board, a vault toilet, and a number of native surface roads. The information board contains a boater registration station, fire regulations, weed education display, and minimum impact camping requirements.

Part of the recreational experience relates to scenery, and the presence of visual intrusions (structures, development, and signs) or litter. In a 2011 visitor survey (University of Idaho 2011), 75 percent of respondents thought campsite cleanliness was good or very good; 17 percent thought it average, and 8 percent thought it poor or very poor. The previous year, 73 percent rated cleanliness good or very good and 10 percent rated it poor or very poor.

## **Effects**

### ***Assumptions***

This analysis is based on the assumption that some people would appreciate day use and campsite amenities (e.g., another vault toilet, garbage receptacles, defined parking areas and campsite parking spots, picnic tables) while others would view these as degrading the natural scenic values of the area.

### ***Diversity of opportunities***

**Campsites with amenities:** Alternatives 1 and 2 would not provide any opportunity for camping in sites with amenities (e.g., picnic tables, fire rings, parking pads), while Alternatives 3 and 4 would provide up to 15 campsites with amenities.

**Ability to drive to campsites on river:** In Alternatives 1 and 2, people would continue to be able to drive to the river's edge to camp in the three popular spots around the Priest Hole field (west, north, and northeast of the field). Whether they continue to be able to drive or camp on the river's edge and on gravel bars would be contingent on decisions by DSL, which regulates uses and activities below the normal high water mark on navigable rivers. At the current time, DSL does not prohibit driving or camping in the area. Alternative 3 would close to motorized use the roads leading to the northern camp spot, and to all but drop-off traffic on the spur at the west side of the Priest Hole field. This alternative would leave open the roads leading to the river's edge on the northeast side of the Priest Hole field. In Alternative 3, the only drive-to camping on the river's edge is on

the northeast side of the Priest Hole field. In Alternative 4, motorized use would not be permitted on roads in the floodplain, except to access the boat launch area to the east of the Priest Hole field. People would still be able to camp on the river wherever they choose, but they would not be able to drive to those areas; they would need to walk in from the parking areas or boat in.

### ***Scenic values***

**Visible intrusions:** Alternative 1 would have the least amount of visible development, with just one existing vault toilet, a few signs and an irrigation pump. Alternative 2 would add a new vault toilet, garbage receptacles and sprinklers, though the sprinklers would be removed after about five years. Alternative 3 would have sprinklers and a new toilet like Alternative 2, but also up to 15 campsites with amenities (picnic tables, fire rings, parking pads). There would be no garbage receptacles in Alternative 3. Alternative 4 would have irrigation sprinklers, and campsites, similar to Alternatives 3, but no new toilet. It would have ½ mile of new road. Alternatives 3 and 4 would have the most visible intrusions.

**Campsite cleanliness:** Under all alternatives, the BLM expects to continue to find litter (e.g., beverage containers, food containers, fishing gear, toilet paper with human waste), especially in wooded areas along the river. Litter is expected to remain static in Alternatives 1, 3 and 4, but decrease in Alternatives 2 which includes placement of garbage receptacles at one or both of the parking areas and installation of a second vault toilet near the Priest Hole field. Visitor satisfaction with campsite cleanliness would be expected to continue at 75 percent in Alternatives 1, 3 and 4 (per 2011 user survey), but increase to 85 percent in Alternative 2 (rough estimate based on BLM field personnel experience with similar situations).

## **Water quality and quantity**

### **Affected environment**

The mainstem of the John Day River flows 284 miles from its source in the Strawberry Mountains to its mouth along the Columbia River. The John Day basin drains nearly 8,100 square miles of central and northeastern Oregon with elevation ranges from 265 feet at the mouth to over 9,000 feet in the Strawberry Mountains. There are approximately 5,350 square miles of drainage above the project site.

The flow of the John Day River can fluctuate greatly between seasons. A gage at Service Creek, 20 miles upstream from the project, has been recording discharge data since 1929. The gage generally records the lowest average discharge in August at 175 cubic feet per second (cfs) and a maximum average discharge in April at 5,190 cfs. The Oregon Water Resources Department recommends an instream flow requirement of 500 cfs from July to January, 1,000 cfs in February, and 2,000 cfs from March through June to meet the needs of fish and recreation.

A total of 95,300 acre feet of water are withdrawn annually from the John Day River for irrigation and storage. The majority of that withdrawal occurs during the spring and summer months for irrigation, with a maximum of 319 cfs available for withdrawal at any one time during May. The BLM irrigates about 70 acres in the Priest Hole areas, drawing 1.05 cfs at any one time, with a maximum of 350 acre feet annually. This accounts for 0.6 percent of the total average flow in August.

The section of the John Day River adjacent to the project area was identified under the John Day Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for not meeting state water quality parameters for temperature. The John Day TMDL states, "Flow restoration is critical to attainment of water quality standards" and that "where feasible, instream flow should be protected to target natural discharge levels during April through September." According to monitoring performed for the TMDL, simply returning flows to a natural level could reduce in-stream temperatures approximately 1° C.

This section of river is a steelhead migration corridor and thus has a 7-day maximum average temperature standard of 20.0° C. The 7-day average daily maximum temperature along the river near Priest Hole was approximately 29° C, according to 2004 TMDL monitoring and modeling. However, the TMDL also modeled the river to have a natural thermal potential at that site of approximately 24° C. Therefore, because the standard is lower than the natural thermal potential, water quality standards will be met once instream 7-day average daily maximum temperatures no longer exceeds 24° C.

During below average flow years the river occasionally develops blue-green algal blooms during the summer near the west end (or downstream) of Priest Hole field. According to the Oregon Department of Human Services, "Blue green algae are simple plants that occur naturally in water. A bloom is a rapid buildup of algae that creates a blue-green, white or brown color on the surface of the water. Warm, calm water and nutrients contribute to the rapid growth of algae. While only a few types of blue-green algae are known to produce toxins, if toxic algae is swallowed it can cause nausea, diarrhea, cramps, fainting, numbness, dizziness, tingling and paralysis." Flood irrigation is effective at transporting nutrients from the field to the river. That, combined with low summer flows and areas of standing water, can create perfect conditions for algal blooms.

## **Effects**

### ***Assumptions***

Vehicle use, camping and campfires on the gravel bars at the Priest Hole occasionally result in trash and human waste left behind. While this debris is unsightly (and that effect is considered in the recreation section), the effect on water quality and fish habitat is not measurable, and is therefore not described further in this EA.

### ***Water returned to the river***

Alternative 1 would continue to remove 1.05 cfs during times of irrigation, totaling up to 350 acre feet annually, during growing months and ending August 15. This accounts for 0.017 percent of the total flow of the river.

Under Alternative 2, the fields would be flood irrigated for the first five years, using up to 250 acre feet annually, and then irrigation would be discontinued. The water rights that were used for irrigation would instead be leased instream in order to bolster low, summertime flows. This would return 100 acre feet annually the river the first five years then 350 acre feet annually. Returning the water instream would help increase the flows of the John Day towards the level recommend by the Oregon Water Resources Department and adopted by the BLM in the John Day River Management Plan. While 1.05 cfs is a minimal amount of flow when compared to the total water withdrawn from the basin and the altered hydrology of the river resulting from degraded uplands, projects within the basin have a cumulative impact in helping to restore the river to a more natural condition.

In alternatives 3 and 4, the irrigation method would be switched from flood to sprinkler (pivot or solid set), and only 45 acres would be irrigated. Pivot irrigation systems have been found to reduce the amount of water used for irrigation by 15 to 30 percent over flood irrigation, based upon soil texture (Brown, 2008). Because the soils within the fields at Priest Hole tend to be loamy to sandy loam, it can be expected that the majority of the irrigation will be infiltrated by the soil and little runoff will occur, resulting in water savings on the higher end of the spectrum. Use the first five years or so (until plant establishment) would be about 245 acre feet annually, dropping to 158 acre feet annually after plant establishment. This would return almost 200 acre feet annually to the river compared to Alternative 1.

## **Wildlife**

### **Affected environment**

The project area consists primarily of riverine riparian and agricultural vegetation communities and a minor component of shrub-steppe / juniper woodland. The combined plant communities provide habitat for a variety of wildlife species. This section will focus on just some of these species of management concern and their associated habitats: mule deer (*odocoileus hemionus hemionus*) and rocky mountain elk (*cervus elaphus nelsoni*) winter habitat and neotropical migratory bird breeding habitat.

#### ***Mule deer and elk***

Although mule deer may be observed at the site year round, they are most abundant during the fall and winter months when they move from higher summer range onto their winter range. The project area is in critical mule deer winter range. The area is in elk summer range but is also used during fall and winter months as elk transition to more favorable winter range to the south.

Due to the low nutritive value and abundance of available forage in the winter, deer and elk have to rely on their body reserves to survive the winter. The better condition an animal is going into winter, the higher chance of survival and reproductive success. Irrigated fields promote availability of high protein forage especially in late summer and early fall when many native forage species have reduced nutrient value. Two irrigated agriculture fields in the project area, 70 acres total are planted in alfalfa. Alfalfa is very high in protein. There are also a number of irrigated fields on private land in the general vicinity. Because mule deer and elk will seek out the best available forage, irrigated fields on private lands receive high amounts of utilization which can be considered as crop damage. Providing high nutritious forage on public lands reduces the pressure on private lands.

#### ***Neotropical migratory birds***

There are about 1.5 miles of riverine riparian habitat in the project area, if one counts just the south side of the river from near the irrigation pump and downstream past the John Day field. The sites are in an early seral state and dominated by shrubs. Willow, sedges and alders represent the dominate vegetation in the community.

Neotropical migratory birds use these areas for raising young in the spring and summer, after which they migrate south for the fall and winter months. Sixty percent of migratory birds in the northwest use riparian areas for breeding or stop overs during migration (Cooke and Zack, 2009). Additionally, these habitats are of

value because loss of riparian habitat has been noted as the primary factor for declines in many landbirds (Cooke and Zack, 2009). Structural complexity of riparian areas is positively correlated with species richness and abundance (Altman and Holmes, 2000; Cooke and Zack 2009). Factors contributing to this complexity include width, height, and connectivity / fragmentation of the riparian corridor. Ideal habitat would have a large width and height and low fragmentation.

Although there are 1.5 miles of riverine riparian habitat in the project area, disturbance by human activity on about ½ mile of this habitat has caused plant mortality. As a result, the habitat is fragmented and increasingly narrow, and no longer optimum habitat. Degradation to the plant community has been primarily caused by motorized vehicles, tent pads, and beach and trail creation.

**Effects**

***Assumptions***

The riparian areas currently receiving heavy vehicle use will recover if not driven on. Dispersed walk in camping use would not substantially damage riparian vegetation.

***Mule deer and elk***

The availability of high nutrition forage for winter survival of deer and elk would be greatest in Alternative 1, where 70 acres of alfalfa would be available on the John Day and Priest Hole fields. Alternative 2 would provide the least amount of high nutrition forage, as irrigation would be phased out in the long term. In Alternatives 3 and 4 up to 45 acres would be irrigated and provide high nutrition forage.

***Neotropical birds***

In Alternative 1, about 0.5 mile of the 1.5 miles of riverine riparian area in the project area would continue to be compromised by people driving and camping on the river banks. Alternative 2 road closures would reduce the impacted area to 0.3 mile; Alternative 3 would close the northern river bank area to motorized vehicles, reducing the impacted area to 0.2 mile. Alternative 4 would provide the most protection and recovery for riverine riparian habitat, since it would eliminate all vehicle access to the river banks, protecting all 1.5 miles of riverbank.

**Table 2. Comparison of effects.**

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>
<b>Recreation opportunity</b>	Defined campsites with amenities	None	None	Up to 15	Up to 15
	Drive-in campsites on river's edge	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

<b>Scenery</b>	Visible intrusions	No new structures, just existing toilet + parking area + irrigation pump.	Similar to Alt. 1 except add 2 <sup>nd</sup> toilet and add garbage receptacles. And the irrigation pump (existing) + new sprinklers are removed after 5 yrs.	Similar to Alt. 2 except also add up to 15 campsites + road closure signs/barriers. Irrigation pump (existing) + new sprinklers stay long term. No garbage receptacles.	Similar to Alt. 3 except more road closure signs or barriers, and no new toilet/parking. Irrigation pump (existing) + sprinklers same as Alt 3. This is only alternative with boat ramp improvement. No garbage receptacles.
	Visitor satisfaction (good or better) with campsite cleanliness	75%	85%	75%	75%
<b>Water quantity &amp; quality</b>	Water returned to the river	None; continue to irrigate with 350 acre feet per year	Return 100 acre feet annually first five years then 350 acre feet annually	Return 105 acre feet annually first five years then 192 acre feet annually	Return 105 acre feet annually first five years then 192 acre feet annually
<b>Wildlife</b>	High nutrition forage for winter survival of deer & elk	70 acres	70 acres first five years then 0	45 acres	45 acres
	Riparian habitat for neotropical birds	1 mile	1.2 miles	1.3 miles	1.5 miles

## Cumulative effects

### Recreation

Designating the roads around Sutton Mountain (near the project area) as a BLM Backcountry is proposed in the JDB Proposed RMP/FEIS. This would increase use in the area, likely also increasing the amount of day use at the Priest Hole recreation site. An increase in the number of people at the site would decrease the opportunity for solitude, and would decrease the appearance of naturalness if additional picnic tables or other structural amenities are added to the area.

### Water quality and quantity

There is currently a basin wide movement to restore much of the flow within the John Day Basin. As described in the John Day Basin TMDL, the lack of summer-time flows in a major contributor to water quality problems

within the basin. By restoring flows throughout the basin, water temperatures will continue to drop which will help to restore water quality throughout the river.

### **Wildlife**

There are no past, ongoing or proposed actions that would be expected to produce measurable effects when combined with the effects of the current action.

## **Chapter 4                      Public and other involvement**

### **Tribes, individuals, organizations, and agencies consulted**

The BLM first requested input on this project in May 2011 when it mailed scoping letters to 257 individuals, groups, agencies, tribes, and local governments. Comments from this scoping period were considered in the design of alternatives in the EA. The BLM again requested input in July 2012 when it published this EA to the BLM’s public website, advertised the availability of the EA in the Central Oregonian newspaper, and sent notification letters to those on the original scoping list and others who expressed interest since scoping.

Specific tribes, agencies and organizations contacted:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Blue Mountain Biodiversity Project                | Oregon Hunters’ Assoc., Redmond Chapter |
| Burns Paiute Tribe                                | Oregon Marine Board                     |
| Center for Water Advocacy                         | Oregon Natural Desert Assoc.            |
| Confed. Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation | Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  |
| Confed. Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation    | Oregon Wild                             |
| Friends of Rudio Mountain                         | Oregon’s Wildlife and Land Use Alliance |
| Native Forest Council                             | Sierra Club, Oregon Chapter             |
| Native Plant Society of Oregon                    | The Bulletin newspaper                  |
| Northwest Environmental Defense Council           | The Central Oregonian newspaper         |
| Northwest Rafters’ Assoc.                         | US Army Corps of engineers              |
| Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife              | Wheeler County                          |
| Oregon Division of State Lands                    | Wildlife Management Institute           |
| Oregon Hunters’ Assoc., Ochoco Chapter            |   |

### **Preparers and reviewers**

#### ***BLM***

- JoAnne Armson – Special status plants and noxious weeds
- Dana Cork – Engineering
- Cassandra Hummel – Wildlife
- Monte Kuk – Wildlife
- Mike McKay – Hydrology

Heidi Mottl – Recreation, Wild & Scenic Rivers, wilderness characteristics  
Jeff Moss – Fisheries, vegetation management  
Craig Obermiller – Livestock grazing  
Teal Purrington – Environmental coordination  
Mike Tripp – Geographic information systems  
John Zancanella – Cultural resources and paleontology

***Other***

Jeff Behan – Contracted by BLM to provide recreation information and analysis

# Appendix 1 Issues not analyzed in detail

Several issues were considered but are not analyzed in detail in this EA:

1. How would the development of campsites, installation of recreation facilities, or conversion of agricultural fields affect cultural or paleontological resources? Several archaeological inventories have occurred in or adjacent to the project area. The earliest inventory (conducted by Polk, 1976) covered the large flat that is now an agricultural field. No archaeological resources were observed, probably due to the developed nature of the field. A second inventory (Schmidt 1992) found materials indicating a native American Indian site may be present near the project area. Until subsurface excavation is conducted to determine the nature, extent and significance of a buried site, project actions would not be conducted in the vicinity of the potential site, and vehicle barriers would be installed if off road use threatens the site. If cultural resources are found anywhere in the project area during implementation, project activities would be stopped until completion of assessment and coordination to avoid impacts. These restrictions mean the project actions would have no effect on cultural resources, therefore the issue is not considered further in this EA. Additional information on cultural resources is in the project record and available upon request. The nature of the setting is not conducive to the presence of paleontological resources; therefore this resource would not be affected by project actions, and is not considered further in this EA.
2. How would wilderness characteristics be affected by the proposed actions? The public lands within the proposed project area have been evaluated for wilderness characteristics. The evaluation found that these public land parcels do not possess wilderness characteristics because they lack sufficient size and do not meet any of the exceptions to the size criteria. See Wilderness Inventory File OR-054-013 Priest Hole Inventory Unit, on file in the Prineville District Office.
3. What effect would the proposed actions have on special status plants, animals and fish? The proposed actions would have no effect on special status plants, animals, primarily because there are few of these species present in the area, but also because of the inclusion of a number of project design features (see Chapter 2) that would make sure actions avoid affecting these species.
4. How would visual resources be affected by the proposed actions? The John Day River Wild & Scenic River Plan, page 17, says BLM will "...manage existing recreational developments located in river segments with VRM Class II designation as VRM Class III 'islands'. New recreational development under this plan would be required to meet VRM Class III standards." The actions would not affect Class III standards. Therefore, the issue is not considered further in this EA. However, effects on scenery as related to the recreational experience are addressed in this EA.

## Appendix 2 References

Brown, Paul. 2008. In: Proceedings, 2008 California Alfalfa & Forage Symposium and Western Seed Conference, San Diego, CA, 2-4 December, 2008. UC Cooperative Extension, Plant Sciences Department, University of California, Davis, CA 95616. (See <http://alfalfa.ucdavis.edu>).

Altman, Bob and Aaron Holmes. 2000. Conservation Strategy for Landbirds in the Columbia Plateau of Eastern Oregon and Washington. Prepared for Oregon-Washington Partners in Flight. Version 1.

Cooke, Hillary A. and Steve Zack. 2009. Use of Standardized Visual Assessments of Riparian and Stream Condition to Manage Riparian Bird Habitat in Eastern Oregon. *Environmental Management*. 44: 173 – 184.


University of Idaho Park Studies Unit. 2011. Priest Hole user survey. 12 pages.

US Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management, Prineville District. 1986. Two Rivers Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision.

US Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management, Prineville District. 2000. John Day River Proposed Management Plan, Two Rivers and John Day RMP Amendments and Final Environmental Impact Statement (BLM 2000). Volume 11, page 285.

US Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management, Prineville District. 2001. Record of Decision, John Day River Management Plan, Two Rivers, John Day, and Baker Resource Management Plan Amendments.

## Appendix 3 Maps



## Priest Hole Implementation Plan EA Vicinity Map



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual or aggregate use with other data. Original data were compiled from various sources and may be updated without notification.


MXD: P:\pri\group\_projects\Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\DATA\_MAPS\_PDFS\_Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\MXD\Vicinity\_Map\_Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA.mxd

Last Modified Date: 6/19/2012 10:22:29 AM


### Legend

- |   |              |                             |
|---|--------------|-----------------------------|
| ● | Cities       | <b>Administered Lands</b>   |
| ▭ | Project Area | ■ Bureau of Land Management |
| — | Highways     | ■ U.S. Forest Service       |
| — | Major Roads  | ■ National Park Service     |
| — | Roads        | ■ State                     |
|   |              | ■ Private                   |





**Priest Hole Implementation Plan EA  
ALTERNATIVE 1**



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual or aggregate use with other data. Original data were compiled from various sources and may be updated without notification.

MXD: P:\pr\group\_projects\Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\DATA\_MAPS\_PDFS\Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\MXD\Transportation\_Alternatives\_2012\ALT\_1.mxd


Last Modified Date: 6/19/2012 10:37:29 AM

**Legend**

- |   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
|  | Vault Toilet                  | <b>Administered Lands</b>   |
|  | River Access                  |  BLM     |
|  | Open Road                     |  Private |
|  | John Day & Priest Hole Fields |   |



**Priest Hole Implementation Plan EA  
ALTERNATIVE 2**




No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual or aggregate use with other data. Original data were compiled from various sources and may be updated without notification.

MXD: P:\pr\group\_projects\Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\DATA MAPS PDFS\Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\MXD\Transportation\_Alternatives\_2012\ALT\_2.mxd


Last Modified Date: 6/19/2012 10:27:39 AM

**Legend**

- Vault Toilet
- River Access
- Closed Road
- Open Road
- New Parking
- John Day & Priest Hole Fields
- Administered Lands**
- BLM
- Private



**Priest Hole Implementation Plan EA  
ALTERNATIVE 3**




No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual or aggregate use with other data. Original data were compiled from various sources and may be updated without notification.

MXD: P:\pr\group\_projects\Priest Hole Implementation Plan EA\DATA MAPS PDFS\Priest Hole Implementation Plan EA\MXD\Transportation Alternatives\_2012\ALT\_3.mxd


Last Modified Date: 6/19/2012 10:22:28 AM

**Legend**

- Vault Toilet
- River Access
- Closed Road
- Open Road
- New Parking
- John Day & Priest Hole Fields
- Administered Lands**
- BLM
- Private



**Priest Hole Implementation Plan EA  
ALTERNATIVE 4**



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual or aggregate use with other data. Original data were compiled from various sources and may be updated without notification.

MXD: P:\prigroup\_projects\Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\DATA\_MAPS\_PDFS\Priest\_Hole\_Implementation\_Plan\_EA\MXD\Transportation\_Alternatives\_2012\ALT\_4.mxd

Last Modified Date: 6/18/2012 10:32:29 AM

**Legend**



Vault Toilet



River Access

Closed Road



John Day & Priest Hole Fields

New, Open Road

**Administered Lands**

Open Road

BLM

Private