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Dear Public Land User:

Enclosed for your review and comment is the Two Rivers Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Two Rivers Planning Area, Prineville District, Oregon. The Bureau of Land Management has prepared this document in partial fulfillment of its responsibilities under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1989.

The Proposed RMP and Final EIS is published in an abbreviated format and is designed to be used in conjunction with the Draft RMP/EIS published in April 1984. Additional copies of the Draft RMP/EIS are available upon request from Bureau of Land Management, 185 East Fourth Street, Prineville, Oregon 97754.

This Proposed RMP and Final EIS contains a summary from the draft, introduction, the proposed plan, text revisions to the Draft RMP/EIS, public comments received on the draft, and the Bureau’s response to these comments. If you wish to comment for the District Manager’s consideration in the development of the decision, please submit your comments by November 15, 1985. Your comments should be sent to:

District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
R.O. Box 550
Prineville, Oregon 97754

The plan decisions will be based on the analysis contained in the EIS, any additional data available, public opinion, management feasibility, policy and legal constraints. The approval of the plan will be documented in a record of decision, which will be completed later and will be available to the public.

The proposed plan cannot be approved until after the Governor of Oregon has had an opportunity to review it. Approval of the plan will also be subject to the final action on any protests that may be filed. Any person who participated in the planning process and has an interest which is or may be adversely affected by the approval of this RMP may protest such approval. A protest may only be effective if it were submitted for the record during the planning process and should be filed with the Director (202), Bureau of Land Management, 1800 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240 within the official protest period ending November 15, 1985. Protests must contain the following information:

- The name, mailing address, telephone number, and interest of the person filing the protest.

- A statement of the issue or issues being protested.

- A statement of the part or parts of the plan being protested.

- A copy of all documents addressing the issue or issues that were submitted during the planning process of the protesting party or an indication of the date the issue or issues were discussed for the record.

- A concise statement explaining why you feel the decision is wrong.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Gerald E. Magnuson
District Manager
Proposed Two Rivers Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement

Final RMP/EIS Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Prineville District

1. Type of Action: Administrative (X) Legislative ( )

2. Abstract: This Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement when combined with the Draft RMP/EIS discusses resource management on 924,705 acres of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the Prineville District. Implementation of the Proposed Plan provides for harvest of timber on 10,715 acres with a sustained annual harvest level of 1.41 million board feet (MMbf); grazing management would continue on 292,736 acres (133 grazing allotments) of public land; riparian vegetation condition would be improved on 1,057 acres; wildlife and fish habitat would be maintained or improved; approximately 1,000 acres of public land would be offered for sale annually; and cultural, soil, water botanical, visual and recreational resources would be protected.

3. Five alternatives are analyzed:

A. Preferred (Proposed Resource Management Plan)
B. Emphasize Commodity Production and Enhancement of Economic Benefits
C. Continue Existing Management (No Action)
D. Emphasize Natural Values While Accommodating Commodity Production
E. Emphasize Natural Values

4. The comment period will end November 15, 1985.

5. For further information contact:

Brian Cunningham
RMP/EIS Team Leader
Bureau of Land Management
Prineville District Office
185 East Fourth Street
R.P. Box 550
Prineville, OR 97754
Telephone (503) 447-4115
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Summary

Five multiple use alternatives for the management of public lands in the Two Rivers Planning Area have been developed and analyzed in accordance with the Bureau’s planning regulations issued under authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. The alternatives respond to eight major issues: livestock grazing, riparian management, wildlife habitat, land tenure and access, minerals management, forestry, recreation and special management areas identified through the planning process. The purpose of the proposed alternatives is to present and evaluate options for managing, protecting and enhancing public resources.

Each alternative is a master plan that would provide a framework within which future, more specific decisions would be made, such as defining the intensity of management of various resources, developing activity plans (e.g., grazing allotment management plans and transportation plans) or issuing rights of way leases or permits.

The five alternatives considered are:

Alternative A (Preferred Alternative)

The Preferred Alternative combines the management, production, use and protection of resources on the public lands in the Two Rivers Planning Area. Management would be directed toward multiple use of natural resources from the public lands while protecting or enhancing natural values. This alternative is the Bureau’s favored management approach.

1. All riparian areas along the Deschutes and John Day rivers and their major tributaries would be managed to full potential, with a minimum of 60 percent of the vegetative potential to be achieved within 20 years.

High mid seral to low late seral ecological condition would be managed for on upland vegetation except where wildlife needs would dictate otherwise.

2. Forage requirements according to Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife management objectives for deer and elk on public lands would be met. Upland vegetation would be managed to achieve maximum wildlife habitat diversity. All streams with fisheries or fisheries potential would be managed to achieve a good to excellent aquatic habitat condition.

3. Forage available for livestock would remain at 17,778 AUMs in the short term and would be projected to increase to 19,920 in the long term. Projects would be implemented as necessary to maintain current livestock grazing levels and to meet riparian and upland vegetation management objectives.

4. The preferred method of land disposal throughout the planning area would be through exchange. A total of 33,600 acres would be considered for sale if no apparent exchange opportunity exists and if no significant resource values are identified. Approximately 1,000 acres of land would be sold annually.

5. There would be 10,715 acres of commercial forestland on which the sustained timber harvest level would be based. The sustainable harvest level would be approximately 1.41 MMbf annually or 14.1 MMbf for a ten year period.

6. Public lands would remain open for exploration and development of mineral resources and related rights of way. Restrictive stipulations for oil and gas exploration and development would remain in effect on 132,006 acres of public land, to protect areas with high visual quality.

7. Approximately 20,000 acres would be limited or closed to off road vehicle use.

8. Five areas with identified outstanding natural or cultural values would be designated as research natural areas, areas of critical environmental concern, or outstanding natural areas. Other unique wildlife or ecological values would be maintained or enhanced.


This alternative emphasizes providing economic benefits. Multiple use management would emphasize the production of goods and services on public lands within the Two Rivers Planning Area to meet local and possibly regional demands.

1. Riparian areas would be managed to achieve a goal of 60 percent of potential production.

2. Forage needs in accordance with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife management objectives for deer and elk would be met.

3. Forage available for livestock would increase to 19,189 AUMs in the short term and projected to increase to 24,217 AUMs in the long term.
4. A total of 143,000 acres would be considered for sale if no apparent exchange opportunity exists and no significant resource values are identified.

5. There would be 10,984 acres of commercial forestland on which the sustained timber harvest level would be based. The sustainable harvest level would be approximately 1.45 MMbf annually or 14.5 MMBf for a ten year period.

6. Public lands would remain open for the exploration and development of mineral resources and related rights of way. The area of no surface occupancy restriction would be reduced to 60,000 acres within the one half mile wide State scenic waterways corridor in the Deschutes and John Day canyons.

7. Approximately 10,000 acres would be limited or closed as off road vehicle use.

8. Two areas would be designated as a research natural area and an area of critical environmental concern. Unique values within other special management areas would be maintained where no significant conflicts with commodity production occur.

**Alternative C. Continue Existing Management (No Action)**

This alternative allows for the management and flow of outputs from the public lands and resources in the planning area at their present levels. The planning area is presently operating under a 1975 Management Framework Plan (MFP). Formal management direction is derived from the MFP with on the ground actions following an interdisciplinary analysis process.

1. Existing riparian enclosures would be maintained on 16 percent of the riparian areas. The remainder would continue to be grazed by livestock.

2. Existing wildlife habitat management plans would be continued. Forage needs for deer and elk according to Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife management objectives would be met.

3. Forage available for livestock would remain at 17,778 AUMs.

4. Up to 4,000 acres would be available for disposal if no significant resource values are identified.

5. There would be 10,833 acres of commercial forestland on which a sustained timber harvest level would be based. The sustainable harvest level would be approximately 1.43 MMbf annually or 14.3 MMBf for a ten year period.

6. Public lands would remain open for exploration and development of mineral resources and related rights of way where no significant conflicts exist with wildlife, riparian or recreation values. Existing stipulations for no surface occupancy on oil and gas exploration and development would be maintained on 132,000 acres to protect areas with high visual quality.

7. Approximately 20,000 acres would be limited or closed to off road vehicle use.

8. Efforts to protect identified special management areas would continue.

**Alternative D (Emphasize Natural Values While Accommodating Commodity Production)**

This alternative emphasizes protection, maintenance and enhancement of the natural environment within the planning area. The production of commodities would occur where significant conflicts with the protection of natural values could be avoided or mitigated.

1. Riparian areas totalling 1,070 acres would be excluded from grazing. The remaining 210 acres, where fencing to exclude livestock is not feasible, would be managed to maintain or achieve 80 percent of potential.

2. Management of wildlife habitat on public land would receive special consideration in all areas. Deer and elk forage requirements in accordance with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife management objectives would be met.

3. Forage available for livestock would decrease to 12,309 AUMs in the short term and projected to be 13,834 AUMs in the long term.

4. A total of 33,618 acres would be available for disposal if no apparent exchange opportunity exists and if no significant resource values are identified.

5. There would be 10,745 acres of commercial forestland on which a sustained timber harvest level would be based. The sustainable harvest level would be approximately 1.42 MMbf annually or 14.2 MMBf for a ten year period.

6. Public lands would remain open for exploration and development of mineral resources and related rights of way where no significant conflicts exist with wildlife, riparian or recreation values. Existing stipulations for no surface occupancy on oil and gas exploration and development would be expanded to include 150,000 acres.
### Table 1 Summary, Long Term Environmental Consequences: Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Existing Situation</th>
<th>Alternative A (Commodity Production)</th>
<th>Alternative B (Existing Management)</th>
<th>Alternative C (Natural Values w/Commodities)</th>
<th>Alternative D (Natural Values)</th>
<th>Alternative E (Natural Values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+M</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+M</td>
<td>+M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Type</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Condition</td>
<td>000's of acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climax</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Seral</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Seral</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Seral</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Diversity</td>
<td>000's of acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Seral</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Seral</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Seral</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened, Endangered or</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Species</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland Habitat</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+M</td>
<td>-L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+M</td>
<td>+M</td>
<td>+M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Habitat</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+H</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+H</td>
<td>+H</td>
<td>+H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+M</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+H</td>
<td>+H</td>
<td>+H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Grazing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Forage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Harvest Level</td>
<td>MMbf acres</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Minerals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Oil &amp; Gas Leasing</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Surface Occupancy</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oil and Gas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Loss of Gain in Value</td>
<td>dollars</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+129,000</td>
<td>+386,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-237,000</td>
<td>-1,066,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Use Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation/Closure</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Values</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/Enhancement of Visual Quality</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>-L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Values</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>-L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
<td>+L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = beneficial impact
* = adverse impact
NC = no change
L = low
M = moderate
H = high
Chapter 1

For Action

A Need

Purpose and Need
Introduction—The Planning Area

This Resource Management Plan/Environmental impact Statement (RMP/EIS) is designed to provide a comprehensive framework for managing public lands in the Two Rivers Planning Area and allocating resources in that area for the next 10 to 15 years. The document analyzes impacts associated with management of 324,705 acres of public land and 384,074 acres of subsurface mineral estate underlying private land in the Two Rivers Planning Area where the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is the administering agency. The two rivers, for purposes of identification in this document, are the John Day River and the Deschutes River.

The land being considered in the Two Rivers RMP/EIS is located in the Central Oregon corridor between the Cascade Mountain Range on the west, and Morrow and Grant counties to the east, in an area north from Crook and Deschutes counties to the Columbia River as shown on Map 1. The area includes public lands scattered across seven counties as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Public Land Acreage, Two Rivers Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Public Land Administered by BLM</th>
<th>Private Surface Federal Subsurface Mineral Estate</th>
<th>Total Acreage of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crock (Big Summit Prairie)</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,908,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>52,913</td>
<td>53,825</td>
<td>1,312,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood River</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>343,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>45,844</td>
<td>79,570</td>
<td>1,149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>54,576</td>
<td>24,357</td>
<td>534,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>71,429</td>
<td>103,901</td>
<td>1,531,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>95,157</td>
<td>121,124</td>
<td>1,092,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>324,705</td>
<td>384,074</td>
<td>7,869,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acreages of public land in the planning area were audited after the Proposed Land Use Alternative brochure was published. Acreage figures reflect changes that include listing lands withdrawn for power sites along the Deschutes and John Day rivers; land acquired and ultimately disposed of through exchanges; acreages within the Crooked River National Grasslands that were not withdrawn by the U.S. Forest Service; and land disposed of through public sale.

The planning area is bounded by four national forests-Mt. Hood, Deschutes, Ochoco and Umatilla-and the John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, which is administered by the National Park Service. Also located adjacent to the planning area is the reservation of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs.

Big Summit Prairie is a blend of public and private lands, an island that includes approximately 4,400 acres of BLM land surrounded by the Ochoco National Forest in Crook County. Transfer of the Prairie to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service has been considered for several years. The recently announced BLM/USFS interchange would accomplish this transfer. The Prairie is included, and will be analyzed as a part of the Two Rivers RMP/EIS since it was still BLM responsibility at the time this document was being prepared. Map 2 shows the boundary and public lands within the Two Rivers Planning Area.

The Bureau of Land Management administers the public lands in the planning area from the District Office in Prineville, Oregon. The intermingling of public land with other Federal lands administered by other agencies has led to cooperative management on some of the lands.

Purpose and Need

The resource management plan, by its very nature, suggests guidelines for the management of public lands in the Two Rivers Planning Area. It also provides a platform for management of all resources and uses within the principles of multiple use and sustained resource yield.

The preferred alternative identified in this document was selected on the basis of input from public meetings and comments made through correspondence, contacts with local governments, suggestions from user groups, and staff discussion as explained in Chapter 4. The plan was developed under the requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and involved interdisciplinary planning processes applicable to multiple use and sustained resource yield.

This RMP/EIS is written in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality regulations and in specific response to litigation in the Natural Resources Defense Council et al. versus Rogers C. B. Morton et al. 1973 (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, ref. Case No. 1983-73). That suit alleged that the Bureau of Land Management's programmatic grazing EIS did not comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. As a result of the settlement of this suit, BLM agreed to prepare site...
MAP 2
Planning Area and Land Status
specific grazing EISs. The Two Rivers RMP/EIS will meet this requirement for this planning area.

Planning Process and Criteria

The Bureau of Land Management planning process involves public involvement at various stages. Four public meetings have been held on the Two Rivers Planning Area—two in Condon and two in Grass Valley (one during the scoping process and one during the review period of the Draft RMP/EIS). The resulting responses have been incorporated in the preparation of this proposal.

The planning process is designed to enable the BLM to accommodate the uses the public wants to make of public lands while complying with laws established by the Congress and policies implemented by the executive branch of the Federal government.

Issues

Federal planning regulations generally equate land use planning with problem solving—resolving issues. That problem solving process included application of the principles of multiple use and sustained resource yield set forth in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and through other applicable laws.

A number of specific issues were identified in public comments at the meetings, in response to a brochure and to other documents on the planning area, and on the basis of input from a number of groups and governmental organizations.

Those identified issues which have been analyzed in detail in the Draft RMP/EIS are: riparian management; wildlife habitat management; grazing management; forestry; minerals management; land tenure and access; recreation management, excluding recreation river use and wilderness; and designation of special management areas.

1. Wildlife Habitat Management

Habitat available for big game and other animals is not adequate in some areas. Improvement in riparian and upland habitat will contribute to year round accessibility of food and shelter for wildlife.

2. Livestock Grazing Management

There is a conflict of use between livestock grazing and other important resource uses. Some management changes may be appropriate to improve range condition and provide equitable forage opportunities for livestock and wildlife, to reestablish, expand, improve or protect riparian areas, and to address nonconsumptive uses. Solutions are needed for stocking levels, season of use, grazing systems, range development projects, and land treatments. Improvement in ecological condition will be slow unless it is coupled with a reduction in sagebrush and juniper cover in some areas. Poor livestock distribution is evident in some allotments, which results in heavy use of favored areas and minimum use elsewhere. That condition will have to be corrected if proper ecological condition is to be maintained or achieved.

3. Riparian Management

Overall condition of riparian vegetation in the planning area is at less than potential.

Protection of riparian areas along the two rivers and their tributaries is essential to improve watershed condition as well as fish and wildlife habitat. By building fences, regulating livestock access to the riparian areas, or changing the timing of livestock grazing, the integrity of the riparian habitat will be protected and/or improved for fish spawning, waterfowl nesting, and use by big game.

4. Forestry

A commercial forestland base and a sustainable allowable harvest level needs to be established which will provide timber sales to assist in meeting local and regional needs. Other resource values need to be protected through appropriate land use allocations restricting or excluding timber harvesting activities.

5. Minerals Management

Conflicts related to mineral exploration and related rights of way exist. The need to allow maximum mineral availability while protecting other resource values must be achieved.

6. Land Tenure and Access

Adjustments in land ownership in parts of the planning area are appropriate to achieve more efficient management and utilization of public resources. Areas need to be identified that should remain under BLM management as well as those which should be exchanged, transferred or sold. Agricultural use and occupancy of public lands needs to be addressed and resolved.
8. Special Management Areas

This RMPE is separate from others. They are not considered in designation of wilderness and other special areas. The planning area is to recognize the value of the land and other resource values in the area. The economic, social, and other resource programs need to be coordinated. The demand for dispersed recreational use has increased. Some areas warrant special consideration for formal recreation and other resource programs.
Chapter 2
Proposed Resource Management Plan

Old windmill in Ferry Canyon
Introduction

Chapter 2 describes the proposed plan, which provides a mid ground or balance between the protection of fragile and unique resources and the production and development of renewable and nonrenewable resources. Management actions were selected on the basis of their ability to resolve the issues raised during the planning process, satisfy planning criteria and public input, and mitigate environmental consequences.

The proposed plan (proposed action) is patterned after the Preferred Alternative identified in the Draft Two Rivers Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS). No significant changes have occurred in the plan.

Approval of the RMP will mark the completion of one stage of the planning process. The RMP is not a final implementation decision on actions which require further specific plans, or decisions under specific provisions of law and regulations. More site specific plans or activity plans, such as habitat management plans (HMPs) will be done through the resource activity programs. Procedures and methods for accomplishing the objectives of the RMP will be developed through the activity plan. Further environmental analyses will be conducted and additional engineering and other studies or project plans done if needed.

Goal and Objectives of the Proposed Plan

Goal: Provide for Commodity Production While Protecting Natural Values

Objectives:

1. Maintain forage production and livestock use at 17,778 AUMs. Maintain current livestock grazing levels and meet riparian and upland vegetation management objectives.

2. Manage riparian areas along the Deschutes and John Day rivers and their major tributaries to full potential, with a minimum of 60 percent of the vegetative potential to be achieved within 20 years.

3. Provide forage to meet management objective numbers of the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for deer and elk. Manage upland vegetation to achieve maximum wildlife habitat diversity. Manage all streams with fisheries or fisheries potential to achieve a good to excellent aquatic habitat condition.

4. Place emphasis on retaining and expanding, by exchange of public land, holdings in: (1) areas of national significance, (2) areas where management is cost effective, and (3) where land is most appropriately managed in public ownership due to significant multiple resource values. Public lands having no reasonable opportunity for exchange would be offered for sale if they are: (1) difficult and uneconomical to manage and are not needed by another agency; (2) no longer needed for the specific purpose for which they were acquired or for any other Federal purpose; (3) provide greater benefits to the public in private ownership. The transfer of public lands to other public land management agencies would occur if more efficient management of the land would result.

Authorizes agricultural use of public lands if proposals are consistent with the management and protection of other values. Pursue attempts to acquire limited public access through exchange or negotiated easement, consistent with management objectives.

5. Intensively manage commercial forestlands suitable for timber production but recognize harvest restrictions or exclusions to protect riparian vegetation, wildlife, visual and other resource values.


7. Designate public lands as open to off road vehicles except in areas where that use would not be appropriate or where significant damage to soils, vegetation, wildlife or other natural values is resulting from that use.

Areas which have high or moderate quality collectible mineral resources, including plant and invertebrate fossils, would be available for rockhounding purposes and would be recognized in land use decisions. Public use areas would be reviewed on a case by case basis to insure that no significant conflict exists with the protection of other natural values.

8. Designate areas with identified outstanding natural or cultural values as areas of critical environmental concern. Maintain or improve other unique wildlife or ecological values.
Planned Management Actions Under the Proposed Plan

This section describes the planned actions and determines priorities for implementing those actions. The management actions would be used to resolve the planning issues identified.

The priorities were established based on public input, administration policy, and Department of the Interior and BLM directives. These priorities may be revised as policy and directives change.

The highest priority for each resource is maintaining its base. This includes funding normal operating costs, completing administrative duties, and processing public inquiries. Priorities are placed in one of three categories—high, medium or low based on a comparative ranking of the management actions.

The listed support actions are foreseeable at this time. The need for additional support actions such as engineering and other studies or specific project plans may be identified as a result of further planning. All such actions will be designed to achieve the objectives of the RMP. Additional environmental analyses will be conducted where appropriate to supplement the analysis in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Wildlife and Fish Habitat

Livestock use on approximately 16,000 acres of deer and elk winter range and 7,580 acres of curlew nesting habitat will be managed to be compatible with, or improve, wildlife habitat values. Upland vegetation will be managed through grazing management and range/wildlife habitat development to provide maximum wildlife habitat diversity (ecological condition of high mid seral to low late seral stage) and to provide sufficient forage to meet the big game management objectives of the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Fish habitat developments on approximately 87 miles of tributary streams include: log and rock placements; gabion developments: tree and shrub plantings; and riparian habitat improvement used to achieve a good to excellent aquatic habitat condition. The fish habitat developments will be concentrated on the tributary streams of the Deschutes and John Day rivers. They will not include direct instream improvements in the main river channel.

Implementation

Sufficient forage and cover will be provided for wildlife on important habitat to maintain existing population levels or meet management objective levels as established by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Specific forage and cover requirements will be incorporated into allotment management plans in areas of primary wildlife use.

Range developments will be designed to achieve both wildlife and range objectives. Existing fences may be modified, and new fences will be built to allow wildlife passage. Where natural springs exist, development will provide a more dependable water source for wildlife and livestock. Water troughs will accommodate use by wildlife and livestock. The spring area and the overflow will be fenced to prevent trampling.

Vegetative manipulation projects will be designed to minimize wildlife habitat impact and to improve habitat when possible. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife will have an opportunity to review all projects involving vegetation manipulation.

Habitat management plans will be written for selected areas of wildlife habitat, e.g., bighorn sheep, bald eagles, resident and anadromous fish. The plans will include detailed information on species emphasis, management objectives, constraints, planned actions, coordination with other programs and agencies, environmental analyses, implementation schedule and cost analyses and evaluation procedures. Priorities will be determined by need (shortage of habitat, conflict with other uses, potential or opportunity for improvement! etc.).

Crucial habitats will be monitored for forage production, habitat condition changes, and overall effectiveness of improvements. Monitoring studies will include browse, photo trend, eagle inventory, and remote sensing. Wildlife habitat monitoring will enable the Bureau to make decisions on forage allocation and seasonal use restrictions made after monitoring described in grazing management.

Streams will be monitored to ensure maintenance of water quality and riparian conditions and to evaluate the effectiveness of stream improvement practices. This monitoring includes riparian inventory and photo trend, water quality inventory, biotic condition index, fish census and remote sensing of riparian habitat. The priority in which these streams will be monitored for improvement is based upon characteristics of the fisheries, intensity of management! and available funding.

Continued seasonal restrictions would be applied to mitigate impacts of human activities on important seasonal wildlife habitat. Some important types of habitat include deer winter range, raptor nesting habitat, and curlew nesting habitat.
The priority for implementation will be as follows:

High—Monitor, maintain or improve habitat for threatened or endangered species, e.g., bald eagles.

Monitor, maintain or improve aquatic habitat on those streams having good potential for fish management. Priorities will be based upon criteria set forth in the Draft RMP/EIS. Monitor, maintain or improve riparian habitat as identified in the Draft RMP/EIS. Monitor, maintain or improve bighorn sheep range.

Medium—Monitor, maintain or improve winter range for deer and elk. Place priorities for specific treatment in those areas having the greatest problems, the best potential or both, Monitor, maintain or improve aquatic habitat streams having nonintensive management values.

Low—Monitor and maintain aquatic habitat on streams having little or no fish management value. Monitor, maintain or improve habitat for game and nongame species of high interest in the area.

Livestock Grazing

The availability of forage will remain at 17,778 AUMs in the short term. Sixty miles of fence will be constructed, approximately 7,800 acres of sagebrush will be controlled through prescribed burning, and 13 springs will be developed. As a result of range developments and improving...
ecological condition, available forage for livestock is projected to increase to 19,920 AUMs in the long term as monitoring indicates these increases are appropriate. Livestock use in the Horn Butte (2571) and Hi Meadows (2644) Allotments will be managed to enhance habitat for the long billed curlew.

Changes in periods of use or exclusion through construction of 131 miles of riparian protection/exclusion fence, or a combination of both will occur where necessary to meet objectives of this alternative. Intensive management, which will encourage a change in ecological condition toward climax, will be implemented on 259,000 acres. On the remaining 34,000 acres there will be less intensive management which will either improve or maintain existing conditions. Table 3 indicates the number of allotments and areas of public land and under what grazing systems they are now grazed by livestock and how they will be grazed in the future. No allotments or entire pastures within allotments are proposed for exclusion of livestock at this time.

**Implementation**
Implementing and monitoring the livestock grazing portion of this plan will require several separate actions that overlap in time, some of which are underway. These actions include development of allotment management plans (AMPs) and Cooperative Resource Management Plans (CRMPs); monitoring to determine stocking levels and forage use decisions; and monitoring to determine if selective management criteria are being fulfilled. The priority for implementation will be as follows:

High-Implement AMPs/CRMPs based upon selective management. Priorities for AMP/CRMP implementation are as follows:
1. Complete or revise partially completed AMPs/CRMPs;
2. Improve category allotments;
3. Maintain category allotments;
4. Custodial category allotments.

Medium-Monitor allotments to establish stocking rates where data indicates reduction in forage use or where data is inconclusive or nonexistent.

Low-Issue grazing decisions where no reductions are required or reductions are negotiated with lessee.

**Riparian**
All riparian areas along the Deschutes and John Day rivers and their major tributaries will be managed to reach full potential, with a minimum of 60 percent of the vegetative potential to be achieved within 20 years. Livestock grazing will be managed to reach the stated riparian objectives.

**Implementation**
Management actions within riparian areas will include measures to protect or restore natural

---

Table 3 Existing and Proposed Grazing Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Existing Situation RMP</th>
<th>Proposed No. Allot./ Acres</th>
<th>Proposed No. Allot./Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12550.178</td>
<td>55183.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22163.243</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2570.271</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12115.560</td>
<td>32147.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1417514</td>
<td>915250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1519460</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12135.586</td>
<td>6628043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57125.076</td>
<td>67128.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6427864</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1</td>
<td>3669356</td>
<td>1571299019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>931105835</td>
<td>76133717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104117959</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals/</td>
<td>233292736</td>
<td>2331292736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Systems which will encourage an upward change in ecological condition (early spring, deferred, deferred rotation, winter rest rotation).
2. Systems which will maintain or improve existing ecological conditions (deferred use one of three years).
3. Systems which will encourage a downward change in ecological condition (spring/summer).
functions, as defined by Executive Orders 11988 and 11990. Management techniques will be used to minimize degradation of stream banks and the loss of riparian vegetation. Roads and either linear facilities will avoid riparian areas where feasible. Riparian habitat needs will be considered in developing livestock grazing systems.

Forestry

Maintaining or improving site productivity will be a basic objective in all forestry practices. Harvesting minor forest products such as posts, poles, firewood, etc., will be guided by similar considerations.

Decisions on forestry practices (treatments) will be made with two primary objectives: (1) Successful reforestation; and (2) Increasing subsequent growth of commercial species. In this process, specific mitigation recommendations will be used to minimize unavoidable, adverse impacts and to resolve conflicts with other resource values.

There will be 10,715 acres of commercial forestland on which a sustained harvest level will be based. The sustainable harvest level will be approximately 1.41 MMbfp annually or 14.1 MMbfp for a ten year period. Management practices will be designed to recognize harvest restrictions for the protection of riparian vegetation, wildlife, cultural or other natural values.

Mineral Resources

Leasable Minerals

Leasable minerals will continue to be made available on most of the land where the surface is also publicly owned. Restrictions or changes in lease stipulations will apply only to areas not presently leased or areas presently leased where leases will be renewed. Leases will not be granted on 12.5 acres of public lands within the Governor Tom McCall Preserve; two parcels of public land totaling 76 acres within the Columbia Gorge; 250 acres of public lands within the proposed Island Research Natural Area; and 2,617 acres of public lands within The Cove Palisades State Park.

Approximately 188,000 acres of public land will be open to exploration—subject to standard lease requirements and stipulations. A restrictive no surface occupancy stipulation for fluid minerals...
exploration and development will be maintained on 132,000 acres of public lands in the planning area--lands identified as nationally significant or visually sensitive!

Exceptions to the stipulation of no surface occupancy will be evaluated using the following criteria:

(1) Evidence of exploration or similar activities would not be visible from the surface of either the John Day River or the Deschutes River. Activities within other areas of the river corridors may be visible, but should not attract attention, or leave long term visual impacts,

(2) All activities involving exploration would use existing roads to the fullest extent possible,

(3) Any proposed exploratory drilling pad or road construction for access to a drilling site would be located to avoid canyon slopes and areas of high visibility. In these areas roads and drilling sites would be fully rehabilitated when operations have been completed.

When leases are issued or renewed with the NSO, the criteria for exception will be included in the stipulation.

Implementation

Table 5 Mineral Leasing Direction Under the Proposed Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Land Open</th>
<th>190,000</th>
<th>26.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to Development with Standard Stipulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Development with Restrictive Stipulations</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed to Leasing</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved Federal Mineral Estate Open to Leasing</td>
<td>383,000</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Standard Stipulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>708,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The restrictive no surface occupancy stipulations reads as follows:
"Because of the high scenic and recreational values, no surface occupancy is allowed on the part of the lease falling within the John Day River canyon or the Deschutes River canyon, unless written permission is granted by the BLM deputy state director for minerals with the consent of the Prineville BLM District Manager."

(Restrictions or changes in lease stipulations would apply only to areas not presently leased or areas presently leased where leases are renewed.)

Locatable Minerals

Areas not specifically withdrawn from mineral entry will continue to be open under the mining laws to help meet the demand for minerals. Mineral exploration and development on public land will be regulated under 43 CFR 3809 to prevent unnecessary and undue land degradation. No new mineral withdrawals are proposed in this plan. The Bureau will recommend that the existing protective withdrawal at the Macks Canyon Archaeological Site be retained.

Salable Minerals

Salable minerals, including common varieties of sand, gravel, and stone will continue to be made available for local governments. The salable mineral program involves several quarries where State and County road departments obtain rock for road surfacing material. New quarry sites may be developed as needed if they are consistent with the protection of other resource values.

All public lands are open to recreational mineral collection unless specific minerals are subject to prior rights, such as mining claims.

Reserved Federal Mineral Estate

The reserved Federal mineral estate will continue to be open for mineral development. Conveyance of mineral interest owned by the United States, where the surface is, or will be, in non Federal ownership, may be enacted after a determination made under Section 209(b) of FLPMA finds:

(1) That there are no known mineral values in the land, or

(2) That the reservation of mineral rights in the land, or will be, in non Federal ownership, would interfere with or preclude non mineral development of the land and that such development is a more beneficial use of the land than mineral development.

All land tenure adjustments will consider the effect on the mineral estate. If the lands are not known to have mineral development potential, the mineral interest will normally be transferred simultaneously with the surface.

Land Tenure and Access Exchange, Transfer or Sale

The preferred method of disposal will be through exchange to achieve goals of public value enhancement in all three zones. The transfer of public lands to other public land management agencies will occur if more efficient management of the land will result. Public lands listed in Appendix J of the Draft RMP/EIS, as revised, will be
considered for sale (totaling 33,310 acres) if no apparent exchange opportunity exists and if no significant resource values are identified. This could average as much as 1,000 acres per year. Public lands in Zone 1 on Map 3 of the Draft RMP/EIS, as revised, will be retained, or may be exchanged for lands with even higher public value. Lands in Zone 2 will require site specific analysis to determine sale potential.

Agricultural Use of Public Lands

Public lands with agricultural potential will be considered for sale if they meet the sale criteria. Existing and potential agricultural use of public lands in the planning area will be authorized by permit or lease if the following criteria are met:

1. The use does not conflict with riparian area management, important wildlife habitat, recreational use of public lands, or other significant resource values.

2. The use is compatible with historical use on adjacent private lands.

3. The use would maintain or enhance other resource values, such as providing feeding or nesting areas for wildlife.

Agricultural use will be permitted on an estimated 450 acres and another 300 acres now under cultivation will be reclaimed. Private appropriation of water from the John Day River as it relates to agricultural use on adjacent public lands will be coordinated through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Oregon Water Resources Board, and the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Division of the Department of Transportation.

When significant conflicts occur, resource values on public lands will be protected and agricultural use will not be authorized.

Public Access

Additional public access may be acquired to serve tracts in Zones 1 and 2 if access is consistent with management objectives. Where public access is desired, the minimum access needed to achieve management objectives will be acquired. The preferred method will be through negotiated purchase of an easement or exchange.

Implementation

The proposed plan designates the following land transfer actions in priority order:

1. BLM/Other Federal Jurisdictional Transfers;
2. Transfers to State and Local Agencies (R&PP and other actions);
3. State Exchanges;
4. Private Exchanges;
5. Sales;

This proposed plan considers 33,310 acres as potentially suitable for sale depending on resource considerations. Therefore, 291,395 acres of public land do not lend themselves for sale designation.

Recreation

Off Road Vehicles

The use of off road vehicles on public lands will be regulated in accordance with the authority and requirements of Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 and regulations contained in 43 CFR 6340.

Open Designation

Public lands which total approximately 263,000 acres will be open to off road vehicle use since no significant impacts are occurring and off road vehicle use is essential for conducting other authorized resource uses.

An estimated 61,685 acres of public land within special management areas where off road vehicle use would not be appropriate and in other areas where significant damage to soils, vegetation, wildlife, or visual qualities is resulting from off road vehicle use will be limited or closed as follows:

Wheat field on the Columbia Plateau
Limited Designation
Vehicle travel on public lands in the following areas will be restricted to existing roads and trails, year long. In addition, a seasonal closure will be implemented when appropriate to prevent excessive damage to soil and vegetation. During this period vehicle travel will be confined to designated roads only.

1. Deschutes River as shown on Map 11 in the Draft RMP/EIS—2,500 acres.
2. Horn Butte Wildlife Area as shown on Map 13 in the Draft RMP/EIS—6,000 acres.
4. Spanish Gulch Mining District as shown on Map 13 in the Draft RMP/EIS—335 acres.
5. Existing ORV use areas in and adjacent to the John Day River Canyon as shown on Map 11 in the Draft RMP/EIS—10,000 acres.
6. John Day River Canyon from Butte Creek to Cottonwood Bridge—35,000 acres.

Vehicle travel in the following areas will be restricted to designated roads and trails on public land, year long.

1. Primitive and developed recreation sites adjacent to the Deschutes River (including but not limited to Steelhead Falls, Trout Creek, South Junction, and Beaver Tail) —582 acres.
2. Spring Basin near the John Day River as shown on Map 11 in the Draft RMP/EIS—6,000 acres.
3. Oregon Trail Historic Sites at McDonald and Fourmile Canyon as shown on Map 13 in the Draft RMP/EIS—424 acres.

Closed Designation
Vehicle travel on public lands in the following areas will not be allowed so as to protect unique natural values and riparian habitat as well as preventing excessive soil and vegetation disturbance.

1. The Governor Tom McCall Preserve at Rowena as shown on Map 13 in the Draft RMP/EIS—12.5 acres.
2. The botanical/scenic areas within the Columbia Gorge as shown on Map 13 in the Draft RMP/EIS—76 acres.
3. The Island in The Cove Palisades State Park as shown on Map 13 in the Draft RMP/EIS—250 acres.
4. Mecca Flat adjacent to the Deschutes River near Warm Springs—320 acres.
5. Public lands in the vicinity of the BLM field headquarters at Maupin—160 acres.

ORV use in wilderness study areas is guided by the Bureau’s “Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review.” Areas designated as wilderness through legislation would have ORV use restricted by the specific legislation and/or Bureau’s “Wilderness Management Policy.”

Rockhounding
Collectible mineral resources with moderate or high value, including plant and invertebrate fossils, will be available for rockhounding and recognized in land use decisions.
Implementation
All public lands in the planning area will be designated under the BLM off road vehicle regulations as part of the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan Record of Decision and publication of the designation order in the Federal Register.

Special Management Areas
The thirteen special management areas identified on Table 16 of the Draft RMP/EIS will be managed as follows:

The Island in The Cove Palisades State Park
Designate and manage 250 acres of public land as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern; Research Natural Area. This includes 80 acres of USFS land and will necessitate a cooperative management agreement.

The designation and management of this area will be designed to protect and preserve what is considered to be the best remaining example of the western juniper/big sagebrush/bluesbunch wheatgrass ecotype plant association in the region. It is also a raptor, deer, and waterfowl use area and contains outstanding scenic vistas of Lake Billy Chinook and the Cascades.

Deschutes and John Day River Canyons (Including the Red Wall)
Continue managing areas of high visual and natural quality in the canyon areas (approximately 139,000 acres) while allowing other compatible uses in the same area. Continue cooperative role with the State Parks and Recreation Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation in managing the public lands consistent with the intent of the Oregon Scenic Waterways Act.

John Day River State Wildlife Refuge, Horn Butte Curlew Area and White River Wildlife Areas
Incompatible uses will be excluded from these areas. They will be managed to meet forage and habitat needs for big game and non game species as recommended by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Horn Butte Curlew Area which totals 6,000 acres will be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern. The designation and management of this area will be designed to protect and preserve the important nesting habitat for the long billed curlew which exists as a result of a bluesbunch wheatgrass, Sandburg bluegrass, needlegrass, snakewood and gray rabbitbrush habitat type.

The Dalles Watershed
Continue management agreement with the City of The Dalles. Surface disturbing activities will be excluded from this 410 acre area if they would have an adverse effect on the watershed.

The Governor Tom McCall Preserve at Rowena and the botanical/scenic areas within the Columbia Gorge.
Designate 12.5 acres within The Governor Tom McCall Preserve as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern; Outstanding Natural Area. The important botanical and scenic qualities of 76 additional acres (in two parcels) outside this preserve, but within the Columbia Gorge, will also be preserved with a designation as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern; Outstanding Natural Area. The designation and management of these areas will be designed to protect and preserve the Idaho fescue/hawkweed and Columbia Gorge forest complex ectotypes or plant associations which exist in the areas. Four rare plants are also within this preserve. High visual qualities are also present and can be seen from both Oregon and Washington highways within the gorge.
Historic Spanish Gulch Mining District

The 335 acre Spanish Gulch Mining District will be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern to protect and maintain significant historical values.

This mining district is an important historic gold mining area dating back to the mid 1800s. Remnants of early mining activities include an old stamp mill, mineshafts and several old cabins.

The Oregon Trail Historic Sites at Fourmile Canyon and McDonald and the Macks Canyon Archaeological Site.

The unusual qualities of these sites will be maintained and protected. Intensive management plans, as well as public information and interpretive plans will be developed for these areas.

Implementation

Designation of the five special management areas as areas of critical environmental concern with three areas being managed as either a research natural area, or an outstanding natural area will be completed upon filing of the record of decision and publication of the designation order in the Federal Register. Additional survey work will be initiated on Sutton Mountain and on the Sherars Bridge Road to determine if the areas meet the criteria for one of the above designations. Any areas which are nominated and found to meet the criteria for classification as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern in the future will receive interim protective management until formal designation occurs.

The Island in The Cove Palisades State Park
Monitoring the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan

The implementation of the Two Rivers RMP will be monitored during the life of the plan to ensure that management actions are meeting their intended purposes. Specific management actions arising from proposed activity plan decisions will be compared with the RMP objectives to ensure consistency with the intent of the plan. Formal plan evaluations will take place at intervals not to exceed 5 years. These evaluations will assess the progress of plan implementation and determine if:

- management actions are resulting in satisfactory progress toward achieving objectives,
- actions are consistent with current policy,
- original assumptions were correctly applied and impacts correctly predicted,
- mitigation measures are satisfactory,
- it is still consistent with the plans and policies of State or local government, other Federal agencies, and Indian tribes,
- new data are available that would require alteration of the plan

As part of plan evaluations the government entities mentioned above will be requested to review the plan and advise the District Manager of its continued consistency with their officially approved resource management related plans, programs and policies. Advisory groups will also be consulted during evaluations in order to secure their input.

Upon completion of a periodic evaluation or in the event that modifying the plan becomes necessary, the Prineville District Manager will determine what, if any, changes are necessary to ensure that the management actions of the plan are consistent with its objectives. If the District Manager finds that a plan amendment is necessary, an environmental analysis of the proposed change will be conducted and a recommendation on the amendment will be made to the State Director. If the amendment is approved, it may be implemented 30 days after public notice.

Potential minor changes, refinements or clarifications in the plan may take the form of maintenance actions. Maintenance actions respond to minor data changes and incorporation of activity plans. Such maintenance is limited to further refining or documenting a previously approved decision incorporated in the plan. Plan maintenance will not result in expansion in the scope of resource uses or restrictions or change the terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved RMP. Maintenance actions are not considered a plan amendment and do not require the formal public involvement and interagency coordination process undertaken for plan amendments. A plan amendment may be initiated because of the need to consider monitoring findings, new data, new or revised policy, a change in circumstances, or a proposed action that may result in a change in the scope of resource uses or a change in the terms, conditions and decisions of the approved plan.

Ongoing Management Programs

The Two Rivers RMP focuses on eight significant resource management issues. Other ongoing BLM management programs and actions discussed in the proposed plan will continue. This section briefly describes these programs and management actions to eliminate confusion regarding their status relevant to the RMP.

Soil, Water and Air Management

The inventory and evaluation of soil, water and air resources on public lands will continue. Soils will be managed to maintain productivity and to minimize erosion. Corrective actions will take place, where practicable, to resolve erosive conditions. Water sources necessary to meet BLM program objectives will be developed and filed on according to applicable State and Federal laws and regulations. Water quality of perennial streams will continue to be monitored, and climatological data will continue to be gathered.

Threatened, Endangered or Sensitive Species Habitat

No land tenure adjustments, programs or other activities will be permitted in the habitat of threatened or endangered species that would jeopardize the continued existence of such species. Management activities in the habitat of threatened or endangered and sensitive species will be designed specifically to benefit those species through habitat improvement.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be consulted before implementing projects that may affect habitat for threatened or endangered species. If an adverse situation for threatened or endangered species is determined through the BLM biological assessment process, then formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be initiated under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.
Threatened or Endangered Plant Species

Prior to any land tenure adjustments or vegetative manipulation is allowed, the BLM requires a survey of the project site for plants listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered species, or its critical habitat. Every effort will be made to modify, relocate, or abandon the project to obtain a "no effect" determination. If the BLM determines that a project cannot be altered or abandoned, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be initiated (50 CFR 402; Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended).

Fire Management

The main emphasis of a fire management program in the Two Rivers Planning Area will continue to be prevention and suppression of wildfire to protect public values such as timber, vegetation, visual resources and adjacent private property. Prescribed fire will be used to reach multiple use objectives. When prescribed fire is considered under various programs it will be coordinated with the Oregon Department of Forestry and adjacent landowners and carried out in accordance with approved fire management plans and appropriate smoke management goals and objectives.

Noxious Weed Control

Infestations of noxious weeds are known to occur on some public lands in the planning area. The most common noxious weeds are diffuse, spotted and Russian knapweed, yellow star thistle, dalmation toadflax, and poison hemlock. Control methods will be proposed and subjected to specific environmental analyses. Control methods will not be considered unless the weeds are confined to public lands or control efforts are coordinated with owners of adjoining infested, non public lands. Proper grazing management will be emphasized after control to minimize possible reinestation.

Withdrawal Review

Review of withdrawals will be completed by 1991. These withdrawals may be continued, modified, or revoked. Revocation of withdrawals will be recommended by BLM where they are no longer needed or where they are in conflict with the RMP if the withdrawal review process determines they are no longer needed. Their revocation and opening to applicable public laws would be consistent with the plan. Upon revocation or modification, part or all of the withdrawn land may revert to BLM management. No additional BLM withdrawals are proposed.

Utility and Transportation Corridors

All utility/transportation corridors identified by the Western Regional Corridor Study of May 1980, prepared by the Ad Hoc Western Utility Group are currently occupied and will be designated without further review. Corridor widths vary, but are a minimum of 2,000 feet. No additional crossing sites on the BLM managed portions of the Deschutes and John Day rivers will be permitted. No facilities will be allowed parallel to the railroad right of way in the Deschutes Canyon. Applications will be encouraged to locate new facilities (including communication sites) adjacent to existing facilities to the extent possible.

All rights of way applications will be reviewed using the criteria of following existing corridors wherever practical and avoiding proliferation of separate rights of way. Recommendations made to applicants and actions approved will be consistent with the objectives of the RMP. All designated areas of critical environmental concern and wilderness study areas will be considered right of way exclusion areas. Public lands will continue to be available for local rights of way, including multiple use and single use utility/transportation corridors following existing routes, communication sites, and roads. Issuance of leases and/or patents under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act and other permits or leases for development of public lands will also continue. Applications will be reviewed on an individual basis for conformance with the Two Rivers RMP to minimize conflicts with other resources or users.

Cadastral Survey and Engineering Programs

Cadastral surveys and engineering activities will continue to be conducted in support of resource management programs. The road maintenance program will continue. Existing approved contracts will not be affected by the RMP.

Land Sales

Sales of public land will continue to be conducted under the authority of Section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) which requires that one of the following conditions exist before land is put up for sale: (1) Such tract, because of its location or other characteristics, is difficult and uneconomical to manage as part of the public lands, and is not suitable for management by another Federal department or agency; or (2) Such tract was acquired for a specific purpose and the tract is no longer required for that or any other Federal purpose; or (3) Disposal of such tract will
serve important public objectives, including but not limited to, expansion of communities and economic development, which cannot be achieved prudently or feasibly on land other than public land and which outweigh other public objectives and values, including, but not limited to, recreation and scenic values, which would be served by maintaining such tract in Federal ownership.

All sales of public land will be preceded by field inventories, environmental assessments and public notification procedures. Activity plans for land sales are not required under BLM policy.

**Land Exchanges**

Exchanges of public land will continue under Section 206 of FLPMA which requires:

- A determination that the public interest will be well served by making an exchange;
- Lands to be exchanged are located in the same state; and
- Exchanges must be for equal value but differences can be equalized by payment of money by either party not to exceed 25 percent of the total value of the lands transferred out of Federal ownership.

Exchanges will be made only when they will enhance public resource values and only when they improve land patterns and management capabilities of both private and public lands within the planning area by consolidated ownership and reducing the potential for conflicting land use.

**Visual Resources**

Before the BLM initiates or permits any major surface disturbing activities on public land, an analysis will be completed to determine adverse effects on visual qualities. Activities that will result in significant, long term adverse effects on the visual resources of the John Day or Deschutes River canyons in areas normally seen from these rivers will not be permitted.

Activities within other areas of high visual quality that may be seen might be permitted if they do not attract attention or leave long term adverse visual changes on the land. Activities in other areas may change the landscape but will be designed to minimize any adverse effect on visual quality.

**Cultural Resource Management**

Cultural resource clearances will be completed on all projects that include surface disturbance which require BLM approval or are initiated by the BLM.
Text Revisions
Chapter 3
Introduction

Significant revisions and corrections to the Draft Two Rivers Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) are presented in this chapter. The page numbers that appear in bold print throughout this chapter indicate the page of the Draft RMP/EIS on which the addition or correction would appear if the entire draft were being reprinted.

Page V  Under Alternative B delete “Multiple Use” from beginning of second sentence.

Page 7  Under state and Local Governments. After second sentence insert: Other agreements between BLM and ODFW which affect the management of the public lands include:

- Lower Deschutes Coordinated Resource Management Plan (Macks Canyon to Deschutes mouth).
- The Deschutes River Trout Management Plan (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife).

All current agreements remain unchanged and will not be affected by this RMP/EIS.

Page 8  Table 3 under Wildlife Goal 1—Discussion—Reword first sentence to read: “All alternatives except Alternative B are consistent with the objective:

Under Wildlife Goal 3—Reword the discussion to read: “Alternatives A, D, and E are consistent with the objective by improving habitat diversity and increasing wildlife species diversity, which would enhance the quality of public enjoyment of wildlife. Alternative B would not be consistent with this objective. Alternative C would maintain the existing situation.

Page 16  Under Locatable Minerals, After first sentence add: Approximately 240 acres of public land at the Macks Canyon recreation/archaeological site next to the Deschutes River are currently withdrawn from mineral entry.

Page 28  Under Soil after second paragraph insert the following:

Soil erosion potential for the public lands within the planning area area is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Erosion Potential</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>48,700</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>162,830</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>81,175</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324,705</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 32  Under Wildlife-Upland Habitat Diversity, after 1st sentence add: Habitats that contain a wide diversity of vegetative species and structure provide for a wider variety of wildlife species. These diverse habitats and resulting wildlife communities are much more stable than those which are monotonic in nature.

Page 33  After 1st paragraph add: This grouping process enables the land manager to evaluate the response of wildlife to habitat much more readily than if each species were considered alone. Thus it is possible to predict the effect of various manipulations on wildlife.

Under Big Game Habitat-Mule Deer and Black-tailed Deer in the second sentence add big sagebrush to the list of cover species.

Page 34  Table 16 should be revised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species and Habitat Type</th>
<th>Public Land Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deer Winter Range</td>
<td>252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Winter Range</td>
<td>4,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Year Long Range</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Year Long Range</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bighorn Sheep Range</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Billed Curlew Nesting Habitat</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Turkey Year Long Habitat</td>
<td>1,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl Nesting and Rearing Habitat</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptor Nesting Habitat</td>
<td>Rivers &amp; Ledges of Major Canyons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 35  See Revised Map 5.

Pages 33, 34 and 35  All references to Blacktail deer should be changed to Black-tailed deer.

Page 54  Public land acreage for Horn Butte Wildlife Area should be changed from 4,360 acres to 6,000 acres.

Page 116  Delete parcels located in T. 6 S., R. 13 E., Sections 14, 15, and 22 totaling 300.32 from the list of potential land disposal tracts in Appendix.
The lands identified by Hood River County are public lands listed as potentially suitable for disposal. A modification of Map 3 to include 300 acres of public land into zone 1 in the above mentioned township, range and section has been made, but not reprinted in this document.

Page 117 For allotment 2536 (Spring Basin) under Alternative D, short term—change 175 AUMs to 45 AUMs.

Pages 130-132 The Fish Species Present Column should be corrected as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Canyon Creek</td>
<td>Add Rb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Canyon Creek</td>
<td>Delete St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckhollow Creek</td>
<td>Add Ch (Chinook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnegam Creek</td>
<td>Add St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Creek</td>
<td>Add St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Creek</td>
<td>Add St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to comments other than direct written comments contained in the final RMP/EIS.

Comment
Hood River County expressed interest in acquiring the 262 acres of forested public land within Hood River County.

Response
The lands identified by Hood River County are public lands listed as potentially suitable for disposal. Prior to any final disposal action, the County will be notified to determine their interest in acquiring these lands under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act or through sale or exchange.
Chapter 4
Consultation and Distribution
Introduction

The Two Rivers RMP/EIS was prepared by an interdisciplinary team of specialists from the Prineville BLM District Office, Writing of the RMP/EIS began in October 1984; however, a process that began in March 1984 preceded the writing phase. The RMP/EIS process included resource inventory, public participation, interagency coordination, and preparation of a management situation analysis (on file at the Prineville District Office). Consultation and coordination with agencies, organizations, and individuals occurred throughout the planning process.

Public Involvement

A notice was published in the Federal Register and local news media in April 1984 to announce the formal start of the RMP/EIS planning process. At that time a planning brochure was sent to the public to request further definition of issues within the planning area. An opportunity was provided to submit comments on proposed criteria to be used in formulating alternatives.

In May 1984 a notice of document availability was published in the Federal Register and in the local news media for the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan Proposed Land Use Alternatives brochure. An outline of proposed alternatives, major issues and revised planning criteria were included in this document. Three alternatives portrayed various resource programs showing a range from emphasis on production of commodities to an emphasis on enhancement of natural values with a middle ground alternative attempting to provide a balance between the two. The fourth (no action) alternative reflected existing management. The proposed alternatives brochure included a map on allotment categorization for grazing management and another map which divided the public lands into three different zones for the purpose of identifying public land values. Neither map generated any comment or public objections during the EIS scoping process.

On April 12, 1985, a notice of document availability was published in the Federal Register and in local news media for the Draft Two Rivers Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. Public meetings were held in Condon on May 21, 1985 and in Grass Valley on May 22, 1985 for the purpose of receiving oral and written comments. The Draft RMP/EIS was also discussed with the District Advisory Council and Grazing Board on June 14 and 20, 1985 respectively. The District Advisory Council and Grazing Board supported riparian management as proposed and the need for maintaining a balance with livestock grazing was voiced. Land sales, mineral leasing and agricultural permits were supported as proposed. Concern was expressed about ORV use and rockhounding as it could affect private land.

Agencies and Organizations Contacted or Consulted

The RMP/EIS team contacted or received input from the following organizations during the development of the RMP/EIS:

Federal Agencies

- U.S.D.E. Bonneville Power Administration
- U.S.D.I. Bureau of Mines
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S.D.A. Wreath Service
- U.S.D.I. National Park Service
- U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service

State and Local Governments

- Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Department of Forestry
- Department of Land Conservation and Development
- Department of Lands
- Historic Preservation Officer
- Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
- Oregon State Parks and Recreation Division of the Department of Transportation
- Department of Water Resources
- Crook County Commissioners
- Gilliam County Commissioners
- Hood River County Commissioners
- Jefferson County Commissioners
- Sherman County Commissioners
- Wasco County Commissioners
- Wheeler County Commissioners

Organizations

- Atlantic Richfield Company
- Brooks Resources Corporation
- Central Oregon Audubon Chapter
- Central Oregon Flyfishers
- Environmental Research Committee
- Meridian Land and Mineral Company
- Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.
- Oregon Council of Rock and Mineral Clubs
- Oregon Hunters Association
- Oregon Natural Heritage Data Base
- Oregon Natural Resources Council
- Southern California Edison Company
- University of Oregon/Land Air Water/An Independent Law Student Group
- Western Utility Group
List of Agencies, Persons and Organizations to Whom Copies of the RMP/EIS Have Been Sent.

Federal Agencies
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S.D.A, Forest Service
U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service
U.S.D.D. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S.D.E Bonneville Power Administration
U.S.D.I. Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. D.I. Geological survey
U.S.D.I. National Park Service
U.S.D.I. Bureau of Mines
U.S.D.I. Bureau of Reclamation
U.S.D.C. National Marine Fisheries Service

State and Local Government
Crook County Court
Crook County Planning Commission
Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council
East Central Oregon Association of Counties
Gilliam County Court
Gilliam County Planning Department
Hood River County Planning Department
Jefferson County Commissioners
Jefferson County Planning Department
Oregon State University Extension Service
Department of Environmental Quality
Department of Fish and Wildlife
Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
Division of State Lands
Department of Land Conservation and Development
Department of Forestry
Parks and Recreation Division of the Department of Transportation
Department of Agriculture
Historic Preservation Officer
Clearinghouse, Executive Department A-95
Intergovernmental Relations Division
State Library
National Association of Conservation Districts
Sherman County Court
Sherman County, Planning Department
Warm Springs Tribal Council
Wasco County Planning Department
Wheeler County Planning Department

Interest Groups and Organizations
1000 Friends of Oregon
American Fisheries Society
American Forest Institute
AMOCO Production Company
Associated Oregon Industries
Associated Oregon Loggers Inc.
Association of Oregon Archaeologists
Atlantic Richfield Company
Audubon Society
Bohemia Mine Owners Association
Brooks Resources Corporation
Cascade Holistic Economic Consultants
Chevron Resources Company
Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission
Columbia Gorge Coalition
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
Defenders of Wildlife
Desert Trail Association
East Cascade Action Committee
East Oregon Forest Protective Association
Eastern Oregon Mining Association
Environmental Education Association of Oregon
Federation of Western Outdoors Clubs
Friends of the Earth
Geothermal Resources Council
Industrial Forestry Association
Izaak Walton League
League of Women Voters
Mazamas
National Public Lands Task Force
Natural Resources Defense Council
National Wildlife Federation
Native Plant Society of Oregon
Nature Conservancy
Northwest Environmental Defense Center
Northwest Federation of Mineralogical Societies
Northwest Mineral Prospectors Club
Northwest Mining Association
Northwest Petroleum Association
Northwest Pine Association
Northwest Power Planning Council
Northwest Timber Association
Oregon Cattlemen's Association
Oregon Council of Rock and Mineral Clubs
Oregon Environmental Council
Oregon Hunter's Association
Oregon Natural Heritage Data Base
Oregon Natural Resources Council
Oregon Sheep Growers
Oregon Sportsman and Conservationists
Oregon Trout
Oregon Wilderness Coalition
Pacific Gas Transmission Company
PNW Research Natural Area Forestry Science Lab
PNW 4 Wheel Drive Association
PNW Forest and Range Experiment Station
Public Lands Council
Public Lands Institute
Rocky Mountain Realty, Inc.
Sagecountry Alliance for a Good Environment
Shell western F&P, Inc.
Sierra Club
Society for Range Management
The Oregon Group
The Wilderness Society
The Wildlife Society
Waldo Mining District Association
Western Council; Lumber Production and Industrial Workers
Western Forest industries Association
Western Land Exchange
Western Oil and Gas Association
Wildlife Management Institute

Approximately 467 additional individuals and organizations who have expressed an interest in use and management of public lands in the planning area were also sent copies of the RMP/EIS. Included in this group are all grazing lessees within the planning area, members of the State legislature, U.S. Congressional delegation, and various educational institutions.

Consistency Review

Prior to approval of the proposed RMP, the State Director will submit the plan to the Governor of Oregon and request that he identify any known inconsistencies with State or local plans, policies or programs. The Governor will have 60 days in which to identify inconsistencies and provide recommendations in writing to the State Director. The consistency of the plan with the resource related plans, programs and policies of other Federal agencies, State and local government and Indian tribes will be reevaluated in the future as part of the formal monitoring and periodic evaluations of the plan.

Comment and Protest Procedures

If you wish to make comments for the District Manager’s consideration in the development of the decision, please submit your comments by November 15, 1985 to the District Manager Prineville District Office. The plan decisions will be based on the analysis contained in the EIS, and additional data available, public opinion, management feasibility, policy and legal constraints.

Any person who participated in the planning process and has an interest that is or may be adversely affected by approval of the proposed RMP may file a written protest with the Director of the BLM within 30 days of the date the EPA publishes the notice of receipt of the proposed RMP and final EIS in the Federal Register. Protests should be sent to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, 18th and C Streets NW, Washington D.C. 20240 by November 15, 1985. The protest shall contain the name, mailing address, telephone number, and interest of the person filing the protest; a statement of the issues being protested (raising only those issues that were submitted for the record during the planning process); a statement of the parts of the plan being protested; copies of all documents addressing the issues submitted during the planning process by the protesting party, or an indication of the date the issues were discussed for the record; and a concise statement explaining why the decision is believed to be wrong.

The Director shall render a prompt written decision on the protest setting forth the reasons for the decision. The decision shall be sent to the protesting party by certified mail and shall be the final decision of the Department of the Interior.
Comment Analysis

Changes or additions to the draft arising from public comments are included in Chapter 3 of this Proposed WMP and Final EIS. The letters which were received have been reproduced in this proposed RMP and Final EIS, with each substantive comment identified and numbered. BLM responses immediately follow each of the letters.

The agencies, organizations and individuals who commented on the Draft Two Rivers RMP/EIS are as follows:

1. Don Childs
2. U.S.D.A, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station
3. Jim Myron
4. Oregon Trout
5. Oregon Forestry Department
6. U.S.D.I, Bureau of Reclamation
7. R. Mariner Orum
8. Oregon Natural Heritage Data Base
9. William Berray
10. Lawrence E. Nielsen
11. State Parks and Recreation Division of the Department of Transportation
12. Oregon Natural Resources Council
13. Wildlife Management Institute
14. John R. Swanson
15. ARCO Exploration Company
17. Shell Western E&P, Inc.
18. Eastern Oregon Mining Association, Inc.
19. Portland Chapter of Izaak Walton League
20. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
21. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
22. Audubon Society of Portland
23. Central Oregon Audubon Society
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(503)246-8780 - P.O. Box 19540 - Portland, Oregon 97219
Oregon Natural Heritage Data Base

May 26, 1985

Donald Magness
Superintendent
Murphy Wildlife Area
Seaside, Oregon 97138

Dear Mr. Magness:

Thank you for giving the Oregon Natural Heritage Data Base the opportunity to comment on the EEG for the Murphy Wildlife Area. We understand that it is comprehensive, if brief, and addresses the issues that are most critical in terms of conservation efforts. We are happy to see that the important habitats and species are listed as elements of local, regional, and national significance. The process of designating the Resource Area and identifying the priority habitats is an essential step in ensuring the long-term survival of these unique areas.

Regarding the specific management areas listed in the EEG we have some specific comments. First, we are pleased that the Island is being proposed as an NHA, in conjunction with adopting Forest Service land. This would make an excellent addition to the NHA system in the region and the Murphy Wildlife Area. Second, the proposed designations of the NHA along the South River and as a designated National Natural Area would add value to the region. Third, the proposal of NHA status for the other areas listed as part of the ISH to be conserved. We fully support this designation for those worthy areas on the Murphy Wildlife Area and feel the benefits derived from their designation will accrue for many years to come.

A special issue addressed in the EEG that we are particularly interested in is the planning of the Murphy Wildlife Area. The planning phase is critical to the management of the area. A specific plan should be developed that will facilitate the development of the area. We believe the best approach is to develop a specific plan that will be reviewed by the appropriate agencies. This plan should be developed with the input of the local community, and will provide a clear direction for the future development of the area.

The Nature Conservancy

8-1. We agree with the proposed designation for the Murphy Wildlife Area. The area is an important part of the biological diversity of the region.

8-2. Our comments are not intended to be critical of the Murphy Wildlife Area. We believe the area is an important part of the biological diversity of the region.

8-3. Our comments are not intended to be critical of the Murphy Wildlife Area. We believe the area is an important part of the biological diversity of the region.

8-4. Our comments are not intended to be critical of the Murphy Wildlife Area. We believe the area is an important part of the biological diversity of the region.

William Kammer
12 Oregon Natural Resources Council

June 30, 1985

Dear Mr. Muggins,

I have included the following key points in your letter:

- The Flats is located in a special management area.
- The Flats is protected by the Department of Natural Resources.
- The Flats is closed to public use.
- The Flats is a high-value public trust asset.
- The Flats is a recreation area.

Please review this information and let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Title]
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Mr. Jared B. Rapnitzky
District Manager
Family Dollar
3001 West Liberty
Indianapolis, IN 46250

Mr. Tom Davis
Draft Resource Management Plan and
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

To: Mr. Rapnitzky

From: Mr. Davis

Subject: AECO Exploration Company

Dear Mr. Rapnitzky,

The AECO Exploration Company would like to take this opportunity to provide the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) with comments regarding the Two Rivers Forest Resource Management Plan (FRMP). We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed FRMP and offer our thoughts and feedback. Below are the key points we would like to share:

1. **Environmental Concerns**
   - We note that the FRMP includes a proposal for the development of a new oil and gas lease in the Two Rivers Forest Area. We understand that the BLM has conducted an environmental impact analysis, but we would like to emphasize the importance of considering environmental impacts to ensure that the proposed development is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner.
   - We are concerned about the potential for habitat degradation and the impact on local wildlife. We believe that measures should be taken to minimize disturbance to the natural ecosystem and to mitigate any potential impacts to wildlife and other sensitive resources.

2. **Resource Management**
   - We support the goal of sustainable resource management and encourage the adoption of practices that promote the long-term health of the Two Rivers Forest Area. We believe that a balanced approach to resource management is necessary to ensure the continued availability of forest products and to protect the ecological integrity of the area.
   - We would like to see more emphasis placed on the use of alternative energy sources and the promotion of renewable energy technologies.

3. **Community Engagement**
   - We believe that community engagement is crucial to the success of any resource management plan. We encourage the BLM to involve local communities in the planning process and to ensure that their voices are heard.
   - We would like to see more transparency and public participation in the decision-making process.

4. **Economic Implications**
   - We recognize the importance of economic development and support the creation of new opportunities for local businesses. However, we believe that the economic benefits should not come at the expense of environmental protection and should be balanced with the needs of the local community.

We appreciate your consideration of these comments and look forward to further engagement on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Tom Davis
Draft Resource Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement
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United States Department of the Interior

Reference Letter

Jared B. Rapnitzky, District Manager
Family Dollar
3001 West Liberty
Indianapolis, IN 46250

RE: AECO Exploration Company

Mr. Jared B. Rapnitzky
District Manager
Family Dollar
3001 West Liberty
Indianapolis, IN 46250

We have reviewed the FRMP draft and believe that the proposed planning process is well-organized and comprehensive. However, we would like to see more emphasis on the potential for alternative energy sources and the importance of community engagement in the planning process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

United States Department of the Interior

Reference Letter

Jared B. Rapnitzky, District Manager
Family Dollar
3001 West Liberty
Indianapolis, IN 46250

RE: AECO Exploration Company

Mr. Jared B. Rapnitzky
District Manager
Family Dollar
3001 West Liberty
Indianapolis, IN 46250

We have reviewed the FRMP draft and believe that the proposed planning process is well-organized and comprehensive. However, we would like to see more emphasis on the potential for alternative energy sources and the importance of community engagement in the planning process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
We appreciate your fresh approach suggesting a greater emphasis on page 4. However, it is difficult to see how it is possible to make a direct correlation with the examples. In any case, we have incorporated additional information highlighting the importance of protecting the environment and the need for sustainable practices. After the final review of the draft, the committee reached a decision to include a few additional points on page 6, page 9, and page 10, addressing other areas of concern.

The Portland City Council Public Lands Committee made recommendations to the department, including a request to include additional information. After the final revisions of the report, the committee agreed to include these additional points on page 6, page 9, and page 10, addressing other areas of concern.

The Department of Fish and Wildlife
Department of Fish and Wildlife
Lakeview, Oregon 97405

June 24, 1985

Donald J. Raymond, Director
Department of Fish and Wildlife

Dear Mr. Rayford,

We appreciate your fresh approach suggesting a greater emphasis on page 4. However, it is difficult to see how it is possible to make a direct correlation with the examples. In any case, we have incorporated additional information highlighting the importance of protecting the environment and the need for sustainable practices. After the final review of the draft, the committee reached a decision to include a few additional points on page 6, page 9, and page 10, addressing other areas of concern.

The Portland City Council Public Lands Committee made recommendations to the department, including a request to include additional information. After the final revisions of the report, the committee agreed to include these additional points on page 6, page 9, and page 10, addressing other areas of concern.
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The Portland City Council Public Lands Committee made recommendations to the department, including a request to include additional information. After the final revisions of the report, the committee agreed to include these additional points on page 6, page 9, and page 10, addressing other areas of concern.
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The Department stresses the importance of proper management of wildlife habitat. It is crucial for the long-term health and survival of wildlife populations. The importance of wildlife habitat cannot be overstated.

The Department of Fish and Wildlife recognizes the critical role of riparian areas in providing essential habitat for numerous species of plants and animals. Riparian areas are defined as the area adjacent to a stream or river and are known for their biodiversity.

The riparian areas provide crucial habitat for a wide variety of species, including fish, wildlife, and plants. The Department encourages the protection and management of these areas to ensure their continued health and viability.

The effectiveness of these efforts is dependent on collaboration among various stakeholders, including landowners, agencies, and the public. The Department is committed to working closely with these groups to achieve the common goal of protecting and enhancing riparian areas.
Photo 1 Camp Creek Exclosure (Crooked River Drainage) 1966

Condition:
Stream gradient - less than 5%
Sediment load - high
Soils - principally Legler silt loams - very deep fine textured, gravel layers present
Stream flow - intermittent
Elevation - greater than 4,000 ft.
Wetted area - less than 10 ft. wide
Estimated at 5% of site potential.

The full potential of the area is:
Dominant tree - Peachleaf willow, lemon willow
Understory tree - Coyote willow, McKenzie willow, whiplash willow
Herbaceous - Nebraska sedge, Baltic rush, 3 square bullrush, red top, Kentucky bluegrass

Wetted Area - More than 100 ft. wide
Securing coyote willow and Macounie willow in scattered patches

Bluegrass, occasional red top

Herbaceous - Northern sedges, baltic rush, 3 plain bullrush, cattail, Kentucky

Present vegetation:

Currently estimated at 40% of site potential

1935 - 19 years of livestock exclusion (same area as is shown in photo I)

Photo 2 - Camp Creek Exclusion (Crooked River Drainage)
Photo 3 - Bear Creek - Crooked River drainage 1978. 3 years of non use by livestock.

Present: condition:
Stream gradient - less than 5%
Sediment Load - low to medium
Soils - principally willowdale loam, very deep, well drained, stratified alluvium, medium textured, gravel layers common.
Elevation - 3500 ft.
Estimated at 352 of site potential.

Present vegetation - mixed grass, sedge, rush with timothy, orchard grass and Kentucky bluegrass.

The full potential of this area is:
Dominant tree - Patches of water birch/alder
Understory - Coyote willow, silverleaf willow, yellow willow, McKenzie willow
Herbaceous - Mixed grass, sedge, rush
Photo 4 - Birch Creek (John Day Drainage) 1980
Present condition:
Stream gradient - less than 5%
Sediment load - low to medium
Debris load - medium to high
Spring flow - high
Summer flow - perennial
Soils - moderately deep.
Textures highly stratified sands and loams. Gravel and cobble deposits are
25% to 75% of profile
Elevation - 3200 ft.
Estimated at 75% of site potential.

The full potential of the area is:
Dominant tree - Black cottonwood, white alder
Understory - McKenzie willow, chokecherry
Bitter cherry, woods rose, dogwood
Herbaceous - Mixed grass/torrb/sedge/rush/shrub
June 30, 1969

Mr. Gerald Hayes
District Manager, Willamette District Office
P.O. Box 755
Salem, Oregon

Dear Mr. Hayes:

This letter is in response to the Tualatin Managed Headwater Plan.

In general, we are pleased to see the increased emphasis on the Tualatin River. This plan, if adopted, is of great importance to us, as it provides a framework within which we can work to improve the quality of our water resources.

1. Extensive riparian planting: We are pleased to see the emphasis placed on the riparian zone. The riparian zone is a critical area for water quality and helps to reduce sediment levels in the river.

2. Improved fish habitat: We support the efforts to improve fish habitat. The Tualatin River is home to a variety of fish species, and any improvements that can be made to support their populations are welcome.

3. Land use planning: We agree with the need for careful land use planning. The Tualatin River watershed is a complex system, and any changes in land use must be carefully considered to avoid negative impacts on water quality.

4. Public education and awareness: We believe that public education is crucial in ensuring the success of any river management plan. We encourage the provision of educational materials and programs to inform the public about the importance of the Tualatin River.

We are concerned about the health and well-being of the Tualatin River. We believe that by working together, we can ensure a healthy and sustainable future for this valuable resource.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Organization Name]

[Contact Information]
July 1, 1985

Mr. Brian Cunningham
212 Fire Tower
Post Office Box 550
Peezville, Oreg. 97534

Dear Brian,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. The BLM's preferred alternative (A) does not represent the maximum timber production alternative. For the following reasons, we prefer alternative (B), commodity production.

A considerable amount of forest land across the state has been designated suitable for timber production. While we stoutly dispute those acreages with wilderness users, we believe these acreages should be reduced in number as shown within your proposed Alternative A and an additional burden upon the remaining productive forest land base.

Although the acreages are not large, why not place the multiple-use net inside acreages within the forest lands base less designated outside of timber production?

The Wild Rivers Study areas are also constraining the land base. This plan must follow additional management constraints on the forest land base.

Selecting alternative (B) allows for the maximum use of previously designated commercial forest land.

Sincerely,

George D. Miller
Forest Planner

[Signature]

W.R. Shaw, State Director
David Heydorn, District Manager

---
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derte Resource Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This is separate from any land use plan, and the information is to better understanding if only the development is shown in reference to Forest (A).

Overall, there are circumstances unknown to us within the Two Rivers planning unit which are probably dictating its management direction. The planning team's final work shows in this well organized EIS. Since there is very little variation between the existing management situation, the preferred alternative (A) and commodity production (B), we see no reason why alternative (B) would not be acceptable as your management direction.

Please your your time and consideration.

[Signature]

W.R. Shaw, State Director
David Heydorn, District Manager