



**PREPLAN ANALYSIS FOR THE
BAKER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Prepared by:
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
VALE DISTRICT OFFICE
VALE, OREGON**

September 11, 2003

**PREPLAN ANALYSIS FOR THE
BAKER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

SUBMITTED

Penelope Dunn Woods, Baker Field Manager

Date

RECOMMENDED:

David R. Henderson, Vale District Manager

Date

APPROVED:

Elaine M. Brong, Oregon-Washington State Director Date

PREPARED BY:

Tami Buchanan, GIS Coordinator, Baker Resource Area
Clair Button, Botany, Baker Resource Area
Steve Davidson, Realty, Baker Resource Area
Ted Davis, Baker Multi-Resources Staff Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist
Jackie Dougan, Fish Biology, Baker Resource Area
Brent Grasty, IRM/GIS, Vale District
Polly Gribskov, Recreation Planner, Baker Resource Area
Todd Kuck, Hydrology, Baker Resource Area
Craig Martell, Rangeland Health, Baker Resource Area
Kevin McCoy, Recreation Planner, Baker Resource Area
Greg Miller, Wildlife Biology, Baker Resource Area
Mary Oman, Cultural Resources, Baker Resource Area
Judy Reese, Geology, Baker Resource Area
Rubel Vigil, Baker Range Staff Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist
Dick Watson, Forestry, Baker Resource Area
Wayne Wetzel, Planning and Environmental Coordination, Vale District
Mike Woods, Noxious Weeds and Fire Ecology , Baker Resource Area

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II. PURPOSE AND NEED.....	4
A. Purpose.....	4
B. Need to Prepare the Baker Resource Area Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.....	5
C. Purpose of this Preplan Analysis.....	5
D. Relationship to other plans and policies.....	6
CHAPTER III. PLANNING AREA DESCRIPTION.....	8
CHAPTER IV. RESOURCE OBJECTIVES.....	10
AND PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA FOR THE BAKER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNING AREA.....	10
A. Resource And Program Goal Statements.....	10
B. Preliminary Planning Criteria.....	14
CHAPTER V. ANTICIPATED ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS.....	20
A. Issues and Management Concerns.....	20
B. Issues Eliminated From Detailed Study.....	34
CHAPTER VI. DATA AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM NEEDS.....	34
CHAPTER VII. PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS.....	34
A. Roles, Responsibilities, and Authorities.....	35
CHAPTER VIII. FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN.....	37
A. General Process.....	37
B. Document Format.....	38
C. Alternative Formulations.....	39
D. Internal Review of the Plan.....	41
F. Form of Input from Interdisciplinary Team and Reviewers.....	41
G. Plan Preparation Schedule.....	41
CHAPTER IX. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION PROCESS AND STAKEHOLDERS LIST.....	42
A. Identification of Issues, Planning Criteria, and Management Concerns.....	42
B. Formulation of Alternatives.....	42
C. Issuance of the Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.....	43
D. Issuance of Proposed Final Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.....	43
E. Response to Protests.....	43
F. Issuance of Approved Plan/Record of Decision.....	43
G. Cooperating Agency List.....	44
H. Stakeholders List.....	45
CHAPTER X. BUDGET.....	45
Appendix A: Proposed Data Needs for the Baker RMP, and Associated Costs.....	A-1
Appendix B: Proposed Plan Preparation Schedule for the Baker RMP.....	B-1
Appendix C: Proposed Budget for the Baker RMP.....	C-1
Appendix D: Proposed Public Participation Methods and Activities for Baker RMP.....	D-1
Appendix E: Contact/Comment Documentation.....	E-1

**PREPLAN ANALYSIS FOR THE
BAKER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The Baker Resource Management Plan (RMP) revision will address public lands managed by the Vale District Baker Resource Area (See Figure 1). The planning area includes approximately 423,000 acres of public land and 513,000 acres of split-estate minerals in Baker, Union, Wallowa, Morrow, and Umatilla Counties in Oregon and in Asotin County in Washington. Table 1 provides an overview of land status for BLM surface ownership for counties totally or partially within the Baker Resource Management Plan Area. A portion of these BLM Baker Resource Area managed lands are within the hydrologic boundaries of the John Day river basin and will be analyzed as part of the John Day Basin Resource Management Plan, which is scheduled to be under concurrent revision with the Baker Resource Management Plan. A permanent boundary revision involving these lands is proposed and may be implemented prior to the onset of scoping for the two resource management plans.

Table 1 – BLM Land within Counties in the Baker RMP (Ownership Acres) ¹		
County	BLM Acres in Resource Area	Total Acres within RMP Area
Baker	358,000	1,926,000
Grant	0	6,000
Morrow	4,000	1,310,000
Malheur	10,000	15,000
Umatilla	23,000	2,067,000
Union	6,000	1,303,000
Wallowa	14,000	2,012,000
Asotin	8,000	109,000
Garfield	0	4,000
Total	423,000	8,752,000

¹ Acres are rounded to nearest 1,000 acres and are based on current statewide BLM Geographic Information System (GIS) coverages. The figures do not reconcile with the 1989 Baker RMP Table 2 because acreages were compiled through digital National Map Accuracy Standards for GIS.

Figure 1 Long Term Oregon/Washington Resource Management Planning Areas

Long Term Oregon / Washington Resource Management Planning Areas
as of October 2002



Several changes in agency and Departmental direction, policy, and socio-political considerations since the original Baker RMP was completed contribute to the need to update the RMP. These changes include:

- Consideration of leasable and renewable energy resources and energy transportation systems, as required by national policies;
- New listings under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) including Bull Trout (threatened, 1998); Snake River Fall Run, Snake River Spring/Summer run and Mid Columbia Spring Run Chinook Salmon (threatened, 1992); Mid Columbia and Snake River Steelhead (threatened, 1997, 1999); and Canadian Lynx (threatened, 2000);
- Recent Biological Opinions issued under the ESA indicating additional guidance is needed to protect some plants and animals in portions of the planning area;
- Interim guidance from PACFISH and INFISH management plans;
- Requirements from the Greater Sage-Grouse and Sagebrush-Steppe Ecosystems Management Guidelines (2000);
- BLM IM 1992-264, Guidelines for Domestic Sheep Management in Bighorn Sheep Habitats and IB OR-99-061, Guidelines for Management of Domestic Sheep and Goats in Native Wild Sheep Habitats (1998);
- Refinement and extension of the Northern Goshawk Management Guidelines (1998)”;
- Implementation of the Rangeland Standards and Guides (1997);
- Direction and guidance from the President’s Forest Health Initiative (2002);
- Planning and reporting requirements from the President’s Energy Plan (2001);
- Downward trends in ecological integrity, based on the condition of soil and vegetation, and perceived impacts from land uses including, recreation, grazing, agriculture, and development;
- An increase in fragmentation and loss of plant and animal species diversity or genetic resilience due to loss of connectivity within and between blocks of upland forest, shrub-steppe and riparian habitats;
- Invasive and noxious weed encroachment and the expansion of juniper and other woody species beyond their historic range of variability;
- Forest health issues and impacts from insect infestations;
- Need to address reducing hazardous fuels surrounding “communities at risk”;
- New information regarding the importance of late and older seral species, historic disturbance factors such as fire on the landscape, and sustainable use and development on public lands;
- Development of the National Fire Plan and the setting of priorities for fuels treatment (communities at risk), protection, and suppression activities;
- Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy and Program Review (1995 Federal Fire Policy)
- Review and Update of the 1995 Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy (2001 Federal Fire Policy)
- 2000 Report to the President: Managing the Impacts of Wildfires on Communities and the Environment (foundation for the National Fire Plan)
- A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment: 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy and Implementation Plan (2001,

- foundation for the National Fire Plan)
- Healthy Forests Initiative (2002)
- Changing socioeconomic conditions and opportunities to revise management direction to provide employment through both through traditional commercial activities and contracted forest and rangeland health initiatives;
- Identification of high priority areas and special emphasis watersheds for restoration activities within the Baker Resource Area;
- Identification of 303(d) listed streams and the anticipated identification of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) levels and development of Water Quality Restoration Plans (WQRPs);
- Designation of Wild and Scenic Rivers and the preparation of the Wallowa and Grande Ronde Rivers Management Plan and the John Day Wild and Scenic River Resource Management Plan Amendment /Record of Decision (February 2001)
- Identification of Wilderness Study Areas;
- Nominations of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC):
- Application for renewal of a FERC hydropower license by Idaho Power for the Hells Canyon Complex dams.
- The Oregon Land Exchange Act of 2000, August 8, 2000, (also known as the Northern Oregon Assembled Land Exchange [NOALE])
- Publication of a Draft EIS for the Lookout Mountain Forest and Rangeland Health Project (2002).

In addition information provided as a result of the development of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) provides new insights into the management of the lands included in the planning area.

CHAPTER II. PURPOSE AND NEED

A. Purpose

The purpose of the Baker RMP is to establish guidance, objectives, policies, and management actions for the Planning Area. The RMP will be comprehensive in nature and will resolve or address issues within the Planning Area.

The RMP will discuss the current management situation, desired future conditions to be maintained or achieved, and management actions necessary to achieve objectives. The RMP will include an implementation plan for achieving the objectives. Due to overlapping, contiguous and related resource administrative and sociopolitical issues, the document will address and integrate, to the degree possible, all BLM plans related to management of land in the Planning Area.

In addition to the purposes described above, the RMP will also fulfill the following needs and obligations set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic River (WSR) Act, the Federal Land Policy

Management Act (FLPMA), and BLM Land Use Plan policy.

B. Need to Prepare the Baker Resource Area Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

The John Day, Two Rivers, and Baker RMPs were evaluated by an interdisciplinary team, which documented their findings in September, 2002. The findings noted plan implementation progress in meeting desired outcomes, plan effectiveness, continued validity of decisions, changes in related plans of other federal, tribal, state and local governments, availability of new data or analyses, unmet needs and opportunities, need for new inventories and new legal or policy mandates. There was very limited need for immediate amendments to the existing plans, but the evaluations noted the advantages of initiating plan revisions to address opportunities, improve inter-program and interagency consistency and update broad-scale environmental analyses in support of anticipated and implementation actions. The full evaluation report for the Baker RMP is on file in the Vale District Office and the Baker Resource Area Office.

In compliance with the BLM Plan Evaluation Policy, management decisions contained in the current RMP and other activity-level planning documents that pertain to the Baker Resource Area, will be evaluated as part of the RMP scoping process. Those decisions determined to be still valid will be carried into the RMP. Similarly, management decisions and actions in Allotment Management Plans (AMPs), wildlife habitat plans, and other related activity plans will also be evaluated for incorporation.

Past and proposed acquisition of NOALE lands and the Wallowa and Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River (WSR) plan will be major factors in the need for a revised Baker RMP. As previously stated, several issues have arisen since the Baker RMP was developed, as well as significant new information coming from the Interior Columbia Ecosystem Management Project contribute to the need to update the current RMP.

As required by NEPA, an EIS will be prepared to analyze proposals in the Baker RMP because the implementation of many of those proposals would constitute major Federal actions that could have a significant effect on the human environment.

C. Purpose of this Preplan Analysis

A Preplan Analysis is being developed to set the direction of work, to define work priorities and planning team responsibilities, to project time lines for public involvement and the EIS comment process, and to project total cost estimates for the RMP. This Preplan provides the general blueprint for how the RMP will be developed. It is intended that the Preplan be dynamic and the preparation strategy be modified as necessary. Specifically, the purpose of this Preplan is to:

1. Document the Planning Area boundaries covered by the RMP;
2. Identify the preliminary objectives of the RMP, issues to be resolved,

- and the planning criteria to be used to address them;
3. Document the scope, complexity, major responsibilities and requirements for the planning effort;
 4. Establish the internal and external coordination for the agencies involved;
 5. Identify a completion schedule and budget; and,
 6. Establish and identify the public participation process.

D. Relationship to other plans and policies

This planning process will recognize ongoing programs, plans, and policies that are being implemented in the planning area by other land managers and interested governments. BLM will seek to be consistent with or complimentary to other management actions. Whenever possible, valid resource decisions and management prescriptions would be carried forward into the planning process. The following plans, which are located within and adjacent to the planning area, will be reviewed for decisions or issues/management prescriptions would be carried forward into the planning process.

County Land Use Plans

- Baker County,
- Union County,
- Wallowa County,
- Umatilla County,
- Morrow County,
- Asotin County, WA and
- Garfield County, WA

Plans from Oregon State Agencies listed as potential cooperators (see Chapter IX), including, but not necessarily limited to:

- State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
- Land Conservation and Development Commission's 19 Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines
- Eastern Oregon Ecosystem Health Strategy (Governor Kitzhaber's 11-Point Plan)
- Oregon Forest Practices Act
- Oregon Healthy Streams Partnership, including water quality management area plans for agricultural areas designated under Senate Bill 1010
- Department of Environmental Quality's developing regional haze state implementation plan for Oregon (involving the Eagle Cap and Hells Canyon Wilderness areas) and plans for particulate non-attainment in the LaGrande urban area.
- Department of Environmental Quality's [Nonpoint Source Control Program Plan](#) and [Oregon's 2000 Water Quality Status Assessment Report - 305\(b\) Report](#)
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife deer and elk management plans, Wildlife Diversity Plan, Native Fish Conservation Policy and draft Hatchery Management Policy

- Oregon's Statewide Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan
- Oregon Water Resource Commission's 1995-1999 Strategic Water Resource Management Plan
- Parks and Recreation Department State Scenic Waterway management plans
- Division of State Land and the State Land Board Asset Management Plan
- Oregon Noxious Weed Strategic Plan
- Any other plans determined through scoping, collaboration with agencies, or through cooperating agency input to have relevance and influence on the Baker RMP revision.

Other Federal Plans

- Malheur National Forest Land Use Plan
- Wallowa-Whitman National Forest Land Use Plan
- Umatilla National Forest Land Use Plan
- Boardman Bombing Range and Threemile Canyon Farms Multi-Species Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances (MSCCAA)
- Umatilla Army Depot Installation Restoration Program

Environmental and Planning Documents

- Baker Resource Management Plan (1989)
- John Day Resource Management Plan
- John Day River Management Plan (2001)
- Powder River Management Plan (1994)
- Wallowa and Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River Management Plan (Dec. 1993)
- South Fork Walla Walla River Area Plan Amendment (1992)
- Lime Hill Coordinated Activity Plan (2001)
- Final Environmental Impact Statement Vegetation Treatment on BLM in Thirteen Western States (May, 1991)
- Ironsides Grazing Management EIS (1981)
- Final Environmental Impact Statement Vegetation Treatment on BLM in Thirteen Western States (May, 1991) to be replaced by EIS for Vegetation Treatments, Watersheds and Wildlife Habitats on BLM Lands prior to the development of this plan revision
- Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Program, also to be replaced by the EIS for Vegetation Treatments, Watersheds and Wildlife Habitats on BLM prior to the development of this plan revision.
- Oregon Wilderness Final Environmental Impact Statement and Study Report to Congress
- Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project Draft EIS (May, 1997)
- Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project Supplemental Draft EIS (March, 2000)
- Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project Final EIS (December, 2000)

Other Plans or Plans in Preparation

- Lookout Mountain Forest and Rangeland Health Project and DEIS (Oct. 2002)
- Water Quality Restoration Plan Process
- National Fire Plan
- 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy and Implementation Plan
- National Vegetation Management Plan/EIS (in preparation)
- Healthy Forest Initiative
- All valid and existing Fire Management Plans, Habitat Management Plans, Endangered Species Recovery Plans, and Recreation Management Plans
- Noxious Weed Strategy for Oregon/Washington (1994)

In addition, to prepare the Baker Plan Revision the Baker Field Office would review the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) and, as appropriate, would incorporate the scientific findings, objectives, standards and guidelines from the ICBEMP documents.

CHAPTER III. PLANNING AREA DESCRIPTION

The Baker RMP will provide management direction on all federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management within the Baker Resource Area of the Vale District, except for approximately four townships within the Baker Resource Area that are being evaluated as part of the John Day Basin RMP being completed by the Central Oregon District. BLM lands included in the Baker RMP are generally located in Baker, Union, Wallowa, Umatilla, and Morrow Counties and includes portions of Asotin and Garfield Counties in Washington. Communities in the basin include: Baker City, Union, LaGrande, Pendleton, Elgin, Wallowa, Enterprise, Joseph, Halfway, Umatilla, Heppner, North Powder, Oxbow, Richland, Asotin, Durkee, Huntington, and other small towns.

The general land pattern is characterized by small to moderate-sized parcels of BLM administered lands that are widely scattered and intermingled with private, state, and federal lands administered by the Forest Service and other federal agencies. The roughly 423,000 acres of BLM surface ownership constitutes approximately five percent of the 8,772,000 acres in the planning area. Most of the BLM lands in the resource area are located in Baker County and are part of the Blue Mountain physiographic province. These BLM lands are generally between 3,000 to 6000 feet in elevation and occur in dissected uplands and canyons.

BLM lands occur less frequently in three other physiographic provinces. In the Snake River province, the Snake River has eroded a deep, rugged canyon as it flows north between Idaho and Oregon. Three reservoirs form behind Hells Canyon, Oxbow and Brownlee Dams owned by the Idaho Power Company. There are several medium to large tracts of BLM lands in the breaks along the canyon and adjacent to the reservoirs. In the Joseph Upland province, the Snake, Wallowa, Grande Ronde, and Imnaha rivers and Joseph Creek have cut canyons 2,000 to 4,000 feet deep through this rolling basaltic upland. The few BLM lands in this area tend to occupy the

rugged topography adjacent to the Grande Ronde River and its tributaries. The Umatilla Plateau is a dry upland underlain by basalt, also dissected by Willow Creek and the Umatilla and Walla Walla Rivers. BLM tracts in this area are small and widely scattered, but a few are located strategically along rivers and streams and provide important riparian habitat.

The climate in the Baker Resource Area ranges from sub-humid in the Blue Mountains to semi-arid in the valleys and lower plateaus. Temperatures vary from sub-zero during winter months to over 100° F. during the summer. The upper elevations may receive up to 50 inches of precipitation annually, mostly in the form of snow, while 12 inches or less falls in the lower elevations annually.

Human use of the area spans at least 10,000 years. There is little information available on specific current Native American Indian use within the area. Information regarding areas visited by individual Indian families for root collecting, hunting, fishing or religious practices is not formally shared within a tribe or with agencies. Ethnographically, it is known that several tribal groups used areas in the Baker Resource Area. The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, the Nez Perce, the Joseph Band Nez Perce, the Shoshone-Bannock, the Shoshone-Paiute and the Burns Paiute have indicated that their tribal members continue to use the area for hunting, fishing, gathering and religious activities.

Human use of the public resources of the area generate private economic activity from grazing, timber, and salable, leasable and locatable minerals that is important to sustaining the local economy. Livestock production and agriculture are important sources of income in the area. Cattle ranching and associated hay crops are major components of these activities. BLM and Forest Service lands provide livestock grazing as well as natural habitats for wildlife. The forest products industry is important in the forested portions of the area around the communities of Baker and La Grande. Mineral resources on public lands in the basin are available for location, sale, or lease by private individuals or companies. Tourism and recreation are growing and contribute significantly to the basin's economy. Recreational visitors spend money at local retail stores, service stations, and lodging facilities. Many service businesses such as guides and shuttle operators exist on major rivers like the Snake, Grande Ronde and Wallowa Rivers. In addition, there is heavy recreational use of the reservoirs and adjacent BLM lands behind the Idaho Power-owned Brownlee, Oxbow, and Hells Canyon dams on the Snake River. Additional studies or literature reviews will be conducted to develop a socio-economic profile of the planning area, possibly in conjunction with the John Day Basin RMP or Blue Mountain National Forest Plans and the PNW Research Station.

CHAPTER IV. RESOURCE OBJECTIVES AND PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA FOR THE BAKER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNING AREA

A. Resource And Program Goal Statements

1. Air Quality

Meet or exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the Prevention of Significant Deterioration increments with all authorized actions. Should Oregon amend the Oregon Smoke Management Plan to include the planning area, we would comply with any Memoranda of Understanding/Agreement with Oregon Department of Environmental Quality concerning smoke management.

2. Water Quality and Resources

Ensure that surface water and groundwater influenced by BLM activities comply with or are making progress toward achieving State of Oregon water quality standards for beneficial uses as established per stream by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ). Water quality will be addressed at a watershed scale and where 303(d) listed waters occur, planning will include input from and consistent with ODA's SB 1010 planning and development process.

Use existing water rights to support programs and projects within the planning area. Secure any further water rights acquired through land exchanges through normal channels as prescribed by Oregon state law.

3. Fire/Fuels Management

Provide an Appropriate Management Response (AMR) on all wildland fire, with priority on firefighter and public safety, while considering benefits and values to be protected consistent with resource objectives. Reduce wildland fire costs, losses and damages. Recognize fire as a critical natural process and use it to protect, maintain, and restore fire adapted ecosystems through the use of fuels management and prescribed fire. Protect communities at risk from wildfire while enhancing ecosystem resilience and sustainability by managing fuel loadings to ensure forest and rangeland health.

4. Rangeland Vegetation

Restore, protect, and enhance the diversity and distribution of desirable vegetation communities, including perennial native and desirable introduced plant species and microbiotic crusts. Provide for their continued existence and normal function in nutrient, water, and energy cycles. Manage big sagebrush cover in seedings and on native rangelands to meet the life history requirements of sagebrush-dependant wildlife. Control the introduction and proliferation of noxious weed species and reduce the extent and density of established weed species to within acceptable limits.

5. Forests and Woodlands

Manage forests and woodlands to restore, maintain and enhance ecosystems in which

biodiversity is preserved and occurrences of fire, insects, and disease do not exceed levels normally expected in healthy forest or woodland. Maintain or restore productivity in forested areas. Manage areas of high or increasing juniper density for more heterogeneous vegetation. Retain old growth characteristics in historic juniper sites not prone to frequent fire. Manage aspen to maintain diversity of age classes and to allow for species reestablishment. Manage forested areas and woodlands for long-term, healthy habitat for animal and plant species.

6. Special Status Species (Plants)

Manage public land to maintain, restore, or enhance populations and habitats of Special Status plant species. Priority for the application of management actions would be: (1) Federal endangered species, (2) Federal threatened species, (3) Federal proposed species, (4) Federal candidate species, (5) State listed species, (6) BLM sensitive species, (7) BLM assessment species, and (8) BLM tracking species. Manage in order to conserve or lead to the recovery of threatened or endangered species.

7. Wildlife Habitat

Maintain, restore, or enhance riparian areas and wetlands so they provide diverse and healthy habitat conditions for wildlife. Manage upland habitats so that the forage, water, cover, structure, and security necessary for wildlife are available on public land.

8. Special Status Species (Wildlife)

Manage public land and resources to maintain, restore, or enhance populations and habitats of Special Status animal species. Priority for the application of management actions would be: (1) Federal endangered species, (2) Federal threatened species, (3) Federal proposed species, (4) Federal candidate species, (5) State listed species, (6) BLM sensitive species, (7) BLM assessment species, and (8) BLM tracking species. Manage in order to conserve or lead to the recovery of threatened or endangered species.

9. Livestock Management

Grazing will be in accordance with current applicable laws, regulations and policies. Grazing will be provided for at sustained level consistent with other resource objectives and public land use allocations. The RMP will address several pasture and allotment boundary changes that have and will occur as a result of land exchanges and grazing management changes. Adjustments to allocations will be made as necessary, based on monitoring and implementation of rangeland standards and guides.

10. Water Resources and Riparian/Wetlands

Ensure that surface water and groundwater influenced by BLM activities comply with or are making progress toward achieving State of Oregon water quality standards for beneficial uses as established per stream by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ).

Restore, maintain, or improve riparian vegetation, habitat diversity, and associated watershed function to achieve healthy and productive riparian areas and wetlands.

Use existing water rights to support programs and projects within the planning area. Secure any further water rights acquired through land exchanges through normal channels as prescribed by Oregon state law.

11. Fish and Aquatic Habitat

Restore, maintain, or improve habitat to provide for diverse and self-sustaining communities of fishes and other aquatic organisms. Implement existing restoration plans, like the Grande Ronde Riparian Plan and ESR plans.

12. Significant Caves

13. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Review and retain valid existing and consider designating new Areas of Critical Environmental Concern/Research Natural Areas (ACECs/RNAs) where relevance and importance criteria are met and special management is required to protect the values identified.

14. Wild and Scenic Rivers

Wild and Scenic rivers or streams must meet the free-flowing characteristics and have one or more outstandingly remarkable values in accordance with the 8351 manual. Protect and enhance Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) of designated National Wild and Scenic Rivers (NWSRs) and protect and enhance ORVs and free-flowing characteristics of rivers found suitable for Wild and Scenic River status until Congress acts. Consider securing in-stream flows necessary to maintain W&S river outstandingly remarkable values.

15. Wilderness Study Areas

Manage Wilderness Study Areas according to *BLM Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review* to protect wilderness characteristics until Congress acts upon designation of the areas. If deemed necessary, complete wilderness inventory of newly acquired lands and identify any lands that have wilderness characteristics. Should areas be identified as having particular wilderness characteristics, the RMP would address (an) alternative(s) that manages for those wilderness characteristics.

16. Recreation

Manage recreation to protect resource values, promote public safety and minimize conflicts among various users while at the same time providing a spectrum of recreational opportunities, including commercial recreation opportunities, where appropriate. Encourage partnership relationships, like the partnership with Idaho Power Company on the Hells Canyon Complex dams, to provide, enhance, and maintain recreational sites and opportunities.

17. Visual Resources

Manage public land actions and activities in a manner consistent with Visual Resource Management (VRM) class objectives.

18. Native American Rights

Consult and coordinate with Tribal Governments and groups to ensure their interests are considered and their traditional religious sites, landforms, and resources are taken into account.

19. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Protect and conserve cultural and paleontological resources. Increase the public's knowledge of, appreciation for, and sensitivity to cultural and paleontological resources.

20. Human Uses and Values

Manage public land and pursue partnerships to provide social and economic benefits to local residents, businesses, visitors, and for future generations.

21. Energy and Mineral Resources

Provide opportunities for exploration and development of leasable energy and mineral resources while protecting other sensitive resources. Provide opportunities for exploration and development of locatable mineral resources while protecting other sensitive resources. Provide for public demand for saleable minerals from public land, while protecting sensitive resources. Solar and wind energy opportunities will be evaluated in conjunction with energy corridor siting and would be processed as R/W permits. Opportunities for geothermal development on BLM lands will also be evaluated.

22. Lands and Realty

Designate land status zones within which BLM would retain public land with high public resource values, and consolidate public land holdings or acquire land or interests in land in non-public ownership with high public resource values to ensure effective administration and improve resource management. Acquired land would be managed for the purposes for which it was acquired. Identify and designate zones where public land is available for disposal by State indemnity selection, private or State exchange, Recreation and Public Purpose (R&PP) Act lease or sale, public sale, or other authorized method. Establish utility and transportation system corridor routes to the extent possible, taking into account avoidance areas, consistent with resource objectives.

23. Off-Highway Vehicles

Manage Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use to protect resource values, promote public safety, provide OHV use opportunities where appropriate, and minimize conflicts among various users. Include and address the goals and objectives of BLM's *OHV National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands*.

24. Integrated Noxious Weed Management (IWM)

The BLM will coordinate with Federal, State and County agencies and tribal governments to inventory for noxious weeds, include provisions for IWM in all BLM authorized activities, develop prevention and early detection programs, determine the best methods for an integrated approach to weed treatment including (cultural, physical, biological and chemical), conduct education and awareness programs, and monitor and evaluate all treatments.

25. Wild Horses

There are no established Herd Management Areas (HMAs) in the Baker Resource Area and none are planned through this RMP revision.

B. Preliminary Planning Criteria

BLM planning regulations (43 Code of Federal Regulations 1610) require preparation of planning criteria for all RMPs. Planning criteria are the constraints or ground rules guiding and directing the development of the Plan, and determine how the planning team and the public approach the development of alternatives and ultimately selection of a Preferred Alternative. Criteria ensure plans are tailored to the identified issues, and unnecessary data collection and analyses are avoided. Planning criteria are based on analyses of information pertinent to the Planning Area, professional judgment, standards prescribed by applicable laws, regulations, and agency guidance, and are the result of consultation and coordination with the public, other Federal, State and local agencies, and Indian tribes.

The preliminary criteria listed below were BLM developed and will be reviewed by the public before being used in the RMP process. The criteria will be included in a *Federal Register* Notice along with notification of public scoping meetings. After public input, criteria become proposed criteria and can be added to or changed as the issues are addressed or new information is presented. The Vale District Manager will approve the issues, criteria, and any changes.

1. The BLM will manage the Baker RA to protect resources in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA, 43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), other applicable laws and regulations, and all existing public land laws.
2. The Plan will recognize valid existing rights within the Planning Area and review how valid existing rights are verified. The Plan will outline the process the BLM will use to address applications or notices filed on existing claims or other land use authorizations after the completion of the Plan.
3. Lands covered in the RMP will be public lands, including split estate lands, managed by BLM. Decisions on lands not managed by the BLM will not be made in the RMP except when formal cooperator status is mutually accepted and leads to additional RODs.

4. The BLM will use a collaborative and multi-jurisdictional approach, where possible to jointly determine the desired future conditions of Public lands.
5. The Plan will emphasize the protection and enhancement of the Planning Area's biodiversity while at the same time providing the public with opportunities for compatible commodity-based and recreation activities
6. The socioeconomic impacts of the alternatives will be addressed.
7. The BLM will use current scientific information, research, technologies, and results of inventory, monitoring and coordination to determine appropriate local, and regional management strategies that will enhance or restore impaired ecosystems.
8. The planning process will include an EIS that will comply with NEPA standards.
9. Any land located within the Planning Area's administrative boundary, and subsequently acquired by the BLM, will be managed consistent with the Plan, subject to any constraints associated with the acquisition.
10. The Plan will recognize the State's responsibility to manage wildlife. BLM would consult with ODFW before establishing no-hunting zones or periods for the purposes of protecting public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment.
11. The Plan will address transportation and access, and will identify where better access is warranted, where it should remain as is, and where decreased access is appropriate to protect Planning Area resources.
12. Laws and regulations regulate grazing management. The Plan will incorporate the Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines. It will provide a strategy for ensuring proper grazing practices are followed within the Planning Area.
13. The planning process will involve American Indian Tribal governments and will provide possible strategies for the protection of recognized traditional uses, if such uses are identified.
14. Decisions in the Plan will strive to be compatible with existing plans and policies of adjacent local, State, Federal, and tribal agencies as long as the decisions are consistent with Federal law governing the administration of public land.
15. In addition to the criteria listed above, the following program specific criteria apply to the RMP/EIS.

i. Air Quality

Under the Clean Air Act, air quality of most of the Planning Area is

designated as PSD Class II. BLM lands will be managed cooperatively with other land management agencies and jurisdiction and will be consistent with the Clean Air Act in meeting PSD objectives. BLM will also cooperate in management of airsheds where visibility protection/regional haze are issues affecting PSD Class I areas (Eagle Cap and Hells Canyon wilderness areas) and where non-attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards occurs within or adjacent to the planning area (LaGrande and Wallula, Washington)

ii. Water Quality and Resources

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1977, as amended (Clean Water Act), requires the BLM to be consistent with State nonpoint source management program plans and relevant water quality standards. Section 313 requires compliance with State water quality standards. The Plan will incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) or other conservation measures for specific programs and activities. Water quality will be maintained or improved in accordance with State and Federal standards. The plan revision will link with the *Water Quality Restoration Plan Process (1997)* identified by the Forest Service and BLM protocol for addressing 303(d) listed waters.

iii. Vegetation Management

Vegetation will be managed to provide for biological diversity at the landscape level, to protect and restore native perennial and desirable nonnative perennial species, and to provide for consumptive uses and non-consumptive values, including visual quality and watershed condition. The RMP/EIS will include provisions for plant maintenance, watershed protection and stability, and wildlife habitat and will provide for livestock. Fire and other treatment methods are considered tools to meet vegetation management objectives.

iv. Soil Management

Soil will be managed to protect long-term productivity. BMPs will be incorporated into other programs to minimize soil erosion and compaction resulting from management actions

v. Livestock Management

Livestock forage allocations, established in all agreements and decisions will not be initially revised by this plan. However, the process for determining livestock forage allocations through allotment evaluations and rangeland health assessments will proceed in accordance with BLM regulations and policy.

Grazing management adjustments will occur on a priority basis over the life of the plan through the adaptive management process and subsequent

agreements, decisions, or activity plan revisions. Authorization of livestock use in the Planning Area will be subject to change through the life of the plan.

Grazing of public land will be authorized under the principles of multiple-use and sustained yield. Livestock will be managed to restore, protect, or improve public land resources and rangeland productivity and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent on the public range over the long term. Forage will be allocated by allotment for livestock grazing on suitable rangeland based on multiple-use and sustained yield objectives. Existing management systems, including those outlined in Allotment Management Plans (AMPs), will continue until evaluations or rangeland health assessments indicate that change is needed to meet objectives.

vi. Fire/Fuels Management

Wildland fire, as a critical natural process, will be integrated into land and resource management planning to assist in the attainment of resource management objectives. Where appropriate, prescribed fire would be used to approximate the desirable level of wildland fire. The use of surface-disturbing equipment to suppress wildland fires in areas such as WSAs and areas containing significant cultural or paleontological values would only be used to the extent necessary to reduce the risk to and protect firefighters, human life, property and resource values. Public land affected by fire will be managed in accordance with multiple-use objectives. Fuels management would focus on reducing fuel loading to ensure healthy, resilient and sustainable forest and rangeland and reduce wildfire risk in urban interface zones and communities at risk.

vii. Forest and Woodland Management

Forested areas will be managed under the principles of multiple-use and sustained yield and in accordance with the President's Forest Health Initiative (2002) and Oregon's Eastern Oregon Ecosystem Health Strategy. All juniper and quaking aspen woodlands will be managed to protect long-term biological productivity and diversity and watershed values. The BLM will participate in and take advantage of various partnerships and collaborative efforts, such as the Blue Mountains Demonstration Area that seek to improve ecosystem health at a landscape scale.

viii. Special Status Species

The BLM is mandated by law to assist in the conservation and recovery of species listed as Threatened or Endangered or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) through the PACFISH and INFISH interim guidance. Federal actions that may affect the well being of these

species require consultation with the USFWS and/or NOAA Fisheries Service. BLM policy requires that authorized actions do not contribute to the need to list any other Special Status species under the provisions of the ESA. The intent is to avoid the need for future listings of species as threatened or endangered. BLM will continue to manage its lands consistent with existing Biological Opinions and letters of concurrence from USFWS and NOAA Fisheries.

ix. Integrated Noxious Weed Management

The BLM will continue its partner relationship with non-governmental organizations and with County, State, and Federal agencies to monitor the locations and spread of noxious weeds, to implement noxious weed control, and to initiate restoration strategies in accordance with the integrated weed management guidelines and design features identified in the Vale District Noxious Weed Management Program. The BLM will assess land prior to acquisition to determine if noxious weeds are present.

x. Riparian Areas, Floodplains, and Wetlands

Riparian areas, floodplains, and wetlands will be managed to restore, protect or improve their natural functions relating to water storage, ground water recharge, water quality, and fish and wildlife values.

xi. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

ACECs will be designated where special management attention is required to protect historical, cultural, or scenic values, natural resources or processes, or human life and safety. Management requirements for ACECs will be identified in the RMP/EIS

xii. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System

As required by law, streams will be evaluated for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System. The evaluation will be conducted according to guidelines published by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture on September 7, 1982, and other applicable guidance including W&S River manual 8351. Designated WSRs will be managed in accordance with laws and existing plans.

xiii. Wilderness Study Areas

Wilderness Study Areas designated under authority of FLPMA, Sections 603 and 202, will be managed in accordance with the Interim Management Policy for WSAs. This planning effort will not change existing decisions regarding wilderness suitability for WSAs established under Section 603 and signed by the Secretary of the Interior, to recommend areas as suitable for wilderness designation. New areas could be inventoried for wilderness characteristics during the planning process. Any new inventories of

wilderness characteristics will be conducted, if necessary, under the authority of Sections 201 and 202 of FLPMA.

xiv. Recreation

Some areas may be subject to special measures to protect resources or reduce conflicts among uses. Where there is a demonstrated need, the BLM may develop and maintain recreation facilities including campgrounds, picnic areas, interpretive sites, boat access, and trails.

xv. Visual Resources

The BLM will manage public land to protect the quality of scenic (visual) values in accordance with established guidelines. All public land will be designated as VRM Class I, II, III or IV.

xvi. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Cultural and paleontological resources will be managed to maintain or enhance scientific, interpretive and educational values. Cultural resources will be managed to protect American Indian interests where possible.

xvii. Energy and Minerals

Except where specifically withdrawn to protect resource values, public land will be available for energy and mineral exploration and development subject to applicable Federal and State laws and regulations

xviii. Land Tenure Adjustments

BLM-administered land will be retained in public ownership unless disposal of a particular parcel is determined to serve the public interest. Land may be identified for disposal by sale, exchange, State indemnity selection or other authorized methods. Land types will be identified for acquisition based on public benefits, management considerations, and public access needs. Specific actions that meet land tenure adjustment criteria established in the RMP/EIS will occur with public participation and will be made in consultation with local, County, State, and tribal governments.

xix. Rights-of-Way

Public land will generally be available for land use authorizations including transportation and utility rights-of-way with preference given to existing corridors. Exceptions will include areas specifically prohibited by law or regulation (e.g., WSRs and WSAs) and to other areas identified in the Plan for specific resource values.

xx. Motorized Vehicle Use

All public land will be designated as open, limited or closed for OHV use. Public safety, resource protection, user access needs, and conflict

resolution will be considered in assigning these designations. Specific roads and trails may be designated in some alternatives as “limited” to the extent warranted and supported by adequate data.

CHAPTER V. ANTICIPATED ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

A. Issues and Management Concerns

A planning issue is identified as a “matter of controversy or dispute over resource management activities or land use that is well-defined or topically discrete and entails alternatives between which to choose.” This suggests groups or individuals are interested in a resource on public land, each resource may be valued differently, and there are alternatives by which to resolve the issue.

Management concerns are topics or points of dispute involving a resource management activity or land use. While some concerns overlap issues, a management concern is generally more important to an individual or a few individuals, as opposed to a planning issue, which has a more widespread point of conflict. Addressing management concerns in the RMP/EIS helps ensure a comprehensive examination of BLM’s land use management. Management concerns will be modified as the planning process continues and will usually not be addressed as thoroughly as an issue.

BLM agency personnel, other agency personnel, and individuals and user groups have raised preliminary issues and management concerns. Some issues and concerns represent BLM’s expectations as to what conflicts or problems exist with current management. The major issues and concerns will be published in a Federal Register Notice, and will be the subject of public comment periods.

After public scoping, known issues, along with any additional issues raised by the public, will be placed in one of three categories:

- 1.** Issues to be Resolved in the Plan,
- 2.** Issues Resolved through Policy or Administrative Action, or
- 3.** Issues Beyond the Scope of this Plan.

Rationale will be provided in the Plan for the category placement of each issue. Each issue has different sub-topics, management concerns, and questions which address specific uses and resources. Each issue may lead to conflicts relating to competing use of a resource. The following outlines each of the issues with management concerns and questions to consider in resolving the issue:

Issue 1: Vegetation Management

This issue highlights concern over management of particular vegetation resources and communities. Management constraints resulting from the RMP will reflect appropriate levels of protection of public land values in relation to uses of vegetative resources. The RMP will incorporate information, strategies, and requirements coming from the BLM's *Environmental Impact Statement for Vegetation Treatments, Watersheds and Wildlife Habitats on Public Lands Administered by the BLM in the Western United States, Including Alaska (Vegetation EIS)* should there be a signed Record of Decision for the EIS.

The issue is driven by concern regarding the management of the following resources:

Upland and Watershed Management

Vegetation on upland range provides the foundation for many uses of resources on public land. Structurally diverse plant communities provide habitat for wildlife as well as forage for domestic animals. A healthy cover of perennial vegetation and microbotic crusts stabilizes the soil, increases infiltration of precipitation, slows surface runoff, prevents erosion, provides clean water to adjacent streams, and enhances the visual quality of public land. Resource uses may affect the natural function and condition of upland communities.

- *How will the BLM manage resource uses to improve and maintain the integrity of upland ecological communities?*
- *How will management actions in upland communities be handled to be compatible with the needs of riparian communities?*
- *What new and existing rangeland projects, including seedings, are needed to improve rangeland resource values?*
- *What criteria should be considered to establish appropriate road densities? (Upland and riparian vegetation)*
- *How will livestock grazing be managed to sustain resource values while maintaining stable watersheds and the continued production of forage? (Upland and riparian vegetation)*
- *What are the visual considerations relating to upland conditions and riparian conditions, and how will the BLM's Visual Resource Management (VRM) play a role? (Upland and riparian vegetation)*
- *What areas previously excluded from grazing could be grazed and under what circumstances? Are there areas or situations when grazing should be excluded? How can grazing management techniques improve water quality? (Upland and riparian vegetation)*

Riparian Areas and Wetlands

Vegetation in riparian areas and wetlands also provides for many uses of resources on

public land. Structurally diverse plant communities provide habitat for wildlife as well as forage for domestic animals. In addition, healthy riparian areas and wetlands stabilize the soil, act as sponges releasing water throughout the year, prevent erosion, and improve water quality for adjacent streams. Resource uses may affect the natural function and condition of riparian areas and wetlands.

- *How will the BLM manage resource uses to improve or maintain the integrity of riparian ecological communities and traditional cultural uses? (Riparian vegetation)*
- *How will riparian vegetation communities be managed to improve or maintain ecological condition, species diversity, bank stability, water quality, and the timing of watershed discharge while providing for resource uses such as grazing, recreation, timber harvest, and mineral exploration and development? (Riparian vegetation)*
- *What grazing practices are necessary to protect sensitive resource values such as riparian and special status species? (Riparian vegetation)*
- *How should management actions, with potential to affect riparian communities, be identified and prioritized? (Riparian vegetation)*
- *How will riparian systems be managed to improve or maintain habitat quality for fish, wildlife, plants, and invertebrates? (Riparian vegetation, wildlife, fish, aquatic resources)*
- *How will riparian and wetland areas be managed to incorporate State of Oregon water quality standards and approved management plans addressing water quality concerns? (Riparian vegetation, wetlands, water quality)*
- *Should Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs) be more specifically defined?*

Forests and Woodlands

The BLM is mandated by FLPMA to manage public lands under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield without permanent impairment to the productivity of the land and the quality of the environment. It is the BLM's policy to manage public domain forest lands in Eastern Oregon under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield (Public Domain Timber Management Policy Statement – March 12, 1982) and in accordance with the President's Forest Health Initiative (2002) and Oregon's Eastern Oregon Ecosystem Health Strategy (also known as the 11-Point Strategy).

Forested areas within the Planning Area are subject to demands for forest products, including sawlogs, wood chips, hog fuel, and small vegetative products (e.g. firewood, posts, and poles). Forested areas also provide resources for wildlife habitat, recreation, and commercial harvest. The BLM will address this demand for forest products by evaluating need and opportunity for timber harvest both in green tree stands and during fire salvage operations. Restoration and rehabilitation of forested areas will also be addressed.

Expansion of juniper woodlands into other plant communities, riparian areas, and quaking aspen groves, and an increase in the density of historic woodlands may be detrimental to other plants and watershed functions. Woodland areas are subject to

various demands for products, including fence posts, wood chips and firewood. Woodlands also provide habitat for wildlife species, help protect watersheds and have aesthetic values difficult to quantify.

- *How will BLM maintain healthy forests while providing wildlife habitat, recreational and commercial timber harvest opportunities?*
- *To what extent and where will commercial timber or woodland product harvest occur?*
- *When and to what extent will timber salvage operations occur following a wildfire? (Forest and woodlands, fire rehabilitation)*
- *How will forest stands be managed to maintain stand health (insects, disease, fire) and production?*
- *What is the appropriate level of slash allowed following a timber harvest? To what extent should pre-commercial thinning occur?*
- *How should forestlands adjacent to communities be treated (fuel loads, visual impacts, recreational use)? (Forest and woodlands, fire)*
- *How will the BLM maintain or improve woodland communities and how will woodlands be managed to maintain or improve rangeland and wildlife habitat? (Forest and woodlands, wildlife habitat, rangeland resources)*
- *Are there juniper woodland areas that should be preserved?*
- *What type of forest and woodland management is compatible with the management of WSAs, ACECs, and WSRs?*
- *How will the BLM maintain resource uses to improve and maintain the integrity of juniper woodlands and while maintaining or improving rangeland and wildlife habitat?*
- *What actions can be taken to restore sustainable conditions in aspen woodlands?*
- *What actions can be taken to restore sustainable conditions in juniper woodlands?*
- *When does the establishment of juniper threaten other resource values, and what management actions can be used to control the invasion?*
- *Where, and to what extent, should juniper treatments be applied in order to restore shrub/steppe ecosystems?*
- *What are the visual considerations relating to juniper treatments and how should BLM's Visual Resource Management (VRM) apply to those treatments?*

Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species

The continued expansion of noxious weeds and invasive species throughout the western United States, including the planning area, will need to be addressed in the plan. The RMP is expected to incorporate strategies from the *Final Environmental Impact Statement Vegetation Treatment on BLM in Thirteen Western States (May, 1991)* and the Vale District Noxious Weed EA following review.

- *How will noxious weeds to be controlled and eradicated across the Planning Area?*
- *How should areas be prioritized for noxious weed treatment?*
- *Can the BLM effectively increase cooperative work with other agencies to monitor locations and spread of weeds, and resolve inconsistencies in the methods by which various agencies treat noxious weeds? If so, how can this be accomplished?*
- *Will there be a need to do follow-up restoration work on noxious weed infestations that have been treated consecutively?*
- *How and under what condition will BLM treat native and nonnative invasive species, such as juniper, to maintain the integrity of upland, forest/woodland and riparian ecological communities?*
- *To what extent are prevention strategies being implemented and how effective have they been?*

Issue 2: Water Quality/Aquatic Resources/Fisheries

Appropriate water quality and proper functioning aquatic habitat conditions are necessary to support viable populations of fish and other aquatic species. There are a number of stream reaches within the planning area that are listed as Water Quality Limited 303(d) by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ), having less than desirable aquatic habitat conditions or both. These streams contain a variety of fish species, several of which are either listed as threatened or are considered sensitive under Federal and State law and policy. Some activities that occur on public land may lead to degraded water quality and aquatic habitat conditions.

- *How will BLM manage resource uses to improve unacceptable aquatic habitat and water quality conditions (such as stream reaches listed as Water Quality Limited 303(d) by ODEQ) or maintain aquatic habitat and water quality that are currently in acceptable conditions?*
- *What type of management is needed to ensure that BLM is not contributing to the degradation of 303(d) listed streams?*
- *How should BLM manage to meet conflicting priorities of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) such as reducing stream temperatures while helping to maintain a warm water fishery in the same stream?*
- *Do water developments/alternative water developments (reservoirs, springs) need to have application made to the State for water rights?*
- *Which areas, if any, are appropriate for reintroduction of native fish?*
- *What management practices for range and woodlands accommodate fisheries habitat requirements?*
- *To what extent will BLM adopt ODFW management objectives for fish?*
- *What management practices best address areas of biodiversity, the needs of fish species at the limits of their range, and species assemblages? (Fish, special status species)*

Issue 3: Special Management Areas

Existing Special Management Areas (SMAs) include two Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) the Wallowa/Grande Ronde and Powder River WSRs; three Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) including McGraw Creek, Homestead, and Sheep Mountain WSAs; and nine Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) including the Grande Ronde River ACEC, Joseph Creek Outstanding Natural Area (ONA)/ACEC, Keating Riparian Research Natural Area (RNA)/ACEC (lands on Clover, Balm and Sawmill Creeks), Powder River Canyon ACEC, Unity Reservoir Bald Eagle Habitat ACEC, Hunt Mountain ACEC, Sheep Mountain ACEC, Oregon Trail ACEC and the Homestead ACEC. Supplemental studies and evaluations may be conducted as part of the planning process to address whether these designations should continue for these existing SMAs and whether additional places in the planning area qualify for special designation to protect unique or significant values. These studies and evaluations will address: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs), and other administrative designations.

- *How will SMAs be managed within the Planning Area?*
- *What public lands require special management attention to protect resource values?*
- *Are there other areas that warrant special designations to protect unique or special values?*
- *Would designating new SMAs or eliminating existing SMAs affect other resource values or management?*
- *What are appropriate standards for suppression and fuel management activities in Special Management Areas?*

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Since the Baker RMP was signed some additional candidates for ACECs have been suggested over time by both the public and staff. Additional nominations will be requested during the RMP formal scoping procedures so that evaluations can be completed in the as part of the comprehensive RMP/EIS process. All nominations will then be studied during the development of the RMP and the Draft RMP will list each proposed ACEC resulting from the evaluation, and the resource use limitations, if any, that would result if the ACEC were designated. Public comment would be solicited as required under the planning regulations, and final ACEC designations would be made as part of the Final RMP.

- *Should existing ACECs be retained under their current designations and management prescriptions?*

Wild and Scenic Rivers

The Baker Resource Area will use the RMP revision as an opportunity to review the

current Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Plans to determine if those plans are meeting the “protection” needs of the ORV’s for which the rivers were designated. If changes to Wild and Scenic Rivers management are deemed necessary, the RMP revision will then amend the river plans to encompass those changes. If the findings of the RMP determine that allocations and management of the Wild and Scenic rivers under the current River plans are meeting ORV requirements, then the RMP will be used to support those plans.

In addition, the RMP will be used as an opportunity to study streams in the planning area that may meet the criteria for future Wild and Scenic River Act designations. BLM will review potential streams to determine “suitability”. Classification and “eligibility” determinations will also be made of streams found to be “suitable”. Alternatives in the RMP will then consider a range of actions on these determinations.

The Final RMP may make recommendations concerning WSR “suitability/eligibility but will not result in a designation of a Wild and Scenic River, as that authority resides with Congress.

- *How will WSRs be managed as they relate to wilderness or other SMAs?(ACECs, Wilderness Study Areas)*
- *Is current management on existing WSRs meeting objectives and protecting the integrity of the WSR resource?*

Wilderness Study Areas

Wilderness Study Area boundaries and recommendations will not change as a result of the planning process. Should other areas be proposed as Wilderness Study Areas by the public, such as newly acquired lands within existing WSAs, the RMP would address these proposals.

- *How will wilderness characteristics be protected against the impacts of unauthorized uses such as OHV use and other mechanized or motorized transport?*
- *How will wildfire suppression be managed within Wilderness Study Areas?*
- *What management actions are needed to protect and preserve wilderness characteristics while offering opportunities for quality recreational experiences?*
- *Where and under what conditions will access be permitted to provide reasonable use and enjoyment of private land within wilderness?*
- *How will land acquired subsequent to the Oregon Wilderness Inventory/EIS, specifically the lands acquired through the Northern Oregon Assembled Land Exchange (NOALE), if determined to contain wilderness characteristics, be managed?*

Issue 4: Recreation Management

Outdoor recreation use within the Planning Area is expanding. There is demand for both developed and undeveloped recreation opportunities. The main recreational uses of lands in the Planning Area include: fishing, hunting, hiking, camping, driving for pleasure, and OHV use. Demand for permits for commercial recreation and organized group uses continue to grow.

- *How should the BLM manage recreation opportunities for developed, dispersed, and commercial recreation uses while meeting other resource objectives?*
- *What types and levels of recreation opportunities should be provided within the Planning Area?*
- *How, when, and to what extent should the BLM enhance recreation opportunities?*
- *What conflicts with resource values or other uses would restrict recreation opportunities?*
- *How should BLM address Special Recreation Permits and any needed allocations?*
- *Would changes in existing OHV designations affect recreation opportunities?*
- *To what extent should the BLM develop facilities (campgrounds, trails, etc.) and generally improve recreation access opportunities to meet public demand, to provide for public health and safety, and to direct use away from areas of conflict?*
- *What role, if any, should BLM serve in encouraging tourism?*
- *How should the BLM provide for public awareness of recreation resources and opportunities?*
- *How should recreation resources and facilities be protected from vandalism?*
- *What type of VRM management should be applied to the newly acquired lands through NOALE?*

Issue 5: Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Only a very small percentage of the Planning Area has been inventoried for cultural resources. There are approximately 400 known archaeological sites, 10 fossil locations, and an unknown number of American Indian traditional use locations. Prehistoric sites consist predominately of lithic scatters, multitask occupation sites, rock shelters, and rock art. Historic sites include homesteads, abandoned dryland farms, wagon roads, sheep camps, and arborglyphs (tree carvings). Agents of site deterioration include but are not limited to erosion, vandalism/looting, road construction, rangeland seedings and improvement, and exposure to elements.

Management actions prescribed within the Plan for the protection, stabilization and/or interpretation of cultural resources will be in accordance with BLM Manual 8110. The Plan will also provide an additional tool to consult with Tribal groups regarding traditional cultural uses or values and the development of appropriate management strategies to protect, preserve, and enhance Tribal groups use of those values.

BLM Manual 8270 will be used in the development of the RMP Revision. Paleontological inventories are very limited in the Planning Area, though some paleontological (fossil) resources are known to occur in the area. The Plan will identify

criteria or restrictions to ensure that significant paleontological resources are identified and evaluated prior to surface disturbing activities, and that threats to those resources are appropriately mitigated. The Plan may also consider opportunities for scientific, educational and recreational use of paleontological locales within the planning area.

- *How will significant cultural and paleontological sites and localities be managed to ensure their protection and preservation?*
- *Where and how will interpretation be used as an education tool to increase the public's awareness and appreciation of the RA's cultural and paleontological resources?*
- *How will the BLM gain the scientific information forming the basis of this interpretation?*
- *How will American Indian interests, traditional religious sites, landforms and resources be considered and protected?*
- *How can cultural and paleontology inventories (beyond project specific clearances) be primarily focused on areas most likely to contain significant, intact properties most susceptible to impacts such as erosion, OHV use, artifact looting, and concentrated recreation use?*
- *How can sites and localities be evaluated for significance and managed as such given timeframes and constraints imposed by the needs of other resource management?*
- *Can cost-share agreements with universities, research teams, undergraduate and graduate students, and the tribe be implemented to gain scientific and cultural information that will form the basis for evaluation and interpretation?*
- *Will resources, both internal and external, be available for BLM cultural personnel to gain training and experience required to make oral and written interpretive presentations as well as prepare design and construction of interpretative panels and facilities?*
- *How will active consultation with Tribal interests be conducted and continued to establish baseline data for traditional religious sites and use areas?*

Issue 6: Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice

The rural nature of the communities in the Planning Area causes them to be both directly and indirectly affected by public land management within the Planning Area. The Plan will address Environmental Justice in the development of the Plan.

- *How would changes in current resource uses and management practices enhance or maintain the economic and social status of rural communities in the Planning Area?*
- *How can public land management contribute to the economic stability of small rural communities in the Planning Area?*
- *How would changing land use and tourism affect rural life styles?*
- *How would land tenure adjustments affect the economic stability of small rural communities in the Planning Area?*
- *Would any changes to current resource management activities have a significant*

impact to minority or low-income groups in the Planning Area?

Issue 7: Energy and Minerals

The Planning Area contains a wide variety of energy and mineral resources, including occurrences of gold, silver, mercury, and geothermal resources. Very small amounts of coal have been reported interbedded between basalt flows. The northern portion of the planning area has been leased for oil and gas, but no discoveries are known. . Potential renewable energy sources and opportunities that exist in the resource area include wind, solar, biomass, geothermal resources. Opportunities also exist for the development of both renewable and non-renewable energy transportation systems in the resource area, however, land allocations for uses like utility corridors (pipelines and electrical transmission lines) and wind turbine sites are also considered and evaluated as lands and realty issues. Although the area contains enormous reserves of saleable minerals such as sand, gravel and rock aggregate, large-scale use has been rare. The area contains limited occurrences of rock-hounding materials, although various mineral and petrified wood specimens can be found in insolated locations of the resource area.

Energy and mineral exploration and development of federal lands is in the national interest. Consistent with federal law and national policy, the Department of Interior encourages development of Federal mineral resources and reclamation of disturbed lands. Federal lands should be available for leasing, exploration and development under the least restrictive conditions needed to protect other surface or subsurface resources.

- *How will energy and mineral resources in the plan area be managed and which areas will be classified as available for energy mineral leasing with standard leasing stipulations?*
- *What areas should be closed to leasing, subject to leasing with no surface occupancy or available with special leasing stipulations for sensitive resources or special areas?*
- *Are there potential sites on BLM managed lands suitable for disposal of common material minerals through sale or other authorized procedures?*
- *Are there BLM managed lands that should be closed to locatable mineral entry?*

Issue 8: Lands and Realty

Lands and Realty

Land exchanges with the State as well as private individuals have allowed the BLM to acquire land with special resource values and to consolidate holdings. Some public land may be exchanged or disposed in the future to provide for expansion of communities or other local needs. As the demand grows for public land resources, the need for legal public access will increase.

Northeast Oregon Assembled Land Exchange (NOALE)

The Central Oregon Resource Area (CORA) and Baker Resource Area of the BLM jointly published the Northeast Oregon Assembled Land Exchange and EIS (1998) which identified BLM disposal lands and non-federal lands BLM targeted for acquisition through exchange. Subsequently, the *Oregon Land Exchange Act of 2000* required BLM to manage certain lands acquired through the Northeast Oregon Assembled Land Exchange project in a manner “*for the protection of native fish and wildlife habitat and for public recreation*” pending completion of a new land use plan for the area. Although an active exchange program has resulted in new acquisitions in the CORA, relatively few lands identified in Baker Resource Area have been acquired through NOALE. Assessment of future exchanges is ongoing.

- *Should some BLM-administered land in the Planning Area be exchanged for other land with high public value, if the exchange is consistent with the land tenure objectives of the BLM? If so, which land should be exchanged?*
- *Where should the BLM consider exchanging BLM-administered land for other land with higher public values or consider selling isolated or difficult-to-manage land?*
- *How should BLM administer land status and values to improve management efficiency and cooperation with private landowners?*
- *Should the BLM consider disposing of land for public purposes and community expansion? (Lands and realty, socioeconomics)*
- *What areas within the Planning Area should be identified as unsuitable for right-of-way routes for major utilities and roads? (Lands and realty, energy)*
- *What areas within the Planning Area should be identified as open for right-of-way or other land use authorizations?*
- *What mitigation measures would be appropriate for land that is suitable for right-of-way routes?*
- *Which land in the Planning Area should have current withdrawals or classifications revoked, continued or modified?*
- *Should any lands within the Planning Area, not currently withdrawn, be withdrawn in order to protect resource values?*
- *Where should utility corridors, avoidance, and exclusion areas be designated? (Lands and realty, energy)*
- *Is there land within the Planning Area that should be identified for retention, acquisition or sale, exchange or other disposal in order to address management objectives and issues?*
- *If large areas come under BLM administration through revocation of withdrawals to other Federal agencies, how should they be managed? Should they remain under BLM administration, or should they be exchanged or otherwise disposed of?*

Issue 9: Transportation, Including OHV Management, and Public Access

Major factors in alternative formulation and the estimation of effects for transportation planning in the RMP will include public access needs, road densities, recreational

activities, administrative needs, and the protection of resource values.

Growth of OHV use has become a significant issue within the Planning Area, as it is on most Public Land, because of concern related to resource degradation that results from dispersed OHV use across the Planning Area.

In January 2001, the BLM issued a *National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands*. OHV use in the Planning Area will be managed in accordance with that strategy. OHV use is currently managed through the designation of BLM-administered land as “open”, “limited” or “closed.” Currently, two-thirds of the Planning Area is designated “open”, and one-third has restrictions on OHV use.

- *How will transportation and access be managed in the Planning Area to provide for use and enjoyment of the Public Lands while protecting significant resource values?*
- *What roads and trails are needed for administrative use and/or public access?*
- *Where and what roads and trails should be open or closed to motorized vehicles or limited to nonmotorized, nonmechanical traffic?*
- *Where and what roads or trails should be seasonally closed for protection and/or improvement of resources or for public safety?*
- *To what standards should roads and trails be maintained?*
- *Are there roads or trails that no longer serve management purposes and can be abandoned and/or reclaimed?*
- *Are there areas where new roads or trails should be considered to provide access to important public resources, to prevent environmental degradation, or to improve transportation?*
- *What criteria will be used to determine if current and future OHV use is compatible with OHV designations in the existing BLM OHV strategy?*
- *What criteria will be used to determine if OHV use is causing “considerable adverse effects” to Planning Area resources?*
- *What changes should occur to current OHV designations if determined not to be compatible with the current BLM OHV Strategy or Planning Area objectives?*
- *How should BLM coordinated with the Forest Service and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) on OHV designations?*

Public Access

- *How should areas be prioritized for public access?*
- *How could BLM work with ODFW to obtain access?*
- *Should public access to streams and rivers be provided from roads and bridges? If it should, what type of easements would be needed to acquire access?*
- *If an active easement program is initiated, where are easements or other use agreements needed to ensure future access?*

Issue 10 Fire and Fuels Management

Historically wildland fire played an important role in ecosystem processes in the planning area. In the recent past fire exclusion has altered those processes. Current policy is to use fire to restore and maintain natural ecosystems while meeting resource objectives and protecting human life and property.

Wildfire occurrences have increased dramatically over the past several years, consuming millions of acres of public and private lands. Many of these fires occurred in wildland-urban interface areas and exceeded fire suppression capabilities. To reduce the risk of fire in the wildland-urban interface, a National Fire Plan and associated strategies have been developed. Using direction from those plans, the Vale District, through the use of a national contractor completed a “Communities at Risk” assessment for urban interface zones in communities adjacent to BLM lands to determine the risk of wildfire. The goal of the Communities at Risk Program is to develop partnerships with local, State and Federal agencies to educate homeowners of the dangers of fuels build-up, prevention and protection strategies, and to develop a program to reduce the risk of wildfire.

The planning effort will address appropriate fire management actions, including areas where fire is not desired, where fire under pre-determined conditions can be used as a resource management tool for habitat restoration, and where fuel reductions are necessary as required by the National Fire Plan and the Vale District Fire Management Plan.

- *How should the BLM manage wildland fire, fuels, and prescribed fire to meet, and be consistent with, resource objectives while protecting life and property?*
- *How can BLM and private landowners work together to protect homes and communities adjacent to forest lands, both prior to and during a wildfire?*
- *What rehabilitation practices will be implemented following the disturbance of vegetative cover?*
- *What criteria and what management practices should be considered for fire rehabilitation, for restoration of wildlife habitat, and to determine whether or not native or introduced species should be seeded to stabilize watersheds?*
- *How should the National Fire Plan be incorporated into the Plan?*
- *How, and to what extent, should prescribed fire be used to manage vegetative resources? Which areas are appropriate for using prescribed/wildland fire as a management tool and how should these areas be prioritized for treatment?*
- *While the BLM continues to protect life, property, and important resources from fire, are there areas where Appropriate Management Response strategies of less than full suppression should be implemented? If so, where and under what conditions would these strategies be applied? Which areas should continue to receive full suppression strategies to protect important values?*
- *Which areas may be subject to constraints (e.g., Oregon Department of*

Environmental Quality (ODEQ) air quality standards) that could limit the use of prescribed fire?

- *How will land ownership patterns affect fire and fuels management?*

Issue 11 Wildlife Habitat/Wildlife

Each wildlife species contributes to biological diversity. All wildlife species in the Planning Area may be affected by competition for resources or conversion of habitat on public land.

- *How will the BLM provide for diverse wildlife habitat in the Planning Area while considering other resource uses?*
- *What practices will be authorized and implemented to provide fish, wildlife, and special status species habitat as well livestock forage while maintaining other uses and values of public land resources? (Wildlife, fish, special status species)*
- *What practices will be authorized and implemented to provide adequate habitat and forage for wildlife while maintaining other resource uses and values?*
- *Which areas, if any, are appropriate for reintroduction of wildlife or special status species? (Wildlife and special status species)*
- *To what extent will BLM adopt ODFW management objectives for wildlife?*
- *What management practices best address areas of biodiversity, the needs of species at the limits of their range, and species assemblages? (Wildlife, special status species)*
- *How will BLM incorporate sage grouse guidelines and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act requirements into the Plan?*

Special Status Species (Plants and Wildlife)

Management of habitat for Special Status plant and animal species is a key issue in striving to keep species from being listed as threatened or endangered and to maintain biological diversity.

- *How can public land management contribute to the preservation and increase in sustainable populations of species now considered in Special Status?*
- *How can land management successfully prevent habitat destruction, which would lead to listing of additional species?*
- *Which areas, if any, are appropriate for reintroduction of Special Status species?*
- *To what extent will the BLM adopt ODFW management objectives for Special Status species?*
- *What are the long-term strategies for managing habitat for Special Status species?*

B. Issues Eliminated From Detailed Study

A number of issues are beyond the scope of the RMP. For example, issues related to private and State lands will not be analyzed. However, as other land management actions affect or have the potential to affect BLM administered lands and waters, BLM will incorporate relevant information from other actions and programs. Issues related to block grants for communities/counties/States, potential changes in Federal law (e.g., laws relating to energy and mineral development and grazing), and release of WSAs are outside the scope of the RMP since they depend upon Congressional actions.

CHAPTER VI. DATA AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM NEEDS

The staff has identified data and Geographical Information System (GIS) needs required to address resource and use issues and develop and analyze impacts of plan alternatives. Appendix A summarizes these data needs and provides a cost estimate for collecting data. In many cases, existing resource information is available from various sources, including the Baker Field Office, and will be used in formulating resource objectives and management actions.

Some data, however, needs to be updated, compiled, and put into digital format for use in the planning process and for development of Plan maps. GIS theme maps are the building blocks to quantify resources, create additional maps, and manipulate resources during alternative formulation. In order to meet Plan deadlines, accelerated map preparation may have to occur, and other work may take a lower priority.

In addition to existing information, new data is also needed in some areas to provide Plan baseline inventory and resource condition information. For example, baseline inventory and resource condition data is needed for newly acquired lands on the Grande Ronde and Wallowa Rivers.

CHAPTER VII. PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS

A number of BLM staff will be involved in the preparation of the RMP Revision throughout all levels of the organization because certain rare skills are not available at the Field Office or District level, but are available at the Oregon State Office or Washington Office level.

A. Roles, Responsibilities, and Authorities

1. Management Team

- a. **BLM State Director (SD):** Reviews and approves preplan, reviews and approves Notice of Intent and related scoping materials, reviews Analysis of the Management Situation, reviews and approves the Draft EIS, reviews and approves the Final EIS, directs staff coordination and review of planning documents throughout the planning process; provides scarce skill specialist assistance for the Interdisciplinary (ID) Team as needed; assists in intergovernmental coordination during the planning process; assists in protests and provides official reports on protests to the Washington Office; and approves the record of decision. The State Director and OSO staff roles will be guided by the new OSO planning Manual Supplement 1601, dated March 20, 2003.
- b. **District Manager (DM):** ensures final product is responsive to the issues and is able to be implemented; ensures management of land and resources along agency administrative boundaries is arrived at in a collaborative manner to avoid different approaches and confusing direction in these areas; helps develop issues and questions; keeps State Director up-to-date on progress and recommends solutions to keeping progress on track; recommends approval of the preplan analysis; recommends draft and final products to State Director.
- c. **Baker Field Manager (RM):** Manages daily operations of Baker RA; provides overall direction and management guidance to the core and ID Team; provides overall supervision of Baker RA staff, sets priorities for completing plan, and general oversight of RMP preparation details; prepares and executes Baker RA budget, hires and supervises staff; serves as point person in the RMP public participation process.
- d. **Vale District Planning and Environmental Coordinator (PEC):** Provides project management oversight of the RMP; assists with coordination efforts with similar planning taking place in the Central Oregon RA and the three affected National Forests; acts as a technical expert for NEPA and Planning programs.

2. Core Team

- a. **Core Team Manager (CTM):** The CTM is responsible for the

day-to-day management and coordination of the planning effort and keeps the District Manager and Field Manager apprized of controversies and conflicts as they arise and makes recommendations for resolving problems. The CTM has overall responsibility for assuring completion of the RMP, quality control, and collaboration with interested publics or governmental agencies. The CTM has direct supervision of the Core Team and Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) and directs their involvement throughout the planning process as required. The CTM ensures that appropriate project management and records management are followed.

- b. **Core Team (CT):** This team consists of a GIS specialist, writer/editor, and administrative support specialist. This team assists the CTM in the day-to-day responsibilities of managing the planning effort including, but not limited to, the management of documents and records and coordination with the IDT, the public, and other agencies.

3. **Interdisciplinary Team (IDT)**

Staff professionals across a range of resource management fields will compose the IDT for the planning effort. The IDT is directed by the CTM and has primary responsibilities in analysis, data gathering or directing inventory needs, providing written materials for inclusion in the document, public outreach, and ensuring accuracy of data and analysis.

4. **Bureau of Land Management Oregon State Office**

- a. **Program Leads:** All resource and land use program leaders will provide management guidance and review, policy interpretation, and general assistance.
- b. **GIS Specialists:** Vale District requests OSO GIS staff provide meta data assistance, and assistance with GTRN (roads) and HYD/ARIMS (streams) for the RMP.
- c. **Planning and Environmental Staff:** The Planning and Environmental Staff at the OSO provides Plan/EIS preparation guidance; interpretation of NEPA policy and regulations; technical review of entire document(s); communication with OSO personnel in seeking clarity and interpretation of policy and direction from OSO; coordinates and consolidates OSO staff review and

responses to issues and draft documents and submits to Project Manager.

Provides quality assurance for procurement and publication (printing, design, and cartographic overview), as well as budget and financial planning help.

5. Bureau of Land Management Washington Office Planning Staff

- a. Staff from these offices will assist in project design and procedural guidance.
- a. The Washington Office will participate in the resolution of any possible planning protests.

6. John Day/Snake Resource Advisory Council

The John Day/Snake Resource Advisory Council will be consulted throughout the Plan development and decision process.

CHAPTER VIII. FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN

A. General Process

All legal and policy requirements will be met in the Plan and in the process regarding public notices, required elements distribution of draft and final documents. The NEPA requirements and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines will be met.

The planning process will be guided by the planning regulations as set forth in 43 CFR 1600 and the H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook. The regulations and manual provide the procedural guidance for implementing Sections 201 and 202 of FLPMA.

The primary outcome of this effort is the Baker RMP revision that will amend the Baker RMP and will establish the basic goals and objectives for resource management activities and the measures needed to achieve these goals and objectives as well as provide for desired future conditions. Planning decisions are generally made on a broad scale and guide subsequent development of implementing activities (activity level plans).

In accordance with the direction set forth in FLPMA, this planning effort will recognize the following principles:

- Use and observe the principles of multiple-use and sustained yield;
- Use a systematic interdisciplinary approach to integrate, physical, biological, economic and other sciences;
- Give priority to the designation and protection of ACECs;
- Rely, to the extent possible, on available data regarding natural resources;
- Consider present and potential uses of public lands;
- Consider the relative scarcity of values and availability of alternative means and sites for recognizing those values;
- Weigh long term benefits to the public against short term benefits;
- Provide for compliance with Tribal, Federal, and state pollution laws, standards and implementation plans;
- Provide for consistency and coordination with other programs, plans, and policies.
- Provide a framework for implementing Standards and Guides.

B. Document Format

The format and outline for the Plan will come from BLM and NEPA land use planning and management guidance and manuals. The proposed RMP Revision /EIS document will follow standard formats. Each chapter will be supplemented with maps, tables, and figures to assist the public in understanding the existing situation and the management opportunities on public land.

The following document outline will be used, though it may be modified as the document is prepared.

Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need

- Introduction
- Location of the Planning Area
- Purpose and Need
- Issues
- Summary of Planning Criteria

Chapter 2 - Alternatives

- Introduction and Development of Alternatives
- Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Study
- Management Common to All Alternatives
- No Action Alternative
- Preferred Alternative
- Other Alternatives
- Comparison Table

Chapter 3 – Affected Environment

Introduction
Affected Environment by Resource

Chapter 4 – Environmental Consequences

Introduction
Analysis Assumptions and Guidelines
Impacts by Resource Value
Summary of Cumulative Impacts
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts
Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitments

Chapter 5 – Consultation and Coordination

Summary of Scoping
Public Participation
Consistency
Distribution List
List of Preparers

Appendices
Glossary
References
Index

C. Alternative Formulations

A range of alternatives, including a No Action Alternative, will be developed to respond to the issues identified at the outset of the process and as a result of public scoping. Each alternative will provide different solutions to the issues and concerns conveyed. The objective in alternative formulation will be to develop realistic solutions that the BLM is capable of implementing. Some subalternatives may be identified where only portions of an alternative require variations in resource management potential.

While it is too early in the process to identify specific alternatives, the following alternative concepts or themes are provided for consideration and to stimulate further development of alternatives. Preliminary alternatives to be formulated for the Plan include:

- **No Action Alternative:** This alternative will continue the existing management situation and directions under existing Bureau plans and programs. It would include the management direction and protections provided by any current biological opinion/agreements, and any currently approved activity plans such as allotment management plans or habitat management plans. Resource values or sensitive habitats would receive management emphasis as at present levels. Emphasis would be on

maintaining existing conditions. There would be no comprehensive plan for restoration of degraded systems. Restoration would be on a case-by-case basis and would utilize either active or passive methods. This Alternative is required by CEQ.

- **Conservation and Restoration Theme Alternative:** At least one Alternative could be based on a Conservation and Restoration theme. This alternative would recognize community reliance on natural resource protection, and would focus on enhanced restoration and/or mitigation to lessen the effects of development. This concept could be applied in a single alternative or throughout a variety of alternatives. Intense restoration of resources at risk or habitats would be promoted.
- **Resource Zone Concept:** At least one alternative could carry forward the concept of themes for different planning zones. This alternative would establish specific zones based on priority management areas. These areas may include high priority areas for development and production of non-renewable resources (i.e. oil and gas, minerals, etc.). Each area would also contain specific management prescriptions based on the sensitivity of resources located in that area and land use allocations would be made accordingly.
- **Special Designation Concept:** One alternative could use the concept of placing high values resources (such as cultural, paleontological, recreation, visual, or biological) in a variety of special designations such as ACECs, HMAs, SRMAs, or others. Areas outside of these special designations would be managed according to standardized best management practices. This alternative would likely result in extensive subsequent activity planning.
- **Ecosystem Health Theme:** This alternative could result in developing projected standards and guidelines for specific categories or uses. Desired Future Conditions would be established for a variety of resources or uses.
- **Exclude Commodity Production and Limit Other Uses, Maximize Natural Processes Theme:** This alternative would exclude all permitted, discretionary uses of the public lands including livestock grazing, mineral sale or leasing, realty actions, recreation uses requiring permits, commercial rights-of-way, etc. The resource area would petition the Department of the Interior (DOI) to withdraw the entire planning area from locatable mineral entry. This alternative would allow no commodity production and would include only those management actions necessary to maintain or enhance natural values and protect life and property. Any management actions would utilize primarily passive methods. Some components of the alternative may not be possible to implement because

of legal constraints, but the alternative is included for purposes of impact comparison.

D. Internal Review of the Plan

The CTM and/or PEC will coordinate appropriate Field Office, State Office, and Washington Office reviews in a timely manner. Forms may be supplied electronically to reviewers to facilitate the receipt of comments and the analysis of those comments.

Review by the Oregon State Office (OSO) Review Team will occur at the following junctures, but is likely to occur at several other points during the plan preparation based on the recently approved 1601 Manual Supplement (currently being revised):

- Before finalizing the Analysis of the Management Situation
- Upon completion of the alternatives
- Before finalizing the Draft RMP Revision/EIS
- Before finalizing the Proposed RMP Revision/FEIS, and
- Before the ROD/Approved RMP Revision is signed by the State Director

F. Form of Input from Interdisciplinary Team and Reviewers

Written products required from team members will be provided either via e-mail, on a 3.5" floppy disk, or on CDs, in Microsoft Word software, according to Bureau standards. Meeting notes and team input will be documented in the Administrative Record. The OSO Planner will coordinate and consolidate comments from the OSO Review Team. These comments will be provided to the CTM via e-mail or hard copy. These comments will be provided to the Field Manager as well as the CTM via e-mail or hard copy. The OSO Review Team will also provide a copy of their comments directly to their IDT member counterpart.

G. Plan Preparation Schedule

Depending on funding approvals, data collection and GIS development for the Baker RMP Revision will be initiated in FY 2005, scoping and AMS development will occur in 2006, with a Draft RMP Revision /EIS being available in mid-2007. This will result in a Proposed RMP Revision/FEIS distributed in 2008, with the ROD/Approved Plan scheduled for release in 2009. Appendix B outlines a detailed schedule with key tasks, milestones, and deliverables identified. The general schedule is as follows:

FY 2004 Preplan Approval

FY 2005	Funding Decision and Data Collection/GIS starts
FY 2006	Public Scoping, Analysis of the Management Situation
FY 2007	Formulation of Alternatives, and Release of Draft RMP Revision/EIS
FY 2008	Review of Public Comment and Proposed RMP Revision/FEIS released
FY 2009	Issuance of the ROD for the Proposed RMP

It should be understood that substantial deviation from proposed staffing or budgets as identified in this preparation plan, or identification of new or emerging issues not considered at this time may impact this schedule.

CHAPTER IX. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION PROCESS AND STAKEHOLDERS LIST

The public participation opportunities for the major stages of the planning process are listed below. Dates for these events will be publicized when finalized. Appendix D provides a preliminary draft of the public participation schedule. Every effort will be made to ensure meaningful public involvement throughout the process, including the use of internet technology.

A. Identification of Issues, Planning Criteria, and Management Concerns

1. *Federal Register* Notices of Intent, media articles, and website information regarding the preparation and content of the Plan, and schedule of upcoming scoping meetings will be readily available. E-mail messages or letters will be sent to people on the mailing list. An Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) will be prepared and circulated for public review prior to issuance of the Draft EIS.
2. Informal, public, open-house scoping meetings will be organized and facilitated by BLM to gather public input on the issues, management concerns to be resolved in the Plan, and on the planning criteria and process. At these meetings interested parties will have the opportunity to give written comments to BLM as well as engage in discussion of issues. Requests for written comments on issues/scope of the Plan will be sent out during the public scoping period. Comments on the Draft and Final RMP/EIS will be solicited.

B. Formulation of Alternatives

1. Scoping meetings with interested parties and agencies will be held at several locations in order to solicit comments on alternatives and ensure all appropriate issues are addressed. Periodic progress reports to interested parties will provide up-to-date information on the RMP/EIS process.

2. Public input via written responses within the 30-day scoping/comment period will be incorporated into the process where appropriate.
3. After the scoping period, flyers will be sent to all parties who have expressed interest in the Planning Area. At that time parties can designate their level of interest in the remaining process by returning the flyer to BLM.

C. Issuance of the Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

1. Public Notice of the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS, *Federal Register* Notices regarding the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and dates for the 90-day period for public comments will be published in local/regional papers advertising the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS. The schedule of the public meetings to be held during the comment period will be published at this time.
2. Public meetings will be held locally during the 90-day public comment period to gather written input on the Draft RMP/EIS.

D. Issuance of Proposed Final Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

1. The Final RMP/EIS will be sent to those who commented on the Draft RMP/EIS and/or requested a copy. The availability of the Plan will be advertised in regional newspapers, *Federal Register*, and other media. A notice of a 30-day protest period will be published in all appropriate media.
2. The Governor's consistency review (60 days) will run partially concurrent with the 30-day protest period.

E. Response to Protests

1. Written responses will be sent to the public by the Director (WO-210), as needed.
2. A *Federal Register* Notice requesting comments on significant changes made as result of a protest will be published if significant changes are warranted.

F. Issuance of Approved Plan/Record of Decision

The public will be notified via news articles, e-mail, website, and transmittal

letters of the availability of the approved Plan and Records of Decisions. The published Record of Decision and approved RMP (or its compact disc equivalent) will be offered to all persons or groups on the RMP/EIS mailing list, as well as posted on the internet and made available in local libraries.

G. Cooperating Agency List

Pursuant to IM-2002-203 and the CEQ Memorandum to Heads of Federal Agencies of January 30, 2002, all Federal agencies should be actively considering designation of Federal and non-federal cooperating agencies in the preparation of analyses and documentation required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and ensuring that Federal agencies actively participate as cooperating agencies in other agency's NEPA processes. To accomplish this, the following will be contacted regarding their desires to participate as cooperating agencies in the RMP revision NEPA process. Through agency consultations and scoping, additional cooperators may be identified.

Potential Federal Cooperators

- Malheur National Forest
- Umatilla National Forest
- Wallowa-Whitman National Forest
- NOAA Fisheries Service
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- National Park Service
- Bureau of Reclamation
- DOD Boardman Bombing Range (Navy)
- Umatilla Depot (Army)
- Corps of Engineers
- Bonneville Power Administration

Potential Tribal Cooperators (IB-OR-2000-095 reinforces that cooperating agency status does not preclude the requirement for a government-to-government consultation with federally recognized tribes.)

- Shoshone-Paiute (Duck Valley)
- Shoshone-Paiute (McDermitt)
- Shoshone-Bannock
- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation
- Nez Perce
- Joseph Band of the Nez Perce
- Burns Paiute
- Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Paiute Reservation

Potential State Cooperators

- Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
- Oregon Department of Forestry

- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Oregon Economic and Community Development Department
- Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
- Oregon Division of State Lands
- Oregon Office of Energy
- Oregon Heritage Commission
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
- Oregon Water Resources Department
- Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Oregon Public Utilities Commission
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
- Oregon Dept. of Agriculture

Potential Local Government Cooperators

- County Commissions or Courts within the BRA
- Incorporated City Governments within the BRA

H. Stakeholders List

Stakeholders that do not qualify as cooperators have been identified and are listed below. Additional stakeholders will be identified throughout the process. A mailing list identifying key people in these organizations, agencies, and interest groups will be compiled with the assistance of the Plan contractor who will be responsible for handling all mailings, and notifications of public meetings, input deadlines, and other steps associated with the public participation process.

Interested publics
 Special Interest Groups
 Adjacent private landowners
 Grazing Permittees
 Interested businesses and consultants
 John Day/Snake Resource Advisory Council
 Media

CHAPTER X. BUDGET

Appendix C provides the proposed total “Budget for RMP Preparation” for 2004 through 2009. The budget includes all costs associated with development of the Plan including, data needs collection, contracting costs, BLM staff work months, *Federal Register* Notices, vehicles, travel, and support costs.

Appendix A: Pre-Plan Data Needs and Associated Costs

Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Issues/Questions	2 Needed Data Sets	3 Is Needed Data Set Available <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Need to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data	5 Est. Cost \$\$\$	6 Are Metadata Available <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Resource, GIS and/or GPS Staffing Needed
Issue 1 – Vegetation Management	Needs Review – Buchanan Needs Review - Staff	Yes	Consolidate multiple county soils Data	1250.00	Yes	NRCS	Yes	GIS - ¼ w/m
	• Soils Inventory & mapping	Yes	soils Data		Yes		Yes	GIS - 1w/m
	• Weed Inventory	Partial	Weed Database Update, GPS and GIS data capture/entry	\$25K	Yes	OSO/Vale	Sids proposed for OSO/DO/WO	Contract – 4w/m
	• Forest Inventory	Partial (10-20%)	Field Inventory and collection, input to GIS, and database input	\$140K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Contract – 26w/m GIS – 2 w/m
	• T&E Plants	Partial (40%)	Incorporate Existing Data into GIS and convert to standard	\$15K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – 2 ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m
	• Update/Finalize Allotment Boundaries	Partial	Finalize, QC and convert boundary theme and convert to statewide standards	\$5k	Yes	OSO	Yes	GIS – 1w/m
	• Input and consolidation of Range Improvement Data	Partial	Data in multiple sources; GIS and Range staff to organize and create themes	\$10K	Partial	OSO/Vale	Yes	GIS – 2w/m
	• Treatment Areas -	No	Prepare and research data and input into GIS	\$5K	No	OSO	Unknown	Staff - 1w/m

Appendix A: Pre-Plan Data Needs and Associated Costs

Pre-Plan Data Status								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Planning Issues/Questions	Needed Data Sets	Is Needed Data Set Available <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	Work Need to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data	Est. Cost \$\$\$	Are Metadata Available <i>Yes/No</i>	Name/Source of Data Standard	Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	Resource, GIS and/or GPS Staffing Needed
Issue 2 Water Quality/Aquatic Resources/ Fisheries,	Needs Review – Buchanan Needs Review - Staff	Partial (60-70%)	ODFW data review, ARIMS existing data review. Identify data gaps, and incorporate into GIS	\$20K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – 2wm GIS – 2 wm
	Inventory/Update critical streams, including riparian values (critical habitat, 7 WS that are in section 7)	Partial	Field inventory on critical streams.	\$15K	Proposed	OSO	Yes	Staff – 2wm GIS – 1 wm
	Roads/Stream Crossings/Culverts	Partial - GIS	Field inventory for stream crossings culverts for fish passage	\$20K	Upon Completion	OSO	Part	GPS – 3wm GIS – 1 wm
	Gather, format existing data for input into ARIMS/GIS	Partial	Review existing restoration and PFC data and identify data gaps, and incorporate into GIS	\$15K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff - 2wm GIS – 1 wm
	Water Quality Monitoring and incorporate into ARIMS	Partial	Gather, input data	\$5K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – 1wm
Issue 3 Special Management Areas	Riparian Photos in digital format	No	Scan and rectify photos	\$40K	NA	NA	NA	Contract – 8wm
	Wild and Scenic Inventory for all free flowing streams, and those on acquired lands and in Washington State on Grande Ronde River	No	Inventory and entry into GIS, including Alternatives analysis	\$65k	Proposed	OSO	Yes	Contract – 13 wm
	Wild and Scenic existing situation	Partial	Review existing mapping and update where needed	\$10K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – ½ wm GIS – ½ wm
Issue 3 (cont)	ACEC – Existing Areas' data capture and documentation	Partial	Manuscripting/Acquire legals, document and capture	\$5K	Upon Completion	In Development	Yes	GIS – 1wm

Appendix A: Pre-Plan Data Needs and Associated Costs

Pre-Plan Data Status								
1 Planning Issues/Questions	2 Needed Data Sets	3 Is Needed Data Set Available Yes/No/ Partially	4 Work Need to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data	5 Est. Cost \$\$\$	6 Are Metadata Available Yes/No	7 Name/Source of Data Standard	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Resource, GIS and/or GPS Staffing Needed
Issue 4 Recreation Management	Needs Review – Buchanan Needs Review - Staff	No	ID Team, GIS Modeling, key observation points, field inventories, and analysis	\$75K	No	OSO	Likely	Contract – 14wm GIS – 1wm
	VRM Inventory	No	Run transportation system analysis, after update	\$10K	Unknown	Unknown	???	GPS/Eng 1wm GIS 1wm
	ROS Inventory	No	Prepare and capture data for existing situation (current 100k data from ICBEMP)	\$10k	In process	OSO	Yes	Staff – 1wm GIS – 1wm
	OHV, existing situation	No	Field and Office Inventory. Field work would update transportation system as well.	\$100K	Upon Completion	OSO	Yes	Staff – 4wm GIS – 1wm Contract/GPS – 15wm
	OHV Designated Routes Inventory and Analysis	No	Field Inventory and GPS and incorporation into GIS	\$12.5K	Yes	OSO	Yes	GPS/Staff – 2wm GIS – ½ wm
	Developed and Concentrated (but not developed) Recreation Sites (good start with rec map)	Partial	Continue mapping effort Idaho Power has started. Brent has IP data	10k	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – 1.5 wm GIS - .5 wm
	Dispersed Recreation Sites	Partial	Extract data from Transportation layer and verify, attribute. Trails will also be developed with alternatives	15k	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – 2wm GIS – 1wm
	Trails/ Back Country B-Y-WAYS	Partial	New Class II Inventory of Sensitive	\$65K	Yes	OSO/Central Oregon Heritage Group	Yes	Contract - 13 wm
	Non Section 106 Inv.	Partial	Capture Site Data for areas and line data (including Oregon Trail and other Historic Trails)	\$5K	Yes	Central Oregon Heritage Group	Yes	GIS – ½ wm Staff – ½ wm
	Finalize Cultural Resources Sites Inventory	Partial	Review/Update Survey Data –	\$5k	Yes	Central Oregon Heritage Group	Yes	GIS – ½ wm Staff – ½ wm
Acquire OSO/SHPO survey data and review for Resource RMP Analysis	No							
Issue 5 Cultural and Pale ontological Resources								

Appendix A: Pre-Plan Data Needs and Associated Costs

Pre-Plan Data Status								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Planning Issues/Questions	Needed Data Sets	Is Needed Data Set Available Yes/No/ Partially	Work Need to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data	Est. Cost \$\$\$	Are Metadata Available Yes/No	Name/Source of Data Standard	Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	Resource, GIS and/or GPS Staffing Needed
Issue 6 Socioeconomics	Needs Review – Buchanan Needs Review - Staff State Office Economist input	No	Will acquire OSO input for Socio-Economic Analysis for RMP Area	\$20K	NA	NA	NA	OSO Support or contract
Issue 7 Energy and Minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Potentials - Includes Locatables, Leasables and Satiables 	No	Research, Manuscripting and Data Capture and acquisition	\$55K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff/Contract – 9w/m GIS 2 w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Known Geothermal Resource Areas Well Locations 	No	Research Legals and Capture	\$5K	Yes	Vale	Yes	Staff – ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Geology 	Possible	Research Existing Data and Incorporate into District Database	\$5K	Yes	National	Yes	Staff ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m
Issue 8 Lands and Realty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utility Corridors Land Tenure Zones Existing Easements Non-Federal Ownership Identification 	Partial No No No	Site/Corridor location research, preparation and capture Legal Locations identification and resources review, and incorporation into GIS Easement Locations identification and resources review, and incorporation into GIS with updated 24k roads Update Resource Area Ownership for non-Federal (particularly State Lands along the Grande Ronde River)	\$5K \$5K \$5K \$5K	Upon Completion No No No	Vale Vale Vale Vale	Unknown Unknown Unknown Unknown	Staff ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m Staff – ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m Staff – ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m
Issue 9 Transportation and Public Access	Road Inventory	No	Update Road Data for Non-Inventoried Routes, and identify road intersections, structures, and crossings. This effort would be partial funding combined with funding from other benefiting activities.	\$25,000	Yes	OSO	Yes	GPS – 4w/m GIS – 1 w/m
Issue 10 Fire and Fuels Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large Fire Perimeter 	Partial	Manuscripting and capture, and preparation for analysis	\$2.5K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – ¼ w/m GIS – ¼ w/m

Appendix A: Pre-Plan Data Needs and Associated Costs

Pre-Plan Data Status								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Planning Issues/Questions	Needed Data Sets	Is Needed Data Set Available Yes/No/ Partially	Work Need to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data	Est. Cost \$\$\$	Are Metadata Available Yes/No	Name/Source of Data Standard	Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	Resource, GIS and/or GPS Staffing Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs Review – Buchanan Needs Review - Staff 	Partial	Complete and update boundaries	\$2.5 K	Upon Completion	Vale	Yes	Staff – ¼ w/m GIS – ¼ w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire Management Zones/ Representative Locations Appropriate Management Categories 	Partial	Complete and update boundaries	\$2.5K	Upon Completion	Vale	Unknown	Staff – ¼ w/m GIS – ¼ w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interagency Protection Agreement Boundaries 	Partial	Complete and update boundaries	\$2.5K	Upon Completion	Vale	Unknown	Staff – ¼ w/m GIS – ¼ w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire Regimes 	Partial	Obtain data from partners. Current data exists on BLM lands for large fires, back to 1980. General fire history likely available from ICBEMP/REO. Data often does not match across district boundaries	\$5k	Yes	OSO/USFS	Will need to be updated.	Staff – ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire Condition Class 	No	Will probably only need information on two classes for RMP—maintenance and restoration.	\$5k	Upon Completion	OSO/USFS	Unknown	Staff – ½ w/m GIS – ½ w/m
Issue 11 Wildlife/Wildlife Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capture/Update and Completion of Large Mammal, Sage Grouse, T&E species 	Partial	Incorporate into WILDSITTE standard, work with ODFW for large mammal data entry, complete raptor and lynx work	\$15K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff – 2w/m GIS – 1w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T&E Habitat 	Partial	Have OSO continue to classify Satellite imagery for Sage grouse. Continue field inventories for SG and other species. This could have District wide benefits. Wildsite input, updates	30k	Yes	OSO	Yes	OSO/Staff – 4 ½ w/m GIS – 1 ½ w/m
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mine Locations (BATS) 	No	Identify and capture mine locations.	10K	Yes	OSO	Yes	Staff - 2 w/m GIS - 1 w/m

Appendix B: Proposed Plan Preparation Schedule for the Baker RMP Revised for 2006 NOI

Planning Phase	Actions	Dates	Responsibility
Formally Initiate Planning Effort and Preliminary Scoping (43 CFR 1610.2)	Hire planning position (Core Team Manager or CTM) Four-year term position	10/01/05	FM
	Hire Core Team positions (GIS specialist, Writer/Editor, Admin. Asst.)	10/01/05 – 12/01/05	CTM/FM
	Publish NOI in Federal Register	10/01/05	FM/PEC
	Update Mailing List	10/01/05	PEC/FO/DO
	Provide Preliminary Planning Bulletin	11/01/05	FO/CTM/PA/PEC
	Pursue MOUs or Cooperating Agency status for entities with jurisdiction by law or special expertise	11/01/05	FM/CTM/PEC
	Initiate government-to-government consultation with Tribal Governments.	11/01/05	FM/DM
	Begin formal solicitation for issues and concerns	12/01/05	CTM/FM/DM/PA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make presentation to Resource Advisory Council • Conduct Open Houses and initiate other public involvement 		
Inventory and Data Collection (43 CFR 1610.4-3)	GIS database <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update Themes • Metadata • Determine Data Gaps 	11/01/02 – ongoing	CTM/IDT
	Data Collection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate Contracts for data collection • Contact adjacent USFS and BLM Offices and State Agencies to determine opportunities for joint data gathering • Other Data collection Collaborative Data evaluation (USFS, BLM Central Oregon FO, USGS, BPA, ODFW, ODF, NOAA Fisheries, USFWS)	As early as possible as funding becomes available. 01/15/06	CTM/IDT FM/OSO/PEC

Appendix B: Proposed Plan Preparation Schedule for the Baker RMP Revised for 2006 NOI

Planning Phase	Actions	Dates	Responsibility
Initiate Consultation on T&E and Cultural Resources	Contact USFWS and NMFS for consultation and timeline for completed consultation. Consider any need to assist in making consultation timely, if necessary.	10/01/05 – until completed	CTM Wildlife Biologist Botanist Fish Biologist PEC
	Contact State Historic Preservation Office and initiate consultation.	10/01/05 – until completed	Archaeologist
Issue Resolution and Alternative Development (43 CFR 1610.4-1)	Based on information received during Scoping (internal and external) formulate management alternatives focused on issue resolution. Continue public involvement and coordination with Tribal, local, and state governments. Continue consultation with Tribal governments.	02/01/06 – continue through process	CTM/IDT/FM/PEC
	Prepare and publish the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) based on data gathering, scoping, and initial issue and alternative development.	11/01/05 – 12/01/06	CTM/IDT/PEC
Development and Publication of the Analysis of the Management Situation (43 CFR 1610.4-4)	Receive public comment on the AMS. Continue public involvement and coordination with Tribal, local, and state government. Continue consultation with Tribal governments.	12/01/06 – 2/01/07 and ongoing	CTM/FM/IDT/PEC

Appendix B: Proposed Plan Preparation Schedule for the Baker RMP Revised for 2006 NOI

Planning Phase	Actions	Dates	Responsibility
Develop, Write, and Publish Draft RMP/DEIS (43 CFR 1610.4-5 –7)	Continue to formulate as preliminarily presented in the AMS. Finalize alternatives and choose a Preferred Alternative Estimate effects of alternatives Write Draft RMP/EIS. Review document with collaborators. Revise draft based on comments. Publish and distribute Draft RMP/EIS. Publish NOA in Federal Register. Allow for 90-day public review and comment.	01/01/07 –07/01/07 07/01/07-10/15/07	CTM/IDT/OSO/PEC
Analyze Public Comment and Prepare Proposed RMP/EIS Proposed Decision (43-CFR 1610.4-8)	Conduct Public Comment Analysis. Review comments for relevance and incorporation into RMP/ Final EIS. Publish and Distribute RMP/EIS. File a copy of the Proposed RMP/EIS Proposed Decision with EPA	10/15/07 –10/15/08	IDT/CTM/FM/PEC
Initiate Protest Period and Governor’s Consistency Review (43 CFR 1610.5-2)	30-day protest period (43 CFR 1610.5-2) If necessary, issue a Notice of Significant Change (additional 30-day protest period)	10/15/08 – 12/15/08	FM/DM/OSO/SD/PA/PEC
Approve RMP/ Signed ROD (43 CFR 1610.5-1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write and sign ROD • Prepare NOA for Federal Register 	12/15/08 – 2/15/09	CTM/FM/DM/OSO/SD/PEC
Prepare Implementation Plan	Document and Prioritize Plan Implementation, Modification, and Monitoring	2/15/09 and ongoing	CTM/PEC

Appendix C: Proposed Budget for Baker RMP

Action	FY - 05	FY - 06	FY - 07	FY - 08	FY - 09
<p>Project Initiation (DO),ⁱ ⁱⁱ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise preplan as needed and directed Hire Core Team Manager Hire Core Team including GIS, Writer/Editor, Support Staff Set up Office Infrastructure Identify need for equipment, including Geographic Information System hardware, software, training, etc. Identify need for other data bases, supplies, etc. 	\$75,000				
<p>Inventory and Data Collection (DO) (Refer to Appendix A)</p> <p>GIS database</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update Themes Metadata Determine Data Gaps <p>Data Collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiate Contracts for data collection Contact adjacent USFS Offices to determine opportunities for joint data gathering Other Data collection <p>Collaborative Data evaluation (USFS, BLM Baker FO, USGS, BPA,ODFW, etc.)</p>	<p>\$375,000</p> <p>BR=\$87k for Shrub/Grassland Vegetation Inventory BT=\$133k for forest and woodland vegetation BV=\$50k for stream/riparian inventory BI=\$75k or balance from above for geographic data acquisition & maintenance \$30k for Economic Profile System analysis and Sonoran Institute support during scoping.</p>	<p>\$914,000</p> <p>BA= \$100k for Recreation Resources inventoried/assessed BC=\$75k for cultural/paleontological inventory, BI=\$369k geographic data acquisition & maintenance BS=\$67k for weed inventory BV=\$83k for stream/riparian inventory BY=\$133k for Linear Recreation Assessments BZ= \$87k for National Designated Rivers and Trails Assessment.</p>			

Appendix C: Proposed Budget for Baker RMP

Action	FY - 05	FY - 06	FY - 07	FY - 08	FY - 09
Scoping (DO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create interagency project mailing list • Publish NOI in Federal Register • Update District Mailing List • Provide Preliminary Planning Bulletin • Conduct Open Houses and intergovernmental briefings • Begin Formal Solicitation of Issues and Concerns 		\$300,000 (includes est. \$10,000 for scoping flyer) (includes \$80,000 for public meetings, related interagency travel, participation of OSO personnel with rare skills, etc.)			
Pursue MOUs for Cooperating Agency Status Consultation (DO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact USFWS and NMFS for consultation and timeline for completed consultation. Consider any need to improve timely consultation, if necessary. • Contact State Historic Preservation Office and initiate consultation. • Cooperative Native American Coordination and Consultation done jointly with CORA on John Day RMP • Contact state agencies with regulatory roles and determine procedural requirements, data and analysis standards 		\$50,000 Includes AJ=\$25k for Native American Coordination and Consultation			
Formulate Alternatives (DO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulate management alternatives focused on issue resolution. • Continue public involvement and coordination with Tribal, local, and state governments. • Continue consultation with Tribal governments. • Publish Scoping report (feedback loop) 		\$311,000 (includes est. \$11,000 publication costs)			

Appendix C: Proposed Budget for Baker RMP

Action	FY - 05	FY - 06	FY - 07	FY - 08	FY - 09
<p>Write and Publish AMS (DP)</p> <p>Analyze Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete FY 05 inventories and assemble into AMS • Prepare and publish the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) based on data gathering, scoping, and initial issue and alternative development • Receive public comment on the AMS. <p>Continue public involvement and coordination with Tribal, local, and state government. Continue consultation with Tribal governments.</p>			<p>\$885,000</p> <p>(includes est. \$60,000 publication costs, and AI=\$25k for Native American Coordination and Consultation)</p>		
<p>Develop, Write, and Publish Draft EIS (DP)</p> <p>Analyze Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write Draft RMP/EIS. • Review document with collaborators. • Revise draft based on comments. • Publish and distribute Draft RMP/EIS. • Publish NOA in Federal Register. • Allow for 90-day public review and comment. • Conduct Public Comment Analysis. • Review comments for relevance and incorporation into RMP/ Final EIS. • Publish and Distribute RMP/EIS. • Publish NOA in Federal Register. 			<p>\$1,000,000</p> <p>(includes est. \$60,000 publication costs, and \$40,000 for OSO special skills travel, meetings, and reviews)</p>		

Appendix C: Proposed Budget for Baker RMP

Action	FY - 05	FY - 06	FY - 07	FY - 08	FY - 09
<p>Prepare and Publish Proposed RMP and Final EIS (DQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare Draft EIS/RMP Comment Analysis • Prepare preliminary final RMP/EIS. • Review document with OSO staff, cooperators/ collaborators. • Revise EIS based on comments. • Brief State Director and WO, secure approvals • Publish, distribute and file Final RMP/EIS. • Publish NOA in <i>Federal Register</i>. • Provide for 30-day public review and protest period. • Provide 60-day Governor review period • Conduct public comment review for clarifications. <p>Assist WO in resolution of any planning protests</p>				\$740,000 (includes est. \$30,000 for Comment Analysis; \$60,000 publication costs; \$25,000 for OSO special skills travel, meetings, and reviews; and AI=\$25k for Native American Coordination and Consultation)	
<p>Prepare and Publish Approved Plan/Record of Decision (DR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify decisions as required by comments or protest resolution or Governor comments on plan consistency • Prepare preliminary Record of Decision and RMP • Review document with OSO staff, revise as needed • Brief State Director and WO, secure approvals • Publish and distribute RMP/ROD • Publish NOA in <i>Federal Register</i> 					\$197,000 (includes est. \$60,000 publication costs; and AI=\$25k for Native American Coordination and Consultation)

Appendix C: Proposed Budget for Baker RMP

Action	FY - 05	FY - 06	FY - 07	FY - 08	FY - 09
TOTAL COST	\$450,000	\$1,575,000	\$1,885,000	\$740,000	\$197,000

ⁱ While Project Initiation might normally be associated with Program Element DN (Preplan), in this case the preplan was completed without specific 1610 funds designated for the DN program element. A minor component of the DO program element is allocated to revision and update of the preplan just prior to Project Initiation.

ⁱⁱ Planning Program Elements (DO, DP, DQ, and DR) associated with the Baker Preplan are based on National Average costs in 2002 for these elements, without accounting for inflation. District Budget projections indicate that the District will lose 12 MLR positions by 2006, so it is likely some, if not all, of the RMP will be completed under contract at higher than average costs. It is assumed that effective project management will be able to reduce some of these higher contract costs and the effects of inflation, but cost figures should be reevaluated and finalized during any preplan revisions just prior to Project Initiation at the beginning of FY-2006.

Appendix D: Proposed Public Participation Methods and Activities for the Baker RMF

Appendix D: Proposed Public Participation Methods and Activities for the Baker RMF		
Planning Phase	Purposes	Methods or Activities
<p>ISSUE, PLANNING CRITERIA IDENTIFICATION</p> <p>Scoping (minimum of 30 days) Public Meeting Announcements (min. 15 days)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announce upcoming scoping meetings. Request written comments on issues/scope of Plan, Analysis of Management Situation. • Develop mailing list. • Explain planning process to public. Solicit issues and concern. Identify scope of Plan. Explain planning process and consistency requirements to local and State government officials. Identify agency issues and concerns. • Review input from groups showing interest in Plan. • Respond back to the public on issues to be addressed initially. Collect additional data where needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Notice of Intent in Federal Register</i> • 30-Day Comment Period • Newsletter to names on Baker RA Plan mailing list • Press release to media • Make presentation to John Day/Snake Resource Advisory Council. • Meet with interested groups and organizations. • Meet with local governments and other agencies. • Initiate government-to-government consultation with Tribal Governments. • Public meetings and open houses • Public comment period • News article
<p>ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe alternatives that have been developed. Make sure issues are addressed. Assure focus of plan. Request comments on alternatives. • Obtain comments on content • Inform local, State, and Federal agencies, interest group's key people of alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newsletter to public, Plan mailing list 30-day comment period • Written responses comment period • Meetings and letters
<p>DRAFT BAKER PLAN/EIS</p> <p>Public Comment Period (min. 90 days)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request comment on Draft Baker Plan/EIS. • Announce upcoming public meetings. • Describe components of the Draft Plan/EIS and solicit comments on it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Baker Plan/EIS mailed, 90-day comment period • Press release to local and Portland media • Notice of Availability in Federal Register • Public meetings and open houses

Appendix D: Proposed Public Participation Methods and Activities for the Baker RMP

Planning Phase	Purposes	Methods or Activities
<p>PROPOSED BAKER PLAN/FINAL EIS</p> <p>Governor’s Consistency Review (min. 60 days) Protest Period (min. 30 days) Notice of Significant Change, if applicable (min. 30 days) Governor’s Appeal to Director, if applicable (min. 30 days)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform key individuals, agencies, and government. • Obtain comments on Draft Plan/EIS • Give public opportunity to review proposed decisions and protest decisions if adversely affected. • Opportunity to comment on any significant changes made as result of a protest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with groups, key people, government • Written responses, 90-day comment period • Publish Proposed Baker RMP/FEIS to public and mail list • <i>Federal Register</i> Notice requesting comments • Begin 60-day Governor consistency review, include notice explaining protest period (30 days)
<p>APPROVED PLAN/ROD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notify public of final decisions. • Distribute Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • News release • News Article, Newsletter, transmittal letters • Mail approved plan to Baker RA Plan mailing list.
<p>IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document and Prioritize Plan Implementation, Modification, and Monitoring 	

APPENDIX E

CONTACT/COMMENT DOCUMENTATION

- 1. NAME OF COMMENTOR(S):**
- 2. LOCATION OF CONTACT:**
- 3. PERSON DOCUMENTING CONTACT:**
- 4. DATE: _____**

5. WHAT PART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS DOES THIS CONTACT DEAL WITH?

- A. Mailing List**
- B. Response to News Article/letter**
- C. Response to *Federal Register* Notice**
- D. Schedule**
- E. Preplan Analysis**
- F. Maps**
- G. Issues**
- H. Management Objectives/Goals**
- I. Management Actions**
- J. Management Concerns**
- K. Draft plan: Which Chapter?**
- L. Alternative(s): Which Ones?**
- M. Final plan: Which Chapter?**
- N. Record of Decision: Which Section?**
- O. Other:**

6. SUMMARY OF CONTACT AND INPUT (Use reverse side if necessary.):