

---

---

## **Areas of Critical Environmental Concern**

---

---

### **Key Points**

- The No Action alternative would provide special management attention or interim special management attention to all 140 existing and potential Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.
- The action alternatives and the Proposed RMP consider the designation of 131 potential (designated, previously nominated, and 14 newly nominated) Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, totaling up to 104,824 acres or about 4 percent of the planning area.
- The Proposed RMP would include the designation of the largest number (108) and Alternative C the least (101) Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.
- All action alternatives and the Proposed RMP would maintain 92–99 percent of the relevant and important values within the potential Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.
- Across the planning area, the potential Areas of Critical Environmental Concern represent a high level of diversity in both the values protected and the number and categories of values within any one Area of Critical Environmental Concern.

### **Summary of Notable Changes from the Draft RMP/EIS**

The BLM has updated acres to account for refined boundaries of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs). The BLM conducted boundary refinements to prevent resource management conflicts, and correct where previous boundaries did not accurately capture the landscapes with relevant and important values. The BLM also updated considerations for designation under the alternatives and the Proposed RMP based on management provided for, or directed by, underlying land use allocations and special management areas, considerations of management in favor of other priorities, or because management of the ACEC would not be consistent with other land management activities.

### **Issue 1**

*How would the alternatives affect the relevant and important resource values of existing and proposed Areas of Critical Environmental Concern?*

### **Summary of Analytical Methods**

The BLM defined special management needed to protect or maintain the relevant and important values of each potential ACEC. The BLM then determined if the management direction for other resources under each alternative and the Proposed RMP protects or maintains the relevant and important resource values associated with each potential ACEC. The BLM also considered whether the application of special management needed to protect relevant and important values would not preclude sustained-yield timber harvest in the Harvest Land Base. The presence or amount of O&C Harvest Land Base within the potential ACECs varies by alternative and the Proposed RMP. The BLM would not designate ACECs under alternatives or the Proposed RMP where the needed special management would preclude O&C Harvest Land Base sustained-yield production.

**Appendix F** lists all potential ACECs within the decision area. For every alternative and the Proposed RMP, the BLM assigned each potential ACEC to one of following categories:

- **Yes**, the BLM would designate the entire potential ACEC. The area requires special management to maintain relevant and important values and management would not preclude O&C sustained-

yield timber harvest at the stand level in the Harvest Land Base, recreation management in Special Recreation Management Areas, or meeting the management objectives of underlying lands with special designations.<sup>32</sup> Special management may condition, but not preclude, O&C sustained-yield timber production and recreation management.

- **Yes\_a**, the BLM would designate a portion of the potential ACEC. The BLM removed portions of the potential ACEC where special management would conflict with O&C sustained-yield timber harvest or recreation management in Special Recreation Management Areas. The BLM determined that the remaining area still supports relevant and important values needing special management.
- **No**, the BLM would not designate the potential ACEC because the area does not require special management to maintain the relevant and important values. Other land designations or land use allocations provide management necessary to retain the relevant and important values.
- **No<sup>1</sup>**, the BLM would not designate the potential ACEC because of conflicts with other management priorities.
- **No\_a**, BLM would not designate the potential ACEC because the special management required to maintain the relevant and important values would preclude O&C sustained-yield timber harvest in the Harvest Land Base.

The BLM assumed that the relevant and important values associated with an ACEC designated under any particular alternative or the Proposed RMP would be adequately protected by the special management direction.

The Planning Criteria provides detailed information on authorities, guidance for ACEC designation on O&C lands, analytical assumptions, methods and techniques, which the BLM incorporates here by reference (USDI BLM 2014, pp. 35–36).

## **Background**

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), defined in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), represent areas within the public lands where special management attention is required to protect or to prevent irreparable damage to any of the following categories:

- Important historic, cultural, or scenic values
- Fish and wildlife resources
- Other natural processes or systems
- Safety from natural hazards

The BLM develops special management direction to protect relevant and important values, but does not apply special management when other management mechanisms adequately protect the relevant and important values or where designation is not warranted.

The BLM designs some special management attention to move the relevant and important value onto a trajectory to reach a desired condition. The BLM designs other special management attention to protect the relevant and important values from management actions or other human activities. This may include prohibiting or modifying certain management activities.

---

<sup>32</sup> Lands with special designations include Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Trails, District Designated Reserve – Lands Managed for their Wilderness Characteristics, Wilderness Areas, and Wilderness Study Areas.

## ACEC Characteristics

An area must meet relevance and importance criteria, and require special management attention to qualify for consideration for designation as an ACEC. An area meets the relevance criterion if it contains any of the categories of values listed above.

The value, resource, process or system, or hazard described above must have substantial significance to satisfy the importance criteria. This generally means that any of the following characterize the value, resource, process or system, or hazard:

- It has qualities that give it special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern, especially compared to any similar resource, are more than locally significant.
- It has qualities or circumstances that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, unique, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable to adverse change.
- It has been recognized as warranting protection to satisfy national priority concerns or to carry out the mandates of the FLPMA.
- It has qualities that warrant highlighting to satisfy public or management concerns about safety or public welfare.
- It poses a significant threat to human life or property.

The BLM describes relevant and important values in four categories as shown in **Table 3-2**. These categories are:

- **Historic, cultural, or scenic values** include, but are not limited to, rare or sensitive archeological resources and religious or cultural resources that are important to Native Americans.
- **Fish and wildlife resources** include, but are not limited to, habitat needed for ESA-listed and Bureau Sensitive species, or habitat essential for maintaining species diversity.
- **Natural processes or systems** include, but are not limited to, endangered, sensitive, or threatened plant species; rare, endemic, or relic plants or plant communities that are terrestrial, aquatic, or riparian; or rare geological features.
- **Natural hazards** include, but are not limited to, areas of avalanche, areas with potential for high flooding, landslide-prone areas, and areas with unstable soils, seismic activity, or dangerous cliffs. The BLM may consider human caused hazards a natural hazard if the BLM determines through the resource management planning process that it has become part of a natural process.

**Table 3-2.** Value categories for designated and previously nominated potential ACECs

District/ Field Office	Historic, Cultural, or Scenic	Fish and Wildlife	Natural Process or System	Natural Hazard
Coos Bay	2	14	17	-
Eugene	2	12	20	1
Klamath Falls	3	3	4	-
Medford	5	7	31	-
Roseburg	1	3	11	-
Salem	9	22	36	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>2</b>

Although it is only necessary for an area to meet the relevance and importance criteria for one value to qualify as an ACEC, many potential ACECs meet the criteria for several values. However, the number of values that meet the relevance and importance criteria can vary widely, as can the combination of values that meet these criteria within an ACEC. For example, the Sterling Mine Ditch potential ACEC contains a historical gold mining ditch, where the Table Rocks ACEC contains a combination of unique geologic

features, vernal pools, Bureau Special Status plants, ESA-listed fairy shrimp, a developed interpretive educational area, and scenic and cultural values.

**Research Natural Areas** (RNAs) represent a specific type of ACEC. These areas are established and maintained for the primary purpose of research and education because the area has one or more of the following characteristics:

- Typical representation of a common plant or animal association
- Unusual plant or animal association
- ESA-listed plant or animal species
- Typical representation of common geologic, soil, or water feature
- Outstanding or unusual geologic, soil, or water feature

The Research Natural Area network in the Pacific Northwest represents a wide range of elevation, geology, topography, soils, and vegetation communities throughout the region. The BLM manages these in partnership with the U.S. Forest Service, state natural resource agencies, and key private organizations. This network allows for evaluation of differential responses to environmental change in comparison to forests managed for sustained yield.

**Outstanding Natural Areas** (ONAs) are also specific types of ACECs. Outstanding Natural Area designations aim to protect unique scenic, scientific, educational, and recreational values of certain areas within the public lands. It is important to note that, when applied by Congress, the term ‘outstanding natural area’ has a different meaning than when the BLM applies it through a planning decision to create a type of ACEC. A congressionally designated ‘outstanding natural area’ provides permanent protection for the values for which Congress designated the area.

### ACEC Designation and Analysis

The BLM only designates ACECs through the land use planning process. During planning, the BLM must identify and fully consider for designation and management all designated and nominated areas meeting the relevance and importance criteria. The BLM reviews ACEC nominations for identification of relevant and important values upon receipt. When reviews find areas to meet relevance and importance criteria, the BLM identifies them as ‘potential ACECs’ and evaluates them to determine if they warrant special management attention. If so, the BLM provides interim protective management for the potential ACECs until the BLM can consider them for designation under a land use planning process.

In accordance with regulations, the BLM reconsidered areas within the planning area designated as ACECs in the 1995 RMPs and previously nominated potential ACECs. The previously nominated potential ACECs include nominated areas evaluated late in the development of the 1995 RMPs, nominations received after 1995, and nominations solicited during the 2008 planning effort. The BLM also solicited and received new ACEC nominations in 2012 for this planning process.

The BLM found that 81 of the 86 of the designated ACECs and 34 of the 38 previously nominated potential ACECs meet the relevance and importance criteria and are carried forward for further analysis. The reviews of these designated and previously nominated potential ACECs resulted in refinements to boundaries and determinations of which values met relevance and importance criteria. For example, this reconsideration resulted in a boundary expansion to an existing RNA, Beatty Creek, in the Roseburg District and removal of the ONA status from the following potential ACECs: McGowan Meadow, Table Rocks, and Valley of the Giants. In addition, the Salem District determined the Little Grass Mountain ONA no longer met the ACEC criteria. The BLM analyzed 4 of the 8 designated and potential ONAs and all 32 designated RNAs in this plan revision.

The BLM evaluated 34<sup>33</sup> new ACEC nominations; 16 meet criteria for relevance and importance. Where necessary, the BLM is providing special management attention to these 16 areas while analyzing them as part of this plan revision. Included in these 16 new potential ACECs is the West Fork Illinois River on the Medford District, which the BLM found to qualify for consideration as a new potential RNA.

In summary, under the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP, the BLM is considering for designation areas within:

- 81 currently designated ACECs
- 34 previously nominated potential ACECs that are currently under interim management
- 16 newly nominated potential ACECs that are currently under interim management
- 32 designated and 1 new potential ACECs that are also RNAs<sup>34</sup>
- 4 designated and 1 previously nominated potential ACECs that are also ONAs

In preparation for this plan revision, the districts evaluated designated ACECs, previously nominated potential ACECs, and newly nominated potential ACECs. During these evaluations, the districts combined areas into new potential ACECs when the areas had similar values and were over-lapping or in close proximity to one another. Many of the nominated potential ACECs are additions to designated ACECs. While the BLM found 16 of the new nominations to meet the relevance and importance criteria, 7 were merged with designated or previously nominated potential ACECs, leaving 9 new potential ACECs.

#### Previously Designated and Previously Nominated Potential ACECs No Longer Meeting ACEC Criteria

The BLM determined that 10 existing and previously nominated potential ACECs no longer meet the ACEC designation criteria. The BLM made these determinations on the basis that the relevant and important values no longer exist within the ACEC boundary, or that the values would be protected without additional special management. The following areas no longer meet the ACEC criteria:

- Long Gulch in the Medford District
- China Ditch, Stouts Creek, North Umpqua River, and Umpqua River Wildlife Area in the Roseburg District
- Little Grass Mountain, North Santiam, Sheridan Peak, Wells Island, and Yampo in the Salem District

The Medford District determined that special management associated with ACEC designation would not be required to protect or maintain the unique trellised drainage pattern at Long Gulch because Riparian Reserve management direction would provide all of the needed protection.

The Roseburg District determined management consistent with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act would adequately protect the relevant and important values at China Ditch and Stouts Creek without additional special management. In addition, Congress designated the North Umpqua River as a Wild and Scenic River in 1992. This designation provides the special management needed for scenic and fisheries relevant and important values of the North Umpqua ACEC.

---

<sup>33</sup> This total number includes two ACEC nominations received after the solicitation period for this planning process. Interdisciplinary staffs for the respective districts evaluated both ACECs at the time they were received. Neither were found to meet the relevance and importance criteria. As such, these were not forwarded for further consideration.

<sup>34</sup> RNAs and ONAs are designations in addition to the ACEC designation. As such, the 33 RNAs and 5 ONAs listed here are a part of the total number of ACECs considered, not in addition to the numbers in the first 3 bullets.

The bald eagle was the single relevant and important value needing special management for the Umpqua River Wildlife Area ACEC. The bald eagle population has grown and the species has been delisted from the ESA, but continues to be protected under the BLM's Special Status Species program and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. This bald eagle population no longer meets the relevance and importance criteria.

The Salem District determined there were no relevant and important values present at the Little Grass Mountain, North Santiam, Sheridan Peak, and Yampo ACECs. The BLM found that the grassy bald at Little Grass Mountain does not contain any values to set it apart from other Coast Range grassy balds. The North Santiam area's highly valued river meander channels and associated alluvial forest habitat are not on BLM-administered lands. The adjacent BLM-administered lands do not have these relevant and important values. A large population of former Bureau Special Status botanical species, *Poa marcida* occupies Sheridan Peak, but it does not meet the relevance and importance criteria. Two Bureau Special Status botany species occurred at the Yampo ACEC. Tall bugbane (*Cimicifuga elata*) is no longer a Bureau Special Status Species, and the BLM has not observed thin-leaved peavine (*Lathyrus holochlorus*) on this small parcel since the 1980s. Therefore, relevant and important values no longer exist at Yampo.

The Salem District determined that while the Wells Island ACEC's values continue to meet the relevance and importance criteria, their maintenance does not require special management associated with ACEC designation. Wells Island, in the Willamette River, has no road access, which protects the relevant and important values from threatening activities. Any special management that the district would prescribe for Wells Island would be the same as what is already in place with designation of those lands as Riparian Reserve.

## **Affected Environment**

There are 86 ACECs currently designated in the decision area, 38 previously nominated ACECs (nominated areas evaluated late in the development of the 1995 RMPs, nominations received after 1995, and nominations solicited during the 2008 planning effort) that have been under interim protective management (**Table 3-3**), and 16 new potential ACECs nominated after the 2008 RMP planning effort (**Table 3-4**).<sup>35</sup> Designated and previously nominated ACECs comprise 3.7 percent, and new potential ACECs comprise 0.7 percent of the decision area. The BLM currently protects the relevant and important values, whether identified in a plan decision or in a nomination, for areas in all of these categories.

---

<sup>35</sup> The Medford District is currently preparing an RMP amendment and environmental assessment to change the boundary of the Table Rocks ACEC to include newly acquired federal lands and to encompass lands administered by The Nature Conservancy. If The Nature Conservancy parcels are acquired in the future by the BLM, The Nature Conservancy lands would become part of the ACEC (see the Existing Decisions section of Chapter 1).

**Table 3-3.** Designated and previously nominated potential ACECs and corresponding RNA or ONA if applicable

District/ Field Office	Designated ACECs (Number)	Potential ACECs (Number)	RNAs* (Number)	ONAs (Number)	Designated and Potential ACECs (Acres)	BLM- administered Lands (Acres)	Potential ACEC Percentage of District/Field Office or Total BLM Acres
Coos Bay	11	5	1	-	14,258	325,824	4.4%
Eugene	13	9	5	1	14,841	313,705	4.7%
Klamath Falls	3	3	1	-	7,385	215,077	3.4%
Medford	24	7	10	1	21,125	810,261	2.6%
Roseburg	9	3	7	-	10,504	425,805	2.5%
Salem	26	11	8	6	24,713	402,983	6.1%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>92,826</b>	<b>2,493,655</b>	<b>3.7%</b>

\* The RNAs and ONAs are also designated as ACECs, and their numbers are already counted within the designated and potential numbers.

**Table 3-4.** New potential ACECs and corresponding RNA or ONA if applicable

District/ Field Office	New Potential ACECs (Number)	RNAs (Number)	ONAs (Number)	New Potential ACECs (Acres)	BLM- administered Lands (Acres)	Percentage of District/Field Office or Total BLM Acres in New Potential ACECs
Coos Bay	1	-	-	45	325,824	< 0.01%
Eugene	7	-	-	10,788	313,705	3.4%
Klamath Falls	2	-	-	319	215,077	0.14%
Medford	4	1	-	5,177	810,261	0.06%
Roseburg	1	-	-	368	425,805	< 0.01%
Salem	1	-	-	805	402,983	0.20%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>17,502</b>	<b>2,493,655</b>	<b>0.7%</b>

The BLM restructured all of the areas considered (designated, and previously and newly nominated potential ACECs) in the planning process into a new set of 121 potential ACECs totaling 97,053 acres as shown in **Appendix F (Table F-1)**. **Table 3-5** displays the number of potential ACECs evaluated under this analysis with relevant and important values by district.

**Table 3-5.** Value categories for potential ACECs evaluated in this analysis

<b>District/ Field Office</b>	<b>Historic, Cultural, or Scenic</b>	<b>Fish and Wildlife</b>	<b>Natural Process or System</b>	<b>Natural Hazard</b>
Coos Bay	6	11	17	-
Eugene	1	8	24	1
Klamath Falls	3	5	6	-
Medford	7	7	31	-
Roseburg	1	2	9	1
Salem	12	16	27	1
<b>Totals*</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>3</b>

\* Many ACECs contain more than one qualifying relevant and important value and therefore the sum of the totals exceeds 121.

## **Environmental Consequences**

This analysis examines the designation of ACECs and the effects on relevant and important values.

Under the alternatives and the Proposed RMP, the varying designations of ACECs would have differing effects on the relevant and important values that the designations protect. **Appendix F** provides the names of the ACECs that the BLM would designate under the various alternatives and the Proposed RMP by district, the associated acres, and the relevant and important values (**Table 3-5** and **Table F-1**). This analysis provides a broad discussion of the various resources that the BLM would protect through ACEC designations.

The BLM's removal of areas from the potential ACECs to avoid precluding O&C Harvest Land Base sustained-yield production or Special Recreation Management Area management creates variation in the number and acres of ACEC designations under the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP. Another factor contributing to this variation is that management direction for the underlying land use allocations or lands with special designations provides for the relevant and important values for some of the potential ACECs. Some ACECs included in this analysis contain portions that overlap with Congressionally Reserved Lands and lands under the National Landscape Conservation System, such as Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Recreation Trail Management Corridors, District-Designated Reserve – Lands Managed for their Wilderness Characteristics, Wilderness Areas, and Wilderness Study Areas (**Appendix F**). For this analysis, the BLM includes acres managed for these other designations as part of the described potential ACEC boundary's acreage because these landscapes also contain relevant and important values. However, the BLM would manage these acres foremost for the management needs under the congressional designation or National Landscape Conservation System needs. These overlapping areas have been included in the analysis of ACEC acres considered, because the associated management needs would support the maintenance and improvement of the relevant and important values identified within these landscapes, and it is important to account for the total acreage of maintained values on BLM-administered lands.

Although the BLM considers areas for designation, the BLM retains discretionary authority as to whether or not to designate potential ACECs as described later in 'Potential ACECs not Designated Under the Action Alternatives and the Proposed RMP.' The BLM's assessments of the need for continuing protective management of existing and proposed ACECs are the primary driver of differences between the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP, and the No Action alternative.

In all cases, where the BLM would designate ACECs or continue the protection of potential ACECs, the effect of the application of special management attention would continue the persistence of the relevant and important values, or affect change to those values towards a desired condition.

### No Action

Under the No Action alternative, there would be no change to the designation of 86 existing ACECs or the application of interim protective management to the 39 previously nominated and 16 newly nominated potential ACECs. The districts would continue to implement special management attention in these areas. The effect of the application of interim special management attention on the resource values in these areas would be to maintain those values, or to change those values towards a desired condition.

### **Potential ACECs Designated Under the Action Alternatives and the Proposed RMP**

The BLM would designate the most ACECs (108) and acres (93,515) under the Proposed RMP and the fewest ACECs (101) and acres (87,044) under Alternative C (**Table 3-6**). Alternative A and the Proposed RMP would provide special management attention to the largest number of relevant and important values; Alternative C would provide the least.

**Table 3-6.** All potential ACECs designations

District/ Field Office	Alt. A		Alt. B		Alt. C		Alt. D		PRMP	
	ACECs (Number)	Acres								
Coos Bay	15	10,922	15	10,814	15	10,814	15	10,814	15	10,814
Eugene	22	14,661	23	14,826	22	14,476	23	14,736	23	14,736
Klamath Falls	6	7,332	4	1,253	4	1,253	6	7,332	6	6,383
Medford	27	25,499	27	25,499	27	25,499	27	25,499	28	25,527
Roseburg	9	10,197	9	10,197	9	10,197	9	10,197	9	10,197
Salem	28	25,934	27	25,859	24	24,806	27	25,798	27	25,859
<b>Totals</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>94,545</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>88,448</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>87,044</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>94,376</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>93,515</b>

Not precluding O&C Harvest Land Base sustained-yield production would require boundary revisions for 4 (Alternative A), 5 (Alternative B), 6 (Alternative C), 11 (Alternative D), and 7 (Proposed RMP) of the potential ACECs. The effect of the application of special management attention on the relevant and important values in the remaining portions of these potential ACECs would be to maintain those values, or to change those values toward a desired condition. The relevant and important values in the areas removed from the potential ACECs would not receive the special management attention needed to maintain or protect them and would eventually experience a loss or degradation of those values.

Under the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP, three ACECs would require boundary revisions to exclude small Special Recreation Management Areas (North Bank, Upper Willamette Valley Margin, and Willamette Valley Prairie Oak and Pine Area), and two ACECs would require boundary revisions to remove existing quarries (Dakubetede and East Fork Whiskey Creek RNA). The areas that would be removed do not contain relevant and important values. The effect of the application of special

management attention on the relevant and important values in the remaining portions of these potential ACECs would be to maintain those values, or to change those values toward a desired condition.

The BLM would designate all 33 of the RNAs, and 3 of the 4 ONAs considered under the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP.

**Potential ACECs Not Designated Under the Action Alternatives and the Proposed RMP**

Identification of an area as having relevant and important values does not require designation of that area as an ACEC. To be considered for designation, the potential ACEC must also need special management to retain the relevant and important values. However, the presence of relevant and important values and the identification that special management would be needed to maintain those values does not require designation of that area as an ACEC. Under the FLPMA, the BLM is only required to consider these areas for designation in the land use planning process. The BLM retains discretionary authority to consider through analysis as to whether or not to designate an ACEC in favor of management for other priorities or because management of the ACEC would not be consistent with other land management activities.

Most of the areas the BLM would not designate do not warrant special management attention. Under the Proposed RMP, 11 potential ACECs do not warrant special management attention, 1 potential ACEC would not be designated because of conflicts with other management priorities, and 1 potential ACEC would not be designated because of conflicts with direction for managing the O&C Harvest Land Base.

The BLM would not designate between 13 and 20 of the areas under action alternatives and the Proposed RMP (Table 3-7). The potential ACECs not designated due to conflicts with management of the O&C Harvest Land Base and other management direction would not receive the special management attention needed to maintain or protect their relevant and important values, which would eventually experience a loss or degradation of these values.

**Table 3-7. Potential ACECs not designated under the action alternatives or the Proposed RMP**

District/ Field Office	Alt. A		Alt. B		Alt. C		Alt. D		PRMP	
	ACECs (Number)	Acres	ACECs (Number)	Acres	ACECs (Number)	Acres	ACECs (Number)	Acres	ACECs (Number)	Acres
Coos Bay	2	1,136	2	1,136	2	1,136	2	1,136	2	1,136
Eugene	2	243	1	76	2	427	1	167	1	167
Klamath Falls	2	318	4	5,449	4	5,449	2	318	2	318
Medford	5	1,610	5	1,610	5	1,610	5	1,610	4	1,582
Roseburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Salem	3	259	4	334	7	1,387	4	395	4	334
<b>Totals</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3,566</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8,605</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10,009</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3,626</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3,537</b>

In several instances, the BLM integrated existing and potential ACECs in the formation of potential ACECs for consideration under the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP. While this changed the number of ACECs considered under the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP, it did not remove acres or relevant and important values from potential protection.

The following table (**Table 3-8**) shows the summary of the values categories that would not receive special management attention by each action alternative or the Proposed RMP.

**Table 3-8.** Relevant and important value categories that would not receive special management attention

Value Category	Alt. A (Number)	Alt. B (Number)	Alt. C (Number)	Alt. D (Number)	PRMP (Number)
Historic, Cultural, and Scenic	-	2	3	1	-
Fish and Wildlife	-	4	6	1	-
Natural Process or System	2	5	6	3	2
Natural Hazard	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>

### Areas Not Warranting Special Management

The BLM would not designate between 9 (Alternative B) and 12 (Alternative A) of the potential ACECs because they would not warrant special management (**Table 3-9**). The BLM would not designate 11 potential ACECs under the Proposed RMP for this same reason. There would be no loss of relevant and important values associated with not designating these as ACECs. The management attention needed for their values comes through the management direction for the underlying land use allocations or for specific resource programs.

**Table 3-9.** Reasons for not designating potential ACECs

Reason For Non-designation	Alt. A (Number)	Alt. B (Number)	Alt. C (Number)	Alt. D (Number)	PRMP (Number)
Areas not warranting special management	12	9	10	11	11
Areas not designated due to conflicts with O&C Harvest Land Base	1	7	10	2	1
Areas not designated due to conflicts with other management priorities	1	-	-	1	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>

The Coos Bay District would not designate the North Spit Addition potential ACEC under all action alternatives or the Proposed RMP because the district would maintain the relevant and important values under the BLM’s Special Status Species program. For Steel Creek, the combination of management direction for the Late-Successional Reserve, Riparian Reserve, and management for ESA-listed species would protect the relevant and important values.

The Klamath Falls Field Office would not designate the Spencer Creek potential ACEC under Alternative A and the Proposed RMP or the Surveyor potential ACEC under all action alternatives and the Proposed RMP because management direction for the Late-Successional and Riparian Reserve would protect the relevant and important values.

The Medford District would not designate the Green Springs Mountain Scenic potential ACEC under any of the action alternatives or the Proposed RMP because management for Visual Resource Management

Class II and the Late-Successional Reserve would provide for the relevant and important values. In addition, management direction for the Late-Successional Reserve would also provide for the relevant and important values for the Hoxie Creek potential ACEC under Alternatives A and D, and the Proposed RMP, making designation unnecessary. The Medford District would not designate the Iron Creek and Tin Cup potential ACECs under any of the action alternatives or the Proposed RMP because the management direction for the Late-Successional Reserve would achieve the desired protection for their relevant and important values. The Moon Prairie potential ACEC would not be designated under Alternatives A, C, and D because Late-Successional Reserve management direction would provide the management needed to provide for the relevant and important values.

The Salem District would not designate the Beaver Creek potential ACEC under the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP because the management direction for the Riparian Reserve would provide for the relevant and important values. The Molalla River Segment B corridor is recommended for inclusion into the national Wild and Scenic River system, which would provide for the relevant and important values of the Molalla Meadows potential ACEC under the action alternatives or the Proposed RMP.

The Yaquina Head potential ACEC lies entirely within the congressionally designated boundary for the Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area and would be allocated to the Congressionally Reserved Lands and the National Landscape Conservation System land use allocation under all action alternatives and the Proposed RMP. The Outstanding Natural Area designation was established by Congress to protect unique scenic, scientific, educational, and recreational values. Under all action alternatives and the Proposed RMP, the BLM would manage the Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area under management direction to conserve and develop the scenic, natural, and historic values and allow continued use for which the area was designated. The Salem District determined between the Draft RMP/EIS and this Proposed RMP/Final EIS that the Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area's congressional designation and the management direction for the Congressionally Reserved Lands and the National Landscape Conservation System land use allocation provides all of the special management attention needed for the relevant and important values. For this reason, the BLM considered, but would not designate the Yaquina Head potential ACEC under any of the action alternatives or the Proposed RMP. Its relevant and important values are not included in **Table 3-8**.

### **Areas Not Designated Due to Conflicts with O&C Harvest Land Base**

The BLM would not designate between 1 (Alternative A) and 10 (Alternative C) potential ACECs under the action alternatives or the Proposed RMP because the special management required for the protection or maintenance of the relevant and important values would preclude O&C sustained-yield timber harvest in the Harvest Land Base as shown in **Appendix F, Table F-1** (as annotated by No<sub>a</sub> in this table).

The BLM would not designate the Williams Lake potential ACEC in the Salem District under the Proposed RMP for this reason. The Williams Lake potential ACEC contains relevant and important values of 'natural processes' due to the presence of fragile lakeside native plant communities. Under the Proposed RMP, lands within this potential ACEC are allocated to the Harvest Land Base. Because these lands are also O&C lands, any designation of an ACEC must not preclude sustained-yield timber management (see Chapter 1, 'Major Authorizing Laws – The O&C Act and the FLPMA'). The Salem District BLM staff reviewed management needs to protect the relevant and important values and determined that those management needs would preclude sustained-yield timber management, largely due to the fragile nature of the plant communities and the potential for disturbance from timber management. The relevant and important values for the potential ACECs not designated due to conflicts with management direction for the O&C Harvest Land Base would be lost or degraded over time (**Table 3-8**).

### **Areas Not Designated Due to Conflicts with Other Management Priorities**

The Hult Marsh potential ACEC in the Eugene District would not be designated under Alternatives A and D, and the Proposed RMP because the special management needed to maintain current hydrologic conditions may conflict with public health and safety. The Eugene District identified Hult Dam as a high hazard dam. Alteration to the dam and the recommended water levels to maintain public safety may not maintain current hydrologic conditions needed to maintain the relevant and important values in the potential ACEC. The Riparian Reserve inner widths under these alternatives and the Proposed RMP would also not provide for the relevant and important values. The BLM includes the loss or degradation of these values in **Table 3-8**.

### **References**

USDI BLM. 2014. Resource management plans for western Oregon planning criteria. Bureau of Land Management, Oregon/Washington State Office, Portland, OR. <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/plandocs.php>.

**Page intentionally left blank**