
Wild and Scenic Rivers

Key Points

- The 13 river segments found suitable for recommendation for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System through the previous western Oregon RMPs (1995) would be recommended under all alternatives and the Proposed RMP.
- Under the No Action Alternative, all 51 eligible Wild and Scenic River segments would continue to be managed as eligible, protecting the rivers and their associated values, until suitability determinations are made through subsequent land use planning processes.
- Under Alternative A, the BLM would not recommend the 51 eligible Wild and Scenic River segments for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System and no protection management would be applied, which could result in effects to their associated values.
- Under Alternatives B and C, and the Proposed RMP, the BLM would recommend for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System the 6 Wild and Scenic River segments found suitable during 2015 evaluations, resulting in protection for those segments. There are 45 eligible river segments that the BLM did not find suitable; these segments would not continue to receive protections, which could result in effects to their associated river values.
- Under Alternative D, the BLM would recommend all 51 eligible Wild and Scenic River segments for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System, resulting in the most protection for all eligible segments and their associated river values.

Summary of Notable Changes from Draft RMP/EIS

The Proposed RMP updated data on river segments that the BLM identified as meeting suitability criteria to identify only the river segment lengths on BLM-administered lands.

Issue 1

How would the proposed management actions in each alternative affect the free-flowing condition, water quality, identified outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification, and on eligible Wild and Scenic River segments in western Oregon?

Background

Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) are rivers or river segments designated by Congress for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (National System) under the authority of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (WSR Act; 16 U.S.C. 1271 *et seq.*). Congress designates rivers under this WSR Act for the purposes of preserving the river or river segment in its free-flowing condition, preserving water quality, and protecting identified outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs). Examples of river segment ORVs may include scenery, recreation, geology, fish, wildlife, historical, cultural, or other similar values.

Congress classifies all designated WSR segments as Wild, Scenic, or Recreational. The BLM, through the evaluation of rivers or river segments for possible inclusion into the National System, assigns these same classifications to all eligible rivers or river segments. Definitions of these classifications are the following:

- **Wild river segments**—Wild river segments are free of impoundments and generally inaccessible, except by trail. Their watersheds or shorelines are essentially primitive and their waters unpolluted.

- **Scenic river segments**—Scenic river segments are free of impoundments. Their shorelines or watersheds are largely undeveloped, but their shorelines are accessible in places by roads.
- **Recreational river segments**—Recreational river segments are readily accessible by road or railroad. They may have some development along their shorelines and may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past.

Section 5(d)(1) of the WSR Act directs Federal agencies to evaluate rivers to determine suitability during the land use process; suitable rivers can be recommended for potential inclusion into the National System. To fulfill this requirement, the BLM inventoried and evaluated rivers as part of this plan revision.

The evaluation of a river for possible inclusion in the National System follows a three-step process: (1) determination of eligibility, (2) tentative classification (Wild, Scenic, or Recreational), and (3) determination of suitability. This process, outlined below, ultimately provides the basis for recommendations made to Congress, and provides guidance on interim management.

In order to be eligible for inclusion into the National System, a river segment must be free-flowing and contain at least one river-related value considered to be outstandingly remarkable (USD I BLM 2012). An eligible river's ORVs should be located in the river itself or on its immediate shore lands. As a part of this plan revision, the BLM evaluated 51 rivers for eligibility and found all 51 to meet the criteria to be eligible. The ORVs identified for these 51 rivers include values for scenery, recreation, geology, fish, wildlife, historical, cultural, and ecology.

The BLM then assigned tentative classification to rivers found to be eligible. This tentative classification is based upon the condition of the river and adjacent lands at the time of study. This tentative classification also serves as a guideline for management until either a suitability determination is made or until a Congressional designation. Of the 51 eligible rivers evaluated as a part of this plan revision, none were tentatively classified as Wild, 4 were tentatively classified as Scenic, and 49¹⁵⁷ were tentatively classified as Recreational.

Once assigned a tentative classification, the BLM further evaluates each eligible river segment to determine whether it is suitable for inclusion into the National System. The suitability analysis provides the basis for determining which rivers to recommend to Congress as potential additions to the National System by determining if certain river segments meet criteria for designation as a component of the National System, as specified in Section 4(a) of the WSR Act. The following questions are addressed when evaluating suitability:

- Should the river's free-flowing condition, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable values be protected, or are one or more other uses important enough to warrant doing otherwise?
- Will the river's free-flowing condition, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable values be protected through designation?
- Is designation the best method for protecting the river corridor?
- Is there a demonstrated commitment to protect the river by any non-Federal entities that may be partially responsible for implementing protective management?

The suitability assessments conducted as a part of this plan revision identified six river segments that are suitable for recommendation for potential inclusion into the National System.

¹⁵⁷ Two rivers, North Fork Clackamas River and North Santiam River, contain two river segments. Each of these rivers had one river segment the BLM tentatively classified as Scenic and one as Recreational.

Interim Management of Eligible and Suitable Rivers

To the extent possible under legal authorities, the BLM's goal in providing interim management for eligible and suitable rivers is to manage their free-flowing condition, water quality, any outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification. This interim management is required for eligible and suitable river segments, until either—

- The BLM determines, through a suitability study, that an eligible river segment is unsuitable for recommendation for inclusion into the National System; or
- Congress adds or precludes the addition of a suitable river segment to the National System.

Since the BLM, through this planning process, conducted suitability assessments on all eligible river segments, no further protection of eligible segments not found suitable would be required for these segments under the WSR Act under the No Action Alternative and Alternative D.¹⁵⁸ In accordance with BLM policy (USDI BLM 2012), Alternative D would recommend all evaluated study segments for inclusion into the National System resulting in interim management for free-flowing condition, water quality, any outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification of these river segments until a Congressional decision was received.

River Designations Not Affected by this Planning Effort

There are currently 9 designated Wild and Scenic Rivers within the planning area, and previous planning efforts (1995 RMPs) identified 13 river segments as suitable, which were recommended for potential inclusion in the National System. The status of these 22 river segments would be unchanged by any decisions made under this planning process.

Designated Rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System

The BLM administers nine designated Wild and Scenic Rivers within the planning area (**Table 3-282**). These rivers were designated by Congress or the Secretary of the Interior for the preservation of the free-flowing condition, water quality, any outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification, which the BLM manages in accordance with the management and protection identified in each river's Comprehensive River Management Plan (USDA FS, USDI BLM, and OPRD 1992; USDI BLM and OPRD 1993, USDA FS and USDI BLM 1993; USDI BLM 1972, 1992, and 2004), which are incorporated by reference.

¹⁵⁸ The Nestucca River Segment B would continue to receive protections under an 'eligible' status awaiting a joint suitability study with the U.S. Forest Service under all alternatives and the Proposed RMP.

Table 3-282. Designated Wild and Scenic Rivers within the planning area

Designated River Name	Year Designated	District/Field Office	Classification	River Miles
Clackamas	1988	Salem	Recreational	0.5
Elkhorn Creek	1996	Salem	Wild/Scenic	3.0
Klamath (upper reach)	1994	Klamath Falls	Scenic	11.0
North Umpqua	1988	Roseburg	Recreational	8.4
Quartzville Creek	1988	Salem	Recreational	9.7
Rogue	1968	Medford	Wild/Recreational	47.0
Salmon	1988	Salem	Scenic/Recreational	8.0
Sandy	1988	Salem	Scenic/Recreational	12.5
South Fork Clackamas	2009	Salem	Wild	0.6
Totals				100.7

Note: The Fish Creek Wild and Scenic River, which is entirely on Forest Service lands within the planning area, was designated in 2009. The Forest Service is completing surveys of the designated Wild and Scenic River corridor, which may result in a small acreage of adjacent BLM-administered lands on the Salem District being included in the corridor.

Previously Recommended Wild and Scenic River Segments

Under the 1995 RMPs, the BLM recommended 13 suitable river segments for inclusion in the National System (**Table 3-283**). The BLM currently manages these segments under interim protection until Congress designates the river segments or releases them for other uses. The BLM revalidated these findings of suitability for these 13 river segments during this planning process.

Table 3-283. 1995 RMPs suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers within the planning area

River Segment Name	District	Wild and Scenic River Tentative Classification	River Miles
Big Windy Creek Segment A	Medford	Wild	1.6
Big Windy Creek Segment B	Medford	Wild	5.7
Dulog Creek Segment A	Medford	Wild	0.5
Dulog Creek Segment B	Medford	Wild	0.9
East Fork Big Windy Creek Segment A	Medford	Wild	0.2
East Fork Big Windy Creek Segment B	Medford	Wild	3.6
Howard Creek Segment A	Medford	Wild	0.7
Howard Creek Segment B	Medford	Wild	6.8
McKenzie River Segment A	Eugene	Recreational	11.0
Molalla River Segment B	Salem	Recreational	13.5
Nestucca River Segment A	Salem	Recreational	13.1
Siuslaw River Segment B	Eugene	Recreational	46.3
Siuslaw River Segment C	Eugene	Recreational	11.7
Total Mileage			115.6

Summary of Analytical Methods

The BLM established impact indicators based on key resources to measure the effects that the management actions associated with each alternative and the Proposed RMP would have on the ORVs and tentative classification of eligible segments.

The BLM originally included water quality as an impact indicator for this analysis, since it is an aspect of river values considered during eligibility and suitability assessments. However, the analysis conducted for this planning effort for water quality determined that no future implementation actions included in any of the alternatives or the Proposed RMP would result in changes to water quality within the decision area (see the Hydrology section in this chapter). That analysis has determined that there would be no changes under implementation actions included in any of the alternatives or the Proposed RMP; therefore, the indicator of water quality has been dropped from this discussion.

The BLM originally included an impact indicator for changes to free-flowing characteristics, since it is an aspect of river values considered during eligibility and suitability assessments. However, no actions included in any of the alternatives or the Proposed RMP would change current free-flowing values of any of the 51 eligible segments. As there is no action upon which to measure differences for this indicator, it has been dropped from this discussion.

The Planning Criteria provides additional information on analytical assumptions, methods and techniques, and geographic and temporal scales, which the BLM incorporates here by reference (USDI BLM 2014, pp. 120–122).

Descriptions of Indicators Used for Analysis

The effect of the alternatives and the Proposed RMP on eligible river segments is assessed by considering the extent of protection of two factors: the ORVs and tentative classification. The BLM considers these factors protected for a given eligible segment when that segment is recommended for designation into the National System in an action alternative or the Proposed RMP. The BLM considers these factors unprotected when a particular segment is not recommended for potential inclusion into the National System.

Where an alternative or the Proposed RMP does not protect a particular segment by recommending it for potential inclusion into the National System, the analysis considers the potential effect of other management (e.g., ACEC designations, RMA designations, and land use allocations) on the two factors. Other management designations or allocations have the potential to provide protections for or negatively affect river ORVs and tentative classifications. Several key resources will be used to determine effects to ORVs and tentative classifications. Impact indicators include: (1) RMAs, ACECs, land use allocations, allowable forest management, and visual resource management (VRM) designations; and (2) establishing limitations for land tenures and minerals resources (e.g., timing limitations, establishing no surface occupancy stipulations, and establishing right-of-way exclusion areas).

Effects Analysis Assumptions

- A no surface occupancy stipulation generally provides protection by prohibiting surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities that might degrade or continue degradation of the ORVs, and by preventing projects that might affect the tentative classification (i.e., Wild, Scenic, or Recreational) or free-flowing nature of the segment.
- Timing limitation stipulations provide a similar level of protection as no surface occupancy, but only during certain times of the year. These are especially important in protecting aquatic and terrestrial wildlife species and their habitat during critical times.

- Non-native invasive weed treatments in the short term may affect eligible segments' ORVs or tentative classification as evidence of human activity may be seen. In the long term, weed treatment and eradication would benefit ORVs as riparian health improves.
- Eligible segments with scenery ORVs, VRM Class I and II management would provide the most protection to the scenery ORV. VRM Class I and II management may also provide indirect protection for other ORVs or tentative classification by preventing certain types of development that would affect the ORVs or tentative classification.
- For eligible segments with scenery ORVs, VRM Class III and IV management would most likely lead to effects on scenery ORVs by allowing development that would directly impair scenic quality. VRM Class III and IV management may also indirectly affect other ORVs or tentative classification by allowing certain types of development.
- Increased recreation has the potential to affect ORVs associated with eligible segments. Building infrastructure to keep people away from sensitive resources could mitigate impacts. Closing areas to motorized travel would protect areas from impacts associated with public motorized travel activities. Designating routes for public motorized travel uses would help protect ORVs to a lesser degree.
- Where eligible segments overlap ACECs, ACEC management would complement management for ORVs and tentative classification.
- The corridor width for suitable or eligible rivers would not exceed an average of 320 acres per mile, which if applied uniformly along the entire river segment, is 0.25 mile on each side of the rivers. For analysis purposes, the affected river corridors are 0.25 mile on both sides of the river.

Affected Environment

Eligible River Segments and Associated Values

Under the 1995 RMPs, the BLM found 51 river segments eligible (**Table 3-284**). These segments are currently managed under interim protection until the BLM makes land use plan decisions regarding their suitability. As part of the current planning effort, the BLM evaluated these 51 eligible segments for suitability. The BLM identified six segments that meet the suitability criteria for recommendation for potential inclusion in the National System (**Table 3-285**). The Suitability Report and subsequent determinations can be found in **Appendix U** are incorporated here by reference.

Table 3-284. All eligible river segments within the decision area

Study River Name	Outstandingly Remarkable Values	Tentative Classification	River Segment Length (Miles)	BLM-administered Lands within WSR Corridors (Acres)
Alsea River	Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	1.1	404
Antelope Creek	Fish	Recreational	1.3	718
Applegate River	Fish	Recreational	1.3	839
Big Butte Creek	Fish	Recreational	2.0	706
Cheney Creek	Fish	Recreational	2.2	711
Clackamas River	Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	0.0	30
Cow Creek	Fish, Wildlife, Historical, Cultural	Recreational	10.0	3,339
Drift Creek	Fish	Recreational	0.4	150
Elk Valley Creek	Fish	Recreational	1.6	464
Fall Creek - Eugene	Recreation	Recreational	0.4	87
Fall Creek - Salem	Fish	Recreational	2.4	670
Kilches River	Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	0.0	66
Lake Creek Segment B	Recreation, Fish	Recreational	0.9	483
Left Fork Foots Creek	Fish	Recreational	0.1	131
Little Applegate River	Fish	Recreational	1.7	1,368
Little Luckiamute River	Ecology	Recreational	0.3	40
Little North Santiam River	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	3.5	1,205
Lobster Creek Segment B	Fish	Recreational	0.1	352
Luckiamute River	Ecology	Recreational	2.2	624
McKenzie River Segment B	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	1.0	56
Middle Santiam River	Cultural, Ecology	Recreational	0.6	193
Nehalem River	Recreation	Recreational	0.2	40
Nelson Creek	Fish	Recreational	2.6	833
Nestucca River Segment B*	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	0.6	212
North Fork Clackamas River	Fish	Scenic (Seg. 1), Recreational (Seg. 2)	1.4	389
North Fork Gate Creek	Fish	Recreational	0.6	199
North Fork Siletz River	Fish, Wildlife, Ecology	Scenic	3.5	990
North Fork Trask River	Recreation, Fish	Recreational	3.0	778
North Santiam River	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Wildlife (Seg. A), Recreation, Fish, Wildlife (Seg. B)	Scenic (Seg. A), Recreational (Seg. B)	1.2	376
Quines Creek	Fish	Recreational	2.7	816
Rifle Creek	Fish	Recreational	1.9	762
Rogue River	Recreation, Fish	Recreational	2.1	754
Sams Creek	Fish	Recreational	1.5	497
Sandy River	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Cultural	Recreational	7.3	1,519
Siletz River	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	0.7	54
Sixes River	Fish, Wildlife, Historical	Recreational	2.0	281
South Fork Coos River	Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	1.4	551
South Fork Coquille	Fish, Cultural	Recreational	1.0	152
South Fork Gate Creek	Fish	Recreational	0.6	108

Study River Name	Outstandingly Remarkable Values	Tentative Classification	River Segment Length (Miles)	BLM-administered Lands within WSR Corridors (Acres)
South Fork Little Butte Creek	Fish	Recreational	1.4	452
South Fork Trask River	Fish	Recreational	0.0	69
South Umpqua	Fish, Wildlife, Historical, Cultural	Recreational	1.4	602
South Yamhill River†	Cultural, Ecology	Recreational	0.0	0
Table Rock Fork – Molalla River	Scenery, Cultural	Recreational	4.7	1,480
Trask River	Recreation	Recreational	0.4	444
Tualatin River	Cultural	Recreational	1.2	326
Umpqua River	Scenery, Recreation, Geology, Fish, Wildlife, Historical, Cultural, Ecology	Recreational	18.0	2,403
West Fork Illinois River	Scenery	Scenic	4.2	1,154
Willamette River	Recreation, Fish, Wildlife, Historical, Cultural, Ecology	Recreational	1.1	83
Wilson River	Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	0.0	109
Yaquina River	Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	1.3	270
Totals			100.9	29,339

* The BLM concluded through the suitability assessment that a joint suitability study with the U.S. Forest Service is needed to make a determination about the segment's suitability. This segment will continue to receive protection until completion of the joint study.

† The BLM discovered through a revalidation of the eligibility determinations that were made in 1992 that the South Yamhill River corridor does not include any BLM-administered lands. Therefore, this segment that was previously determined eligible did not move forward for suitability evaluation as part of this RMP revision.

Table 3-285. Eligible rivers within the decision area that the BLM identified as meeting suitability criteria

River Segment Name	District	Outstandingly Remarkable Values	Suitable River Tentative Classification	River Miles
Little North Santiam River	Salem	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Wildlife	Recreational	3.5
North Fork Siletz	Salem	Fish, Wildlife, Ecology	Scenic	3.5
Rogue River	Medford	Recreation, Fish	Recreational	2.1
Sandy River	Salem	Scenery, Recreation, Fish, Cultural	Recreational	7.3
Table Rock Fork Molalla	Salem	Scenery, Cultural	Recreational	4.7
West Fork Illinois	Medford	Scenery	Scenic	4.2
Total Miles				25.3

Environmental Consequences

This section analyzes the environmental impacts to eligible river segments within the decision area that could result from the implementation of the management actions proposed under the alternatives or the Proposed RMP in relation to other resources and resource uses. This analysis is two-part: (1) effects to ORVs and tentative classifications that would result from recommendation for inclusion into the National System under each alternative and the Proposed RMP; and (2) effects to ORVs and tentative classifications of segments that would not be recommended for inclusion into the National System under each alternative and the Proposed RMP.

Effects to Eligible River ORVs and Tentative Classifications Resulting from Recommendation for Inclusion in the National System

As described in more detail below, the No Action alternative and Alternative D would provide the most protection for the 51 current eligible river segments. Both of these alternatives fulfill regulation that requires analysis of a No Action alternative (where suitability assessments would not be considered completed and eligible rivers would continue with interim management based upon the tentative classification and ORVs), and analysis of an alternative that includes recommendation for national designation of all eligible segments, regardless of suitability determinations. The BLM would continue to manage all 51 eligible segments based upon the ORVs and tentative classifications under both of these alternatives. Alternative A fulfills regulation that requires analysis of an alternative that would not recommend any eligible river segments for inclusion into the National System, and no management for ORVs or tentative classification would occur. Alternatives B and C and the Proposed RMP would recommend the six eligible rivers found suitable through assessment for inclusion into the National System. **Table 3-286** compares the miles and acres of eligible river segments that would be protected in the action alternatives and the Proposed RMP.

Table 3-286. Eligible river segment protection totals within the decision area

Alternative/ Proposed RMP	Eligible Rivers Determined Suitable (Number of Segments)	Protected River Miles (Total Miles)	Protected River Acres (Total Acres)
No Action	51	100.9	29,339
Alt. A	-	-	-
Alt. B	6	25.3	7,102
Alt. C	6	25.3	7,102
Alt. D	51	100.9	29,339
PRMP	6	25.3	7,102

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action alternative, the BLM would continue to manage the 51 segments identified as eligible during the 1995 RMP process to protect their ORVs, water quality, free-flowing characteristics, and tentative classification as Wild, Scenic, or Recreational until suitability is determined during subsequent land use planning efforts on the 100.9 river miles and 29,339 acres within the study river corridors. Under this protective management, the BLM would not approve any action that would adversely affect the 51 segments' ORVs or tentative classification, and the BLM assumes that these characteristics would persist.

Alternative A

Under Alternative A, the BLM would not recommend any of the 51 eligible river segments in the planning area for inclusion into the National System. The BLM would not continue to manage these 100.9 river miles and 29,339 acres of land for river ORVs and tentative classification. While management under the guidance of the WSR Act would not occur, the BLM assumed that this change in management would only negatively affect miles and acres of eligible rivers that occur in land use allocations or special management areas where management direction would be in conflict with retention of the ORVs and tentative classification. The specific actions and acres that could result in long-term adverse impacts to the ORVs and tentative classification identified during the eligibility assessments are discussed below.

Alternatives B and C, and the Proposed RMP

Under Alternatives B and C, and the Proposed RMP, the BLM would recommend six segments for potential inclusion into the National System (**Table 3-285**). The BLM would continue to manage these 6 segments, totaling 25.3 river miles and 7,102 acres of land, to ensure the continued protection of their ORVs and tentative classification until Congress makes a determination whether to designate the segment(s) as part of the National System. The BLM would not recommend 45 segments for inclusion into the National System. While management under the guidance of the WSR Act would not occur, the BLM assumed that this change in management would only negatively affect miles and acres of eligible rivers that occur in land use allocations or special management areas where management direction would be in conflict with retention of the ORVs and tentative classification. The specific actions and acres that could result in long-term adverse impacts to the ORVs and tentative classification identified during the eligibility assessments are discussed below.

Alternative D

Under Alternative D, the BLM would recommend all 51 eligible segments for inclusion into the National System. The BLM would continue managing the segments to protect the ORVs and tentative classification. Implementation of Alternative D would result in effects similar to or the same as those described under the No Action alternative, as the BLM would provide interim protection to these river segments (**Appendix B**). The BLM assumes that these characteristics would persist.

Effects to Eligible Segment ORVs and Tentative Classifications from Management for Other Resources

In accordance with the WSR Act, the BLM would release some or all eligible river segments from interim protective management where they are not recommend for potential inclusion into the National System under Alternatives A, B, and C, or the Proposed RMP. Management of BLM-administered lands within these released river corridors would occur in conformance with the applicable land use allocations, of which some would result in effects that would potentially degrade released values. However, portions of these same segments would also receive indirect protection for their ORVs and tentative classification from management intended to protect other resources. These potential effects and indirect protections are detailed below.

The No Action alternative and Alternative D are not included in this section of the analysis. By continuing existing management, under the No Action alternative, study river corridors would continue to receive protective management under existing eligible determinations. In Alternative D, the BLM would recommend all river corridors for inclusion into the National System and, therefore, the BLM would continue to provide adequate protections to ORVs and tentative classifications within these study river segments.

Effects from Riparian Management

Fish have been identified as an ORV on 85 percent of BLM-administered acres within the eligible river corridors. Fish have been identified as the sole ORV on 19 river segments (37 percent of all eligible segments). Under all alternatives and the Proposed RMP, there would be no impact to fish-related ORVs for any of the 41 currently eligible segments with fish as an ORV, regardless of whether they are recommended for inclusion in the National System. As stated in the Fisheries and Hydrology sections of this chapter, the riparian management strategies would all have similar consequences in that they would be protective of stream shade and would not increase stream temperatures for any of the alternatives or the Proposed RMP. Absent any affect to stream temperature, there would be no affect to fish ORVs resulting from any of the alternatives or the Proposed RMP. However, the discussions below on the effects to ORVs from resource management do not exclude these 19 eligible stream segments only containing fish ORVs. As such, the discussions of effects from various programs to ORVs, outside of the specific discussions to recreation and scenery ORVs, are overstated.

Effects from Minerals and Right-of-Way Management

Development of leasable and locatable minerals has the potential to affect some ORVs and the tentative classification segments not recommended for inclusion into the National System. Similarly, the granting of rights-of-way along segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System could have adverse effects to, for example, tentative classifications through changes in access to river segments where low to no access is an element of the tentative classification. Mineral or right-of-way development along the segments not recommended for inclusion into the National System could result in a substantially higher level of surface disturbance, access changes, and visual effects. **Table 3-287** shows the incidental protection of river segments not recommended for inclusion into the National System from minerals and rights-of-way restrictions.

Table 3-287. River segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System receiving incidental protection from mineral and right-of-way management

Alternative/ Proposed RMP	River Segments Not Recommended for National System Inclusion (Number)	Stipulation	Right-of-way		Recommended for Withdrawal from Locatable Mineral Entry (Acres)	Closed to Salable Mineral Development (Acres)
		No Surface Occupancy, Controlled Surface Use, Timing Limitation (Acres)	Exclusion (Acres)	Avoidance (Acres)		
Alt. A	51	4,401	1,467	7,507	4,096	1,870
Alt. B	45	1,567	-	4,138	1,330	1,618
Alt. C	45	1,948	-	6,196	1,504	1,706
PRMP	45	3,348	444	3,063	976	1,389

Where alternatives and the Proposed RMP require leasable mineral stipulations for the protection of other resources along non-suitable river segments these stipulations would provide some level of protection for certain ORVs. In Alternative A, 15 percent of river segments not recommended for inclusion into the National System would receive incidental protection from mineral stipulations, compared to 7 percent in Alternative B, 9 percent in Alternative C, and 15 percent in the Proposed RMP.

River segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System may also receive incidental protection from being within right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas designated for the protection of

other resources. Right-of-way exclusion would provide the most protection to ORVs and tentative classification by not permitting new discretionary rights-of-way in the area. In Alternative A, 5 percent of river segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System would receive incidental protection from right-of-way exclusion and 25 percent from right-of-way avoidance. In Alternative B, 19 percent of segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System in Alternative would receive incidental protection from right-of-way avoidance compared to 28 percent in Alternative C. The 22,237 acres of river segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System in Alternatives B and C would receive no incidental protection from right-of-way exclusion but 14 percent would from right-of-way avoidance. Compared to Alternatives A, B, and C, the Proposed RMP protects fewer acres.

Effects from Visual Resource Management

Variations in VRM classes relative to the location of river segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System would potentially allow for impacts to the scenic quality and potential loss of a qualifying ORV. Rivers with a scenery ORV would be impacted if visual resources were degraded. VRM Class designations I and II preserve and retain the existing character of the landscapes, respectively. VRM Class III and IV partially retain and allow for major modification of the existing character of the landscape. **Table 3-288** identifies the nine river segments not recommended for inclusion under at least one alternative in the National System with scenery as a qualifying ORV in VRM Class I and II.

Table 3-288. Eligible river segment corridors with overlapping scenery ORVs and VRM Class I or II, where the river segment is not recommended for inclusion into the National System

Eligible River Segments with Scenery ORVs*	BLM-administered Lands within WSR Corridors (Acres)	BLM-administered Lands within WSR Corridors Managed as VRM Class I or II			
		Alt. A (Percent)	Alt. B† (Percent)	Alt. C* (Percent)	PRMP* (Percent)
Little North Santiam River	1,205	<1%	Recommended for Inclusion		
McKenzie River Segment B	56	100%	100%	100%	64%
North Santiam River	376	-	-	-	100%
Sandy River	1,519	100%	Recommended for Inclusion		
Siletz River	54	-	-	-	-
Table Rock Fork–Molalla River	1,480	21%	Recommended for Inclusion		
Umpqua River	2,403	1%	1%	1%	1%
West Fork Illinois River	1,154	8%	Recommended for Inclusion		
Totals	8,459	24%	3%	3%	14%

* In addition to the rivers listed, the Nestucca River Segment B would continue to receive protections under an ‘eligible’ status awaiting a joint suitability study with the U.S. Forest Service under all alternatives and the Proposed RMP.

† Total acre percentages are the percentage of the remaining five rivers’ 3,101 corridor acres that would not be recommended for inclusion into the National System.

The extent to which management under a VRM Class III or IV designation could impact scenery ORVs to the point that they would no longer be present within the river segment corridor is unknown and not possible to assess at the scale of the planning area. While some river segments not recommended for inclusion into the national system do include acres managed as VRM Class III or IV, all river segments would also contain the Riparian Reserve land use allocation within the first 50 to one site-potential tree height distance from the river under all action alternatives and the Proposed RMP. Because the Riparian Reserve allows for limited forest management, depending on site-specific vegetation, slope, and terrain, the management direction of the Riparian Reserve could protect existing scenery ORVs to the extent that they would not be lost. Additionally, the location of land management resulting in a change in visual resources within the river segment corridor (i.e., visibility of the harvested stand or constructed road from

the river) would greatly determine the magnitude of the effect of the change in visual resources on the river segment and existing ORVs.

Under Alternative A, no river segments would be recommended for inclusion into the National System. Of the nine river segments with scenery ORVs, Mackenzie River Segment B and Sandy River would receive incidental protection of scenery ORVs on all BLM-administered lands within the WSR corridor. Little North Santiam River, Table Rock Fork–Molalla River, Umpqua River, and West Fork Illinois River would receive minimal incidental protection of the BLM-administered corridor, and the North Santiam River and Siletz River would receive no incidental protection of their corridors.

Alternatives B and C and the Proposed RMP would recommend all rivers found suitable for inclusion into the National System. The Little North Santiam River, Sandy River, Table Rock Fork – Molalla River, and West Fork Illinois River would all be recommended for inclusion into the National System and would be managed as VRM II. Alternatives B and C would provide incidental protection of scenery ORVs on all BLM-administered lands within the WSR corridor of Mackenzie River Segment B, and minimal incidental protection of the BLM-administered corridor for Umpqua River. The North Santiam River and Siletz River segments not recommended for inclusion into the National System with scenery ORVs would receive no incidental protection to their river corridors.

The Proposed RMP would provide incidental protection of scenery ORVs on all BLM-administered lands within the WSR corridor of the North Santiam River segment, incidental protection to more than half of the acreage of the BLM-administered corridor for McKenzie River Segment B, and incidental protection on a minimal acreage of the BLM-administered corridor for the Umpqua River. The Siletz River segment not recommended for inclusion into the National System with scenery ORVs would receive no incidental protection to their river corridors. Compared to the alternatives, the Proposed RMP provides the most level of protection to eligible rivers with scenery ORVs when compared to the action alternatives because it would manage the four segments with scenery ORVs found suitable and recommended for inclusion into the National System as VRM II and would provide incidental protection to 14 percent of the remaining eligible rivers that would not be recommended for inclusion.

In addition to scenery ORVs, VRM could have affects to management of scenic tentative classifications on eligible rivers not recommended for inclusion in the National System. In Alternatives A, B and C, 8 percent of the 4 eligible rivers (North Fork Clackamas, North Fork Siletz, North Santiam, and West Fork Illinois) with scenic classifications that would not be recommended for inclusion into the National System, would receive incidental protection to the scenic classification through VRM Class I or II designation. In the Proposed RMP, the four eligible rivers with scenic classifications would receive incidental protection to the scenic classification through VRM Class I or II designation, except where these acres overlap the Harvest Land Base. Approximately 220 acres of the total 2,909 BLM-administered lands within the corridors for these 4 rivers overlap the Harvest Land Base and would be managed as VRM Class III.

Effects from ACEC Management

The relevant and important values for an ACEC are often identical to ORVs identified for an eligible river that occurs in the same area. In such cases, overlapping ACEC management for that relevant and important value would also directly maintain or enhance that ORV. Management for overlapping ACECs may also indirectly maintain or enhance an eligible river's ORVs, even if the ORV is not also an ACEC relevant and important value. **Table 3-289** displays acres of the 13 eligible river segments with overlapping ACEC designations.

Table 3-289. Eligible river segment corridors with overlapping ACEC designations where the river segment is not recommended for inclusion in the National System

Eligible River Segments with ACEC Overlap	BLM-administered Lands within WSR Corridors (Acres)	Alt. A (Acres)	Alt. B (Acres)	Alt. C (Acres)	PRMP (Acres)
Big Butte Creek	706	33	33	33	33
Cow Creek	3,339	138	138	138	138
Fall Creek – Salem	670	11	11	11	11
Lake Creek Segment B	483	54	54	54	54
Little Applegate River	1,368	10	10	10	10
McKenzie River Segment B	56	47	47	47	44
Middle Santiam River	193	172	172	172	172
North Fork Siletz River	990	353	Recommended for Inclusion		
Riffle Creek	762	9	9	9	2
Rogue River	754	47	Recommended for Inclusion		
Sandy River	1,519	1,516	Recommended for Inclusion		
Umpqua River	2,403	20	20	20	20
West Fork Illinois River	1,154	897	Recommended for Inclusion		
Total BLM-administered Lands within WSR Corridors that Overlap with ACECs (Acres)	14,397	3,307	494	494	484

In Alternative A, 13 eligible rivers not recommended for inclusion into the National System would overlap with ACECs with complementary management. The majority of this overlap is a relatively low percentage of each eligible river’s corridor. The highest percentage of overlap occurs on the Sandy River segment (99.8 percent overlap), West Fork Illinois segment (77 percent overlap), and McKenzie River (72 percent overlap). Management of public lands to maintain or enhance relevant and important values within these ACECs would effectively maintain or enhance eligible river ORVs and tentative classification on these three segments under Alternative A. Since all other eligible river segments have relatively low percentages of corridor overlap, it is unlikely ACEC management would influence retention or maintenance of ORVs or tentative classification.

In Alternatives B and C, and the Proposed RMP, nine eligible rivers not recommended for inclusion into the National System overlap with ACECs with complementary management. Since all other eligible river segments have relatively low percentages of corridor overlap, it is unlikely ACEC management would influence retention or maintenance of ORVs or tentative classification.

Effects from Recreation and Visitor Services Management

Management of recreation outcomes and setting characteristics within Recreation Management Areas (RMAs) would generally be complementary to management for study river values where Recreation was identified as an ORV. In such cases, overlapping recreation management for recreation values would also directly maintain or enhance that ORV. **Table 3-290** identifies the eligible segments with recreation as a qualifying ORV and the acres that overlap with RMAs for all eligible river segments.

Table 3-290. Eligible river segments with recreation ORVs and overlapping Recreation Management Area designations, where the river segment is not recommended for inclusion into the National System.

Eligible River Segments with Recreation ORVs*	BLM-administered Lands within WSR Corridors (Acres)	Alt. A (Acres)	Alt. B (Acres)	Alt. C (Acres)	PRMP (Acres)
Alsea River	404	3	3	3	3
Clackamas River	30	-	-	-	-
Fall Creek – Eugene	87	-	-	-	-
Kilchis River	66	-	-	-	66
Lake Creek Segment B	483	2	2	2	2
Little North Santiam River	1,205	104	Recommended for Inclusion		
McKenzie River Segment B	56	3	3	3	3
Nehalem River	40	-	-	14	14
North Fork Trask River	778	-	-	-	-
North Santiam River	376	150	148	148	148
Rogue River	754	12	Recommended for Inclusion		
Sandy River	1,519	33	Recommended for Inclusion		
Siletz River	54	-	-	-	-
South Fork Coos River	551	-	-	-	-
Trask River	444	-	-	-	-
Umpqua River	2,403	53	52	269	481
Willamette River	83	68	-	-	-
Wilson River	109	-	-	48	61
Totals	9,654	428	208	487	778

* In addition to the rivers listed, the Nestucca River Segment B would continue to receive protections under an ‘eligible’ status awaiting a joint suitability study with the U.S. Forest Service under all alternatives and the Proposed RMP.

Alternative B has 208 acres, Alternative A has 428 Acres, Alternative C has 487 acres, and the Proposed RMP has 778 acres of eligible river segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System with recreation ORVs that are incidentally protected by RMAs. Compared to Alternative B, Alternative A has double the acreage of eligible with complimentary RMA designation and Alternative C has a slightly higher acreage than Alternative A. The Proposed RMP protects the largest acreage of eligible rivers not recommended for inclusion into the National System with recreation ORVs through complimentary RMA designation. The Proposed RMP provides the largest level of protection for recreation ORVs associated with non-suitable rivers when compared to all action alternatives.

Based on the tentative classification criteria for recreational river segments, some development and substantial evidence of human activity is present within 93 percent of eligible rivers. Lands within river areas with tentative recreational classifications are characterized by historical active management, including the full range of agricultural and forestry uses, showing evidence of past and ongoing timber harvest activities. Additional development, including that which supports increased recreation use along the non-suitable segments could result in slightly higher levels of surface disturbance and visual impacts then would occur under the No Action alternative. However, other resource protection measures for water, riparian areas, and wildlife would add protections that would indirectly protect segments found not suitable for inclusion into the National System from land and realty impacts.

Effects from Forest Management

The No Action alternative and Alternative D are not included in this section of the analysis. By continuing existing management, under the No Action alternative, study river corridors would continue to receive protective management under existing eligible determinations. In Alternative D, the BLM would recommend all river corridors for inclusion into the National System and, therefore, the BLM would continue to provide adequate protections to ORVs and tentative classifications within these study river segments.

For those eligible rivers not recommended for inclusion into the National System, ORVs could be negatively impacted where eligible river segment corridors overlap with the Harvest Land Base. **Table 3-291** displays acres of eligible river segment not recommended for inclusion in the National System that have corridor overlap with the Harvest Land Base.

Table 3-291. Eligible river segments that have corridor overlap with the Harvest Land Base land use allocation where the river segment is not recommended for inclusion into the National System

Alternative/ Proposed RMP	River Segments Not Recommended for Inclusion in the National System (Number)	Harvest Land Base within WSR Corridors (Acres)	Total BLM- administered Lands in River Corridors (Acres)
Alt. A	51	2,469	29,339
Alt. B	45	3,882	22,236
Alt. C	45	5,442	22,236
PRMP	45	3,723	22,236

Alternative A would have 8 percent of eligible river segment corridors not recommended for inclusion in the National System within the Harvest Land Base, the fewest when compared to Alternatives B and C and the Proposed RMP (17 percent, 24 percent, and 17 percent, respectively). Effects from forest management activities on ORVs for eligible segments not recommended for inclusion into the National System would be the least under Alternative A and the most under Alternative C, with Alternatives B and the Proposed RMP having similar effects.

Forest management could affect ORVs, specifically scenery, wildlife, botany, ecology, and recreation. However, the extent to which forest management could affect ORVs to the point that they would no longer be present within the river segment corridor is unknown and not possible to assess at the scale of the planning area. While some river segments not recommended for inclusion into the national system do include acres of the Harvest Land Base land use allocation, all river segments would also contain the Riparian Reserve land use allocation within the first 50 to one site-potential tree height distance from the river under all action alternatives and the Proposed RMP. Depending on site-specific vegetation, slope, terrain, and segment ORVs, the management direction of the Riparian Reserve could protect existing ORVs to the extent that they would not be lost. Additionally, the location of the Harvest Land Base within the river segment corridor (i.e., visibility of the stand from the river) would greatly determine the magnitude of the effects of forest management on the river segment and existing ORVs.

Effects from Comprehensive Trail and Transportation Management

Eligible river segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System could be affected by public motorized access designations. See the Trails and Travel Management section of this chapter (Issue 1) for more details on public motorized access designations. Designating areas as *closed* or *limited* for public motorized access would reduce effects in the corridors of the eligible segments. Damage to vegetation would be reduced or eliminated, which would protect ORVs, specifically historical, ecology,

scenic, wildlife, and botany. **Table 3-292** displays public motorized access designations for river segments not recommended for inclusion into the National System by alternative and the Proposed RMP.

Table 3-292. Public motorized access designation designations for eligible river segments

Public Motorized Access Designations within River Segments	Alt. A (Acres)	Alt. B (Acres)	Alt. C (Acres)	PRMP (Acres)
Closed	327	1,760	3,243	1,398
Limited to Designated	110	218	1,501	-
Limited to Existing	29,052	27,619	26,136	28,614
Open	-	-	-	-
Totals	29,489	29,597	29,880	30,012

Under Alternatives A, B, and C, and the Proposed RMP, the majority of acres within eligible river segment corridors not recommended for inclusion into the National System are designated as *limited* for public motorized access. The remainder of the acres under these alternatives and the Proposed RMP are designated as *closed*. No acres would be designated as *open* for public motorized access under these alternatives. By shifting to *limited* from an *open* designation, the ORVs for eligible river segments not recommended for inclusion in the National System would be better protected from effects of public motorized access.

References

- USDA FS. 1993. Clackamas National Wild and Scenic River and State Scenic Waterway – Environmental Assessment and Management Plan. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR. 188 pp. <http://www.rivers.gov/documents/plans/clackamas-plan-ea.pdf>.
- USDA FS and USDI BLM. 1993. Salmon National Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR, and USDI BLM Salem District, Salem, OR. 188 pp. <http://www.rivers.gov/documents/plans/salmon-oregon-plan.pdf>.
- USDA FS, USDI BLM, and Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department. 1992. North Umpqua National Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Umpqua National Forest, BLM Roseburg District, Roseburg, OR, and Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Salem, OR. 110 pp. <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/roseburg/plans/files/NoUmpRvr.pdf>.
- USDI BLM and Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department. 1993. Sandy Wild and Scenic River and State Scenic Waterway Management Plan – Environmental Assessment. BLM-OR-PT-92-29-1792. A cooperative river management planning document developed by USDI BLM Salem District Clackamas Resource Area in cooperation with Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department, Salem, OR. 174 pp. <https://archive.org/details/sandywildscenicr5601rate>.
- USDI BLM. 1972. Rogue River National Wild and Scenic River-Revised River Management Plan. In: Federal Register, Vol. 37, No. 131—Friday, July 7, 1972. BLM Medford District, Medford, OR. <http://www.rivers.gov/documents/plans/rogue-plan.pdf>.
- . 1992. Quartzville Creek National Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. BLM-OR-PT-93-03-1792. BLM Salem District, Salem, OR. 102pp. <https://archive.org/details/managementplanq5180unit>.
- . 2004. Upper Klamath River Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan Amendments. <http://soda.sou.edu/awdata/031014y1.pdf>.
- . 2012. BLM Manual 6400 – Wild and Scenic Rivers – Policy and Program Direction for Identification, Evaluation, Planning, and Management. Washington D.C. http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/wo/Information_Resources_Management/policy/blm_manual.Par.76771.File.dat/6400.pdf.
- . 2014. Resource Management Plans for Western Oregon Planning Criteria. BLM Oregon/Washington State Office, Portland, OR. <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/plandocs.php>.

Page intentionally left blank