
Appendix X – Guidance for Use of the Completed RMPs

This appendix describes on how the BLM will implement, evaluate, and change the RMPs after approval of the RMP revisions. These descriptions, which provide background information and explanations of how the BLM will use the completed RMPs, do not constitute additional requirements beyond the management direction described in **Appendix B**. The BLM may make changes to the processes described in this background information through plan maintenance, as explained below, in that changes to processes, in and of themselves, would not expand the scope of resource uses or restrictions or change the terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved plan.

Implementation of the Completed RMPs

At this time, the BLM anticipates issuing two Records of Decision/Resource Management Plans (RODs/RMPs): one ROD/RMP that would apply to the Coos Bay District, Eugene District, Salem District, and the Swiftwater Field Office of the Roseburg District; and another ROD/RMP that would apply to the Klamath Falls Field Office of the Lakeview District, the Medford District, and the South River Field Office of the Roseburg District.

The Records of Decision will only make decisions on lands that fall under BLM jurisdiction (including mineral estate). The major provisions of the RMPs will include the following land use plan decisions—

- Objectives for the management of BLM-administered lands and resources;
- Land use allocations relative to future uses for the purposes of achieving the various objectives; and
- Management direction that identifies where future actions may or may not be allowed and what restrictions or requirements may be placed on those future actions to achieve the objectives set for the BLM-administered lands and resources.

Management objectives are descriptions of desired outcomes for BLM-administered lands and resources in an RMP; the resource conditions that the BLM envisions or desires would eventually result from implementation of the RMP. As such, management objectives are not rules, restrictions, or requirements by which the BLM determines which implementation actions to conduct or how to design specific implementation actions.

For some land use allocation decisions, such as the location of the Late-Successional Reserve, Harvest Land Base, and District-Designated Reserve – Lands Managed for their Wilderness Characteristics, the maps accompanying the approved RMP of these allocations represent the decision. For other land use allocation decisions, such as the location of the Riparian Reserve, the decision requires identification of features on the ground (e.g., a perennial stream) and the allocation of a corresponding width of Riparian Reserve.

Although the location of the Riparian Reserve will require the identification of specific features on the ground, the maps accompanying the approved RMP of the three subwatershed classes for the purpose of defining Riparian Reserve widths and management direction (**Appendix B**) represent the decision. In identifying subwatershed classes, the BLM considered the information in critical habitat designations and data on high intrinsic potential streams to indicate the importance of subwatersheds to the conservation and recovery of ESA-listed fish. However, future changes in designated critical habitat or data on high intrinsic potential streams would not alter the identification of subwatershed classes for the purpose of

Riparian Reserve design and management direction. Any change to the subwatershed classes would constitute a change to the approved RMP and such changes would only be made consistent with the discussion below in the section on Changes to the Approved RMP. As noted above, the Records of Decision will only make decisions on lands that fall under BLM jurisdiction; as such, the identification of subwatershed classes within the planning area is only relevant to defining Riparian Reserve widths and management direction for streams and water features on BLM-administered lands within the subwatershed.

The decision requires the future allocation of marbled murrelet occupied stands⁶¹ to the Late-Successional Reserve for occupied sites identified⁶² after March 26, 2015 as a result of BLM marbled murrelet surveys in (1) all land use allocations within 35 miles of the Pacific Coast, and (2) Late-Successional Reserve and Riparian Reserve between 35–50 miles from the Pacific Coast and outside of exclusion Areas C and D (shown in **Figure 3-166**). In addition, this decision requires the future allocation of red tree vole “habitat areas”⁶³ to the Late-Successional Reserve for occupied sites identified as a result of BLM red tree vole surveys within the range of the North Oregon Coast Distinct Population Segment of the red tree vole north of Highway 20.

Through the RMPs, the BLM will determine and declare the annual productive capacity for sustained-yield timber production. In the Records of Decision for the approved RMPs, the BLM will declare the annual productive capacity for sustained-yield timber production and describe the level of allowable variation in the amount of timber offered for sale in a given time period. In addition, the Records of Decision for the approved RMPs will define any necessary transition period from the declarations of the annual productive capacity in the 1995 RMPs to the declarations of the annual productive capacity in the approved RMPs. The BLM will make the determination and declaration of the annual productive capacity for each of the six sustained yield units, which match the five western Oregon BLM district boundaries and the western portion of the Klamath Falls Field Office of the Lakeview District.

Land use plan decisions (land use allocations, management objectives, and management direction) do not directly authorize implementation of on-the-ground projects. Land use plan decisions guide and control future implementation decisions, which the BLM can carry out only after completion of further NEPA compliance and decision-making processes and consultation as appropriate.

Implementation decisions authorize implementation of on-the-ground projects. Examples of implementation decisions include but are not limited to the following: offering a specific tract of timber for sale, applying a vegetation treatment, approving or denying an application for a permit, issuing an individual grazing lease, designating specific roads and trails as *open* or *closed* to motorized travel, or completing a specific land exchange. The Proposed RMP does not include any implementation decisions to be included in the eventual Records of Decision/Approved RMPs.

Implementation Planning

Implementation planning is a process the BLM uses to develop a coordinated strategy to facilitate implementation of new land use plans. Consistent with the 2005 BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), the BLM will complete implementation planning within one year of approval of the RMPs. The

⁶¹ Marbled murrelet occupied stand refers to all forest stands, regardless of age or structure, within 1/4 mile (1,320 feet) of the location of marbled murrelet behavior indicating occupancy and not separated from the location of marbled murrelet behavior indicating occupancy by more than 328 feet of non-forest.

⁶² In this context, “identified after March 26, 2015,” means that survey data for occupied marbled murrelet sites was entered into the BLM corporate database after March 26, 2015.

⁶³ Red tree vole “habitat areas” are described in the management direction (**Appendix B**).

implementation planning process is a three-step process by which the BLM identifies and outlines work tasks to achieve the desired outcomes of one the land use plans. The product of this effort will be a worksheet, which outlines implementation actions in correlation to management objectives and direction described in the RMPs for 5–10 years. The implementation plan will prioritize work tasks for funding and implementation based upon direction provided and given the existing or anticipated resources. Implementation planning enables the BLM to prioritize the preparation of implementation decisions.

Project-level Planning and Analysis

The BLM will make decisions on specific projects to implement, including on-the-ground locations and timing of projects, subsequent to the approval of the RMPs. All implementation decisions must conform to the approved RMP, consistent with 43 CFR 1610.5–3.

Revision of an RMP necessarily involves a transition from the application of the old RMP to the application of the new RMP. The planning and analysis of implementation projects typically requires several years of preparation before the BLM can reach a decision. Allowing for a transition from the old RMP to the new RMP avoids disruption of the management of the BLM-administered lands and allows the BLM to utilize work already begun on the planning and analysis of projects. The Records of Decision for the approved RMPs will address the application of the RMP to new and ongoing projects.

The analysis in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS describes the cumulative effect of anticipated implementation actions under the RMPs, based on the information available to the BLM at this time and forecasting of reasonably foreseeable implementation actions under the RMPs. The analysis in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS will provide useful analysis, including cumulative effects analysis, to which most implementation-level analyses will tier, consistent with 40 CFR 1502.20. As the BLM plans and analyzes implementation actions, the BLM will have better and more specific information on the location, scope, and timing of proposed implementation actions, and site-specific conditions for project-level NEPA compliance.

Implementation-level Travel Management Planning

In accordance with 43 CFR 8342 and current BLM policy, the BLM is deferring implementation-level Travel Management Planning during the current RMPs for Western Oregon planning effort. Implementation-level TMP is the process of establishing a final travel and transportation network that includes route-specific designations within the broader land use planning level designations for public motorized access. In the future, implementation-level travel planning will follow a site-specific process for selecting a final public road and trail network. The BLM may delineate Travel Management Areas within these broader land use planning level designations for public motorized access to address particular concerns and prescribe specific management actions for a defined geographic area. The BLM will make final route designations within the decision area in comprehensive, interdisciplinary Travel and Transportation Management Plans, scheduled to be completed within five years after the completion of the western Oregon RMPs. Until implementation-level Travel Management Planning is complete, routes and trails would be managed in accordance with their designation of *closed* or *limited* to existing routes for public motorized travel activities, as described in **Appendix Q**. Implementation-level Travel Management Planning would be conducted within the decision area generally prioritizing planning to occur first where the BLM has legal public access and where implementation-level planning is needed to reduce threats to resources or to protect public safety. Specific prioritization criteria are listed in **Appendix Q**, and would be applied by each district and field office based upon local knowledge of their administrative areas.

BLM Participation in Barred Owl Management

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is currently authorizing the removal of barred owls from four study areas in California, Oregon, and Washington to evaluate the feasibility, cost, and effectiveness of barred owl removal and the resulting effects to northern spotted owl populations (USDI FWS 2013). In the Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl, Recovery Action 29 describes the design and implementation of large-scale barred owl control experiments to assess the effects on spotted owl site occupancy, reproduction, and survival (USDI FWS, 2011, p. III-65). Recovery Action 30 calls for management to reduce the negative effects of barred owls on spotted owls so that the recovery criterion for a stable population trend can be achieved. In the Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acknowledges the need for aggressive strategies to address the threat from barred owls in the face of scientific uncertainty, and will employ an active program of adaptive management in order to deal with uncertainty and risk (USDI FWS 2011, p. II-6 – II-10).

Based on information in the Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl (USDI FWS 2011), the analysis in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service EIS for Experimental Removal of Barred Owls to Benefit Threatened Northern Spotted Owls (USDI FWS 2013), and preliminary results from experimental removals (Diller 2013, Diller *et al.* 2014), barred owl management may result in decreased competition between barred owls and northern spotted owls, increased site occupancy by northern spotted owls, and increased northern spotted owl survival and reproduction. These outcomes may increase the likelihood of recovery of the northern spotted owl. As such, the experimental removals represent an inquiry into the best manner in which barred owl management can contribute to the recovery of the northern spotted owl.

The BLM is cooperating with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and providing financial support for this experimental removal of barred owls. Further, when the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determines the best manner in which barred owl management can contribute to the recovery of the northern spotted owl, the BLM would participate in, cooperate with, and provide support for an interagency program for barred owl management to implement Recovery Action 30. Barred owl management actions on BLM-administered lands within the range of the northern spotted owl could include BLM participation in scheduling, funding, and implementing such actions. These actions would be implemented pursuant to appropriate NEPA analysis and decision-making. To the extent the BLM funds implementation of the Experimental Removal of Barred Owls to Benefit Threatened Northern Spotted Owls (USDI FWS 2013), the NEPA analysis for that action is already completed. The EIS prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service describes and evaluates nine alternatives for an experimental removal of barred owls on a scale sufficient to determine if the removal would increase northern spotted owl site occupancy and improve northern spotted owl population trends. Results from these experiments would be used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to inform future decisions on potential, long-term management strategies for barred owls (USDI FWS 2013). That analysis is hereby incorporated by reference.

The BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would develop a monitoring program that would evaluate whether such a barred owl management program is having the biological benefits to the northern spotted owl assumed by the Biological Opinion on the RMP. The BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would meet as necessary, at least annually, to review the results of the monitoring program.

Incidental Take of Northern Spotted Owls

As described under the Proposed RMP in Chapter 2 and **Appendix B**, upon signing of the ROD/RMP, the BLM would not authorize timber sales that would cause the incidental take⁶⁴ of northern spotted owl

⁶⁴ The ESA defines ‘take’ as “to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct” 16 U.S.C. 1532(19). The definition of harm is “an act which actually kills or injures wildlife. Such an act may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures

territorial pairs or resident singles from timber harvest until implementation of a barred owl management program consistent with the assumptions contained in the Biological Opinion on the RMP has begun. Implementation of a barred owl management program includes the existence of a monitoring program that would evaluate whether a barred owl program is having the biological benefits to the northern spotted owl assumed by the Biological Opinion on the RMP.

Whether a specific timber harvest would result in incidental take would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Until implementation of a barred owl management program has begun, the BLM would not authorize any timber harvest after the signing of the ROD/RMP that it determines would cause incidental take of northern spotted owls or is determined to cause incidental take through a Section 7 consultation process. The BLM would be authorizing timber harvest that does not result in incidental take of northern spotted owls (e.g., harvest in unoccupied home ranges or harvest within occupied home ranges that does not constitute incidental take), provided that such harvest otherwise meets BLM's obligations under ESA section 7.

As part of the process to determine whether a planned timber harvest would result in take of northern spotted owls, the BLM would establish whether the northern spotted owl is actually present in the area that would be affected by the timber harvest using the best available science at that time, such as through pre-project northern spotted owl surveys consistent with USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. 2012. Protocol for Surveying Proposed Management Activities That May Impact Northern Spotted Owls. (February 2, 2011; revised January 9, 2012). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has updated the northern spotted owl survey protocol to account for the influence of barred owl and may update it in the future.

If the BLM and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service jointly determine that implementation of a barred owl management program has begun, the BLM may proceed with implementation of timber harvest consistent with the ROD/RMP that may include incidental take of northern spotted owl territorial pairs or resident singles. Any proposed timber harvest that may include such incidental take would be implemented only after and consistent with appropriate project-level Section 7 consultation and incidental take statement.

After implementation of a barred owl management program has begun, the BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would meet as necessary, at least annually, to review the results of the monitoring program. If the BLM or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service conclude that the monitoring program shows that the results of such a barred owl management program are not consistent with the assumptions in the Biological Opinion, the BLM would reinstate Section 7 consultation on the RMP.

If the BLM or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concludes that implementation of a barred owl management program consistent with the assumptions contained in the Biological Opinion has not begun after five years from the effective date of the ROD/RMP, the agencies would meet as necessary, at least annually, and evaluate whether implementation of a barred owl management program consistent with the assumptions of the Biological Opinion is reasonably certain to occur. If both the BLM and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service agree that such a barred owl management program is still reasonably certain to occur, the BLM would continue to not authorize timber sales that would cause the incidental take of northern spotted owl territorial pairs or resident singles from timber harvest. If the BLM or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concludes that such a barred owl management program is not reasonably certain to occur, the BLM would reinstate Section 7 consultation on the RMP.

If implementation of a barred owl management program has not begun after 8 years of the effective date of the ROD/RMP, the BLM would reinstate Section 7 consultation on the RMP.

wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering" (50 CFR 17.3); *Babbitt v. Sweet Home Chapter of Cmty. for a Greater Or.*, 515 U.S. 687, 696-700 (1995).

If reinitiation of Section 7 consultation on the RMP is triggered for any of the reasons above, the BLM would comply with ESA section 7(d) and would not authorize timber harvest that is likely to adversely affect the northern spotted owl or likely to adversely affect its critical habitat until consultation is complete.

After implementation of a barred owl management program has begun, the BLM would continue to seek to avoid or reduce negative impacts to northern spotted owl sites, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base, as detailed below.

Management of Northern Spotted Owl Known Sites Associated with the Harvest Land Base⁶⁵

In 2013, an estimated 175 known sites occurred in what would be the Harvest Land Base under the Proposed RMP. In addition, the Harvest Land Base under the Proposed RMP would contribute to the 500-acre core use areas of an additional estimated 660 known sites located in other land use allocations, and to the median provincial home range areas of another estimated 250 known sites. Thus, an estimated 1,085 known sites, or 44 percent of the known sites associated with BLM-administered lands, potentially would be affected by BLM management actions in the Harvest Land Base under the Proposed RMP. Given the severe biological stressors currently affecting the northern spotted owl, when designing, locating and implementing actions in the Harvest Land Base, BLM managers would⁶⁶ reduce, avoid, or delay negative impacts to northern spotted owl known sites located in the Harvest Land Base, and avoid causing the abandonment of northern spotted owl known sites located in other land use allocations, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base.

This guidance is not intended to prevent all negative effects to known sites associated with the Harvest Land Base or the eventual loss of known sites in the Harvest Land Base. Instead, this guidance is intended to avoid or delay, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base, near-term negative effects to known sites as northern spotted owl habitat continues to develop in the reserved land use allocations and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service evaluates options for barred owl management.

The following information is intended to help BLM managers implement this guidance.

⁶⁵ As stated in the beginning of this appendix, this description, which provides background information and explanations of how the BLM will use the completed RMPs, does not constitute additional requirements beyond the management direction described in **Appendix B**. This description provides guidance for the timing or order of timber harvest in the Harvest Land Base but does not alter which lands are available for timber harvest. Guidance in this section for avoiding harvest or prioritizing harvest is in the context of those actions that are allowable consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base.

⁶⁶ As stated above, guidance in this section for avoiding harvest or prioritizing harvest is in the context of those actions that are allowable consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base. Thus, statements throughout this section about actions that the BLM would or would not take are solely explanations of how the BLM would use the completed RMPs and do not constitute additional requirements beyond the management direction described in **Appendix B**.

Known Sites Located in the Harvest Land Base

With respect to sites currently⁶⁷ occupied by a northern spotted owl territorial pair or resident single, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base, BLM managers would—

- Avoid management actions that would cause the abandonment of more than 10 percent of such sites during the first decade of plan implementation, more than 15 percent of such sites during the second decade of plan implementation, and more than 20 percent of such sites per decade thereafter. These thresholds are intended to reflect site abandonment caused by a BLM action; they are not intended to reflect site abandonment from other causes such as displacement by barred owls or habitat losses on adjacent lands. If the BLM determines that an action would not cause the incidental taking of a territorial pair or resident single, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurs with that determination, subsequent abandonment of a site associated with the action would not be considered as resulting from the action.
- Give priority to maintaining existing habitat conditions in the associated nest patch, 500-acre core use area and median provincial home range area, in that order of priority, to support continued site occupancy.

With respect to sites not currently occupied but known to have been occupied by a territorial pair or resident single within the past 5 years, BLM managers would give priority to maintaining existing habitat conditions in the nest patch and 500-acre core use area, and maintaining existing nesting-roosting-foraging habitat in the associated median provincial home range area, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base. If the BLM cannot maintain all existing nesting-roosting habitat in the median provincial home range area, BLM managers would give priority to maintaining nesting-roosting habitat closest to the 500-acre core use area and maintaining at least 50 percent of the median provincial home range area as nesting-roosting-foraging habitat when all lands are considered.

With respect to sites not currently occupied, but known to have been occupied by a territorial pair or resident single within the past 10 years, BLM managers would give priority to maintaining existing habitat conditions in the nest patch and maintaining existing nesting-roosting habitat in the 500-acre core use area, or promoting the protection and development of nesting-roosting habitat in the nest patch and 500-acre core use area, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base.

BLM managers would give priority to implementing management actions that are located outside the median provincial home range area of a site, or would affect sites not known to have been occupied by a territorial pair or resident single within the past 10 years, over actions that would affect sites that have been occupied within the past ten years.

Known Sites Located Outside the Harvest Land Base

In 2013, approximately 590 known sites in other BLM land use allocations under the Proposed RMP were occupied by a territorial pair or resident single within the past 5 years. In addition, if the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service implements a barred owl management program, the BLM anticipates that northern spotted owls would reoccupy currently unoccupied habitat.

⁶⁷ For the purpose of this guidance, “sites currently occupied” means northern spotted owl sites that the BLM has determined are occupied at the time of implementation of the management action. The BLM will determine occupancy using the best science available at that time, such as through pre-project northern spotted owl surveys.

As stated above, when designing, locating and implementing actions in the Harvest Land Base, BLM managers would avoid causing the abandonment of northern spotted owl known sites located in other land use allocations, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and management direction for the Harvest Land Base.

BLM managers would give priority to actions that affect sites—

- That are not known to have been occupied by a territorial pair or resident single within the past 10 years. The longer a site has been unoccupied, the less likely it is to be re-occupied by northern spotted owls.
- That have less than 50 percent nesting-roosting-foraging habitat within the associated median provincial home range area when all land ownerships are considered. Sites with median provincial home range areas supporting less than 50 percent nesting-roosting-foraging habitat are less likely to be re-occupied by northern spotted owls until habitat conditions recover.
- With less than 50 percent of the associated median provincial home range area occurring in the Late-Successional Reserve, when all land ownerships and U.S. Forest Service reserves are considered. Sites associated with more reserved lands are more likely to be re-occupied by northern spotted owls, resist displacement by barred owls and contribute to species recovery.

BLM managers would avoid actions that—

- Occur in the nest patch of a site. Habitat modification in the nest patch will negatively affect re-occupancy of the site by northern spotted owls until habitat conditions recover.
- Cause the loss of nesting-roosting-foraging habitat in the 500-acre core use area surrounding a site. Sites with core use areas supporting less than 50 percent nesting-roosting-foraging habitat, when all land ownerships are considered, are less likely to be re-occupied by northern spotted owls until habitat conditions recover.
- Cause the amount of nesting-roosting-foraging habitat in the median provincial home range area surrounding a site to decline below 50 percent, when all land ownerships are considered.

Best Management Practices

Best Management Practices (BMPs) are practices that have been determined to be the most effective and practicable in preventing or reducing the amount of pollution generated by diffuse sources to a level compatible with water quality goals (40 CFR 130.2 [m]). **Appendix J** – Best Management Practices lists these practices and provides a detailed discussion of the role and application of BMPs. Project-level planning and analysis will identify the appropriate and applicable BMPs needed to achieve management objectives.

Watershed-Scale Information for Implementation Actions

The BLM will compile watershed-scale information on aquatic and riparian resources, including identifying resource conditions, watershed processes, risks to resources, and restoration opportunities, as needed for planning and analysis of implementation actions under the approved RMP. The BLM will compile watershed-scale information with the purpose of developing and documenting a scientifically-based understanding of the ecological structures, functions, processes, and interactions occurring within a watershed. The number and detail of the aspects considered will depend on the issues pertaining to a given watershed and the scope of proposed implementation actions.

This compilation of watershed-scale information does not constitute a separate or additional analysis beyond what the BLM would provide for NEPA or Endangered Species Act compliance for implementation actions. The BLM will focus on collecting and compiling information within the

watershed that is essential for making sound management decisions. This watershed-scale information will be relevant to analyzing the effects of implementation actions, determining monitoring and restoration needs for a watershed, and developing priorities for funding and implementing actions.

The BLM will use such watershed-scale information, where appropriate, to facilitate NEPA and Endangered Species Act compliance for specific projects. For example, such watershed-scale information will typically be relevant in the preparation of biological assessments for consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA on the effects of implementation actions that may affect ESA-listed fish species or their critical habitat.

Watershed Restoration

Watershed restoration will be an integral part of a program to contribute to the conservation and recovery of ESA-listed fish and protect water quality. Important components of a watershed restoration program include control and prevention of road-related runoff and sediment production, restoration of access to stream channels, restoration of instream habitat complexity, and restoration of the condition of riparian vegetation.

Watershed restoration will include road treatments, such as obliteration, decommissioning, closure, or upgrading. Upgrading may involve practices such as removing soil from locations where there is a high potential of triggering landslides, modifying road drainage systems to reduce the extent to which the road functions as an extension of the stream network, and reconstructing stream crossings to reduce the risk and consequences of road failures or wash outs.

Watershed restoration will include maintaining and restoring access to stream channels for all life stages of aquatic species. Specific actions will include replacing stream crossings that currently or potentially block or hinder fish passage with crossings that allow aquatic species to pass at each life stage and at a range of flows.

Watershed restoration will include instream restoration to create desired levels of channel complexity and improve fish habitat. Specific actions may include log and boulder placement in stream channels, tree tipping, and gravel enhancement to create spawning, rearing, and holding habitat for fish.

Watershed restoration will include silvicultural treatments of riparian forest stands, as needed to ensure that stands are able to provide trees that would function as stable wood in the stream, to increase diversity of riparian species, and develop structurally-complex stands. Watershed restoration will also include fuels reduction treatments in riparian forest stands, as needed to reduce the risk of stand-replacing, crown fires.

The BLM will evaluate restoration opportunities based on watershed-scale information on aquatic and riparian resources, considering ecological processes and limiting factors. The BLM will use the BLM Western Oregon Aquatic Restoration Strategy in determining priorities for watershed restoration. The BLM Western Oregon Aquatic Restoration Strategy presents a restoration strategy that uses a combination of habitat based intrinsic potential modeling and professional field knowledge to focus restoration efforts in areas deemed likely to have the highest production potential for fish species of interest and is incorporated here by reference (BLM 2015b). The BLM may update the Western Oregon Aquatic Restoration Strategy periodically, and the BLM will continue to use the updated strategy to guide watershed restoration priorities.

Funding

Implementation of actions in conformance with the approved RMP will be subject to sufficient funding and staffing to complete the necessary analysis and compliance steps and to carry out the actions. The RMP sets management objectives and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS analyzes effects based on assumptions about implementation of future actions. If the BLM does not implement future actions as anticipated in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the BLM will consider through plan evaluation whether the plan objectives are being met or are likely to be met, as discussed below.

Timber Production Capability Classification

The Timber Production Capability Classification is a process of partitioning forestland within the sustained yield unit into major classes based on the biological and physical capability of the site to support and produce forest products on a sustained yield basis using operational management practices. Through the Timber Production Capability Classification, the BLM identifies some sites as unsuitable for sustained-yield timber production because of their biological and physical capabilities. Over time, the BLM will add additional areas to those areas reserved through updates to the Timber Production Capability Classification system, when examinations indicate that an area meets the criteria for reservation. The BLM will also delete areas from those areas reserved and return the area to the Harvest Land Base through updates to the Timber Production Capability Classification system, when examinations indicate that an area does not meet the criteria for reservation. The BLM will implement these additions and deletions to the Timber Production Capability Classification through plan maintenance, as discussed below, because such changes will represent minor changes based on further refining the decision in the RMP.

Management of Newly Acquired Lands

Lands may come under BLM administration after approval of the RMPs through exchange, donation, purchase, revocation of withdrawals to other Federal agencies, or relinquishment of Recreation and Public Purpose leases. Discretionary acquisitions (such as exchanges) would be guided by the acquisition criteria described in **Appendix K – Lands and Realty**.

The BLM would manage newly acquired or administered lands or interests in lands for the purpose for which they were acquired or in a manner that is consistent with management objectives for adjacent BLM-administered lands or other BLM-administered lands having similar resource values. For example, the BLM would typically manage acquired lands consistent with the land use allocations, management objectives, and management direction of comparable or adjacent BLM-administered lands. Newly acquired lands, regardless of status, would be subject to non-discretionary access rights provided for under the terms and conditions of most reciprocal right-of-way agreements and permits.

In accordance with Section 205 (e) of the FLPMA (Pub. L. 99-632), lands acquired by the BLM in exchange for O&C or Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) lands would have the same status and be administered in accordance with the same provisions of law applicable to those lands disposed of; and those newly acquired lands would be designated as O&C or CBWR lands, as appropriate, and managed under the sustained yield principles as prescribed in the Act of August 28, 1937 and other laws applicable to the O&C or CBWR lands. Additionally, lands acquired using proceeds generated from the disposal of O&C or CBWR lands under the authority of the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (Pub. L. 106-248) would also take on the same status as the lands from which the funds were generated (O&C or CBWR) and would likewise be managed in accordance with the Act of August 28, 1937 and other applicable laws.

Lands acquired by the BLM that take on the status of either O&C or CBWR lands would require classification in accordance with the Act of June 9, 1916, as to power-site, timberlands, or agricultural lands. Lands classified as timberland or agriculture would be open to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws in accordance with the Act of April 8, 1948. Lands acquired by the BLM under Section 205 or 206 of the FLPMA take on the status of ‘acquired lands,’ and therefore would not be available for location, lease, or sale until the BLM formally opened the lands to such entry.

Land acquisitions resulting in net adjustments in the Harvest Land Base may be made without adjusting the declaration of the annual productive capacity for sustained-yield timber production or amending the RMP, unless the cumulative effects of all changes to the Harvest Land Base indicate that the decadal amount of sustained-yield timber production would be modified by more than 10 percent of the declared annual productive capacity for sustained-yield timber production.

Management of Future Proposed Special Areas

After approval of the RMPs, the BLM could receive recommendations, nominations, or identification of new special areas, such as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern or Wild and Scenic Rivers, requiring study or evaluation for special management. The BLM would conduct reviews and evaluations of these newly proposed or identified areas under the guidance of the national programs and BLM policies applicable to their management. Where the BLM determines that values are present, the BLM would provide management to protect the values while awaiting further evaluations or designations to the extent possible under existing legal authorities. The BLM would consider the protection of any identified values through due consideration in site-specific NEPA analysis and decisions in conformance with the applicable and current agency policies, BLM manuals, and law.

Valid Existing Rights

Other Federal, State, or local government agencies, Tribes, private individuals, or companies may hold valid existing rights within the decision area. Considering the intermingled nature of the BLM-administered lands in the planning area, the BLM has granted many rights-of-way, leases, permits, and other established legal rights within the decision area over the years. Valid existing rights may pertain to timber sale contracts, mining claims, mineral or energy leases, leases, easements, permits, rights-of-way, and water rights. Perhaps the most extensive and unique rights are the reciprocal rights-of-way agreements with dozens of adjacent landowners established to provide for the logical, effective, and efficient development of access on the intermingled lands.

The decisions in the RMPs will not alter or extinguish valid existing rights on BLM-administered lands. Valid existing rights take precedence over the decisions in the RMPs. Authorization for implementing an action that would affect these valid existing rights may be subject to approval by the holders of valid existing rights and may not be discretionary to BLM.

Adaptive Management

In some instances, management direction in the Proposed RMP provides for a range of activities or resource uses. In these cases, levels of activities or resource uses would vary within the range prescribed by the management direction, without the need for additional planning steps such as plan amendment. The BLM would adapt the level of activities within the range given by management direction, depending on variation in resource needs or organizational capability.

In addition to the constraints or latitude provided by management direction, the ability to adapt or change management without the use of planning steps or NEPA analyses would be restricted by how much of a departure would be from analytical assumptions in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This is because the BLM derived conclusions regarding environmental consequences from analytical assumptions. Analytical assumptions include such things as levels or methods of activities, number of acres treated, and miles of roads maintained.

If the need for adaptive management changes would so alter the implementation of the RMP that the environmental consequences would be substantially different than those anticipated in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, then the BLM would engage in additional planning steps and NEPA procedures. The BLM would make the determination as to when additional planning steps and NEPA procedures would be required through the plan evaluation process, as discussed below.

The BLM may also apply adaptive management by acting on information found through the monitoring questions (**Appendix V**). Adaptive management associated with monitoring could include corrective actions precipitated by findings of non-compliance. Corrective action precipitated by monitoring could range from simple changes in administrative procedures, refinements of the plan through plan maintenance, or more substantive changes through plan amendment or revision, as discussed below.

Plan Evaluation

Evaluation is the process of reviewing the RMPs to determine whether the BLM is implementing the plan decisions as expected and the associated NEPA analyses are still valid. The BLM will conduct plan evaluations at five-year intervals. In addition to the monitoring results (**Appendix V**), the BLM will examine many of the underlying assumptions regarding levels of activities and anticipated environmental consequences at the time of the five-year plan evaluation to determine if the plan objectives are being met or are likely to be met. The evaluation will also assess whether changed circumstances or new information have created a situation in which the expected impacts or environmental consequences of the plan are significantly different from those anticipated in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Through the plan evaluation, the BLM will make a finding of whether or not a plan amendment or plan revision is warranted.

The BLM could conduct unscheduled plan evaluations to address certain unanticipated events or new information that would call into question the underlying analysis and decisions of the plan.

Changes to the Approved RMPs

Subsequent to approval of the RMPs, the BLM can make changes to the RMPs through plan maintenance, amendment, or revision, consistent with 43 CFR 1610.5. The appropriate mechanism for making changes to the RMPs depends on the scope of the changes.

The approved RMPs may contain data, typographical, mapping, or tabular errors not apparent at the time of approval. Many of the decisions in the approved RMPs, such as mapping of land use allocations, are based on the BLM data available at the time of RMP approval. As noted above, the map of land use allocations accompanying the approved RMPs represents the decision on the mapped allocations. Given the extent and detail of the data on resource conditions that the BLM used to determine the location of the land use allocations, it is inevitable that there are some errors in that underlying data that, if corrected prior to approval of the RMPs, would have resulted in a change in mapped land use allocations. Regardless of any such errors in underlying data, the map of land use allocations accompanying the approved RMPs represents the decision on those allocations, and changes to those allocations would

require changes to the approved RMPs. That is, changes to the data that the BLM used to determine the location of a mapped land use allocation in the approved RMPs would not automatically result in changes to the location of the mapped land use allocation.

For example, the BLM used existing, district-specific information on structurally-complex forests in part to determine the location of the Late-Successional Reserve. Future identification of patches of structurally-complex forest not included in the Late-Successional Reserve, in and of itself, would not alter the land use allocation. If the BLM identifies substantial areas of errors in the underlying data used to determine land use allocation locations, such that the environmental consequences would be substantially different than those anticipated in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, then the BLM would engage in additional planning steps and NEPA procedures to make changes to land use allocations.

For some land use allocation decisions, such as the location of the Riparian Reserve, the decision requires identification of features on the ground (e.g., a perennial stream) and the allocation of a corresponding width of Riparian Reserve. The BLM would make this identification of features and allocation of a corresponding width of Riparian Reserve as needed, generally through project implementation. The future identification of features and the allocation of a corresponding width of Riparian Reserve would represent implementation of the approved RMP and would not constitute a change to the approved RMP.

The decision also requires the future allocation of some marbled murrelet occupied stands and red tree vole “habitat areas” to the Late-Successional Reserve, as described earlier in this section. The future identification of marbled murrelet occupied stands and red tree vole “habitat areas” and allocation to the Late-Successional Reserve would represent implementation of the approved RMP and would not constitute a change to the approved RMP.

Plan Maintenance

The BLM may maintain RMP decisions as necessary to reflect minor changes in data, consistent with 43 CFR 1610.5-4. Plan maintenance is limited to further refining, documenting, or clarifying a previously approved decision. Plan maintenance would not expand the scope of resource uses or restrictions or change the terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved plan. The BLM may use plan maintenance to adjust the declaration of the annual productive capacity for sustained-yield timber production based on minor changes, such as updated operations inventory data. Plan maintenance does not require formal public involvement, interagency coordination, or the NEPA analysis required for making new RMP decisions.

Plan Amendments and Revisions

New information, updated analyses, or new resource use or protection proposals may require amending or revising RMPs.

Plan amendments change one or more of the terms, conditions, or decisions of an approved RMP. Plan amendments are most often prompted by the need to—

- Consider a proposal or action that does not conform to the plan;
- Implement new or revised policy that changes RMP decisions;
- Respond to new, intensified, or changed uses on public land in the decision area; and
- Consider significant new information from resource assessments, plan evaluations, monitoring, or scientific studies relevant to the effects of the RMP.

Plan amendments would be accompanied by either an environmental assessment or EIS, depending on the scope and environmental effects of the amendment.

Plan revisions involve preparation of a new plan to replace an existing one. An RMP revision would be necessary if monitoring and evaluation findings, new data, new or revised policy, or changes in circumstances indicate that decisions for an entire plan or a major portion of the plan would no longer serve as a useful guide for resource management. Plan revisions would be accompanied by an EIS.

References

- Diller, L. V. 2013. To shoot or not to shoot: the ethical dilemma of killing one raptor to save another. *The Wildlife Professional* 7(2013): 54–57. <http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/Documents/BOethics-TWP-Diller%20Winter2013.pdf>.
- Diller, L.V., J. P. Dumbacher, R. P. Bosch, R. R. Bown, and R. J. Gutierrez. 2014. Removing barred owls from local areas: techniques and feasibility. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 38(1): 211–216. http://www.fws.gov/oregonFwo/Species/Data/NorthernSpottedOwl/BarredOwl/Documents/Diller_et%20al.2013BOremoval.pdf.
- USDI FWS. 2011. Revised recovery plan for the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*). Region 1. Portland, OR. 258 pp. <http://www.fws.gov/wafwo/pdf/NSO%20Revised%20Recovery%20Plan%202011.pdf>.
- . 2013. Experimental removal of barred owls to benefit threatened northern spotted owls - Final Environmental Impact Statement. Portland, OR. http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/Species/Data/NorthernSpottedOwl/BarredOwl/Documents/Final_EIS.pdf.