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APPENDIX B – INVENTORY AREA EVALUATION

Evaluation of Current Conditions:

1) Document and review the existing BLM wilderness inventory findings on file, if available, regarding the presence or absence of individual wilderness characteristics, using Form 1, below.

2) Consider relevant information regarding current conditions available in the office to identify and describe any changes to the existing information (use interdisciplinary (ID) team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.), and document your findings on Form 2, below.

When Citizen Information has been submitted regarding wilderness characteristics, document the submitted materials including: date of Submission; Name of District(s) and Field Office(s) Affected; Type of material Submitted (e.g. narrative, map, photo). Evaluate any submitted citizen information regarding the validity of proposed boundaries of the unit(s), the existence of roads and other boundary features, the size of the unit(s), and the presence or absence of wilderness characteristics based on relevant information available in the office (prior BLM inventories, ID team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.)

Conduct field reviews as necessary to verify information and to ascertain current conditions. Reach conclusions on current conditions including boundaries, size of areas and presence or absence of wilderness characteristics. Fully explain the basis for each conclusion on form 2, including any critical differences between BLM and citizen information.

Document your findings regarding current conditions for each inventoried area. Describe how the present conditions are similar to, or have changed from, the conditions documented in the original wilderness inventory. Document your findings on Form 2 for each inventory area. Cite to or attach data considered, including photographs, maps, GIS layers, field trip notes, project files, etc.
Year: 2009   Unit Number/Name: OR-034-068 — Whiskey Jack Spring

FORM 1 -- DOCUMENTATION OF BLM WILDERNESS INVENTORY FINDINGS ON RECORD

1. Is there existing BLM wilderness inventory information on all or part of this area?
   Yes X   No   

   (If yes, and if more than one unit is within the area, list the names of those units.):

A.) Inventory Source(s) -- (X) Denotes all applicable BLM Inventory files, printed maps, or published BLM Decision documents with information pertaining to this unit.

   Wilderness Inventories
   • (X) 1978-1980 – BLM Wilderness Inventory Unit 3-46 Cold Springs of OR-03-03-23 (unpublished BLM documents in case files)
   • (X) April 1979 – Wilderness -- Proposed Initial Inventory – Roadless Areas and Islands Which Clearly Do Not have Wilderness Characteristics, Oregon and Washington

   Wilderness Decision Documents
   • (X) August 1979 – Wilderness Review – Initial Inventory, Final Decision on Public Lands Obviously Lacking Wilderness Characteristics and Announcement of Public Lands to be Intensively Inventoried for Wilderness Characteristics, Oregon and Washington (green document)
   • ( ) October 1979 – Wilderness Review – Intensive Inventory - Oregon, Proposed Decision on the Intensive Wilderness Inventory of Selected Areas (grey document)
   • ( ) March 1980 – Wilderness Review – Intensive Inventory; Final Decisions on 30 Selected Units in Southeast Oregon and Proposed Decisions on Other Intensively Inventoried Units in Oregon and Washington (orange document)
   • ( ) November 1980 - Wilderness Inventory – Oregon and Washington, Final Intensive Inventory Decisions (brown document)
   • ( ) November 1981 Stateline Intensive Wilderness Inventory Final Decision, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, Utah (tan document)

B.) Inventory Unit Name(s)/Number(s)
   BLM 3-46 Cold Springs of OR-03-03-23

C.) Map Name(s)/Number(s)
   • (X) Final Decision – Initial Wilderness Inventory Map, August 1979, Oregon
   • ( ) Proposed Decision -- Intensive Wilderness Inventory of Selected Areas Map, October 1979, Oregon
   • ( ) Intensive Wilderness Inventory Map, March 1980, Oregon
   • ( ) Intensive Wilderness Inventory --Final Decisions Map, November 1980, Oregon
   • ( ) November, 1981 Stateline Intensive Wilderness Inventory Final Decision, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, Utah (tan document)
2. BLM Inventory Findings on Record

(Existing inventory information regarding wilderness characteristics (if more than one BLM inventory unit is associated with the area, list each unit and answer each question individually for each inventory unit):

**Inventory Source:** See above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit#/ Name</th>
<th>Size (historic acres)</th>
<th>Natural Condition? Y/N</th>
<th>Outstanding Solitude? Y/N</th>
<th>Outstanding Primitive &amp; Unconfined Recreation? Y/N</th>
<th>Supplemental Values? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLM 3-46 Cold Springs of OR-03-03-23</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* -- Determinations for these criteria were not specifically stated in the inventory of this unit.
APPENDIX B – INVENTORY AREA EVALUATION

Evaluation of Current Conditions:

1) Document and review the existing BLM wilderness inventory findings on file, if available, regarding the presence or absence of individual wilderness characteristics, using Form 1, below.

2) Consider relevant information regarding current conditions available in the office to identify and describe any changes to the existing information (use interdisciplinary (ID) team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.), and document your findings on Form 2, below.

When Citizen Information has been submitted regarding wilderness characteristics, document the submitted materials including: date of Submission; Name of District(s) and Field Office(s) Affected; Type of material Submitted (e.g. narrative, map, photo). Evaluate any submitted citizen information regarding the validity of proposed boundaries of the unit(s), the existence of roads and other boundary features, the size of the unit(s), and the presence or absence of wilderness characteristics based on relevant information available in the office (prior BLM inventories, ID team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.)

Conduct field reviews as necessary to verify information and to ascertain current conditions. Reach conclusions on current conditions including boundaries, size of areas and presence or absence of wilderness characteristics. Fully explain the basis for each conclusion on form 2, including any critical differences between BLM and citizen information.

Document your findings regarding current conditions for each inventoried area. Describe how the present conditions are similar to, or have changed from, the conditions documented in the original wilderness inventory. Document your findings on Form 2 for each inventory area. Cite to or attach data considered, including photographs, maps, GIS layers, field trip notes, project files, etc.
Note: In February, 2004, the Vale District received from Oregon Natural Desert Association (ONDA) its evaluation of wilderness characteristics for what ONDA named its 27,828 acre “Roostercombs Proposed WSA”. For reference, a hard copy of ONDA’s proposal is retained in this unit’s file. Information provided by ONDA’s proposal was considered and incorporated as appropriate for this BLM Wilderness Characteristics Inventory maintenance. OR-034-068 represents only a portion of ONDA’s proposal. ONDA’s proposal includes basically two 1970’s BLM inventory units (3-40 and 3-46) and additional adjacent public lands which, respectively, are currently associated with the following BLM Wilderness Characteristic Inventory maintenance units: OR-034-066, OR-034-067 and OR-034-068.

For BLM unit OR-034-068, differences between BLM and ONDA regarding inventory unit boundary features are that, unlike ONDA’s proposal, BLM concludes that BLM route 034-RT24 (ONDA’s route MN13a) is a road; not what ONDA identifies as a vehicular “way” [i.e., motorized primitive trail – MPT] . Also, a route which ONDA does not characterize but which it identifies as a boundary for its proposed WSA is further reviewed by BLM (assigned as a segment of route 034-RT31). Refer to each of the two associated Road Analysis forms, BLM Photo Points Map/Log and associated photos for this BLM inventory unit for additional documentation on these routes. This information is located in this inventory unit’s hard copy and electronic files.

Description of Current Conditions: [Include land ownership, location, topography, vegetation features and summary of major human uses/activities.]

1. Is the unit of sufficient size?

Yes [X] No [ ]

Description: Refer to the associated Map 1 of this inventory unit for its location. The unit has 6,118 acres of public land. The unit’s boundaries are the same as the late 1970’s wilderness characteristics inventory unit 3-46 --- a combination of non-BLM land tracts and BLM roads 7324-0-00, 034-RT24 and 034-RT31. These roads receive mechanical maintenance as needed to ensure their ability to provide for relatively regular and seasonally continuous use.
2. Is the unit in a natural condition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** The unit’s terrain consists of broken, rim-rocked hills, with multidirectional drainage draws. Elevations range from 4,600 to 5,567 feet. Dominate vegetation is native grasses and sagebrush; juniper trees are sparsely distributed along the northern-most reaches of the unit. The southeastern sector of the unit includes part of the Cold Springs Wild Horse Herd Management Area.

Refer to this unit’s associated Map 1 and Map 2 for human imprints. They include 5.4 miles of rangeland fence, 3.8 miles of 5 MPT’s, 7 earthen reservoirs and one developed spring. All of the reservoirs are within a quarter mile of a boundary road. There remains no visually contrasting evidence of a 2008 250 acre manual planting of shrubs. Due to the type and few developments within the unit (and they being of nominal visual contrast), when considered individually and collectively the unit appears to be affected primarily by the forces of nature with human imprints substantially unnoticeable to the average visitor.

ONDA states within its proposed Roostercombs Proposed WSA juniper and mountain mahogany can be found throughout the area. BLM’s concludes the distribution of these species is limited to the northern reaches of OR-034-068, and with few to isolate specimens within the OR-034-066 and OR-034-067 BLM inventory units which (the 3 BLM units combined) constitute ONDA’s proposed WSA. ONDA identifies none of the 5 known MPTs of this BLM unit, makes no mention of the developed spring or fences and mentions the presence of but not the number of earthen reservoirs within its proposed WSA while concluding that it appears affected primarily by the forces of nature with the imprint of man’s work substantially unnoticeable. For comparative reference of human imprints, refer to this BLM unit’s associated Map 1 and Map 2 and to ONDA’s proposal map, all located in this unit’s inventory file folder.

3. Does the unit have outstanding opportunities for solitude?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** The unit is between 1.5 and 3.5 miles in width and a half mile to 4 about miles in length. Although a visitor could experience a sense of being alone within some of the unit, the combination of its relatively small size and irregular or narrow shape along with the absence of vegetation of adequate size or density and the lack of sufficient diversity in relief relative to the units size results in the area lacking sufficient properties to provide for an outstanding opportunity for solitude.

ONDA states that outstanding opportunities for solitude for its proposed WSA are present due to the proposal’s much larger size, its configuration, its diverse topography, and opportunities for vegetative screening (ONDA references its photo TB34, which shows a slope with juniper trees --- this slope is not within BLM unit 034-068). ONDA states vegetative screening is certainly harder to find, but within its proposed WSA juniper and
mountain mahogany can be found throughout the area. BLM concludes that within OR-034-068 these species are not of sufficient number, distribution or density to provide (with or without other potential features for visual screening) an outstanding opportunity for solitude in OR-034-068. Based on the current results of BLM’s wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, BLM does not have a comparative inventory unit in this area that approaches the size or possesses other solitude-related features which ONDA indicates are present in its proposed WSA. For that portion of ONDA’s WSA proposal which includes OR-034-068, BLM concludes for reasons stated in the above paragraph that unit OR-034-068 does not possess outstanding opportunities for solitude.

4. Does the unit have outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?

Yes _______  No ___X____  N/A _______

Description: The primary recreation opportunities include hunting of common game species (primarily chukar, deer and antelope) and associated day hiking. Other activities available include backpacking, general sightseeing and general photography. There are no special or unique features or attractions of the unit which would more so attract visitors for primitive and unconfined recreation activities. There are opportunities for wild horse viewing, but the activity is not an outstanding opportunity for primitive and unconfined recreation. Individually or in combination, the activities occurring within the unit do not provide an outstanding opportunity for primitive and unconfined recreation.

ONDA states that within its proposed Roostercombs WSA the terrain will offer outstanding opportunities for backpacking, hiking, sightseeing, photography, and hunting. BLM does not conclude that outstanding opportunities exist for backpacking, sightseeing and photography within OR-034-068; features and natural values associated with this BLM unit which may include these activities are not so notable, unique or special as to provide for outstanding opportunities to experience them – individually or in combination. For reasons stated in the above paragraph, hunting and hiking opportunities are not outstanding in OR-034-068.

In the 1970’s, BLM did not recognize either of its two inventory units (3-40 and 3-46) presently affected by ONDA’s proposed WSA as possessing outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation; nor do the present BLM inventory units within ONDA’s proposed WSA possess such an outstanding opportunity. Unlike ONDA, BLM has made no determination of whether the larger size and/or other possible wilderness characteristics criteria of ONDA’s “Roostercombs Proposed WSA” equates to outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. Currently, public lands associated with unit OR-034-068 do not possess outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation for reasons stated in the opening paragraph, above.
5. Does the unit have supplemental values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description:** ONDA states that their proposed Roostercombs WSA “may also be home to Mojave Black-collared Lizard, Desert Horned Lizard, Ground Snake, Ferruginous Hawk, Pygmy Rabbit, and White-tailed Antelope Squirrel,” which ONDA’s February 2004 submission to the Vale District declares are listed as “sensitive species” by the State of Oregon. As of 2009, the Mohave Black-collared Lizard, Desert Horned Lizard, Ground Snake and the White-tailed Antelope Squirrel were not considered sensitive by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, BLM, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. BLM acknowledges that habitat requirements may exist for the Mojave Black-collared Lizard, Desert Horned Lizard, Ground Snake, Ferruginous Hawk, Pygmy Rabbit, and White-tailed Antelope Squirrel; however, neither ONDA nor any other entity has provided BLM official documentation confirming the presence of these species within this inventory unit.
Summary of Findings and Conclusion

Unit Name and Number:  OR-034-068 — Whiskey Jack Spring

Summary Results of Analysis:
1. Does the area meet any of the size requirements?  ___X___ Yes  _____No
2. Does the area appear to be natural?  ___X___ Yes  _____No
3. Does the area offer outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation?  _____Yes  ___X___ No  _____NA
4. Does the area have supplemental values?  _____Yes  ___X___ No  _____NA

Conclusion -- check one:
______ The area, or a portion of the area, has wilderness character.

___X___ The area does not have wilderness character.

Prepared by:  Robert Alward, Wilderness Planner contractor

Team Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Christensen, Rangeland Management Specialist</td>
<td>2/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Drahmel, Outdoor Recreation Planner</td>
<td>3/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Rockefeller, Soil Scientist</td>
<td>4/28/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Caviness, Wildlife Biologist</td>
<td>2/5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman Wigglesworth, Botanist</td>
<td>03/09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tia Ray, GIS Specialist, contractor</td>
<td>2/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Grasty, GIS Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat Ryan, Malheur Resource Area Field Manager</td>
<td>6/9/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This form documents information that constitutes an inventory finding on wilderness characteristics. It does not represent a formal land use allocation or a final agency decision subject to administrative remedies under either 43 CFR parts 4 or 1610.5-2.
H-6300-1-WILDERNESS INVENTORY MAINTENANCE
IN BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON

APPENDIX C – ROAD* ANALYSIS
(Factors to consider when determining whether a route is a road for wilderness inventory purposes.)

Wilderness Inventory Unit Name/Number: OR-034-068 – Whiskey Jack Spring

NOTE: This unit is affected by ONDA’s “Roostercomb proposed WSA”.

Route Name and/or Identifier (Include Transportation Plan Identifier, if known; include route number supplied by citizen information when available):
034-RT 24

(It is ONDA’s MN13a route, which it identifies as a vehicular “way” (i.e., motorized primitive trail – MPT.)

I. LOCATION: See attached map. Is the north boundary route of this BLM inventory unit.
List photo point references (if applicable): Refer to this BLM inventory unit’s associated hard copy of its BLM Photo Points map, and affiliated Photo Log and photos - retained in this unit’s permanent hard copy file, and electronically retained under this unit’s subfolder Final Findings/GIS Products. Any applicable ONDA photos and affiliated Photo Log are electronically retained under /S/Wilderness Characteristics/Citizen Proposals.

II. CURRENT PURPOSE OF ROUTE:
(Examples: Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment).)

Describe: This route serves as a connector between 7324-0-00 (a road) and 034-RT -23 (a BLM-determined road) in its most western sector, as well as a primary connector from the north to a large State land parcel and which eventually provides access with 034-RT31 (a BLM determined road) via 7319-0-00 further to the south below the State parcel. Additionally, 034-RT24 is one of a close network of routes which supports access for hunters and for the management of livestock within the greater area.
III. ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY:

Is a road right-of-way associated with this route?

Yes ______ No ___X__ Unknown _____

IV. CONSTRUCTION

Yes ___X__ No ______

Examples: Paved _______ Bladed ___X__ Graveled ____ Roadside
Berms ___X__ Cut/Fill _____ Other ______

Describe: Date of construction is unknown. Past blading is evidenced by the change in vegetation between the outside edge of the surface disturbance (an observable delineation of shrub) and approaching the interior of the current travel surface width of the route. Berm is evident as the route traverses the Roostercomb topographic feature. Example BLM photos are 034-RT24-C-S and 034-RT24-D-N.

V. IMPROVEMENTS

Yes ______ No ___X__

By Hand Tools _______ By Machine _____

Examples: Culverts _______ Stream Crossings _____ Bridges _______
Drainage _______ Barriers _______ Other _______

Describe: None present.

VI. MAINTENANCE:

A. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes _______ No ___X__

If yes: Hand Tools (Y/N) _______ Machine (Y/N) _______

Explain: Presently, there appears to be no visual evidence of maintenance performed on this route, although BLM photo 034-RT24-C-S shows bladed berm which may have occurred – but cannot be confirmed – after the route’s construction. Re-establishment of grasses is evident on the travel surface in some locations, while other locations have no growth within the travel width of the route.
B. If the route is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM in the event this route became impassable?

Yes __X____ No _____

Comments: This route is, overall, in good condition; readily passable by a high clearance vehicle. Mechanical maintenance would be approved should it be required to keep the route passable, recognizing it is a significant connector for several routes in its proximity (summed under I. Purpose, above).

VII. REGULAR AND CONTINUOUS USE:

Yes ___X____ No ______

Describe -- evidence (vehicle tracks observed) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis:

The presence of tracks and leveled grasses on the route’s travel surface are apparent. Recognizing its role of connectivity with nearby routes and why those routes are traveled, this route will continue to be traveled on a relatively regular basis over time.

VIII. CONCLUSION:

To meet the definition of a road, items IV or V, and VI-A or B, and VII must be checked yes.

Road: Yes ___X____ No ______

Explanation: The route does meet road criteria, as described and explained above.

Evaluator(s): __________________________ Date: 5-4-2009

Steve Christensen, Range Management Specialist

* road: An access route which has been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road.

a. “Improved and maintained” – Actions taken physically by people to keep the road open to vehicle traffic. “Improved” does not necessarily mean formal construction. “Maintained” does not necessarily mean annual maintenance.
b. “Mechanical means” – Use of hand or power machinery or tools.

c. “Relatively regular and continuous use” – Vehicular use that has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis. Examples are: access roads for equipment to maintain a stock water tank or other established water sources; access roads to maintained recreation sites or facilities; or access roads to mining claims.

Following is the definition from Glossary of OSO 7-3-2007 Draft H-6300-1:

road: The BLM will continue to base the definition of what constitutes a “road” from the FLPMA’s legislative history. The language below is from the House of Representatives Committee Report 94-1163, page 17, dated May 15, 1976, on what became the FLPMA. It is the only statement regarding the definition of a road in the law or legislative history.

“The word ‘roadless’ refers to the absence of roads which have been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road.”

The BLM previously adopted and will continue to use the following sub-definitions of certain words and phrases in the BLM road definition stated above:

a. “Improved and maintained” – Actions taken physically by people to keep the road open to vehicle traffic. “Improved” does not necessarily mean formal construction. “Maintained” does not necessarily mean annual maintenance.

b. “Mechanical means” – Use of hand or power machinery or tools.

c. “Relatively regular and continuous use” – Vehicular use that has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis. Examples are: access roads for equipment to maintain a stock water tank or other established water sources; access roads to maintained recreation sites or facilities; or access roads to mining claims.

A road that was established or has been maintained solely by the passage of vehicles would not be considered a road, even if it is used on a relatively regular and continuous basis. Vehicle roads constructed by mechanical means but that are no longer being maintained by mechanical methods are not roads. Sole use of hands and feet to move rocks or dirt without the use of tools or machinery does not meet the definition of “mechanical means.” Roads need not be “maintained” on a regular basis but rather “maintained” when road conditions warrant actions to keep it in a usable condition. A dead-end (cherry-stem) road can form the boundary of an inventory area and does not by itself disqualify an area from being considered “roadless.”
H-6300-I-WILDERNESS INVENTORY MAINTENANCE  
IN BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON

APPENDIX C – ROAD* ANALYSIS  
(Factors to consider when determining whether a route is a road for wilderness inventory purposes.)

Wilderness Inventory Unit Name/Number: OR-034-068 – Whiskey Jack Spring

NOTE: This unit is affected by ONDA’s “Roostercomb proposed WSA”.

Route Name and/or Identifier (Include Transportation Plan Identifier, if known; include route number supplied by citizen information when available):

034-RT 31

(ONDA’s 2004 submission to Vale District does not have an identifier or route type associated with this route on the map of the Association’s “Roostercombs Proposed WSA”. However, this route segment across public lands is delineated by ONDA as part of the southeast boundary of its proposed WSA.

VIII. LOCATION: See attached map. It is the southeast boundary route of this BLM inventory unit, but is only the western-most two short segments of the entire 034-RT31 which extends further east (where it abuts BLM WC inventory units OR-034-066 and OR-034-067. List photo point references (if applicable): Refer to this BLM inventory unit’s associated hard copy of its BLM Photo Points map, and affiliated Photo Log and photos -- retained in this unit’s permanent hard copy file, and electronically retained under this unit’s subfolder Final Findings/GIS Products. Specifically, see photos 034-RT31-H-NE and 034-RT31-H-SW. There are no ONDA photos of this route segment across public lands.

IX. CURRENT PURPOSE OF ROUTE:  
(Examples: Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment).)

Describe: These western-most two short segments of this route across public land is part of the longer primary connector 034-RT31 between the Crowley Road (CNTY 585) southwest to County road 3778. The two segments associated with this BLM inventory unit are separated by a private land parcel (through which this same route crosses) and then continues northeast to provide primary access to and through other private and State parcels before continuing the same direction across public land again to where it intersects with County 585. The entire 034-RT31 route serves as a replacement of route
of 7319-0-00 which is north and generally parallels the eastern portion of 034-RT31. These western-most segments of 034-RT31 also provide for access from the southwest to other significant routes of the larger area (including to 034-RT24, a BLM-determined road). The route is traveled to access the private and State land parcels, to manage and monitor livestock operations, and provides access for the hunting public in the area at large.

X. ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY:

Is a road right-of-way associated with this route?

Yes _____ No ___X____ Unknown _____

XI. CONSTRUCTION

Yes ___X___ No _______

Examples: Paved __________ Bladed ___X______ Gravelled _____ Roadside
Berms___ Cut/Fill ___X___ Other _____

Describe: Date of construction is unknown. Blading occurred with the slight slope cuts associated with the route. The cuts are now stabilized with dense coverage vegetation of woody and grass species.

XII. IMPROVEMENTS

Yes ______ No ___X_____

By Hand Tools _______ By Machine _____

Examples: Culverts _______ Stream Crossings ______ Bridges _______
Drainage _______ Barriers _______ Other _______

Describe: None present.

XIII. MAINTENANCE:

A. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery?       Yes ________ No ___X_____

If yes: Hand Tools (Y/N) _______ Machine (Y/N) ________
Appendix C – Road Analysis: 034-RT 31

Explain: Presently, there appears to be no visual evidence of maintenance performed on this route. The nature of the route’s surface materials and the terrain it traverses has not required maintenance actions during any noticeable timeframe.

B. If the route is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM in the event this route became impassable?

   Yes ___X____ No ____

Comments: This route is in good condition; readily passable by a high clearance vehicle. Mechanical maintenance would be approved should it be required to keep the route passable, recognizing it is a significant connector for multiple non-BLM land parcels and allows primary access to several other routes in its proximity (summed under I. Purpose, above).

XIV. REGULAR AND CONTINUOUS USE:

   Yes ___X____ No ______

Describe -- evidence (vehicle tracks observed) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis:

The presence of tracks are apparent and with but nominal amounts of short grass within any of its travel width. Recognizing its connectivity for abutting non-BLM parcels and to nearby routes and why those routes are traveled, this route will continue to be traveled on a relatively regular basis over time.

VIII. CONCLUSION:

To meet the definition of a road, items IV or V, and VI-A or B, and VII must be checked yes.

Road: Yes ___X____ No ______

Explanation: The route does meet road criteria, as described and explained above.

Evaluator(s): ___________________________ Date: 5/4/09

Bill Lutjens, Range Management Specialist

Evaluator(s): ___________________________ Date: 4-28-2009

Steve Christensen, Range Management Specialist
* **road**: An access route which has been **improved and maintained** by **mechanical means** to insure **relatively regular and continuous use**. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road.

  a. **“Improved and maintained”** – Actions taken physically by people to keep the road open to vehicle traffic. “Improved” does not necessarily mean formal construction. “Maintained” does not necessarily mean annual maintenance.

  b. **“Mechanical means”** – Use of hand or power machinery or tools.

  c. **“Relatively regular and continuous use”** – Vehicular use that has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis. Examples are: access roads for equipment to maintain a stock water tank or other established water sources; access roads to maintained recreation sites or facilities; or access roads to mining claims.

Following is the definition from Glossary of OSO 7-3-2007 Draft H-6300-1:

**road**: The BLM will continue to base the definition of what constitutes a “road” from the FLPMA’s legislative history. The language below is from the House of Representatives Committee Report 94-1163, page 17, dated May 15, 1976, on what became the FLPMA. It is the only statement regarding the definition of a road in the law or legislative history.

“The word ‘roadless’ refers to the absence of roads which have been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road.”

The BLM previously adopted and will continue to use the following sub-definitions of certain words and phrases in the BLM road definition stated above:

  a. **“Improved and maintained”** – Actions taken physically by people to keep the road open to vehicle traffic. “Improved” does not necessarily mean formal construction. “Maintained” does not necessarily mean annual maintenance.

  b. **“Mechanical means”** – Use of hand or power machinery or tools.

  c. **“Relatively regular and continuous use”** – Vehicular use that has occurred and will continue to occur on a relatively regular basis. Examples are: access roads for equipment to maintain a stock water tank or other established water sources; access roads to maintained recreation sites or facilities; or access roads to mining claims.

A road that was established or has been maintained solely by the passage of vehicles would not be considered a road, even if it is used on a relatively regular and continuous basis. Vehicle roads constructed by mechanical means but that are no longer being maintained by mechanical methods are not roads. Sole use of hands and feet to move rocks or dirt without the use of tools or machinery does not meet the definition of “mechanical means.” Roads need not be “maintained” on a regular basis but rather “maintained” when road conditions warrant actions to keep it in a usable condition. A dead-end (cherry-stem) road can form the boundary of an inventory area and does not by itself disqualify an area from being considered “roadless.”