CITIZEN PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM  
(EVALUATION OF NEW INFORMATION REGARDING  
WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS ON AN AREA OF PUBLIC LANDS) 

Directions: Keep this record as part of the inventory file. Use these findings as part of the wilderness resources discussion in any subsequent NEPA document. Notify the proponent of your findings. 

Date of Submission: 1/11/2007 - Based on ID Team Meeting held on 1/10/2007 

Proponent: NA – Internally Identified by BLM ID Team 

Name of Area Identified by the Proponent: Visher Unit (Number 06-02) 

BLM Field Office(s) Affected: Three Rivers RA, Burns DO and Malheur RA, Vale DO 

EVALUATION 

1) Does the submission include the required: 

a) map which identifies the specific boundaries of the area in question?  
NA – BLM Identified Visher Unit (06-02). 

Yes _______ No _______ 

b) detailed narrative that describes the presence or absence of wilderness characteristics of the area and documents how that information differs significantly from the information in prior inventories conducted by the BLM regarding the wilderness values of the area?  
NA – BLM Identified Unit 

Yes _______ No _______ 

c) photographic documentation?  
NA – BLM Identified Unit 

Yes _______ No _______ 

2. Is there an existing wilderness inventory on this area? 

Yes ___ X (See Note Below) 

Existing inventory findings 

_____ Has wilderness character  

_____ Doesn’t have wilderness character 

NOTE: As associated with Vale District’s 1978 wilderness evaluation records for its Visher Unit, 06-02. The north boundary of that unit ended at the district boundary between Burns and Vale Districts. Respectively, the Visher Unit, measured then as 3,960 acres, was determined in 1978 to lack sufficient size to possess wilderness characteristics. There is no 1970’s wilderness evaluation documentation found in the Burns District for those public lands north and adjacent to the Visher Unit of Vale District. 

No _______
3. Evaluation of the proposal based on relevant information available in the office (prior BLM inventories, interdisciplinary team knowledge, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.). Explain the basis for each conclusion (use additional space as necessary).

a) Are the boundary roads and any roads separating subunits still roads?
   Yes X No _____
   Explanation: The boundaries (see attached map) confirmed by the ID-team includes both the original Visher Unit in the Vale District and the BLM-administered lands in the Burns District to the north of the Visher Unit. They are described as follows:
   - To the north and east, unit boundaries are defined by the Crowley-Riverside Malheur County Road; maintained to insure relatively regular and continuous use.
   - To the west, unit boundaries are defined by private land and the Juntura-Riverside Malheur County Road (alias, Crane Venator Lane.); maintained to insure relatively regular and continuous use.
   - To the southeast, unit boundaries are defined by Visher Creek Road; maintained to insure relatively regular and continuous use.
   - To the south, unit boundaries are defined by private land.

b) Does the unit/subunit meet the minimum acre requirements?
   Yes X No ______
   Explanation: The updated Visher Unit is approximately 6,473 acres (BLM-administered) and is evaluated below.

c) Have there been changes in the area since the initial/intensive inventory that may affect naturalness?
   Yes ______ No X ______
   Explanation: During the late 1970's BLM wilderness inventory evaluation, the area was split by administrative boundaries between Burns and Vale Districts. This update makes the Visher Unit larger, but there are no changes since the 1970's in the updated unit which may affect the overall natural condition of the unit.

d) Does the unit/subunit appear to meet the definition of naturalness?
   Yes X No ______
   Explanation: The known non-natural features described below are scattered throughout the unit and are not substantially noticeable (see attached map).
   - No known spring developments.
   - Two earthen reservoirs – Fence and Graves (in sections 22 and 23, respectively, of T. 24 S., R. 37 E.)
   - Approximately 6 miles of fence.
• Approximately 3.5 miles of motorized vehicle routes within the unit, consisting of approximately 1 mile of cherry stem road to near McEwen Springs which is manually maintained to insure relatively regular and continuous use, and 2.5 miles of non-maintained primitive trail leading from near McEwen Spring to both Fence and Grave's Reservoirs (per 1/16/07 field observation by Bob Patterson of Vale District).

• Though Medusahead, a noxious weed, can be found throughout the unit, its presence is unlikely to affect the area’s natural appearance to the average visitor.

e) Does the unit/subunit appear to contain outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
   Yes ______ No _____ X____
   Explanation: The updated Visher Unit does offer opportunities for several types of primitive recreational activities including hunting, horseback riding, hiking, and rock collecting. They are not outstanding given the lack of unusual or unique features.

f) Does the unit/subunit contain appear to have outstanding opportunities for solitude?
   Yes ______ No _____ X____
   Explanation: The updated Visher Unit consists primarily of gently rolling hills sagebrush community that provides only limited vegetative or topographic screening. Limited solitude may be possible in some canyons, however given lack of screening in most of the unit, the opportunity for solitude is not outstanding.

4. From the evidence presented by the proponent, as well as other relevant information (prior BLM inventories, aerial photographs, field observations, maps, etc.), does the WSA Inventory Team conclude that the information is significantly different from the information in prior inventories conducted by BLM regarding the wilderness values of the area or a portion of the area?
   Yes X____ No ______
   Explanation: Combining the contiguous roadless public lands of both Burns and Vale District increased the updated Visher Unit from 3,960 acres to 6,473 acres, thereby meeting the sufficient size requirement of 5,000 acres.

5. From the evidence presented by the proponent and from other relevant information (prior BLM inventories, aerial photographs, field observations, maps), the undersigned WSA Inventory Team concludes: (Check a or b below.)
   X____ a) the decision reached is that the area lacks wilderness characteristics and should not be considered further.
   (or)
   _____ b) there is a reasonable probability that the area in question (or a significant portion(s) thereof) may have wilderness characteristics and a field inventory is necessary.

The updated Visher Unit was found to be natural, however, it does not possess outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. Therefore, no wilderness characteristics were found to be present.
WSA Inventory Team

Laura Bowland, Outdoor Recreation Planner (Wilderness Specialist) – Burns District 1/30/07

Lisa Grant, Rangeland Management Specialist – Burns District 1/30/07

Rick Hall, Natural Resource Specialist (Botany) – Burns District 1/30/07

Jeff Rose, Fire Ecologist – Burns District 1/30/07

Bill Andersen, District Range Management Specialist 1/30/07

Terri Geisler, Geologist – Burns District 11/30/2007

Douglas Linn, Botanist – Burns District 1/30/07

Scott Thomas, Archeologist – Burns District 1/30/07

Robert Alward, Outdoor Recreation Planner – Vale District 1/24/07

I Concur:

Steve Christensen, Range Management Specialist – Vale District 2/25/07

Cynthia Dauier, Fisheries – Burns District 1/30/07

Field Manager – Burns District Office 1/30/07

Field Manager – Vale District Office 1/25/07

This determination is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal resource inventory process and does not constitute an appealable decision.