## WILDERNESS INVENTORY MAINTENANCE IN BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON

(Source: Oregon State Office Internal Guidance as of July 2007)

Year: 2008 Inventory Unit Number/Name: West Warm Springs Unit 21

# FORM 1: DOCUMENTATION OF BLM WILDERNESS INVENTORY FINDINGS ON RECORD:

this area	1?	wilderness inventory information on all or part o
No	Yes X	(if more than one unit is within the area, list the
namec/n	umbers of those ur	nits):
a) Inven	tory Source: Wil	derness Inventory - OR/WA Final Intensive
a) Inven	Total State of the	1 - 1000\ Page 140
Immonto	- Decigions (Nov	ember 1980), Page 140
Invento	ry Decisions (Nov	vember 1980), Page 140
		s)/Number(s): Foster Flat Subunit 2-61E
b) Inver	ntory Unit Name(	
b) Inver	ntory Unit Name( Name(s)/Number District(s)/Field	s)/Number(s): Foster Flat Subunit 2-61E

### 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: Wilderness Inventory – OR/WA Final Intensive Inventory

Decisions (November 1980), Page 140

Unit#/ Name	Size (historic acres)	Natural Condition? Y/N	Outstanding Solitude? Y/N	Outstanding Primitive & Unconfined Recreation? Y/N	Supplemental Values? Y/N
2-61E	15,470	Y	N	N	Y

# FORM 2 - DOCUMENTATION OF CURRENT WILDERNESS INVENTORY CONDITIONS

Unit Number/Name: West Wa	arm Sp	rings U	nit 21
(1) Is the unit of sufficient size	ze?		
Current Unit Acres: 17,083	Yes _	X	No

[State the BLM acreage of the unit. Describe the boundaries of the unit (roads, property lines, etc.) If the area meets one of the exceptions to the size criterion, check "Yes" and describe the exception. If more than one inventory unit is involved, list the acreage in each and evaluate each unit/subunit separately. Complete the analysis for (1), (2), (3),(4) and (5) for each unit or sub-unit. If you check "No" above, check "N/A" (Not Applicable) in the remaining boxes below, and you need not provide additional evaluation for the unit or subunit. Use additional space as necessary].

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

Citizen Information Received: On September 19, 2007 the BLM received a citizen proposal from the Oregon Natural Desert Association (ONDA) for the 462,828-acre Buzzard Creek proposed WSA. ONDA included in their information a narrative report, maps, photos, photo and route logs and GIS data with their route and photo point data, all of which were considered as part of the wilderness inventory maintenance process for this BLM Unit. The photos submitted by ONDA were taken in July of 2004 and June of 2005. They identified the Buzzard Creek proposed WSA as having no routes which meet their definition of a boundary road and included state land within their proposal.

As part of BLM's boundary determination process, it was determined that several of ONDA's "ways" are still boundary roads. It is BLM's finding that ONDA's Buzzard Creek proposed WSA is not one large roadless unit, but is made of several smaller units that are similar, though not exactly the same, as those units identified by the 1979 and 1980 wilderness inventory effort.

Boundary changes since 1980: The boundaries for Unit 21 appear similar to those identified (See Unit Boundary Map 2) for subunit 2-61E. Two non-federal inholdings that were in 2-61E are now BLM land, increasing the number of acres in Unit 21.

#### **Current Unit Boundaries:**

#### See Unit Character Map for Photo Point (Pt.) Locations

N/E: Road 7256-0-2J0 (BLM Route Analysis #2 & 3, Photo Pts. A2, A3 & A4) (ONDA Photo Pts. FK-62 SSW and FL-31 W – it was difficult to determine the direction of this photo, hecause the log indicated the photo was taken towards the west, but of a way into Buzzard Canyon which is to the east) This road was recently bladed in 2005 or 2006 likely after ONDA photos were taken June of 2005.

SE: Road 8209-0-00 (ONDA Photo Pts. FL-32 S, FL-33 E) and Road 8202-0-00 (ONDA Photo Pt. FP-56 NE)

SW: Road 7256-0-2JA & 1JA and a short unnumbered segment that continues on through to 7256-0-1J (ONDA Photo Pt. FK-3 NW) there is minimal vegetation in the center of the road, but the road is not overgrown and is still in a useable condition and get relatively regular use.

NW: Road 7256-0-2J0 and 1J (BLM Route Analysis #6, Photo Pts. A8 & A9) (No ONDA Photos)

Note: Other ONDA photo pts. did not appear to be of boundary roads for this BLM unit.

Both ID-teams from the Burns and Lakeview districts confirmed that based on their knowledge of the area and reviewing ONDA information and the BLM information gathered as part of the unit boundary determination process, that these routes do meet boundary road criteria.

(2) Is	the	unit in a natu	ral condition?	
Yes _	X	N	o N/A	

1980 Unit Description: The unit is located approximately 20 miles northwest of the community of Frenchglen. The 1980 Inventory Report described this unit as consisting mainly of an extensive flat terrace with virtually no relief; a plateau is located in the extreme north. Directly below the plateau's south rim lies a shallow narrow drainage. Five dry lakebed areas are scattered throughout the area. Low sagebrush and an understory of grass comprise the subunit's common vegetative types. Though several developments were identified, the unit was found to be in a natural condition.

Current Condition Description: The ID-team reviewed photos from the 1977 inventory effort and landscape related photos provided by ONDA. Brush beating has occurred along some of the boundary roads within the last three years. This consists of mowing sagebrush (24 feet) on either

side of the road to assist with providing a fire break. The primary human uses in the unit and the surrounding area are associated with livestock grazing and recreation by the public. The unit currently has the following developments (See Unit Character Map):

- 9.1 miles of interior routes (non-boundary roads)
- 8 miles of fencing. The fence running east/west in the southern half of the unit also has an interior route along it.
- 1 reservoir and 6 waterholes

The ID-team found that many of these developments and treatments were along the outer edges of the unit or dispersed enough that the imprint of humans is still substantially unnoticeable and that the unit is in a natural condition. This finding is generally consistent with ONDA's proposal for their Buzzard Creek Unit, which they found to be natural as a whole.

			found to be natural as a	
(3) Does the unit	have outs	standing	opportunities for solitue	de?
Yes	No_	X	N/A	
terrace containing screening. There area has a drainag solitude from othe above it. Because	broad sha is no vege e at the ba ers; however	allow drain stative screase of a place, the arc ek of vege	part of the subunit consist nages that provide no eff- eening. The northern con- ateau that would provide ea is visible from the gen- stative screening and the fa- g opportunities for solitue	ective mer of the some tle slopes flat terrain
accurate. In addit drainage to the no ONDA's report in Creek WSA and e	ion, there rth, furthe dicated the adless rol	is also a refucing at the she ling hills,	ne general description about the role of their proposed rimrock ridges, and juniportunities for solitude or	through the this area. Buzzard per stands
roadless area, but Given the lack of	rather sev topograph his unit, th	eral small ic and ver e ID-team	Buzzard Creek WSA is not ler units, including this B getative screening and the found this unit does not	LM unit.
(4) Does the unit unconfined recre		standing	opportunities for primit	tive and
Yes	No_	X	N/A	

1980 Unit Description: Opportunities for hunting, horseback riding, and hiking are present in this area; however, they are not outstanding.

Current Condition Description: The ID-team found that the recreation opportunities identified above are likely still present. ONDA's report also identified wildlife viewing, backpacking, camping, rock hounding, and photography. ONDA indicated that the sheer size of their proposed Buzzard Creek WSA cannot help but provide for a diverse and exceptional recreational experience and that the endless rolling hills, rimrock ridges, juniper stands and multiple water features, and geologic structures present add to the interest of their unit. They also indicated they observed several wildlife species including birds of prey, pronghorn antelope, coyotes, badgers, and numerous birds.

The BLM found that ONDA's proposed Buzzard Creek Unit is not one large roadless area, but rather several smaller units, including this unit. While the recreation opportunities identified by both BLM and ONDA may be present, no unique features were identified for this particular BLM unit and the diversity and quality of these recreational opportunities are not unlike that which can be found on much of the public lands in eastern Oregon in the Northern Great Basin region. None of the game species generally hunted in the area, including and around this unit, are considered by the State as being unique or rare, thus these opportunities are not outstanding.

After reviewing the information submitted, the ID-team found that the recreation opportunities present are not unique and do not present characteristics either individually or collectively that would result in these recreation activities being outstanding within the unit. Below is additional supporting BLM information related to recreation resources for this unit.

Both the 2003 Lakeview Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (RMP/ROD) and the 1992 Three Rivers RMP/ROD show that most of this unit is open to off-road use by motorized vehicles; however, currently most motorized vehicle use appears to be occurring along existing roads for this unit. The only exception is the southwest portion of the unit within the fenced area which has a "Limited" category to protect Foster Flat Research Natural Area.

Recreation opportunities within the entire Lakeview Resource area have also been addressed through the designation of extensive and special recreation management areas in the Lakeview RMP/ROD. An extensive recreation management area (ERMA) is defined in the Lakeview RMP/ROD (page 113) as an area "where significant recreation opportunities and problems are limited and explicit recreation management is not required." This inventory unit was included in an ERMA designation along with much of the rest of the lands within the

Lakeview District (RMP/ROD, page 84 and Map R-9), further indicating that the existing or potential recreation opportunities available in this area are not outstanding when compared with the rest of the public lands in the Lakeview Resource Area. BLM lands in this unit also fall within the Three Rivers ERMA (Three Rivers RMP/ROD, page 2-108-109, Map R-1).

During the development of the Lakeview RMP/ROD, the BLM classified all of the public lands within the planning area into one of six recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) classes (primitive, semiprimitive nonmotorized, semiprimitve motorized, roaded natural, rural, and urban). Class definitions and criteria (remoteness, size, evidence of human use, social setting, and managerial setting) used in developing the ROS classification for lands in the Lakeview Resource Area are available in the in Appendix M2 (Pages A-287-288 and A-291) of the 2001 Draft Lakeview Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

Map R-3 of the Lakeview RMP/ROD shows that this unit falls within the ROS class of semi-primitive motorized. This classification was identified in recognition of the fact that motorized recreational use is allowed and expected. In contrast, those areas identified as falling within a semiprimitive non-motorized class are areas that have a high potential for "outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined types of recreation . . . where the use of the area is through non-motorized, nonmechanical means." BLM lands in this unit for the Three Rivers Resource Area have not been classified under the ROS system, but have similar characteristics as those in the Lakeview Resource Area

Characterist	ies as those in the Lakevie	w Resource Area.	
(5) Does th	e unit have supplemental	values?	
Yes	No	N/A X	
<u>S</u> 1	ummary of Findings and	Conclusion	
Unit Name and Number	r: West Warm Springs U	nit 21	
Summary Results of	<u> </u>		
1. Does the area m	eet any of the size requirer	ments? X Yes	No
2. Does the area ar	pear to be natural?	X_Yes _	No
<ol><li>Does the area of unconfined type of</li></ol>	fer outstanding opportuniting recreation?	ies for solitude orYes _	
4. Does the area ha	ve supplemental values?	Yes	No X 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: Laura Dowlan, Wilderness Specialist

## Team Members:

Lawa Dowlan	9/4/08
Laura Powlan, Outdoor Recreation Planner (Wilderness Specialist) – Burns District	8/20/08
Brett Page, Outdoor Recreation Planner - Burns District	Date
Nick Miller, Wiftlife Biologist – Burns District	2/18/68 Date
Rob Sharp, Range Management Specialist – Burns District	8/25/2008 Date
Ronda Purdy, Range Technician Burns District	8-13-2009 Date
Fred McDonald, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist – Burns District	8/22/08 Date
Willie	8-11-2008
Willie Street, Range Management Specialist – Burns District	Date
Autumn Richardson, SCEP Range Management Specialist – Burns District	8 -11-2 008 Date
Kin MCLean, Outdoor Recreation Planner - Lakeview District	9/15/00 Dato
Paul Whitman	9/12/2008
Paul Whitman, Planning & Environmental Coordinator – Lakeview District	Date
Jayna Ferrey, Range Management Specialist – Lakeview District	9/12/08 9/12/08
Todd Forbes, Associate Field Manager – Lakeview District	9/12/08 Date

### Approved by:

Joan M. Suther, Three Rivers Field Manager – Burns District	8/31/08
Joan M. Suther, Three Rivers Field Manager - Burns District	Date
The Clamer	9/10/00
Thomas F. Rasmussen, Lakeview Field Manager - Lakeview District	Date

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 1610.5-2.02

