

**Southeastern Oregon
Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
and Final Environmental Impact Statement**

Chapter 2
*Proposed RMP
Amendment*

This page intentionally left blank.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Table of Contents

2.1 Introduction.....2-1

 Protection of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics2-1

 Off Highway Vehicle Area Designations2-2

 Livestock Grazing Management2-2

2.2 Lands with Wilderness Characteristics2-3

 Management Objective2-3

 Management Direction.....2-3

2.3 Travel Management2-8

 Management Objectives.....2-8

 Management Direction.....2-8

2.4 Livestock Grazing2-10

 Management Objectives.....2-10

 Management Direction.....2-11

2.5 Summary2-15

16
17
18
19
20
21

Tables

Table 2-1. Acres/number of units protected for wilderness characteristics by alternative.....2-3

Table 2-2. Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment OHV allocations.2-9

Table 2-3. Resource use considerations in evaluating permit relinquishment under the PRMPA.....2-13

Table 2-4. Land Use Planning Allocations by alternative.....2-16

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 2

Proposed RMP Amendment

2.1 Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) developed the Southeastern Oregon Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment (SEO PRMPA) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) with input from the public, cooperating agencies, other federal partners, Tribes, the Southeast Oregon Resource Advisory Committee (SEORAC), and BLM staff and management.

The Southeastern Oregon Draft RMPA/Draft EIS (DRMPA/DEIS) was released May 29, 2019, followed by a 90-day comment period (BLM 2019a). The BLM received over 4,000 submissions from individuals, non-governmental organizations, federal and state agencies, county governments, and tribes with interest in future management of the SEO Planning Area. These comments resulted in changes to the alternatives and the development of the PRMPA. The PRMPA/FEIS draws from several DRMPA/DEIS alternatives in developing management direction for: **lands with wilderness characteristics; off-highway vehicles (OHV¹) area allocations; livestock grazing when the BLM’s Standards for Rangeland Health are not being achieved; and processing the voluntary relinquishment of a grazing permit.** The allowable uses (allocations) and management actions under the existing 2002 SEORMP and Record of Decision (ROD) as amended, that are not addressed by this Amendment, remain valid.

Once the PRMPA is approved through the issuance of a Record of Decision (ROD), the BLM will implement, in consultation with the public and in compliance with the *National Environmental Protection Act* (NEPA), actions in accordance with the Approved RMP Amendment. All future actions must conform to the Approved RMP Amendment and ROD.

Following is a summary of the proposed management direction in the PRMPA.

Protection of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

- **The PRMPA proposes to protect 33 lands with wilderness characteristic units totaling 417,190 acres excluding 9,247 acres in boundary road setbacks (see Appendix M, Map WC 6).** Protecting these 33 units is responsive to feedback and input the BLM received on the DRMPA/DEIS from Tribal governments, the Southeast Oregon Resource Advisory Council (SEORAC), cooperating agencies (US Fish and Wildlife Service and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife), and the public. The DRMPA/DEIS presented five alternative options (see Appendix C for methodologies) for the management of wilderness characteristics. Protection of the 33 units proposed in the PRMPA was analyzed under Alternative D in the DRMPA/DEIS.
- A new management objective (see Section 2.2) would be established under the PRMPA for the 33 protected lands with wilderness characteristics units.
- The PRMPA/FEIS balances the BLM’s priorities for different resources by protecting 33 wilderness characteristics units, while emphasizing other multiple use objectives in the other 43 wilderness characteristic units in the planning area. The 33 units proposed for protection were identified using evaluation criteria that emphasized vegetative condition, hydrologic function, and the proximity of the units to other protected areas (such as Wilderness Study

¹ To be consistent with BLM Manuals on this topic, the BLM uses the term “off-highway vehicle” or “OHV” hereafter in this chapter and all chapters and sections of this PRMPA/FEIS, although it is referred to as “off-road vehicle” or “ORV” in the 2010 Settlement Agreement (see Appendix A).

1 Areas). See Appendix C for more information on the evaluation criteria and methodology
2 utilized in identifying the 33 units for protection).

3 **Off Highway Vehicle Area Designations**

- 4 • The DRMPA/DEIS alternatives considered a broad range of options for OHV management.
5 The PRMPA reflects a high level of public interest in minimizing conflicts and negative
6 impacts caused by cross-country motorized vehicle use. In this PRMPA, all but 40,368 acres
7 of currently designated OHV Open areas are proposed for designation as OHV Limited
8 (motorized vehicles are limited to existing routes).
- 9 • The PRMPA proposes to limit off-highway vehicle (OHV, see Map OHV 5) use to existing
10 routes on 359,869 acres that are currently open to cross-country OHV use. This brings the
11 total of OHV Limited acres in the planning area to 4.5 million. The entirety of the 33
12 protected lands with wilderness characteristics units are within this OHV Limited designation.
13 Two areas, totaling 40,368 acres, would remain designated as open to OHV use. The 15,829
14 acres that are currently closed to motorized use would remain closed. These changes in OHV
15 allocations respond to comments received in support of limiting OHV Open areas.

16 **Livestock Grazing Management**

- 17 • **The alternatives considered a range of management responses when Rangeland Health**
18 **Standards were not being achieved and the BLM's processes upon receipt of a voluntary**
19 **grazing permit relinquishment.**
- 20 • The PRMPA would provide additional guidance and clarifications regarding addressing areas
21 that do not meet Standards for Rangeland Health and the processing of voluntarily
22 relinquished grazing permits.

23 Appendix A displays the full range of alternatives considered in this planning process. Appendix A brings
24 forward the alternatives from the DRMPA/DEIS (Chapter 2, The Alternatives) and incorporates changes
25 made to the alternatives to address public comments and provide clarification. Appendix Q provides an
26 overview of all changes made between the DRMPA/DEIS and this PRMPA/FEIS, including changes to
27 the alternatives.

28 The following sections detail the specific management objectives and management direction that would
29 be implemented under the PRMPA.

2.2 Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Management Objective

Prioritize the protection of wilderness characteristics in the 33 lands with wilderness characteristics units that are identified for protection in this Southeastern Oregon PRMPA.

Management Direction

Management of the 33 wilderness characteristics units (417,190 acres composed of 55 individual subunits or “parcels”), where the protection of wilderness characteristics is prioritized, would emphasize the maintenance and/or enhancement of the wilderness resource: roadless size of the unit, naturalness, and outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. Management in these units would be limited to actions and project designs that maintain and/or enhance wilderness characteristics. See Appendix B: Map WC 1 which displays all lands with wilderness characteristics, and Appendix M: Map WC 6 which shows units protected under the PRMPA.

Table 2-1 provides a summary of acres protected under each alternative and the PRMPA.

Table 2-1. Acres/number of units protected for wilderness characteristics by alternative.

Alternative	Acres to Emphasize Protection of Wilderness Characteristics	Acres in Boundary Road Setbacks	Number of Units Prioritized to Protect Wilderness Characteristics
No Action	1,236,907	No setbacks established	76
Alternative A	0	0	0
Alternative B ^a	1,206,780	30,127	76
Alternative C	167,709	5,784	27
Alternative D	417,196	9,247	33
PRMPA	417,190 ^b	9247	33

Note: Lands with wilderness characteristics are described individually as “units.” Some units are composed of more than one, non-contiguous geographic area; these sub-units are referred to as “parcels” of public land.

^a The acreage difference between the No Action Alternative and Alternative B results from excluding setbacks in the latter.

^b The acreage difference between Alternative D and the PRMPA is a result of data updates made between DRMPA and this PRMPA.

Travel Management

Manage protected wilderness characteristics units as OHV Limited to existing primitive routes, including within the boundary road setback, unless currently closed to OHV use (see Travel Management section 2.3, below, Chapter 3 Section 3.7.2 Travel Management, and the Appendix I: Glossary for definitions).

Visual Resource Management

Manage protected wilderness characteristics units as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II, unless currently managed as VRM Class I (see Appendix M, Map VRM 5).

- The goal of VRM Class II management direction is to preserve the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention.

- 1 • VRM management of protected units—or areas within a unit—which are currently designated
2 as VRM I would be unchanged.
- 3 • VRM management in boundary road setbacks remain as designated under the 2002 SEORMP,
4 as amended.

5 Minerals Management

6 **Leasable Minerals**

7 ***Unleased Fluid Minerals***

8 Protected wilderness characteristics units would be managed as No Surface Occupancy (NSO) unless
9 current management is otherwise more restrictive (closed to leasing). No waivers, exceptions, or
10 modifications to a fluid mineral lease NSO stipulation would be granted. Leasable minerals management
11 in boundary road setbacks remain as designated under the 2002 SEORMP, as amended.

12 **Leased Fluid Minerals**

13 Where leasable minerals are currently leased, management would apply the following stipulations:

- 14 • Apply reasonable conservation measures consistent with management of wilderness
15 characteristics
- 16 • Require Master Development Plans for fluid minerals processing
- 17 • Require unitization (see Glossary) for fluid minerals when necessary for proper development
- 18 • Identify areas where land acquisitions, including nonfederal mineral rights, may benefit
19 management of wilderness characteristics by consolidating the surface and subsurface rights
- 20 • There would be a continuation of existing minerals management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as
21 amended, BLM 2002) within boundary road setbacks.
- 22 • Appendix M, Map MIN 17 displays leasable mineral restrictions under the PRMPA across the
23 planning area.

24 **Saleable Minerals**

- 25 • Protected wilderness characteristics units would be closed to new mineral material sales (see
26 Appendix M, Map MIN 18).
- 27 • Expiring mineral material authorizations—including free-use permits² and mineral material
28 sales—may be renewed after environmental review and a determination that the action would
29 be substantially unnoticeable.
- 30 • There would be a continuation of existing saleable minerals management (2002 SEORMP and
31 ROD as amended, BLM 2002) within boundary road setbacks.

² BLM regulations provide for the exploration, development, and disposal of mineral material resources on the public lands to any Federal, State, or territorial agency, unit, or subdivision, including municipalities, or any non-profit organization that is appropriately permitted, and in so doing provides for the protection of the resources and the environment.

1 Lands and Realty

2 **Land Tenure Zone Category³**

3 Protected wilderness characteristics units would be managed as Land Tenure Zone 1 (retention in public
4 ownership). The land tenure zone designation in boundary road setbacks would remain as designated
5 under the 2002 SEORMP, as amended. See Section 3.7.21 Lands and Realty for details on each of the
6 three land tenure zones, and Appendix M, Map Land 19.

7 **Rights-of-way (ROW)**

- 8 • Protected wilderness characteristics units—and their associated boundary road setbacks—
9 would be managed as exclusion areas for major ROWs (see Appendix M, Map Land 20). A
10 ROW exclusion area is not available for ROW location under any condition.

11 Major ROWs are defined as: projects with a large footprint (either linear or site), large
12 diameter (24 inches or greater) oil or gas pipelines, high voltage transmission lines (115 kV or
13 above), roads, ROWs involving multiple federal jurisdictions, or proposals which have a
14 substantial level of environmental controversy of the action.

- 15 • Protected units—and their associated boundary road setbacks—would be managed as
16 exclusion areas for commercial renewable energy projects (see Appendix M, Maps LAND 22
17 [Solar] and LAND 23 [Wind]).

18 Commercial renewable energy projects are defined as solar, wind, and biomass projects with
19 surface disturbance that would cause a reduction or elimination of wilderness characteristics.

- 20 • Protected units would be managed as avoidance areas—unless currently designated as
21 exclusion areas— for communication sites and other minor ROWs. A ROW avoidance area is
22 an area to be avoided but may be available for ROW location with special management
23 stipulations that ensure the protection of the area’s wilderness characteristics.

24 Minor ROWs are those which take less time to process⁴ and have few resource concerns.
25 Minor ROWs would be allowed only where they are consistent with the protection of
26 wilderness characteristics.

27 Boundary road setbacks would continue to be managed as avoidance areas or exclusion areas
28 for communication sites and other minor ROWs as designated under the 2002 SEORMP, as
29 amended.

30 Appendix M, LAND 21 displays the minor ROW designations.

- 31 • Management emphasis in protected wilderness characteristics units would be placed on co-
32 location of new, minor ROWs in existing designated corridors where feasible or in existing
33 authorized ROWs. Co-location would also be a management emphasis for communication
34 sites, where technically feasible. This includes installing new towers within existing

³ The 2002 SEORMP and ROD (BLM 2002) designated three Land Tenure Zones (Appendix L): Zone 1—retention in public ownership, Zone 2—limited retention and land ownership consolidation through exchange, and Zone 3—BLM land available for disposal by authorized method.

⁴There are six ROW Processing Categories. Categories 1–4 are based on the number of federal work hours involved to process an application, ranging from 1–50 hours. Category 5 is for Master Agreements. A ROW that requires more than 50 hours to process is a Category 6. Minor ROWs may fall within Categories 1–4 (43 CFR 2804.14, 2805.16, 2884.12 and 2885.24; also see WO IM-2021-001 (BLM 2021b) which establishes the annual cost recovery and monitoring schedule).

1 communication sites. Co-location would be allowed only where consistent with the protection
2 of wilderness characteristics.

3 Existing designated ROW corridors are displayed in Appendix M, on all (Land 20-23) ROW
4 maps.

5 Boundary Road Setbacks

6 Where roads form the boundary of a protected wilderness characteristic unit, a 250-foot management
7 setback would be established. The setback would not be considered part of the protected wilderness
8 characteristic unit; therefore, the protected unit would begin 250 feet inward from the centerline of the
9 boundary road, where present.

10 The setbacks are intended to provide the BLM flexibility to adapt to resource needs, threats, and
11 opportunities along the boundary roads, including protection of the values within the protected wilderness
12 characteristics unit. Selection of the 250-foot boundary distance is based on Interdisciplinary Team (IDT)
13 consideration of: common widths of existing and potential linear (roads and utilities) Rights-of-way
14 corridors; current management allowances under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD in OHV Limited areas⁵;
15 consideration of management restrictions in support of Greater Sage-grouse habitat; fire suppression and
16 support needs, and transportation management and maintenance. The 250-foot setback was selected to
17 provide management flexibility while being compatible with the protected units.

18 The PRMPA would not establish setbacks for wilderness characteristics unit boundaries formed by a
19 change in land ownership or by the edge of an existing authorized right of way.

20 The area in boundary road setbacks totals 9,247 acres (see Table 3-4 in Chapter 3). Appendix M, Map
21 WC 6 displays the locations of lands with wilderness characteristics units, and the relevant setbacks that
22 are proposed.

23 Unless otherwise noted, there would be a continuation of management under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD as
24 amended, within the road boundary setbacks.

25 BLM would not authorize actions in boundary road setbacks that would have the potential to eliminate the
26 wilderness characteristics in the adjacent protected unit. Activities that are highly visible due to their
27 potential for dominating the visual landscape from within the adjacent protected unit would be excluded,
28 including:

- 29 • Any project that would have impacts that are pervasive and omnipresent, as seen from within
30 the protected unit, and would thus potentially eliminate the adjacent wilderness
31 characteristics.
- 32 • Commercial or industrial renewable energy projects (see Lands and Realty section above).
- 33 • Major Rights-of-way (see Lands and Realty section above and Glossary).

34 General Management

35 The BLM may authorize future management actions within protected units including, but not limited
36 to: vegetation and habitat restoration, fuels treatments, installation of signage and rangeland
37 management infrastructure and improvements The BLM would only authorize management actions in
38 protected units if, after environmental review, it determines that the actions would meet the
39 management objective and management direction for protected units. Project proposals will be
40 evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure wilderness characteristics are maintained and/or enhanced.
41 Actions within the protected units would be subject to NEPA compliance.

⁵The 2002 SEORMP/ROD (BLM 2002) authorized motorized vehicle-supported camping, unless otherwise posted to meet other objectives, up to 150 feet off existing motorized routes (p. 66).

1 Monitoring of protected wilderness characteristics units would be based on conformance with the
2 management objective and management direction established by this Amendment. Because many
3 wilderness characteristics units proposed for protection are contiguous with, or adjacent to, Wilderness
4 Study Areas (WSAs), opportunities to connect monitoring of protected units while monitoring WSAs
5 would be integrated where possible. Identification of unauthorized resource impacts (for example,
6 unauthorized user-created impacts) would be documented, and the appropriate management response
7 implemented. Monitoring would be performed when any ground disturbing action occurs in a protected
8 wilderness characteristic unit. Periodic monitoring will be performed to ensure that identified wilderness
9 characteristics are being maintained.

10 Protected Wilderness Characteristic Units Contiguous to 11 Wilderness Study Areas

12 If Congress releases a Wilderness Study Area (WSA) from further consideration as wilderness, these
13 lands would no longer be managed according to Manual 6330, Management of Wilderness Study Areas
14 (BLM 2012f), but instead according to the underlying land use planning allocations and management
15 direction for the area (for example, OHV Limited due to Sage-grouse protections, designated Wild and
16 Scenic River or Area of Critical Environmental Concern status). If a protected wilderness characteristics
17 unit(s) —or one or more of the associated parcels—is contiguous to a WSA that is congressionally
18 released from wilderness designation, and that unit (or parcel) depends on being contiguous with the
19 WSA to meet the criteria of possessing wilderness characteristics, the unit (or parcel) would no longer be
20 prioritized for protection. Of the 33 protected units, 23 include one or more area that are contiguous with
21 WSAs (see Glossary) and are dependent on this contiguous association to meet the criteria of possessing
22 wilderness characteristics (see Appendix B, Table B-2 for a listing of contiguous units/parcels and their
23 acreages).

24 Should Congress designate a WSA(s) for wilderness protection, the contiguous lands with wilderness
25 characteristics unit(s) would continue to be managed in accordance with this PRMPA unless their
26 management is otherwise addressed by Congress.

27 Wilderness Characteristics Units Not Prioritized for Protection

28 Wilderness characteristics units which are not prioritized for protection would not receive land use
29 planning level protections. The potential effects of actions to the unit's wilderness characteristics would
30 be considered and BLM would analyze the potential effects of the action in the applicable NEPA analysis,
31 should BLM determine it is an issue requiring analysis. See Chapter 3, Section 3.7.1 Lands with
32 Wilderness Characteristics for details.

2.3 Travel Management

Land use planning level travel management decisions allocate appropriate motorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) use.

Management Objectives

The PRMPA proposes no change in Travel Management objectives from those identified in the 2002 SEORMP, as amended. The existing Travel Management (OHV) objectives are carried forward, as described below.

2002 SEORMP/ROD

Off-Highway Vehicles: Manage off-highway vehicle (OHV) use to protect resource values, promote public safety, provide OHV use opportunities where appropriate, and minimize conflicts among various users (BLM 2002, 65).

Greater Sage-grouse Approved RMP Amendment (GRSG ARMPA)

- Objective 1 (Travel and Transportation Management Objective [TTM 1]: Manage OHV designations (Open, Limited⁶, and Closed) to conserve Greater Sage-grouse habitat and populations by taking actions that create neutral or positive responses (BLM 2015d, 2:30).
- Objective 2 (TTM 2): Reduce disturbance to Greater Sage-grouse by evaluating or modifying OHV designations and route selection in accordance with minimization criteria (BLM 2015e, 2: 30).

Management Direction

The PRMPA would change the acres of land managed as OHV Open and Limited. The acres of OHV Closed would remain unchanged from the 2002 SEORMP, as amended. OHV designations are provided in Table 2-2 below and displayed on Map OHV 5 in Appendix M.

- Two areas, totaling approximately 40,368 acres, would be managed as open to cross-country recreational motorized and non-motorized use.
- Approximately 319,501 acres that are currently open to OHV use would be designated as OHV Limited. This brings the total of OHV Limited acres in the planning area to 4,585,249. This includes: 2,017,038 acres designated as Limited under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD (see distinction of Limited to Designated and Limited to Existing⁶, BLM 2002); 2,248,711 acres

⁶ For this RMP Amendment/EIS, use of the off-highway vehicle area designation term “Limited” applies to both areas designated as Limited under the 2002 RMP, and limited OHV area designations under the ARMPA. The 2002 RMP identified 1,481,605 acres where OHV use is Limited to Designated routes and 535,417 acres as Limited to Existing routes. Designated routes were identified in the 2002 SEORMP as routes that: were in existence as of the issuance of the SEORMP ROD in 2002 (BLM 2002); are located in special management areas including WSAs, certain ACECs, WSRs, and special habitat areas; and were specifically identified for continued public use. These routes are on file at the Vale District Office. An existing route is one that existed on the issuance date of the 2002 SEORMP ROD and are located in special management areas and sensitive habitat that otherwise were not designated as Limited to Designated routes (Ibid., 65–67) or Closed. In 2016, the BLM updated its 1626 Travel and Transportation Management Manual (BLM 2016f) and no longer identifies areas as Limited to Designated routes in RMPs or RMP Amendments. The 2015 Greater Sage-grouse Amendment to the 2002 RMP Amendment (BLM 2015d), designated an additional 2,248,711 acres as OHV Limited to existing routes. In this RMP Amendment/EIS, the BLM is using the term “Limited”.

1 designated as Limited under the 2015 Greater Sage-grouse ARMPA; and an additional
 2 319,501 acres of OHV Limited area designations under this PRMPA.

- 3 • The current 15,829 acres that are closed to motorized use under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD
 4 would remain Closed.

Table 2-2. Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment OHV allocations.

OHV Category	Acres
Open	40,368
Limited ^a	4,585,249
Closed ^b	15,829

5 ^a The 2015 Greater Sage-Grouse ARMPA (BLM 2015e) designated all Sage-grouse habitat as OHV Limited, if not
 6 already closed to OHV. That decision shifted approximately 2.3 million acres of public land in the SEO planning
 7 area from OHV Open to OHV Limited to existing roads and primitive routes.

8 ^b Areas closed to OHV use (OHV Closed) remain as designated under the 2002 SEORMP (BLM 2002), as amended.

9 The two OHV Open areas are: located near populated areas; accessible along existing, developed travel
 10 routes; presently being used for motorized activities, primarily along existing routes that are known to be
 11 popular with hunters, OHV users, and other backcountry motorized vehicle users. OHV activities in these
 12 two areas can also be successfully managed thereby minimizing impacts to other resources and uses.

2.4 Livestock Grazing

The PRMPA proposes additional guidance and clarification for “Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management for Public Lands Administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the States of Oregon and Washington” (BLM 1997) management direction and expands and clarifies the process BLM would follow upon receipt of a voluntary permit relinquishment. Figure G-1 in Appendix G displays the existing process when a livestock grazing permit is voluntarily relinquished.

Management Objectives

Livestock management objectives under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD as amended, would be carried forward.

SEORMP 2002

Provide for a sustained level of livestock grazing consistent with other resource objectives and public land use allocations (BLM 2002, 56).

Greater Sage-grouse Approved RMP Amendment (ARMPA: BLM, 2015e)

- Objective 1 (Livestock Grazing, LG 1): Manage livestock grazing to maintain or improve Greater Sage-grouse habitat by achieving Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 2015d, 2:17).
- Objective 2 (LG 2): The 2015 ARMPA identified public land acres across eastern Oregon that will continue to be available for livestock grazing in Greater Sage-grouse habitat (BLM 2015d, 2-18). On public lands within the SEO planning area (4,641,445 acres), there are approximately 4,091,925 acres of Sage-grouse habitat, of which 4,036,441 acres are currently available for livestock grazing.⁷
- Objective 3 (LG 3): Complete rangeland health evaluations for grazing permits/leases that have not been renewed and prioritized by Allotment (Selective Management) Categories⁸ I (Improve), M (Maintain), and C (Custodial). A priority order for completing rangeland health evaluations in Greater Sage-grouse habitat was established in the 2015 ARMPA (BLM 2015d, 2-18).

⁷ The 2015 GRSG ARMPA (BLM 2015d) designated 9,354 acres within “Key” Research Natural Areas (RNA) in the SEO planning area as unavailable to livestock grazing (ARMPA p 2-18, Table 2-6). In March 2019, BLM issued a Record of Decision (ROD) to amend the 2015 GRSG ARMPA to reverse the 2015 closure of all or parts of Key RNAs to grazing (BLM 2019d); the 2019 ROD was subsequently appealed. On October 16, 2019, the U.S. District Court for Idaho (1:16-CV-00083-BLW) enjoined implementation of the March 2019 ROD. During this preliminary injunction, the 2015 RMPA remains in effect. BLM has begun the process of making all or portions of the Key RNAs identified in the 2015 ARMPA/ROD (BLM 2015d) unavailable to grazing.

⁸ Priority setting for assessing Standards for Rangeland Health has been superseded by WO IM 2018-024 (BLM 2018a).

1 **Management Direction**

2 Standards for Rangeland Health

3 BLM would continue to follow livestock grazing administration regulations found in 43 CFR § 4180 and
 4 manage in accordance with “Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing
 5 Management for Public Lands Administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the States of Oregon
 6 and Washington” (BLM 1997). The BLM would continue to implement the 2002 SEORMP/ROD
 7 management direction that states, “Where livestock grazing is found not to be consistent with meeting
 8 objectives, actions that control the intensity, duration, and timing of grazing and/or provide for periodic
 9 deferment and/or rest will be required to meet the physiological requirements of key plant species and to
 10 meet other resource management objectives. Upon determining through the adaptive management process
 11 that existing grazing management practices or levels of grazing on public land are significant factors in
 12 failing to achieve resource objectives, appropriate actions will be implemented.”⁹

13 In accordance with 43 CFR § 4180.2, if existing livestock grazing management is determined to be a
 14 significant causal factor for non-attainment of Standard(s), then the authorized officer must meet
 15 regulatory requirements to make changes by the next grazing season that will result in significant progress
 16 towards meeting applicable Standards.

17 In addition, the PRMPA would add the following management direction:

18 If a Standards for Rangeland Health Assessment and Evaluation is completed and indicates that one
 19 or more Standard is not met in an allotment or pasture due to factors that are subject to BLM control,
 20 then the authorized officer shall consider taking action to make progress toward land health
 21 standards and land use plan objectives, even if existing livestock grazing is not determined to be a
 22 significant causal factor for non-attainment of Standard(s). Actions available to the authorized
 23 officer could include, but are not limited to, changes in livestock grazing management.

24 If a Standards for Rangeland Health Assessment and Evaluation has not been completed for an
 25 allotment or pasture, or if the existing evaluation no longer represents resource conditions previously
 26 assessed and evaluated, then the BLM would not permit increases to AUMs that, based on analysis,
 27 are determined to cause negative impacts to other resources over the term of the renewed permit
 28 until the rangeland health assessment and evaluation is completed or revised. The other resources
 29 being considered are those identified in the OR/WA Standards and those identified in the 2002
 30 SEORMP and 2015 ARMPA.

31 BLM would also continue to prioritize completion of OR/WA Standards for Rangeland Health
 32 assessment and evaluations as identified through the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse RMP Amendment
 33 (BLM 2015d).

⁹ Appropriate action means implementing actions pursuant to applicable regulatory authorities that will result in significant progress toward fulfillment of the Standards for Rangeland Health and significant progress toward conformance with the guidelines (43 CFR 4180.2(C)). These actions may include development of grazing-related portions of activity plans and changes to terms and conditions such as either addressing seasons or intensities of livestock use (or both), rangeland project construction and maintenance, temporary livestock exclusion at pasture or allotment-scale (i.e., closure to livestock grazing), or cancellation or suspension of the grazing permit and associated land use plan amendment to change land use allocations to not include livestock grazing. These actions would require NEPA analysis as well as a Proposed and Final Grazing Decisions as described under 43 CFR 4160.

Voluntary Relinquishment of Grazing Permits

BLM would continue to follow WO IM 2013-184 (BLM 2013b) when BLM received a voluntary permit relinquishment. Under this guidance, BLM would continue to be required to accept all voluntary relinquishments of grazing permits. The voluntarily relinquished grazing permit would result in ending the relinquishing party's permitted use and preference. The voluntary relinquishment would not, in and of itself, result in that forage allocation becoming unavailable for use by livestock.

The PRMPA would also incorporate the following processes for a voluntarily relinquished permit:

Upon receipt of a voluntary permit relinquishment, BLM would review compatibility of livestock grazing use with other existing resources in the permitted area. Based on competing resources or other opportunities (see Table 2-3 and resource list which follows), the BLM could wholly or partially: designate an area as unavailable to livestock grazing, create a reserve common allotment, and/or only allow livestock grazing for vegetation treatments (e.g., targeted, or prescriptive grazing). This management direction would apply across the entire planning area.

The resource considerations in Table 2-3 would be evaluated in all cases where a voluntary relinquishment of a grazing permit is received by the BLM. National BLM guidance on processing permit relinquishments requires the BLM to consider "other resource uses". See Appendix G, Figure G-4 for a summary of this process under the PRMPA.

The resource considerations, and the degree to which grazing is compatible or in conflict with these resources, would be evaluated through a NEPA analysis. The BLM would provide the rationale for how these resource considerations were addressed in an allocation decision. This decision would establish the allocation of forage resources for the life of the plan; additional land use planning-level analysis would not be required. If livestock grazing is found to be incompatible, the forage allocation could be made to another resource. If grazing is found to be compatible with the other resource considerations, then the area would remain available to livestock grazing and/or be designated as a reserve common allotment.

Table 2-3. Resource use considerations in evaluating permit relinquishment under the PRMPA.

Resource or Use	Resource Considerations
Wildlife, Fish, and Plant Habitat	Big game winter range Bighorn sheep habitat, T&E ^a , and other bureau sensitive species Priority Sage-grouse habitat
Special Management Areas (SMA)	Single SMA ^b Multiple SMAs
Fire and Fuels	Fire return interval Resistance and resilience (H, M, L) ^c
Realty, Energy, and Minerals	Private inholdings High level of extractive resource potential Existing/potential development (mining, communication sites, Rights-of-way)
Vegetation and Ecology	Existing invasive species concerns Species or habitat at risk of loss due to presence of invasive species (Category 5) Extensive presence of invasive species (Category 6) Unique ecology (plant, animal, and soils)
Grazing Management	Presence of grazing infrastructure Grazing restrictions by season Meeting Standards for Rangeland Health Standards for Rangeland Health not meeting due to grazing (historic and/or existing) Forage (AUMs) Common Allotments Custodial Allotment
Recreation, Land Use, and Public Impacts	Proximity to urban areas and/or neighboring areas of high use Existing and potential recreation use or demands Lands with wilderness characteristics
Tribal, Social, and Community	Traditional use areas, community, and economic concerns Tribal concerns and sensitive areas
Physical Characteristics and Water	Topography/relief Riparian, wetlands, and hydrology Water Developments (existing)

1 ^a Threatened and Endangered.

2 ^b Designated Special Management Areas include Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern,
3 Research Natural Areas, National Historic Trails, and Wild and Scenic Rivers. These are areas with approved
4 management decisions for designation of special management under policy, regulation, or by congressional action.

5 ^c High (H), Moderate (M), or Low (L) Resistance or Resilience indicates whether a landscape is likely to recover
6 naturally after disturbance or would require active introduction of rehabilitation or restoration efforts.

1 Additional clarification for each Resource and Resource Use found in Table 2-3 is provided in the list
2 below:

3 **Wildlife, Fish, and Plants:** The BLM would consider important wildlife habitat management
4 concerns, including disease transmission, management priorities, forage demands, and grazing
5 impacts to other species.

6 **Special Management Areas: (SMAs):** Designated SMAs are managed according to BLM
7 regulations and manuals, allowable uses, and to what degree they are defined.

8 **Fire:** More areas at risk from fire, historic impacts of fire, geography and ecology conditions
9 influence the relationship with grazing use and systems.

10 **Realty, Energy, and Minerals:** Existing and potential mining operations, Rights-of-way, land
11 tenure, mineral resources, and demand influences activities that may be authorized in a permitted
12 livestock grazing allotment.

13 **Vegetation and Ecology:** Ecologic condition and potential of landscapes drive opportunities for
14 grazing and other uses. Functioning systems may increase opportunities, while nonfunctioning
15 systems may require treatments or other actions which support reduced, deferred, or rested areas.
16 Areas of invasive species (Category 6) or at risk of conversion (Category 5) may suggest certain
17 types of treatment or restoration needs.

18 **Grazing Management:** Alternative grazing systems that adhere to existing land use plan objectives
19 and policies would be considered, as well as the establishment of reserve common allotments, and/or
20 targeted grazing treatments. Existing and future evaluations of Standards of Rangeland Health form
21 the basis for future grazing management decisions to address issues. Custodial allotments are
22 typically small areas of public lands within larger privately owned areas and may suggest
23 opportunities for other uses. Whether a permitted area is a common (multiple permittees) or an
24 individual allotment influences both the impacts to the relinquished permit allocation and related
25 permits in the allotment.

26 **Recreation and Land Use:** Existing recreational activities, adjacency to other land ownerships
27 (including inholdings within the permitted area), opportunities for land acquisitions or exchange may
28 be considered in the decision for allocating resources.

29 **Social, Tribal and Community:** Historic and current communities depend on public land resources.
30 Changes in grazing have direct and indirect impacts to local communities socially and economically.
31 Traditional tribal uses would be recognized in making future allocation decisions. Social interests are
32 integral to recognize how changes in management may be balanced among protection or restoration
33 efforts and other allowable uses in the future.

34 **Physical Characteristics and Water:** Topography, water quality, riparian condition, and ecological
35 site potential would be used to recommend future management.

1 **2.5 Summary**

2 The PRMPA described above would guide management in the planning area. The environmental and
3 social impacts of the PRMPA and alternatives are analyzed in Chapter 3. Table 2-4 summarizes the
4 Management Direction for the PRMPA and provides a comparison of the land use planning allocations by
5 alternative. Table 3-2 in Chapter 3 provides a comparison of the environmental impacts of the
6 alternatives.

Table 2-4. Land Use Planning Allocations by alternative¹⁰.

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Summary</p>	<p>Continuation of existing management under the 2002 SEORMP and ROD, as amended, and as required by the 2010 Settlement Agreement. All proposed actions are analyzed to avoid diminishing or eliminating wilderness characteristics.</p>	<p>Reflects management under the 2002 SEORMP and ROD, as amended. The 2002 ROD did not provide specific management or protection of lands with wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>Alternative A would not propose additional land use planning-level resource protection for the wilderness characteristics resources.</p> <p>OHV Area Designations and Grazing Management are not amended.</p>	<p>Emphasize protection of all 76 wilderness characteristics units (excluding road boundary setbacks).</p> <p>All 76 wilderness characteristics units and all WSAs would be managed as Closed to OHV use.</p>	<p>Emphasize protection of twenty-seven (27) identified lands with wilderness characteristics (excluding boundary road setbacks) units). See Appendix C Alternatives C and D Methodologies for details on identifying units for protection under Alternative C.</p> <p>The twenty-seven (27) wilderness characteristics units would be managed as OHV Limited to existing roads and primitive routes for OHV.</p>	<p>Emphasize protection of thirty-three (33) identified lands with wilderness characteristics (excluding road boundary setbacks) units. See Appendix C - Alternatives C and D Methodologies for details on identifying units for protection under Alternative D.</p> <p>The thirty-three (33) wilderness characteristics units would be managed as OHV Limited to existing roads and primitive routes for OHV.</p>	<p>Emphasize protection of the thirty-three (33) identified lands with wilderness characteristics (excluding road boundary setbacks) units. The 33 units analyzed under Alternative D would be managed to emphasize protection of wilderness characteristics under this PRMPA.</p> <p>The thirty-three (33) wilderness characteristics units would be managed as OHV Limited to existing roads and primitive routes.</p> <p>Two areas near the city of Vale, Oregon would be retained as OHV Open.</p>

¹⁰ Unless otherwise specified, numbers refer to acres by land use allocation.

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Summary (Cont. 'd)</p>		<p>Livestock management would be carried forward as identified under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD, as amended.</p>	<p>Where the BLM determines existing livestock grazing practices are a significant causal factor in not meeting Standards for Rangeland Health, the BLM would suspend the grazing permit for the life of the RMP.</p> <p>When a grazing permit is voluntarily relinquished and pastures are within 2010 Settlement Agreement-specified management areas (Appendix A, Table A-2), the BLM would not re-allocate use to livestock grazing for the life of the RMP.</p>	<p>Permit renewal regarding existing livestock grazing practices as a significant causal factor would be managed as under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD.</p> <p>Processing voluntary relinquishment of a grazing permit same as the No Action Alternative. The BLM has clarified this process in this Alternative.</p>	<p>Where the BLM determines livestock grazing practices are a significant causal factor in not meeting Standards for Rangeland Health, the BLM would suspend the grazing permit until monitoring identifies the area is making significant progress toward meeting the standard.</p> <p>When a permit is voluntarily relinquished, and pastures overlap 2010 Settlement Agreement-specified management areas (Appendix A, Table A-4), the BLM would not re-allocate use to livestock grazing for the life of the RMP.</p>	<p>Permit renewal regarding existing livestock grazing practices as a significant causal factor would be managed as under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD.</p> <p>Processing voluntary relinquishment of a grazing permit and implementation of Oregon/Washington BLM implementation of Standards for Rangeland Health remain the same as the No Action Alternative.</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Units Identified to Prioritize Protection of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics¹¹</p> <p><i>(See Appendix B DEIS for protected unit summaries and maps)</i></p>	<p>Management under the 2010 Settlement Agreement would continue: all 76 units found to possess wilderness characteristics are managed to not permit any actions that would, “diminish the size or cause the entire BLM inventory unit to no longer meet the criteria for wilderness characteristics.”</p> <p>Boundary Road Setbacks: None</p> <p>Seventy-six (76) units protected for wilderness characteristics: 1,236,907 acres</p> <p>(Map WC 2: DEIS)</p>	<p>Management would not establish new land use planning-level direction to prioritize protection of wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>Boundary Road Setbacks: None</p> <p>No additional land use planning protections for wilderness characteristics</p> <p>(Map WC 1: DEIS)</p>	<p>All 76 units (excluding setbacks) determined by the BLM to possess wilderness characteristics would be managed to prioritize protection of those characteristics.</p> <p>Alternative A prioritizes all units with wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>Boundary Road Setbacks: 30,127 acres</p> <p>Seventy-six (76) units protected for wilderness characteristics: 1,206,780 acres</p> <p>(Map WC 3: DEIS)</p>	<p>27 identified units determined by the BLM to possess wilderness characteristics would be managed for those characteristics.</p> <p>Protection of units identified by applying BLM’s 2017 analysis methodology (see Appendix C Methodology).</p> <p>Boundary Road Setbacks: 5,714 acres</p> <p>Twenty-seven (27) units protected for wilderness characteristics: 167,709 acres</p> <p>(Map WC 4: DEIS)</p>	<p>33 units identified areas determined by the BLM to possess wilderness characteristics would be managed for those characteristics.</p> <p>Protection of units identified based on recommendations of the SEORAC (see Appendix C Methodology).</p> <p>Boundary Road Setbacks: 9,247 acres</p> <p>Thirty-three (33) units protected for wilderness characteristics: 417,196 acres</p> <p>(Map WC 5: DEIS)</p>	<p>33 units identified areas determined by the BLM to possess wilderness characteristics would be managed for those characteristics.</p> <p>Units analyzed for prioritized protection under Alternative D carried forward into the PRMPA.</p> <p>Boundary Road Setbacks: 9,247 acres</p> <p>Thirty-three (33) units protected for wilderness characteristics: 417,190 acres</p> <p>(Map WC 6)</p>

¹¹Appendix B in this RMPA/DEIS provides unit summaries for each protected unit.

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Off-highway Vehicle (OHV) Motorized Use</p>	<p>Continuation of existing management.</p>	<p>All wilderness characteristics units, including setbacks, and all WSAs, including Lands Adjacent (2002 SEORMP and ROD) would be assigned an OHV area designation of Closed to motorized vehicles. All existing primitive routes in these areas would be Closed to OHV use. Motorized access for authorized and administrative uses would be allowed.</p>	<p>All other areas currently managed as Open (cross-country motorized travel allowed) to OHV use would be managed as OHV Limited to existing roads and primitive routes.</p>	<p>Protected wilderness characteristics units, excluding setbacks, would be managed as Limited to existing routes, unless already managed as Closed to motorized vehicles. Existing OHV management under the 2002 SEORMP/ROD in setbacks would continue.</p> <p>Eight discrete areas in the northern portion of the planning area which are currently Open to OHV use would be retained as Open.</p> <p>All other areas currently managed as Open (cross-country motorized travel allowed) to OHV use would be managed as OHV Limited to existing roads and primitive routes.</p>	<p>Protected wilderness characteristics units, including setbacks, would be managed as Limited to existing primitive routes, unless already managed as Closed to motorized vehicles. OHV area designations in WSAs are unchanged (currently Limited in the 2002 SEORMP/ROD).</p> <p>All other public lands in the planning area would retain their current OHV designation as identified in the 2002 SEORMP, as amended.</p>	<p>Except as noted below, all currently OHV Open areas would be designated as OHV Limited, including protected wilderness characteristics units and their respective setbacks, unless already managed as Closed to motorized vehicles.</p> <p>40,368 acres would continue to be managed as OHV Open as identified in the 2002 SEORMP, as amended.</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
Off-highway Vehicle Motorized Use (Cont.'d)	OHV Area Allocations (acres) <i>Open: 359,869</i> <i>Limited: 4,265,748</i> <i>Closed to motorized vehicles: 15,829</i> Map OHV 1: DEIS)	OHV Area Allocations (acres) <i>Open: 0</i> <i>Limited: 2,127,604</i> <i>Closed to motorized vehicles: 2,513,842</i> Map OHV 2: DEIS)	OHV Area Allocations (acres) <i>Open: 107,075</i> <i>Limited: 4,518,539</i> <i>Closed to motorized vehicles: 15,829</i> Map OHV 3: DEIS)	OHV Area Allocations (acres) <i>Open: 325,686</i> <i>Limited: 4,299,928</i> <i>Closed to motorized vehicles: 15,829</i> Map OHV 4: DEIS)	OHV Area Allocations (acres) <i>Open: 40,368</i> <i>Limited: 4,585,249</i> <i>Closed to motorized vehicles: 15,829</i> Map OHV 5)	
Visual Resource Management (VRM) Classification	Continuation of existing management ¹² Acres of Visual Resource Management by Classification (acres) VRM Class I: 1,310,702 VRM Class II: 219,040 VRM Class III: 639,284	All lands with wilderness characteristics units (excluding setback areas) would be designated as Visual Resource Management Class II (unless currently managed as VRM Class I). Acres of Visual Resource Management by Classification (acres) VRM Class I: 1,310,702 VRM Class II: 1,291,381 VRM Class III: 490,445	Identified lands for prioritized protection of wilderness characteristics units (excluding setback areas) would be designated as Visual Resource Management Class II (unless currently managed as VRM Class I) Acres of Visual Resource Management by Classification (acres) VRM Class I: 1,310,702 VRM Class II: 350,315 VRM Class III: 617,779	Identified lands for prioritized protection of wilderness characteristics units (excluding setback areas) would be designated as Visual Resource Management Class II (unless currently managed as VRM Class I) Acres of Visual Resource Management by Classification (acres) VRM Class I: 1,310,702 VRM Class II: 578,361 VRM Class III: 600,543	Identified lands for prioritized protection of wilderness characteristics units (excluding setback areas) would be designated as Visual Resource Management Class II (unless currently managed as VRM Class I) Acres of Visual Resource Management by Classification (acres) VRM Class I: 1,310,702 VRM Class II: 578,361 VRM Class III: 600,543	

¹² VRM Class II objectives are defined as, “Retain the existing character of the landscape. Allow a low level of change that should not attract the attention of a casual observer.” All VRM class objectives are presented in the Visual Resource Management Section 3.7.16 of Chapter 3.

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
VRM Class <i>(Cont.,d)</i>	VRM Class IV: 2,472,520 (Map VRM 1: DEIS)	VRM Class IV: 1,549, 018 (Map VRM 2: DEIS)	VRM Class IV: 2,362,750 (Map VRM 3: DEIS)	VRM Class IV: 2,151,940 (Map VRM 4: DEIS)	VRM Class IV: 2,151,940 (Map VRM 5)	VRM Class IV: 2,151,940 (Map VRM 5)
Minerals -Leasable Minerals <i>CSU: Controlled Surface Use</i> <i>NSO: No Surface Occupancy</i>	<p><i>Unleased Minerals</i> Until the Amendment is completed, proposals for new leasable mineral development will not be implemented if the proposed action is deemed by the BLM to diminish the size or cause an entire BLM inventory unit to no longer meet the criteria for wilderness characteristics.</p> <p><i>Leased Minerals</i> Continuation of existing management under the 2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended.</p>	<p><i>Unleased Minerals</i> Continuation of existing management under the 2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended.</p> <p><i>Leased Minerals</i> Continuation of existing management under the 2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended.</p>	<p><i>Unleased Minerals</i> Where leasable minerals are currently unleased, identified areas managed to protect wilderness characteristics would have no surface occupancy (NSO) unless otherwise more restrictive (Closed to leasing). Continuation of existing management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended) within the setbacks.</p> <p><i>Leased Minerals</i> Where leasable minerals are currently leased, apply the following stipulations to all areas protected for wilderness characteristics: Apply reasonable conservation measures consistent with management of wilderness characteristics. Implement design features for management of wilderness characteristics to meet VRM Class II objectives. Require Master Development Plans for fluid minerals processing within areas managed for wilderness characteristics. Require unitization for fluid minerals when necessary for proper development.</p>	<p><i>Unleased Minerals</i> Where leasable minerals are currently unleased, identified areas managed to protect wilderness characteristics would have no surface occupancy (NSO) unless otherwise more restrictive (Closed to leasing). Continuation of existing management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended) within the setbacks.</p>	<p><i>Unleased Minerals</i> Same as Alternatives B, C and D for the 33 protected wilderness characteristics units proposed for protection under the PRMPA would be designated as NSO unless otherwise more restrictive (Closed to leasing). Continuation of existing management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended) within the setbacks. Approximately 148,420 additional acres in the planning area would be NSO above NA and A.</p> <p><i>Leased Minerals</i> Same as Alternatives B, C and D in areas protected for wilderness characteristics under the PRMPA. The same stipulations would apply in these areas.</p>	<p><i>Unleased Minerals</i> Same as Alternatives B, C and D for the 33 protected wilderness characteristics units proposed for protection under the PRMPA would be designated as NSO unless otherwise more restrictive (Closed to leasing). Continuation of existing management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended) within the setbacks. Approximately 148,420 additional acres in the planning area would be NSO above NA and A.</p> <p><i>Leased Minerals</i> Same as Alternatives B, C and D in areas protected for wilderness characteristics under the PRMPA. The same stipulations would apply in these areas.</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Leasable Minerals CSU: Controlled Surface Use NSO: No Surface Occupancy <i>(Cont. 'd)</i></p>	<p>Geophysical Exploration Until the Amendment is completed, proposals for new leasable mineral development will not be implemented if the proposed action is deemed by the BLM to diminish the size or cause an entire BLM inventory unit to no longer meet the criteria for wilderness characteristics.</p>	<p>Geophysical Exploration Continuation of existing management under the 2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended.</p>	<p>Identify areas where land acquisitions, including nonfederal mineral rights, may benefit management of wilderness characteristics. If such acquisition is determined to provide a benefit, proceed with acquisition process where appropriate. Continuation of existing management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended) within the setbacks.</p> <p>Geophysical Exploration The BLM would allow geophysical exploration in units managed to emphasize protection of their wilderness characteristics, with appropriate design features to meet VRM Class II objectives and in a manner consistent with the new objective for wilderness characteristics. Continuation of existing management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended) within the setbacks.</p>			<p>Geophysical Exploration Same as Alternatives B, C, and D in areas protected for wilderness characteristics under the PRMPA/FEIS.</p>
	<p>Leasable Mineral Allocations (acres) No Lease: 1,288,440 NSO: 1,767,976 CSU: 1,800,450 Open: 145,411 (MAP MIN 7: DEIS)</p>	<p>Leasable Mineral Allocations (acres) No Lease: 1,288,440 NSO: 1,767,976 CSU: 1,800,450 Open: 145,411 (MAP MIN 7: DEIS)</p>	<p>Leasable Mineral Allocations (acres) No Lease: 1,288,440 NSO: 2,246,378 CSU: 1,339,355 Open: 128,104 (MAP MIN 12: DEIS)</p>	<p>Leasable Mineral Allocations (acres) No Lease: 1,288,440 NSO: 1,853,091 CSU: 1,715,378 Open: 145,368 (MAP MIN 8: DEIS)</p>	<p>Leasable Mineral Allocations (acres) No Lease: 1,288,440 NSO: 1,916,396 CSU: 1,662,995 Open: 134,446 (MAP MIN 13: DEIS)</p>	<p>Leasable Mineral Allocations (acres) No Lease: 1,288, 440 NSO: 1,916,396 CSU: 1,662,995 Open: 134,446 (MAP MIN 17)</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Saleable Minerals</p> <p><i>CSU: Controlled Surface Use</i></p>	<p>Until the Amendment is completed, proposals for new saleable mineral development will not be implemented if the proposed action is deemed by the BLM to diminish the size or cause an entire BLM inventory unit to no longer meet the criteria for wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>If visual impairment criteria are met, these areas would remain open to free use permits and sales in existing designated pits and common use areas.</p>	<p>Continuation of existing management under the 2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended.</p>	<p>All identified units managed to prioritize protection of their wilderness characteristics would be Closed to new mineral material sales. If visual impairment criteria are met, these areas would remain open to free use permits as well as sales in existing designated pits and common use areas.</p> <p>Continuation of existing management (2002 SEORMP and ROD as amended) within the setbacks.</p>			
	<p>Saleable Mineral Allocations (acres): Closed: 3,033,405 Open, CSU: 1,399,733 Open: 540,739</p> <p>(MAP MIN 9: DEIS)</p>	<p>Saleable Mineral Allocations (acres): Closed: 3,033,405 Open CSU: 1,399,733 Open: 540,739</p> <p>(MAP MIN 9: DEIS)</p>	<p>Saleable Mineral Allocations (acres) Closed: 3,511,664 Open CSU: 962,901 Open: 499,312</p> <p>(MAP MIN 14: DEIS)</p>	<p>Saleable Mineral Allocations (acres): Closed: 3,120,353 Open CSU: 1,314,045 Open: 539,480</p> <p>(MAP MIN 10: DEIS)</p>	<p>Saleable Mineral Allocations (acres): Closed: 3,183,104 Open CSU: 1,262,725 Open: 528,048</p> <p>(MAP MIN 15: DEIS)</p>	<p>Saleable Mineral Allocations (acres): Closed: 3,183,104 Open CSU: 1,262,725 Open: 528,048</p> <p>(MAP MIN 18)</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Land Tenure Zone Category</p>	<p>Continuation of existing management</p> <p>Land Tenure Zone (acres)</p> <p>Zone 1—(Retention/Acquisition): 4,578,352 Zone 2—(Exchange): 52,302 Zone 3—(Disposal): 10,785 (MAP LAND 1: DEIS)</p>	<p>Continuation of existing management</p> <p>Land Tenure Zone (acres)</p> <p>Same as No Action</p> <p>(MAP LAND 1: DEIS)</p>	<p>76 units prioritized for protection of wilderness characteristics would be categorized as Land Tenure Zone 1 (Retention in Public Ownership)</p> <p>Land Tenure Zone (acres)</p> <p>Zone 1—(Retention/Acquisition): 4,578,556 Zone 2—(Exchange): 52,302 Zone 3—(Disposal): 10,581 (MAP LAND 2: DEIS)</p>	<p>27 units prioritized for protection of wilderness characteristics would be categorized as Land Tenure Zone 1 (Retention in Public Ownership)</p> <p>Land Tenure Zone (acres)</p> <p>Same as No Action</p> <p>(MAP LAND 1: DEIS)</p>	<p>33 units prioritized for protection of wilderness characteristics would be categorized as Land Tenure Zone 1 (Retention in Public Ownership)</p> <p>Land Tenure Zone (acres)</p> <p>Same as No Action</p> <p>(MAP LAND 1: DEIS)</p>	<p>33 units prioritized for protection of wilderness characteristics would be categorized as Land Tenure Zone 1 (Retention in Public Ownership)</p> <p>Land Tenure Zone (acres)</p> <p>Same as No Action</p> <p>(MAP LAND 19)</p>
<p>Rights-of-way (ROW) Authorizations</p>	<p>New surface disturbing ROWs would not be allowed in lands with wilderness characteristics units if the action would diminish or eliminate the characteristics. New ROWs could be co-located within existing authorized</p>	<p>Continuation of existing management</p>	<p>76 units managed to prioritize protection of wilderness characteristics would be designated as Exclusion Areas for new ROWs for “major” ROWs, and commercial solar and wind development.</p>	<p>27 units managed to prioritize protection of wilderness characteristics would be designated as Exclusion Areas for new ROWs for “major” (as defined by the 2015 GRSG ARMPA) ROWs, and commercial solar and wind development.</p>	<p>33 units managed to prioritize protection of wilderness characteristics would be designated as Exclusion Areas for new ROWs for “major” (as defined by the 2015 GRSG ARMPA) ROWs, and commercial solar and wind development.</p>	<p>33 units managed to prioritize protection of wilderness characteristics would be designated as Exclusion Areas for new ROWs for “major” (as defined by the 2015 GRSG ARMPA) ROWs, and commercial solar and wind development.</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Rights-of-way Authorizations (Cont. 'd)</p>	<p>ROWs with design features (for example, buried utilities) along boundaries of the unit.</p> <p>Rights-of-way Allocations (acres) <i>Major Rights-of-way</i> Open: 436,569</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 4,065,070</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p> <p>(MAP LAND 3: DEIS)</p> <p><i>Minor Rights-of-way</i> Open: 1,584,022</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 2,917,617</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p>	<p>Rights-of-way Allocations (acres) <i>Major Rights-of-way</i> Open: 436,569</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 4,065,070</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p> <p>(MAP LAND 3: DEIS)</p> <p><i>Minor Rights-of-way</i> Open: 1,584,022</p> <p>Existing Corridor Designation: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 2,917,617</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p>	<p>Designate these units as Avoidance Areas for “minor” ROWs and communication sites.</p> <p>Rights-of-way Allocations (acres) <i>Major Rights-of-way</i> Open: 391,287</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 2,875,699</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 1,279,492</p> <p>(MAP LAND 4: DEIS)</p> <p><i>Minor Rights-of-way</i> Open: 1,101,635</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 3,400,004</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p>	<p>Designate these units as Avoidance Areas for “minor” ROWs and communication sites.</p> <p>Rights-of-way Allocations (acres) <i>Major Rights-of-way:</i> Open: 435,284</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 3,894,027</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 217,166</p> <p>(MAP LAND 5: DEIS)</p> <p><i>Minor Rights-of-way</i> Open: 1,499,019</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 3,002,619</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p>	<p>Designate these units as Avoidance Areas for “minor” ROWs and communication sites.</p> <p>Rights-of-way Allocations (acres) <i>Major Rights-of-way:</i> Open: 423,275</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 3,652,854</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 470,349</p> <p>(MAP LAND 6: DEIS)</p> <p><i>Minor Rights-of-way</i> Open: 1,428,928</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 3,072,711</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p>	<p>Designate these units as Avoidance Areas for “minor” ROWs and communication sites.</p> <p>Rights-of-way Allocations (acres) <i>Major Rights-of-way:</i> Open: 423,275</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 3,652,854</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 470,349</p> <p>(MAP LAND 20)</p> <p><i>Minor Rights-of-way</i> Open: 1,428,928</p> <p>Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967</p> <p>Avoidance Areas: 3,072,711</p> <p>Exclusion Areas: 44,839</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
Rights-of-way Authorizations <i>(Cont. 'd)</i>	(MAP LAND 7: DEIS) <i>Commercial Solar Development</i> Open: 436,569 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 3,073,267 Exclusion Areas: 1,036,642	(MAP LAND 7: DEIS) <i>Commercial Solar Development</i> Open: 436,569 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 3,073,267 Exclusion Areas: 1,036,642	(MAP LAND 8: DEIS) <i>Commercial Solar Development</i> Open: 436,569 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 3,073,267 Exclusion Areas: 1,036,642	(MAP LAND 9: DEIS) <i>Commercial Solar Development</i> Open: 435,284 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,939,802 Exclusion Areas: 1,171,392	(MAP LAND 10: DEIS) <i>Commercial Solar Development</i> Open: 423,275 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,852,432 Exclusion Areas: 1,270,771	(MAP LAND 21) <i>Commercial Solar Development</i> Open: 423,275 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,852,432 Exclusion Areas: 1,270,771
	(MAP LAND 11: DEIS) <i>Commercial Wind Development</i> Open: 436,565 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,240,892 Exclusion Areas: 1,869,021	(MAP LAND 11: DEIS) <i>Commercial Wind Development</i> Open: 436,565 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,240,892 Exclusion Areas: 1,869,021	(MAP LAND 12: DEIS) <i>Commercial Wind Development</i> Open: 391,283 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 1,406,133 Exclusion Areas: 2,749,062	(MAP LAND 13: DEIS) <i>Commercial Wind Development</i> Open: 435,281 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,107,428 Exclusion Areas: 2,003,769	(MAP LAND 14: DEIS) <i>Commercial Wind Development</i> Open: 423,272 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,020,059 Exclusion Areas: 2,103,148	(MAP LAND 22) <i>Commercial Wind Development</i> Open: 423,272 Existing designated ROW corridor: 94,967 Avoidance Areas: 2,020,059 Exclusion Areas: 2,103,148
	(MAP LAND 15: DEIS)	(MAP LAND 15: DEIS)	(MAP LAND 16: DEIS)	(MAP LAND 17: DEIS)	(MAP LAND 18: DEIS)	(MAP LAND 23)

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Standards for Rangeland Health</p>	<p>Continuation of Existing Management Standards for Rangeland Health: the BLM shall take appropriate action in accordance with 43 CFR § 4180.2 upon determining that existing grazing management practices or levels of grazing use on public lands are significant factors in failing to achieve the standards and conform with the guidelines for livestock grazing management for public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the states of Oregon and Washington.</p>		<p>Where existing grazing practices are determined by the BLM to be a significant causal factor for nonattainment of the Standards for Rangeland Health, the BLM would suspend term grazing permits, either at the allotment or pasture scale, for the <u>duration of the plan.</u></p>	<p>Same as the No Action Alternative and Alternative A.</p>	<p>Where existing grazing practices are determined by the BLM to be a significant causal factor for nonattainment of the Standards for Rangeland Health, the BLM would suspend term grazing permits, either at the allotment or pasture scale, for the <u>duration of the term permit (10 years) or until monitoring indicates significant progress toward meeting Standards for Rangeland Health.</u></p>	<p>Same as the No Action Alternative and Alternatives A and C with additional Management Direction incorporated to address both when Standards are not being achieved regardless of causal factor(s) and when a current Rangeland Health Assessment/Evaluation is not available.</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Receipt of Voluntary Permit Relinquishment from Permittee</p>	<p>Continuation of Existing Management: Relinquishment by a permittee of any grazing permit within the planning area would be processed in accordance with WO IM 2013-184 (BLM 2013b) or subsequent IMs, handbooks, or manual guidance.</p>		<p>When a grazing permit is voluntarily relinquished and any part of the permitted area overlaps one or more 2010 Settlement Agreement-identified management areas (listed below), grazing use would not be re-allocated for the permitted portion of the affected pasture(s) and therefore not authorized for the duration of the plan. The permit would only be affected for pasture(s) overlapping the listed areas. Grazing would be reduced by the total AUMs of the affected pasture(s) in the relinquished permit(s) when such actions occur in common allotments.</p>	<p>Same as No Action and Alternative A with the addition of further management direction that the permit relinquishment process uses an identified set of resource considerations as a baseline (see Table A-3, Appendix A) when evaluating the compatibility of continuing to permit livestock grazing if a grazing permit is relinquished.</p>	<p>When a grazing permit is voluntarily relinquished and any part of the permitted area overlaps one or more 2010 Settlement Agreement-identified management areas listed below, grazing use would not be re-allocated for the permitted part of the affected pasture(s) and therefore would not authorize for the duration of the plan. The permit would only be affected for pasture(s) overlapping of the listed area(s). Grazing would be reduced by the total AUMs of the affected pasture(s) in the relinquished permit(s) when such actions occur in common allotments.</p>	<p>As with the No Action Alternative and Alternatives A and C, relinquishment by a permittee of any grazing permit within the planning area would be processed in accordance with WO IM 2013-184 (BLM 2013b) or subsequent IMs, handbooks, or manual guidance. The PRMPA also incorporates specific resources and resource uses identified under Alternative C for consideration upon receipt of a relinquished permit.</p> <p>Further, upon receipt of a voluntary permit relinquishment, BLM would review compatibility of livestock grazing use with other existing resources in the permitted area. Based on competing resources or other opportunities (see Table 2-3 and resource list which follows), the BLM could wholly or partially: designate an area as unavailable to livestock grazing, create a reserve common allotment, and/or only allow livestock grazing for vegetation treatments (e.g., targeted, or prescriptive grazing). This management direction would apply across the entire planning area.</p> <p>The resource considerations in Table 2-3 would be evaluated in all cases where a voluntary relinquishment of a grazing permit is received by the BLM. National BLM guidance on processing permit relinquishments requires the BLM to consider “other resource uses”. See</p>

Land Use Allocation or Management Action	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment
<p>Receipt of Voluntary Permit Relinquishment from Permittee <i>(Cont. 'd)</i></p>			<p><u>2010 Settlement Agreement-identified management areas:</u></p> <p>National Conservation Lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Wild and Scenic Rivers --Wilderness Study Areas --National Historic Trails <p>Other Identified Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Areas of Critical Environmental Concern --Research Natural Areas --Designated Critical Habitat (<i>Endangered Species Act, ESA</i>) --Lands with wilderness characteristics 		<p><u>2010 Settlement Agreement-identified management areas:</u></p> <p>National Conservation Lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Wild and Scenic Rivers --Wilderness Study Areas --National Historic Trails 	<p>Appendix G, Figure G-4 for a summary of this process under the PRMPA.</p> <p>The resource considerations, and the degree to which grazing is compatible or in conflict with these resources, would be evaluated through a NEPA analysis. The BLM would provide the rationale for how these resource considerations were addressed in an allocation decision. This decision would establish the allocation of forage resources for the life of the plan; additional land use planning-level analysis would not be required. If livestock grazing is found to be incompatible, the forage allocation could be made to another resource. If grazing is found to be compatible with the other resource considerations, then the area would remain available to livestock grazing and/or be designated as a reserve common allotment.</p>