U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Medford District Office
3040 Biddle Road
Medford, Oregon 97504

September 2003

Record of Decision, Medford District Resource Management Plan Amendment in the Kelsey Whisky Landscape Management Area

As the Nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering the wisest use of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places, and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The Department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to assure that their development is in the best interest of all our people. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in Island Territories under U.S. administration.

BLM/OR/WA/PL-03/046+1792

Record of Decision, Medford District Resource Management Plan Amendment in the Kelsey Whisky Landscape Management Area

Introduction

The March 2003 Kelsey Whisky Landscape Plan and Resource Management Plan Amendment and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) presented an array of proposals that would implement management direction from the Medford District Resource Management Plan (RMP). The FEIS document proposed amendments to the off-highway-vehicle restriction components of the transportation system plan (Preferred Alternative). The project area is within the 104,000 acre Wild Rogue Watershed, with the Wild Rogue Wilderness to the west, the Rogue Wild and Scenic River Corridor through the center, designated critical habitat for northern spotted owls and marbled murrelets, Late-Successional Reserve, and two connectivity/diversity blocks. The area is located about 26 miles northwest of Grants Pass, Oregon. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages most of the watershed. The public lands within the FEIS area are designated as Oregon and California (O&C) lands.

Medford Resource Management Plan Amendment Decisions

The decision amends the Medford District Resource Management Plan by adding off-highway vehicle (OHV) restrictions to the transportation system plan for a total reduction of 16.6 miles through road decommissioning and road closures with gates and barricades. In addition, 21.2 miles of existing roads would be improved or reconstructed and 1.5 miles of temporary roads authorized to facilitate transportation and management for other potential actions in the area.

We determined there was no immediate need to designate any Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) to provide for habitat connectivity. We also determined there was no need to pursue changing land use allocations and subsequent management of the area generally referred to as the Zane Grey area.

Multiple projects are expected to be approved in subsequent decision documents to implement management actions over a period of 5-7 years including, fuels management areas and types of treatments, forest health projects and treatments, wildlife habitat enhancement projects and commercial timber sales.

Policies and Procedures Remaining in Effect and Sequential Decisions to be Made Later

1) *Statutory requirements*. BLM has a legal responsibility to comply with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Oregon and California (O&C) Sustained Yield Act of 1937, the Endangered

Species Act of 1973, the Wilderness Act 1964, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, the Clean Air Act of 1967 and other applicable statutes, Executive Orders, regulations, manuals and handbooks.

2) *National Policy.* BLM also has an administrative obligation to conform with current national policies or procedures regarding program development and coordination or for individual resources or uses.

3) *Funding levels and program activity or project funding allocations.* These are determined annually at the national level and are beyond the control of the field office. It is assumed that funding will be available to fully implement the changes in land use allocations and subordinate projects or activities. It is anticipated that the majority of these projects will be completed within 5-7 years, however the implementation could be longer if funding is limited.

4) *Wilderness Inventory and Study Area Review Procedures and Policy.* No Resource Management Plan amendment or revision is warranted to consider wilderness characteristics or potential Congressional consideration of special designations for the Zane Grey Area.

Resource or Bureau program activity or project decisions are not generally appropriate at the RMP level of Bureau planning and are not be included in this Record of Decision. Examples of these types of decisions include fuels treatments as described below.

5) *Forest health treatments*. Fuels management areas and types of treatments, forest health projects and treatments, wildlife habitat enhancement projects will become effective upon final approval of subsequent Record(s) of Decision. This Record of Decision only identifies areas and potential treatments.

6) *Timber Sale Decisions.* Timber sale decisions become effective upon notice of sale. This record of decision only identifies areas and treatments that are potential future timber sales.

Plan Decisions and Alternatives Considered

The Medford District Resource Management Plan, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is amended by approving and implementing the applicable portions of the proposed action, as described in Alternative 1 in the FEIS. This RMP Amendment was prepared under the regulations implementing the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 CFR Part 1600) and in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969.

We considered a number of alternatives for evaluation during the Landscape Planning process. Several were eliminated from further study. The FEIS includes a brief description of these alternatives and the reasons for their elimination from further study on page 2-4. Included in that section is a discussion of whether BLM should consider

designation of wilderness or provide some other protective designation in the planning area. We determined, however, that this was a level of planning that the EIS should not encompass.

Four alternatives were considered for detailed analysis. These are summarized below. A more detailed description of the alternatives can be found in the FEIS on pages 2-3 to 2-27.

Alternative 1 adds off-highway vehicle restrictions to the transportation plan for a total reduction of 16.6 miles through road decommissioning and road closures with gates and barricades, as identified in the FEIS on pages 2-5, A-37 through A-41, and on map # 4. In addition, 21.2 miles of existing roads would be improved or reconstructed and 1.5 miles of temporary roads authorized to facilitate transportation and management for other actions in the area. Approximately 7.4 miles of road would require re-establishing the original road prism. No ACEC would be designated.

In subsequent projects or implementation activities, subject to sequential decision-making, this alternative emphasizes implementation of timber harvest objectives for Matrix lands, and is consistent with the objective to provide a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products. Up to approximately 12 MMBF could be harvested, 5,000-6000 acres of fuels treatments, forest health projects and wildlife habitat enhancement projects (as described in the FEIS table S-2 and provided for reference in this document as table R-2).

Alternative 2 adds off-highway vehicle restrictions to the transportation plan for a total reduction of 16.6 miles through road decommissioning and road closures with gates and barricades, as identified in the FEIS on pages 2-5, A-37 through A-41, and on map # 5. In addition, 21.2 miles of existing roads would be improved or reconstructed and 1.9 miles of temporary roads authorized to facilitate transportation and management for other actions in the area. Approximately 7.4 miles of road would require outsloping and waterdips rather than re-establishing the original road prism.

Under this alternative, there would be a change in RMP guidance for late successional forest in approximately one half of the East Fork Whisky Creek subwatershed through designation of a new 1,677 acre Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). Designation of an ACEC would require an amendment of the RMP management guidelines for a specific portion of General Forest Management Area by eliminating scheduled timber harvest, commercial thinning, road building, fuels treatments, and modifying fire response actions. The proposed ACEC would also provide restrictions on leasable energy and mineral resources, utility transmission corridors or sites and special use permits.

In subsequent projects or implementation activities, subject to sequential decision-making, this alternative emphasizes implementation of timber harvest objectives for Matrix lands, and is consistent with the objective to provide a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products. Up to approximately 9 MMBF could be harvested,

5,000-6,000 acres of fuels treatments, forest health projects and wildlife habitat enhancement projects (as described in the FEIS table S-2 and provided for reference in this document as table R-2). This alternative also emphasizes implementation of the RMP with timber harvest on Matrix lands, with modifications from timber harvest in Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 or the continued existing management direction strategy, would make no changes in off-highway vehicle restrictions to the transportation plan, and there would be no road decommissioning, no road closures with gates and barricades, no improvements or reconstruction of existing roads or any authorization for temporary roads to facilitate transportation and management for other actions in the area.

RMP related routine management actions would continue to occur, including fire suppression, road maintenance and plantation maintenance. Planning for RMP implementation actions would be ongoing in the Resource Area, and would include the Wild Rogue North Watershed. The opportunity for timber harvest, fuels treatments and forest health treatments in this watershed would continue to be a viable option for future entries.

Alternative 4 adds off-highway vehicle restrictions to the transportation plan for a total reduction of 22.8 miles through road decommissioning and road closures with gates (but no use of barricades), as identified in the FEIS. In addition, 31.5 miles of existing roads would be improved or reconstructed, including 10.3 miles of paved backcountry byway routes. No temporary roads are proposed to facilitate transportation and management for other actions in the area. Approximately 7.4 miles of road would require outsloping and waterdips rather than re-establishing the original road prism.

Under this alternative, there would be a change in RMP guidance for late successional forest in the East Fork Whisky Creek subwatershed through designation of a new 2,844 acre Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). Designation of an ACEC would require an amendment of the RMP management guidelines for a specific portion of General Forest Management Area by eliminating scheduled timber harvest, commercial thinning, road building, fuels treatments, and modifying fire response actions. The proposed ACEC would also provide restrictions on leasable energy and mineral resources, utility transmission corridors or sites and special use permits.

In subsequent projects or implementation activities, subject to sequential decision-making, this alternative emphasizes that planned commercial timber harvest would be implemented only where it would benefit wildlife habitat, fuels management or forest health. Up to approximately 3.9 MMBF could be harvested, 5,000-6,000 acres of fuels treatments, forest health projects and wildlife habitat enhancement projects (as described in the FEIS table S-2 and provided for reference in this document as table R-2). This alternative emphasizes non-commercial forest health treatment and change in RMP guidance for late successional forest in the East Fork Whisky Creek subwatershed and proposes a new Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), with ACEC management restrictions similar to those for the ACEC in Alternative 2.

Environmental Preferability of the Alternatives

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ, 1981) judges environmental preferability using the criteria in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and subsequent guidance. The CEQ has defined the environmentally preferable alternative as the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in Section 101 of the NEPA. This section lists six broad policy goals for all Federal plans, programs, and policies:

1) Fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
2) Assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
3) Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
4) Preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
5) Achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and
6) Enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

Based on these criteria, identification of the most environmentally preferable alternative involves a balancing of current and potential resource uses with that of resource protection. Although the RMP amendment actions are essentially limited to transportation system planning and consideration of potential special areas, the decisions are intended to facilitate and complement other anticipated long-term forest health and commercial harvest activities within the landscape area in conformance with the intent of the existing Medford RMP. When viewed as a composite set of actions, all four alternatives fulfill CEQ policy goal #1 with different emphases and associated risks from actions and inactions. All three “action” alternatives modify the identified local surroundings of the planning area (CEQ goal #2) with minimal, if any effects, on human safety, and health. However, the level of facilitated and anticipated commercial productivity and associated employment opportunities may be considered, by some people, to be inversely proportional to the adverse effects on the esthetics and cultural values of the area. The four alternatives provide and document a diverse range of beneficial uses of the environment, with the associated impacts to the environment and other CEQ goal #3 consequences.

Resource uses that are dependent on an improved transportation system could provide for higher standards of living from commodity production or local economic benefits from timber harvests and forest health treatments. Impacts would vary in proportion to acres treated and volume sold, with the greatest benefits under CEQ goals #5 and #6 under alternative 1, then the lesser amounts, in descending order, under alternatives 2, 4 and 3.

At the potential project level, benefits and impacts from the timber harvests and prescribed or assumed harvest methods are proportional to acres by alternative, but include various design features to minimize adverse effects under CEQ goals #2-4. None of the CEQ goals specifically mentions habitat connectivity or scarcity, but it could be inferred from all of the goal statements. The Rationale for the Decision section below indicates the significance of the alternative impacts and suggests that in this area, given existing conditions, all of the alternatives provide for habitat values, with the treatments, or lack thereof, creating both opportunities and risks for the future. Given all six CEQ goals, we find that alternative 1 provides the best overall transportation system in support of our forest health treatment strategy and is the environmentally preferred alternative.

Management Considerations

Rationale for the Decision

The purposes and needs for the actions identified in the FEIS were expressed in the form of issues and are listed below: (FEIS pg 1-6).

1. There is a growing need for RMP implementation management actions to reduce fuel hazard in the planning area to avoid large losses of valuable resources. The planning area has many high value resources, including late-successional forest providing habitat for late successional affiliated species, connectivity/diversity blocks, habitat for federally listed threatened or endangered species, riparian reserves, commercial timber lands and recreation areas.

2. In order to meet annual forest management requirements, the Glendale Resource Area needs to develop and implement plans for harvesting trees, restoring sites, conducting forest health treatments, and reducing fire hazards.

3. There is a need to maintain late successional forest in the watershed to aid in the short term viability of affiliated species and connectivity between Late Successional Reserves. Designation of an Area of Critical Environmental Concern would limit impacts to late successional forest.

4. To support access for fire response and timber harvest/silvicultural treatments, and to improve the quality of the environment, the BLM needs to maintain or improve existing roads and consider construction of new roads or closing roads. Portions of the watershed have high road densities and others have none. Portions of the road system were constructed for timber harvest or primary access and are no longer needed. Some of the public stressed the importance of maintaining area without roads or other developments to support recreation, wildlife and aesthetic values.

The rationale for selecting Alternative 1 is based on factors primarily relating to the Resource Management Plan implementation portion of the FEIS. The transportation system in Alternative 1 provides access to areas for timber harvest and fuels treatments, while also reducing road density and access to roads to provide for habitat values. Alternative 1 provides an overall forest management strategy that both supplies timber to the market and addresses the needs of the ecosystem.

Alternative 3, the no-action alternative, does not meet three out of four of the needs. The no-action alternative does not provide a means to reduce fuel hazards; over time additional fuels will accumulate, increasing the risk of losing valuable resources through fire. Annual forest management requirements would not be met, either through harvest, thinning, density management, or fuels treatments. Habitat connectivity would be maintained at its current level. Road conditions would continue to deteriorate although some will grow over and blend in with the adjoining landscape. Erosion from road deterioration would become more apparent over time.

All three action alternatives meet the purpose and need identified above to various degrees.

Most of the roads to be closed are short dead-end spurs, with the exception of a portion of the Dutch Henry road system. Under Alternative 1 there would be a net decrease in miles of permanent roads throughout the Kelsey Whisky planning area. Approximately 9.7 miles of existing road would be decommissioned. New gates and road barriers would be constructed to close off an additional 7.6 miles to public motor vehicle use.

Restoring sites (Issue 2) and supporting silvicultural treatments through closing roads (Issue 4) would occur with road closure and decommissioning in Alternatives 1 and 2 which include identical road closure treatments, and Alternative 4 which includes an increased number of miles decommissioned (13.6) and miles closed with gates (9.2), and zero miles closed with barricades. Annual forest management requirements (Issue 2) includes timber harvest, with the highest volume in Alternative 1, approximately half in Alternative 2, and approximately one third in Alternative 4.

The actions meet the purpose and need since the natural hydrologic conditions would be improved within the watershed through subsoiling, outsloping and waterbarring, which "…restore the natural hydrologic functions of infiltration and dispersed runoff into natural drainages." (FEIS pg 4-6, 4-7). A positive effect would also be to return some acres to timber production, although the return of roadbed to timber production "…would be incremental and of little significance by itself. Added to roads already closed and future roads that can be expected to be closed over time, there may be some cumulative benefit over the long term (FEIS pg 4-15)." From a habitat perspective, a small increment towards accelerated development of late successional habitat would be realized with the reduction of 9.7 miles of road through decommissioning but there would also be a negative potential for limiting access for fire response (FEIS pg 4-25).

In consideration of the actions proposed in the Kelsey Whisky Landscape Management Plan, there were two substantive areas of concern identified by the public. The first was the concern over changing from Alternative 2 as the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS to the higher timber volume Alternative 1, in apparent disregard for the wildlife habitat needs. The BLM examined this issue thoroughly and found sufficient justification to reconsider and reselect the Preferred Alternative.

The FEIS indicates in several places that all three action alternatives would affect wildlife habitats, and acknowledges the concerns for habitat connectivity identified the watershed analysis. The final EIS, on pages 4-19 to 4-25 addresses potential effects on Late Successional Habitat. The section 4.7.1 introduction notes "*At the landscape scale of the fifth-field watershed, none of the alternatives would have large direct adverse effects on late successional habitat.*" The subsequent sections explain the concepts of connectivity and fragmentation and anticipated impacts by alternative. Although the scale of effects is primarily analyzed at the 5th and 6th field watershed scale, localized impacts in subwatersheds are discussed, beginning on page 4-21, section 4.7.3.1. Impacts projected for Alternative 1 identify the East Fork Kelsey subwatershed as the location that would experience the greatest amount of disturbance to late-successional affiliates as a result of 308 acres of regeneration harvest. This level of harvest represents approximately 9% of the existing mature or old growth forest (3422 acres) in the 3,993 acre East Fork Kelsey Creek sub-watershed. Post harvest there would continue to be a substantial amount (3,114 acres) of the area remaining in mature and old growth forest for habitat connectivity. The impacts are minor and many of the treatment acres, aside from timber sale acres, are designed to enhance long term forest health, favor sugar pines, and meet RMP and Northwest Forest Plan objectives for connectivity. Section 4.7.10 provides a *Summary of effects on late-successional habitat and species,* and while acknowledging cumulative effects, also notes the remaining sub-watershed late successional reserve forests will support both habitation and movement of late-successional species.

The EIS further goes on to discuss movement between LSRs on page 4-35, Section 4.9.1.2. The Cool Springs Spotted Owl Activity Center would experience negligible effects relative to dispersal between the Galice-Fishhook LSR and the Galesville-South Umpqua LSR.

There would be some effects to habitat corridors and connectivity, but the cumulative effects of the overall landscape plan and individual projects are consistent with the Medford RMP. We will adopt and implement any required terms and conditions which are identified in the biological opinions issued in the consultations under the Endangered Species Act.

The second concern identified by the public was that The East Fork Whisky Creek sub-watershed be protected with the larger (Alternative 4) Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation. This subwatershed has no proposed harvests or fuel treatments identified under any of the alternatives. The analysis of environmental consequences did not reveal any detrimental effects from this project since there are no planned vegetative treatments in this area. The BLM would have the same opportunity to examine the habitat and connectivity aspects identified in the watershed analysis when future entries into the Wild Rogue Watershed are proposed. Under the Preferred Alternative in the FEIS, the area remains unroaded, with no scheduled commercial harvests or fuels treatments.

While we concur there could be some modest level of protective management direction from changes in minerals and energy resources or utility corridor related land use

allocations if the proposed ACEC were to be designated, there are no significant or immediate adverse effects from the subject landscape area plan and no individual projects are planned which would diminish future opportunities for management. There is, therefore, no need to amend the RMP with the designation of an ACEC.

Mitigation Measures

The BLM prepared an Environmental Impact Statement for this project because of the sensitivity of the area to the interested public. The Kelsey Whisky landscape planning area encompasses the Wild Rogue Watershed and includes designated critical habitat for northern spotted owls and marbled murrelets, a Late-Successional Reserve, and two connectivity/diversity blocks. The watershed borders the Wild Rogue Wilderness to the west, and has a portion of the Rogue Wild and Scenic River Corridor through the center of the planning area. Any project proposed in this area generates public controversy, and BLM believed that the purposes of NEPA would be best served by preparing an environmental impact statement to address any possible environmental concerns to the public. However, the analysis of the minor amendments proposed for this portion of the project does not show any major impact of environmental concern. Furthermore, the proposed action already has incorporated into the design of the project alternatives design features that would minimize impacts (see FEIS section 2.3.4). For example, all alternatives include seasonal work restrictions in relation to stream channel activity, restricted locations for equipment refueling, and temporary work suspension when soil saturation on roads threatens excessive stream sedimentation.

Public Involvement in the Planning Process

The Kelsey Whisky planning involved the public through three public scoping meetings in June, July and October, 1999; through accepting comments on development of alternatives and analysis of effects through March, 2001; through a 90-day comment period for the Draft EIS from April 12 through July 12, 2002; and through a 30 day protest/comment period for the Final EIS from April 21 through March 21, 2003. BLM received comments from the scoping as well as the two document review processes (DEIS: 145 comments; FEIS: 48 comments. The comments from the DEIS were evaluated and incorporated when revising the EIS text. The evaluation of the comments is included in the FEIS as Appendix 15 (also available on CD and at www.or.blm.gov/Medford under planning documents).

Two protests dealing with the exclusion of the ACEC from the Preferred Alternative were filed with the Director of the BLM and were resolved in July 2003. From the protests the Director identified two major issues which concerned maintaining a late successional corridor, and inconsistency with the purpose and need by not designating an ACEC. The Director found the cumulative effects to be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Medford RMP and the Northwest Forest Plan and would not diminish future opportunities for management.

Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service was conducted under Section 7, of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Two programmatic consultations provided terms and conditions.

-USDI and USDA. 2001. Rogue River/South Coast FY 01/02/03 Timber Sale Projects for Medford District, BLM, and Rogue River and Siskiyou National Forests, Biological Assessment 18 July, 2001, and Biological Opinion 12 October, 2001. Portland, OR.

-USDI and USDA. 1996. Rogue River/South Coast biological assessment for FY97/98 timber sale projects, and FY97-05 for all other projects. Grants Pass, OR.

Consultation with NOAA Fisheries was conducted and a letter of concurrence was received February 4, 2003 assessing impacts to Southern Oregon/Northern California coho salmon.

Tribal Participation

Under Federal law and regulations, consultation with Native American Tribes who have an interest in the planning area is required. There are no areas within the Kelsey Whisky EIS Planning Area that are known to be currently important as Native American religious sites or are in use for traditional purposes at this time.

Managers' Findings and Recommendations

We find the planning and analysis process as well as the resulting land use allocations and resource management directions have been developed and will be implemented in a manner consistent with the procedures and intent of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Oregon and California (O&C) Sustained Yield Act of 1937, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Wilderness Act 1964, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 and other applicable statutes, Executive Orders, regulations, manuals and handbooks. Having considered a full range of alternatives, associated impacts, and public input, we recommend adoption and implementation of the Proposed Medford Resource Management Plan amendment of the Preferred Alternative, as described above.

Lynda L Boody 9/10/03

Lynda L. Boody **Date**
Field Manager
Glendale Resource Area

Timothy B Reuwsaat 9/10/03

Timothy B. Reuwsaat **Date**
District Manager
Medford District Office

State Director Approval

I approve the Amendment to the Medford District Resource Management Plan as described above, in the FEIS, and as identified in the attached Table R-1. This document meets the requirements for a Record of Decision, as provided in 40 Code of Federal Regulations part 1505.2 and for a resource management plan, as described in 40 Code of Federal Regulations part 1610.0-5(k).

Elaine M. Brong 9/22/03

Elaine M. Brong **Date**
Oregon /Washington State Director

Table R-1. Comparison of Alternative Proposed Amendments to the Medford District Resource Management Plan

	Alternatives			
Management	**1 Preferred**	**2**	**3 No-Action**	**4**
Land Use Allocations Which Amend the Medford Resource Management Plan				
Designation of ACEC in East Fork Whisky Creek subwatershed	-----	+1,677 acres	-----	+2,844 acres
Off-Highway-Vehicle Restrictions Which Amend the Medford Resource Management Plan				
Miles closed due to road decommissioning	9.7 miles	9.7 miles	-----	13.6 miles
Roads closed with gates	5.1 miles	5.1 miles	-----	9.2 miles
Roads closed with barricades	1.8 miles	1.8 miles	-----	-----
Leasable Mineral and Energy Resources Amendments to the Medford Resource Management Plan (Area is described in Medford RMP as low potential for oil & gas and geothermal resources)				
No surface occupancy stipulation	-----	+470 acres, not including pre-existing constraints	-----	+1,093 acres not including pre-existing constraints
Standard leasing stipulations	-----	-----	-----	-1,093 acres
Utility Transmission Corridor or Sites and Special Use Permit Opportunity Amendment to the Medford Resource Management Plan (Area does not include occupied corridors, or have known interest in special use permits or sites)				
Use/permit Restricted acres	-----	+1,677 acres	-----	+2,844 acres

Table R-2. Comparison of management in all alternatives. Treatment acreages and mileages are approximations for analytical purposes, based on preliminary field review and existing spatial data. Actual treatment acres may vary slightly. MBF is based on similar estimates and represent +/- 10%.

	Alternatives			
Management	**1 Preferred**	**2**	**3 No-Action**	**4**
Activity / Implementation Actions Affecting the Planning Area Transportation System				
Permanent Road Construction	-----	-----	-----	-----
Road Renovation	7.1 miles	7.1 miles	-----	7.1 miles
Temporary Road Construction	1.5 miles	1.9 miles	-----	-----
Reestablish original Road Prism	7.4 miles	-----	-----	-----
Road Outslope and Waterdip	-----	7.4 miles	-----	7.4 miles
Road Decommission	9.7 miles	9.7 miles	-----	13.6 miles
Road closed with gates	5.1 miles	5.1 miles	-----	9.2 miles
Road closed with barricades	1.8 miles	1.8 miles	-----	-----
Road to be rocked	6.7 miles	6.7 miles	-----	6.7 miles
Road to be paved (byway)	-----	-----	-----	10.3 miles
Forest Stand Treatments Proposed to Implement the Medford District Resource Management Plan				
Treatments Designed to Meet the Medford District Resource Management Plan Timber Management Objectives				
Regeneration harvest (RH, OR, OR/CT RH/CT, RH/OR)	531 acres 6,100-7,450 MBF	355 acres 4,050-4,900 MBF	-----	-----
Commercial Thin	930 acres	969 acres	-----	955 acres

Table R-2. Comparison of management in all alternatives. Treatment acreages and mileages are approximations for analytical purposes, based on preliminary field review and existing spatial data. Actual treatment acres may vary slightly. MBF is based on similar estimates and represent +/- 10%.

	Alternatives			
Management	**1** **Preferred**	**2**	**3** **No-Action**	**4**
Treatments Designed to Meet the Medford District Resource Management Plan Timber Management Objectives (continued)				
(CT, CT/PCT)	3,650-4,500 MBF	3,300-4,050 MBF	-----	3,150-3,850 MBF
Total Harvest Treatments	1,461 acres 9,750-11,950 MBF	1,324 acres 7,350-8,950 MBF	-----	955 acres 3,150-3,850 MBF
Tractor Yarding	-----	-----	-----	-----
Cable Yarding	1,012 acres	874 acres	-----	700 acres
Cable/Helicopter	197 acres	171 acres	-----	122 acres
Cable/Tractor	164 acres	155 acres	-----	51 acres
Helicopter Yarding	98 acres	124 acres	-----	82 acres
Precommercial Thin	50 acres	50 acres	-----	61 acres
Fuels Treatments Associated with RMP Timber Objective Treatments				
Slash/Pile (SP)	1,829 acres	1,751 acres	-----	1,659 acres
Broadcast Burn (BB,UB,UB/SP)	807 acres	740 acres	-----	261 acres
Mechanical Fuels Treatment (MFT)	51 acres	51 acres	-----	51 acres

Table R-2. Comparison of management in all alternatives. Treatment acreages and mileages are approximations for analytical purposes, based on preliminary field review and existing spatial data. Actual treatment acres may vary slightly. MBF is based on similar estimates and represent +/- 10%.

	Alternatives			
Management	**1** **Preferred**	**2**	**3** **No-Action**	**4**
	Treatments Designed to Meet RMP Non-Timber Objectives (e.g., forest health, wildlife habitat, fuels, etc.)			
Partial Cut (CDM, CDM/NDM)	328 acres 700-850 MBF	329 acres 700-850 MBF	-----	328 acres 700-850 MBF
Tractor Yarding	-----	1 acre	-----	-----
Cable Yarding	103 acres	103 acres	-----	103 acres
Helicopter Yarding	137 acres	137 acres	-----	137 acres
Cable/Helicopter	51 acres	51 acres	-----	51 acres
Cable/Tractor	37 acres	37 acres	-----	37 acres
Non-Commercial Density Management (LSR)	181 acres	181 acres	-----	181 acres
Pine enhancement/ acres, maintenance acres (West Fork Whisky Cr.) (Matrix)	1,091 total acres, 561 acres CT 550-650 MBF	1,091 total acres, 561 acres CT 550-650 MBF	-----	1,105 total 575 acres of CT 550-700 MBF
Pine Conversion; Pine to Douglas-fir (Quail Cr. fire) (LSR)	221 acres -----	221 acres 10 MBF	-----	221 acres -----

Table R-2. Comparison of management in all alternatives. Treatment acreages and mileages are approximations for analytical purposes, based on preliminary field review and existing spatial data. Actual treatment acres may vary slightly. MBF is based on similar estimates and represent +/- 10%.

	Alternatives			
Management	**1** **Preferred**	**2**	**3** **No-Action**	**4**
RMP Fire Suppression Priorities and Equipment Limitations				
Wildfire Suppression	Full Fire Suppression	Full Fire Suppression but limits on heavy equipment in ACEC	Full Fire Suppression	Full Fire Suppression but limits on heavy equipment in ACEC
Wildlife Habitat Enhancement to Meet RMP Objectives				
Spring/Pond Enhancement	4 sites	4 sites	-----	4 sites

BB Broadcast Burn
CDM Commercial Density Management
CT Commercial Thin
MFT Mechanical Fuels Treatment
NDM Non-commercial Density Management
OR Overstory Removal
P Hand Pile, burn piles
PCT Pre-commercial Thin
RH Regeneration Harvest
SL Slash
UB Underburn
L&S Lop and Scatter
MBF Thousand Board Feet
SP Slash/Pile