E8.0 LAND MANAGEMENT AND AESTHETICS

This section of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (Project) Exhibit E provides a report on land management and aesthetics potentially affected by the proposed Project as stipulated in Title 18 Section 4.51 (f) (6) of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations:

> The report must discuss the management of land within the proposed project boundary, including wetlands and floodplains, and the protection of the recreational and scenic values of the project. The report must be prepared following consultation with local and state zoning and land management authorities and any federal or state agency with managerial authority over any part of the project lands. Consultation must be documented by appending to the report a letter from each agency consulted indicating the nature, extent, and results of the consultation. The report must contain:
>
> (i) A description of existing development and use of project lands and all other lands abutting the project impoundment;
>
> (ii) A description of the measures proposed by the applicant to ensure that any proposed project works, rights-of-way, access roads, and other topographic alterations blend, to the extent possible, with the surrounding environment; (see, e.g., 44 F.P.C. 1496, et seq.);
>
> (iii) A description of wetlands or floodplains within, or adjacent to, the project boundary, any short-term or long-term impacts of the project on those wetlands or floodplains, and any mitigative measures in the construction or operation of the project that minimize any adverse impacts on the wetlands or floodplains;
>
> (iv) A statement, including an analysis of costs and other constraints, of the applicant's ability to provide a buffer zone around all or any part of the impoundment, for the purpose of ensuring public access to project lands and waters and protecting the recreational and aesthetic values of the impoundment and its shoreline;
>
> (v) A description of the applicant's policy, if any, with regard to permitting development of piers, docks, boat landings, bulkheads, and other shoreline facilities on project lands and waters; and
>
> (vi) Maps or drawings that conform to the size, scale and legibility requirements of Sec. 4.39, or photographs, sufficient to show the location and nature of the measures proposed under paragraph (f)(6)(ii) of this section (maps or drawings in this exhibit may be consolidated).

E8.1 EXISTING LAND USE AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES AND FACTORS AFFECTING LAND USE AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

E8.1.1 Land Use and Management in the Project Vicinity

Existing land uses in the area of the proposed Project include agriculture and livestock grazing, timber production, hydroelectric generation and distribution, residential development, and recreation.

The Project is located on lands owned by PacifiCorp, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and a few private owners. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) also owns several parcels outside the proposed Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) boundary but near the Project around Copco reservoir. The area of consideration for the proposed Project consists of lands within the proposed FERC Project boundary or the Klamath River (and generally ¼ mile beyond to provide context). The area includes PacifiCorp facilities and operations on the Klamath River from the J.C. Boyle reservoir in unincorporated Klamath County, Oregon, to just below Iron Gate dam in unincorporated Siskiyou County, California. Project facilities include those used for hydroelectric production (dams and powerhouses) and distribution, and ancillary facilities (fish hatcheries and river recreation areas).

The Spring Creek diversion, which is located in Jackson County, Oregon, is not analyzed in detail in this document. If needed, relevant analysis and other information will be provided in supplementary documents.

In the course of study and in the interim between the draft license application and this final application, PacifiCorp made a few changes to the proposed Project. The newly proposed Project begins at the J.C. Boyle Development and continues downstream to the Iron Gate Development. The Spring Creek diversion is now included in the Fall Creek Development. The East Side, West Side, and Keno developments are no longer part of the proposed Project. Keno dam will remain in operation, but is not included in the FERC Project because the development does not have generation facilities, and its operation does not substantially benefit generation at PacifiCorp's downstream hydroelectric developments. Land management and aesthetic resource results presented in the final license application are generally limited to this new proposed Project. Complete study area results are available in the Land Use, Visual, and Aesthetic Resources Final Technical Report (FTR).

E8.1.1.1 Ownership

Land ownership in the proposed Project area is shown in Figure E8.1-1, Land Ownership. The figure identifies lands owned by PacifiCorp as well as major BLM and USFS holdings. The primary purpose of the ownership figure is to show how the holdings of government agencies, for which there are applicable plans, policies, or regulations governing use or management, relate geographically to the Project. The primary government land owners are BLM and USFS. The states of Oregon and California and the local agencies—Klamath and Siskiyou counties—do not have significant land holdings in the area. Although a lack of available data precludes mapping the holdings of private owners other than PacifiCorp, these lands are generally outside of the scope of this study.

Figure E8.1-1 Land Ownership.

11X17 – 11 Tiles - INSERT HERE

E8.1.1.2 Management

City, county, state, and federal agencies have land and resource management authority in the Project area. These agencies are described below.

County

Local agencies (e.g., cities and counties) exercise their land use authority through comprehensive plans and ordinances, including zoning. Klamath County (OR), and Siskiyou County (CA) are the two agencies with zoning authority in the Project area. Zoning designations are illustrated in Figure E8.1-2, Zoning. The applicable plans of these agencies are described in Section E8.3.2. The city and county agencies generally do not own the lands but have planning and zoning authority over them.

State and Federal

The relevant state agencies with land management responsibilities are the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA), Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD), and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. The federal agencies are BLM (Klamath Falls Resource Area [OR], Medford District Resource Area [OR], and Redding Resource Area [CA]), and the USFS (Klamath National Forest [CA]). These agencies own or manage land in the Proposed project area. Relevant plans and requirements are reviewed below.

E8.1.1.3 Use

Existing generalized land uses within the proposed FERC boundary and ¼ mile beyond it are shown in Figure E8.1-3, Existing Land Use. The purpose of this map is to provide an overview of the land uses in the proposed Project area; it is not intended to identify land management or policy direction. Where multiple uses occur in the same area, an attempt was made to classify the land by the predominant use. The following generalized uses are illustrated:

- Agriculture (generally intensive agricultural uses such as cropland or pasture; may include grazing lands)
- Open Space and Conservation (general category for undeveloped lands not in active use; may include timber production, some grazing, developed and dispersed recreational uses in some locations; generally excludes residential)
- Residential (low-density rural residential)
- Hydro Operations Lands (lands used primarily for PacifiCorp hydroelectric operations facilities or maintenance activities)
- Recreation Lands (designated recreational sites)

Most residential uses occur along portions of Copco reservoir. The proposed Iron Gate Estates subdivision east of Iron Gate reservoir is subdivided but primarily undeveloped and is generally not in residential use except for isolated residences outside of the Proposed project area.

Downstream of Keno Recreation Area, the majority of the land is classified as "open space and conservation." By definition, this category includes other dispersed, undeveloped uses including timber production, limited grazing, and developed and dispersed recreation areas. There are a number of hydro operations lands and recreation lands in this area, but few other developed uses. Irrigated pasture lands in the alluvial terraces adjacent to the Klamath River upstream from Copco reservoir are identified as being in agricultural use.

E8.1.2 Aesthetic and Visual Resources

The topographic characteristics of the Project area vary widely from east to west. Along the eastern edge, the Klamath River borders remnants of the geologic basin and range formation of central Oregon. Here the river flows through a broad flat valley that gradually transitions to a narrow channel as it traverses the low rolling ridges of the Cascade Mountains. In the central section of the Project, upstream of J.C. Boyle dam, the topography changes dramatically, dropping rapidly into a 1,000-foot-deep river canyon. The ruggedness of the terrain exemplifies the surrounding landscape, where nearby mountain peaks often reach 5,000 feet in elevation. Less than 5 miles downstream, the canyon and neighboring ridges gradually become flatter and wider as the river flows southwesterly across the state line and into Copco reservoir. Here, along the western edge, the topography surrounding Copco and Iron Gate reservoirs is open and rolling.

The Upper Klamath River canyon represents a transition from a mountainous to a desert landscape as it crosses the Cascade Mountains. The steep-walled canyon is the predominant visual element in the region. The river enhances the visual variety within the canyon. As it flows through the deep gorge, it changes from slack, slow-flowing water in the wider areas to a rushing torrent of cascading whitewater. This variety of flow enhances the Klamath River's scenic value. The area's remoteness and steep topography provide visitors with a natural and uncrowded aesthetic experience not usually available at the more popular national parks, monuments, and rivers in the region.

Figure E8.1-2 Zoning

11X17 – 11 Tiles - INSERT HERE

Figure E8.1-3 Existing Land Use

11X17 – 11 Tiles - INSERT HERE

E8.1.2.1 Key Observation Points

Key observation points (KOPs) were identified to represent typical public viewing locations. The views selected for analysis are not comprehensive, but rather represent typical and representative views for members of the public viewing Project facilities, the river reaches, and reservoirs from developed vistas and roads in the Project area. The KOPs are listed in Table E8.1-1.

Table E8.1-1. Key observation points (KOPs).

KOP Number and Name	Project Facility (KOP not influenced by water levels)	Project Operations (KOP is influenced by water levels)
J.C. Boyle Reservoir		
K5: J.C. Boyle Reservoir from Pioneer Park East	X	
K6: J.C. Boyle Reservoir from Pioneer Park West	X	
K7: J.C. Boyle Reservoir from Topsy Recreation Area	X	
Boyle Bypass Reach		
BB1: J.C. Boyle Dam from Dam Access Road	X	
BB2: Klamath River from Bridge Below J.C. Boyle Dam		X
BB3: Outflow from J.C. Boyle Dam from Access Road		X
BB4: J.C. Boyle Bypass Reach View #1 from Access Road		X
BB5: J.C. Boyle Bypass Reach View #2 from Access Road		X
BB6: J.C. Boyle Bypass Reach View #3 from Access Road		X
BB7: J.C. Boyle Bypass Reach View #4 from Access Road		X
BB8: J.C. Boyle Powerhouse and Penstocks	X	
BB9: J.C. Boyle Powerhouse and Transmission Line	X	
Hell's Corner Reach		
HC1: Klamath River from Boater Access below J.C. Boyle Powerhouse		X
HC2: Topsy Grade Road Potential Overlook #1		X[2]
HC3: Topsy Grade Road Potential Overlook #2		X[2]
HC4: Topsy Grade Road Potential Overlook #3		X[2]
HC5: Klamath River from Frain Ranch Boater Access		X
HC6: Klamath River (Caldera Rapids) from Frain Ranch		X
HC7: Klamath River from Stateline Takeout		X
HC8: Klamath River from Fishing Access #5 (Ager-Beswick Road)		X
Copco Reach		
C1: Copco Reservoir from Mallard Cove Recreation Area		X
C2: Copco Reservoir from Copco Cove Recreation Area		X
C3: Copco No. 1 Dam and Powerhouse	X	
C4: Copco No. 2 Dam	X	
C5: Copco No. 2 Forebay from Copco No. 2 Dam		X[1]
C6: Copco No. 2 Powerhouse	X	

Table E8.1-1. Key observation points (KOPs).

KOP Number and Name	Project Facility (KOP not influenced by water levels)	Project Operations (KOP is influenced by water levels)
C7: Copco Transmission Line	X	
Fall Creek		
FC1: Fall Creek Recreation Area and Trail	X	
FC2: Fall Creek Fish Hatchery	X	
FC3: Fall Creek from Hatchery Trail		X[1]
FC4: Fall Creek Powerhouse	X	
FC5: Fall Creek Transmission Line	X	
Iron Gate Reach		
IG1: Jenny Creek from Jenny Creek Recreation Area		X[1]
IG2: Iron Gate Reservoir from Wanaka Springs Recreation Area		X
IG3: Iron Gate Reservoir from Camp Creek Recreation Area		X
IG4: Iron Gate Reservoir from Juniper Point Recreation Area		X
IG5: Iron Gate Reservoir from Mirror Cove Recreation Area		X
IG6: Iron Gate Reservoir from Overlook Point Recreation Area		X
IG7: Iron Gate Reservoir from Long Gulch Recreation Area		X
IG8: Iron Gate Transmission Line	X	
IG9: Iron Gate Dam and Powerhouse	X	
IG10: Iron Gate Fish Hatchery and Fish Ladder	X	
IG11: Bogus Creek from Viewpoint at Iron Gate Fish Hatchery		X[1]
IG12: Klamath River from Iron Gate Hatchery River Access		X
Below Iron Gate		
BG1: Klamath River from Access Below Klamathon Bridge		X
BG2: Klamath River from Collier Rest Area Overlook/Interpretive Area		X
BG3: Klamath River from Tree of Heaven River Access Boat Ramp		X

[1] While the views from these KOPs are not influenced by Project operations, they are discussed with KOPs of other water features which are influenced by Project operations.

[2] Although this view potentially could be influenced by changes in water level or flows, field work indicated that its location is too distant from the river for such a change to be visible.

For the purpose of this analysis, Project *facilities* and Project *operations* are treated differently. Project facilities include power generation and transmission equipment and recreation sites. Each facility KOP is limited to one photograph illustrating representative conditions. Project operations include effects of the Project on flows and water levels in the Klamath River and reservoirs, respectively. Multiple photographs were taken at river reach and reservoir KOPs to illustrate the different visual conditions that result from the influence of seasonal conditions and Project operations on water levels. New flow measures proposed as part of this license application would not result in flows or elevations outside the range documented in this study.

Photographs were taken of the KOPs during field work in September 2002, January 2003, May 2003, and October 2003 (see Appendices E-8A and E-8B).

Visual Resource Management Classification

In its resource management plans (RMPs), BLM identifies visual resource management classifications (VRMCs). These classifications identify the acceptable level of change to the landscape. Project facilities fall under three BLM RMPs—the Klamath Falls Resource Area RMP, the Medford RMP, and the Redding District RMP. While the Draft Upper Klamath River Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan Amendments (BLM, April 2003) was reviewed for this study, it will not be a decision document until it is finalized; therefore, it does not govern activities in the Project area.

The objectives of the applicable BLM VRMCs are as follows:

- Class II: Retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low relative to the existing character of the landscape. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.
- Class III: Partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate relative to the existing character of the landscape. Management activities may attract attention, but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

E8.1.2.2 Project Facilities

Photographs of representative Project facilities are provided in Appendix E8-A. Photographs of all major Project facilities are provided in Appendix 4A of the Land Use, Visual, and Aesthetic Resources FTR.

Project facilities are characterized using the BLM visual resource management (VRM) methods. These characterizations are compared to the applicable VRM objectives. All of the facilities except three are located in areas that have been designated as a Class III area by an RMP or have been classified as a Class III area because the area has not been given a specific VRM class by BLM. In a VRM Class III area, management activities may attract attention, but they should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Three facilities are located in Class II areas, where non-native elements should not attract the attention of the casual observer: J.C. Boyle dam (KOP BB1), J.C. Boyle powerhouse and penstocks (KOP BB8), and the J.C. Boyle powerhouse and transmission lines (KOP BB9).

These facilities attract the attention of the casual observer. The dam's size makes it very apparent in the landscape despite its lines and height, which follow the site's topography. The powerhouse is prominent in the landscape because of its color and strong lines, which contrast with its natural setting. The transmission line is noticeable because it crosses a long distance and rises above the other features in the landscape.

The following four Project facilities located in Class III areas dominate the view of the casual observer:

- C3: Copco No. 1 dam and powerhouse
- C6: Copco No. 2 powerhouse
- FC4: Fall Creek powerhouse
- IG10: Iron Gate fish hatchery and fish ladder

These facilities tend to dominate the view because of their size and prominence in relation to the position of the viewer. That is, the KOP is located quite close to the facility and is not necessarily representative of the prominence of the facility in the broader landscape setting. These facilities also have lines, forms, and colors that contrast with their natural settings. However, two of the KOPs (LR5 and IG10) are much less prominent from a slight distance and are small compared to the surrounding natural features.

The following eight KOPs were determined to be consistent with the VRM Class III objectives:

- K3: Keno dam
- C4: Copco No. 2 dam
- C7: Copco transmission line
- FC1: Fall Creek recreation area and trail
- FC2: Fall Creek fish hatchery
- FC5: Fall Creek transmission line
- IG8: Iron Gate transmission line
- IG9: Iron Gate dam and powerhouse from Iron Gate fish hatchery

These KOPs are primarily dams, transmission lines, and recreation and trail areas. Even though the dams are large structures, they have been designed to sit within the profile of the surrounding landscape, making them appear more like part of the landscape than they would otherwise. In general, the dams are constructed with colors and lines that blend with their surroundings. Despite the fact that the transmission lines rise above other features, they are typically at a distance from the casual viewer and blend into the sky above. From a distance, the lines do not obstruct or overpower other elements in the landscape. In cases where the transmission lines or support structures dominate a view, it is typically for a short time as the viewer walks or drives by. The facilities in the trail and fish hatchery views are generally small in size compared to natural features; as a result, the non-native elements are not dominant.

The Spring Creek diversion, located in Jackson County, Oregon, is not analyzed in this document. Relevant analysis and other information will be provided in supplementary documents if needed.

E8.1.2.3 River Reaches

The visual quality of each review reach was assessed at low and medium or high flow conditions. At low flows, rocks and vegetation are visible at the channel edges and hydraulic expression is mostly limited to areas where rocks extend above the water surface. As flows increase, fewer rocks and less vegetation are visible. At some locations hydraulic expression increases as the flows increase.

E8.1.2.4 Reservoirs

Visual characteristics of the reservoirs were documented at two different water levels: high pool and low pool. For completeness, the J.C. Boyle and Copco reservoirs also were documented at very low levels seen during maintenance drawdown events.

J.C. Boyle Reservoir

Although the differences between low and high pool levels are not great owing to the relatively small change in water level, some differences are visible. At low pool, all three views of the reservoir show an open expanse of relatively flat water with light green vegetation growing up from the lake bottom, but the characteristics of the shoreline vary. The shoreline of one view has a small area of exposed dirt (KOP K5). Another is primarily a short, steep rock face (KOP K6). The last shows J.C. Boyle dam and a disturbed area next to the dam that stands out from the rest of the view (KOP K7). At high pool conditions, the light green vegetation is no longer apparent from the KOPs. At KOP K5, less of the shoreline and reservoir bottom are visible. The increase in water level is most evident at KOP K6, where only the very top of a submerged tree is visible. The photographs taken during maintenance drawdown conditions show a large area of exposed lake bottom that dominates the view.

Copco Reservoir

During high pool conditions, a small area of near-shore lake bottom is exposed at the two KOPs for this reservoir. The area of exposed lake bottom increases during low pool conditions. At one of the views, the water has receded to the extent that two docks appear to no longer extend over the water during low pool conditions. The visual quality is lower here during low pool conditions because of the increased exposure of the shoreline. A change in visual quality is not noticeable at the other KOPs during the different pool conditions. As with J.C. Boyle reservoir, the photographs taken during maintenance drawdown conditions show a large area of exposed lake bottom that dominates the view.

Iron Gate Reservoir

The views from six recreation areas at the reservoir were documented. At high pool, little to none of the lake bottom is exposed along the shoreline at the recreation areas. At low pool, conditions vary slightly. In several views, larger areas of lake bottom are more exposed than in other views. At one recreation area, a sandbar is exposed, and, at another, driftwood has become visible. The visual quality of the reservoir is lowest when its elevation is at low pool.

E8.1.2.5 Summary of Visual Analysis Results by Location and River Reach

The visual analysis results are summarized in Table E8.1-2. Representative KOP photographs are provided in Appendices E-8A and E-8B.

E8.2 WETLANDS AND FLOODPLAINS

The Project area includes limited wetlands and Federal Emergency Management Agency-(FEMA) defined floodplains. Applicable wetland and floodplain policies contained in land use and resource management plans are identified in Section E8.3.2.3.

E8.2.1 Wetlands

Wetlands and wetland impacts are illustrated and discussed in the Terrestrial Resources Final Technical Report and Section E5.0 Botanical and Wildlife Resources of Exhibit E. As shown in the maps in that section, the size and distribution of palustrine wetlands vary considerably by location within the Project area. A number of wetlands are present in and around the upper end of J.C. Boyle reservoir. From J.C. Boyle dam until Copco and Iron Gate reservoirs, few wetlands are present because this section of river is narrow with steep banks. On Copco and Iron Gate reservoirs, wetland areas are generally small and relatively infrequent.

E8.2.2 Floodplains

Floodplains in the Project area are illustrated in Figure E8.2-1 and characterized below. Because of the sparse development adjacent to the Klamath River in the Project area and the low population density, only limited determination and mapping of floodplains has been conducted in the Project area. Because much of the river corridor is contained in a relatively narrow canyon, floodplain areas are generally confined to the river channel itself. Exceptions include the reservoirs and also the agricultural lands adjacent to the river upriver of Copco reservoir.

E8.2.2.1 Klamath County

The Project area in unincorporated Klamath County has not been mapped by FEMA for flood hazard and no floodplain mapping is available for this area.

E8.2.2.2 Siskiyou County

According to the FEMA flood hazard maps for Siskiyou County, FEMA has not conducted detailed flood hazard mapping in the Project area. The maps indicate that the Klamath River has been designated as Zone A year flood (within the 100-year floodplain), as determined by approximate methods of analysis. No hydraulic analyses have been performed, and no base flood elevations are available for this area.

Table E8.1-2. Summary of visual resource analysis results.

J.C. Boyle Reservoir	J.C. Boyle Bypass and Peaking Reaches	Copco Reservoir	Copco No. 2	Fall Creek	Iron Gate Reservoir	Downstream of Iron Gate Reservoir
Facilities: None **River Flows:** None **Reservoirs:** The views of KOPs K5 to K7 do not vary greatly between low pool (3,791 feet above mean sea level [msl]) and high pool (3,792 feet above msl) conditions. However, some differences are visible. Primarily, light green vegetation visible on the water surface during low pool conditions is not present during high pool conditions. During maintenance drawdown events at the reservoir, large areas of lake bottom are exposed and there is little water.	**Facilities:** KOPs BB1, BB8, and BB9 are located in VRM Class II areas, where non-native elements should not attract the attention of the viewer. These facilities attract the attention of the casual observer. However, BB9 is only moderately visible owing to its small size in comparison with the natural background features. **River Flows:** As the river flows vary at KOPs HC1 and HC5 to HC8, the characteristics of the view change. For example, more vegetation and rocks are visible at low flows than high flows and more hydraulic expression is present during high flows. The different flow levels do not alter the quality of the views. The flows analyzed were approximately 350 cubic feet per second (cfs) (low flow), 1,700 cfs (medium flow), and 2,800 cfs (high flow). Views from the potential overlooks shown in HC2 to HC4 do not show enough details to analyze the effects of the different flow levels. **Reservoirs:** None	**Facilities:** KOP C3 is located in a U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Class III area, where non-native elements may attract the viewer's attention but should not dominate the view. KOP C3 dominates the view because it contrasts with the natural setting owing to its size, color, and geometry. **River Flows:** None **Reservoirs:** The visual quality of KOPs C1 and C2 does not change with the subtle differences apparent during low pool (2,602.9 feet above msl) and high pool (2,604.7 feet above msl). During maintenance drawdown events at the reservoir, large areas of lake bottom are exposed and there is little water.	**Facilities:** KOPs C4, C6, and C7 are located in a BLM Class III area, where non-native elements may attract the viewer's attention but should not dominate the view. KOPs C4 and C7 are consistent with this objective; however, KOP C6 dominates the view because it contrasts with the natural setting owing to its size, color, and geometry. **River Flows:** None **Reservoirs:** One view of KOP C5 was included to document existing conditions. Pool conditions at this KOP do not change as a result of Project operations.	**Facilities:** KOPs FC1, FC2, and FC5 are consistent with the area's VRM Class III objectives because they do not dominate the view, even though they are visible. FC4 does dominate the view because of its location. However, because it is located out of sight of the average viewer, its relative impact and dominance are less. **River Flows:** Fall Creek is spring fed, so KOP FC3 is not influenced by Project operations. One view of FC3 has been included to document existing conditions. **Reservoirs:** None	**Facilities:** The non-native elements in IG8 and IG10 contrast with the surrounding landscape and dominate the view of the casual viewer. However, because most views of IG8 are in passing and because IG10 is small compared to the surrounding natural features, their relative dominance is considered reduced. IG9 does not dominate the view. **River Flows**: IG1 and IG11 have been included to document existing conditions, but these KOPs are not influenced by Project operations. The characteristics of IG12 (for example, amount of vegetation, rocks, and hydraulic expression) change with the different river flows. However, the visual quality of the view does not. Flows at IG12 were documented at low (762 cfs), medium (1,350 cfs), and high (1,767 cfs) conditions. **Reservoirs**: The visual quality of KOPs IG2 to IG7 is greatest during high pool (2,326.6 feet above msl) when little to none of the lake bottom is exposed. At low pool (2,323.5 feet above msl) several areas of near-shore lake bottom are exposed and visual quality is less.	**Facilities:** None **River Flows:** The characteristics of KOPs BG1 to BG3 change from low flow to high flow conditions but the composition of the views and their visual quality does not change. **Reservoirs:** None

Figure E8.2-1. Floodplains—Klamath Falls and Siskiyou County

(11x17) Front of page 1 of 2

Figure E8.2-1: Floodplain (11x17) Back of page 1 of 2

Figure E8.2-1: Floodplain (11x17) Front of page 2 of 2

Figure E8.2-1: Floodplain (11x17) Back of page 2 of 2

E8.3 LAND MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

E8.3.1 Agencies and Tribes with Land Management Responsibility

Agencies with applicable existing land management plans relevant to the Project and its vicinity are listed in Table E8.3-1.

Table E8.3-1. Agencies with jurisdiction over Project lands or Project-adjacent lands.

Level of Government	Agency with Land Use/Land Management Jurisdiction
Federal	Bureau of Land Management (Klamath Falls, Medford, and Redding Resource Areas) Forest Service (Klamath National Forest) National Park Service (Upper and Lower Klamath River)
State	Oregon Department of Agriculture (Lost River Subbasin) Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (Statewide Planning Goals implemented by local jurisdictions) Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD)
County	Klamath County, Oregon (Planning and Zoning) Siskiyou County, California (Planning and Zoning)

E8.3.2 Existing Land Management Plans

The published plans of federal, state, and local agencies in the Project area were inventoried and reviewed. For each plan, land use requirements and land use-related resource management goals and objectives relevant to the Project and its lands were reviewed. As needed, agencies were contacted to understand potential changes to land use or new plans that may affect the Project.

The FERC Revised List of Comprehensive Plans (FERC, 2002) was reviewed and all applicable plans identified. Land use and general RMPs that were potentially applicable to the proposed Project area were reviewed. Plans on the FERC list that address specific resources (e.g., fisheries, wildlife, recreation) are addressed by other resource-specific sections of Exhibit E.

A number of other land use and resource management plans that are not on the FERC Revised List of Comprehensive Plans were identified and determined to be relevant to land use or resource management in the Project area. The land use and resource management plans that were identified as relevant to the Project are summarized in Table E8.3-2. The plans that were considered but determined to not apply to the Project are listed in Table E8.3-3 with the reasons for dismissal. For additional discussion of the reviewed plans, refer to the Land Use, Visual, and Aesthetic Resources Final Technical Report.

E8.3.2.1 FERC-Recognized Plans

In the FERC List of Comprehensive Plans (2002), 108 plans address lands within the state of Oregon, 48 plans address lands within the state of California, and 23 plans generically address lands within the United States, or lands within both California and Oregon. Of the 179 plans, four (one in California and three in Oregon) were identified as relevant to the Project. The remaining plans on FERC's list are specific to geographic locations not affected by the Project,

do not address land use or resource management policy, or are not relevant to the Project. The four relevant plans are discussed below.

California

1. Bureau of Land Management. 1993. Redding Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision. Department of the Interior, Ukiah, California. June 1993. 55 pp.

Summary. The RMP is a 15-year strategy addressing where and how BLM will administer public lands under its jurisdiction within the Redding Resource Area. This document provides guidance for managing public lands throughout Butte and Tehama counties as well as the majority of Shasta, Siskiyou, and Trinity counties. The RMP focuses on four planning issues: land tenure adjustment (where BLM should provide long-term federal stewardship); recreation management (where and what mixture of recreation activities should be encouraged or discouraged); access (the ability of public users to physically access their public lands); and forest management (where should forest management be allowed given existing restrictions and changing land ownership). The Record of Decision (ROD) documents the decisions made by BLM in the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS).

Land Use Project Consistency. The continued operation of Project facilities would not affect the scenic quality of the river corridor or cultural resources along the river. Initiatives to improve the condition of the riparian vegetation could occur with the existing Project facilities in place. Iron Gate reservoir and Copco reservoir provide opportunities for nonmotorized recreation. The transfer of land from the Klamath National Forest to BLM would not affect the continued operation of Project facilities. For these reasons, the Project is consistent with this plan.

Visual Resource Management Element. All BLM management actions must conform with the objectives of the assigned VRM Class. However, VRM prescriptions are limited to only those areas assigned VRM Class I and Class II (out of four total classes). Visual resource management within designated wilderness and wilderness study areas must conform with the protection of wilderness values, including scenic quality. Within the Klamath Management Area, in the Klamath River, two policies focus on maintaining the scenic quality of the Upper Klamath River corridor and maintaining the scenic quality of Jenny Creek.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. Project facilities predate the preparation and adoption of the Redding District RMP. Project facilities were already a part of the landscape when that plan was prepared. Additionally, with the exception of several small isolated parcels on Copco reservoir and Iron Gate reservoir, none of the Project facilities are on lands managed by the Redding District BLM. The consistency of the Project's facilities with the RMP's VRMC guidelines therefore is not applicable because no modifications are proposed to those facilities and no corresponding level of change occurs.

Table E8.3-2. Summary of relevant land use and resource management plans.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
CALIFORNIA								
Bureau of Land Management. 1993. Redding Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision.	Yes	Redding, CA, Resource Area, Siskiyou County, CA	Yes	Yes	The plan identifies all public lands for retention and lands available for disposal from federal management.	Within the plan's Klamath Management Area, the Upper Klamath River is named as a resource with the following objectives: (1) maintain scenic quality; (2) improve riparian vegetation; (3) protect cultural resources; and (4) improve nonmotorized recreation opportunities. The plan also seeks to transfer four parcels from the Klamath National Forest to the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM).	The Project is consistent with this plan. The continued operation of Project facilities would not affect resource objectives, and plan initiatives to improve riparian vegetation could occur with the existing Project facilities in place. The transfer of land would not affect the Project.	
Forest Service. 1994. Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.	No	Klamath National Forest, CA	Yes	Yes	Programmatic management direction is found in two sources: the forest-wide standards and guidelines and the specific management areas. The four categories of forest-wide goals vary in the level of conservation and allowable amount of forest product production.	None of the Project facilities are located on land addressed by this plan. The closest area is a section near the east end of Copco Lake that is designated as a late-successional reserve. This area is managed to protect and enhance habitat for late-successional and old growth-related species.	Because none of the Project facilities conflict with the management direction provided by the plan, the Project is consistent with the plan. No additional actions are proposed by the Project that would affect forest conservation or production in or near lands addressed by this plan.	
Siskiyou County. 1973. General Plan of Siskiyou County, California.	No	Siskiyou County, CA (unincorporated area)	Yes	Yes	Land use policies are determined by allowing the physical environment to determine the appropriate future land use pattern. The preservation of recreational and scenic lands is also emphasized.	The General Plan guides land use policy within a large section of the Project area. Two hydroelectric reservoirs, Copco and Iron Gate, provide water surfaces for recreation and are surrounded by recreational lands. Outside of these areas, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) land along the Klamath River is devoted to open space and agricultural uses.	Existing Project facilities are consistent with the policies outlined for each environmentally sensitive area, including surface hydrology areas, in which hydroelectric power facilities are one of the few uses allowed. Because no additional facilities are proposed as a part of the Project, the Project also is consistent with the agricultural and open space policies.	
Siskiyou County. 1994. Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance.	No	Siskiyou County, CA (unincorporated area)	Yes	Yes	The Zoning Code has no land use element per se, but applies to all land use in general by regulating allowable uses throughout the county.	Hydroelectric facilities are subject to local review in part through the zoning code. The Project area is located in three zones—AG-1 (Prime Agricultural), AG-2 (Non-Prime Agricultural), and RR (Rural Residential Agricultural).	Public utility facilities are a conditional use in each of the three zones in the Project area. All of the Project facilities are consistent with the zoning through conditional use permits. No additional facilities are proposed for this Project.	

Table E8.3-2. Summary of relevant land use and resource management plans.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
OREGON								
Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary.	Yes	Klamath Falls, OR, Resource Area (Lakeview District)	Yes	Yes	The resource management plan (RMP) responds to the need for a healthy forest ecosystem and a sustainable supply of forest products. BLM will use ecological, economic, social, and managerial principles to achieve healthy and sustainable natural systems and maintain the health of aquatic ecosystems. The rangeland program summary identifies resource concerns for each grazing allotment.	Eleven miles of the Klamath River, from the J.C. Boyle powerhouse to the state border, are designated as a protected Special Area. This area is not available for new hydroelectric development. There are several recreational sites along the Klamath River and several trails. Within the Klamath River Complex Special Resource Management Area (SRMA), the plan supports the cooperative management agreement with PacifiCorp for coordinated recreation trail and facility development.	The Project does not propose any new hydroelectric developments; therefore, the continued operation of the hydroelectric facilities is consistent with the Special Area designation along the Klamath River. Outside of the Special Area, the operation of the Project's facilities would not preclude effective ecosystem management in the plan area's forest and agricultural lands. The Project would not be in conflict with the existing or proposed recreational opportunities in the RMP.	
Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Medford District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan.	Yes	Medford, OR, District—including Ashland Resource Area	No	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	The Spring Creek diversion facility is located in Jackson County within the Medford RMP area. Otherwise, the Project study area is completely outside of the RMP planning area.
Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part I—Comprehensive Plan, Polices.	No	Klamath County, OR (unincorporated area)	Yes	Yes	The Land Use Element describes the county's ten land use designations, which are further broken down into implementing zones. Conservation of agricultural and forest lands is advocated by the plan, as well as the preservation of open space and scenic rivers. All land uses are allowed as a conforming or nonconforming use at the time the plan was approved.	Project facilities are scattered through Klamath County, including the Keno dam, the J.C. Boyle dam and powerhouse, and several recreation sites. No policies relate directly to the Project or its facilities, although the protection of wilderness habitat and riparian areas is a common theme within the plan, and much of the Project area within the county is in the wilderness.	The Project area is nearly all forest lands, and the Project's land uses are grandfathered in by the provisions of the plan. No additional facilities are proposed for the Project that could interfere with riparian areas; therefore, the Project is consistent with the plan.	
Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part III—Land Development Code.	No	Klamath County, OR (unincorporated area)	Yes	Yes	The Land Development Code does not have a land use element per se, but applies to all land uses in general by regulating allowable uses throughout the county.	Project facilities are scattered through Klamath County. The Project area is located in two zones—Forestry and Forestry/Range. The purpose of the Forestry zone is to protect forest ecosystems; the Forestry/Range zone is used to promote the management and conservation of lands of mixed farm and forest use.	Public utility facilities are either permitted or conditional uses (depending on the facility type) in each of the zones in the Project area. All of the Project facilities are consistent with the zoning through conditional use permits. No additional facilities are proposed for this Project.	

Table E8.3-2. Summary of relevant land use and resource management plans.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
Klamath Headwaters Agricultural Water Quality Advisory Committee. 2002. Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan: Klamath Headwaters, excluding Lost River.	No	Klamath County, OR (Klamath headwaters subbasin)	Yes	Yes	The plan's goal is "to prevent and control potential water pollution from agricultural activities and to achieve water quality standards." The plan's objectives are divided into three categories: 1) improved water quality; 2) education and public involvement; and 3) funding.	The plan generally covers the Klamath River south of Keno to the state line and also Lake Ewauna within the Project area. Strategies to control pollution mostly target agricultural lands and practices. The most prominent strategy involves the management of a high-quality riparian buffer along channel slopes to act as a sediment trap.	FERC lands along the Klamath River south of Keno are in current use as open space. The Project proposes no additional facilities and no changes in the open space. Therefore, the existing natural open space along the river will remain as a riparian corridor in accordance with this plan.	
Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District. 1990. Spencer Creek Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan. July 26, 1990.	No	Klamath County, OR (Spencer Creek Watershed, including Miners and Clover Creek)	Yes	Yes	Land use objectives include maintaining livestock grazing and timber production and maintaining or enhancing riparian zones within the watershed to improve water quality and reduce erosion. Recreational opportunities should be provided on public lands within the watershed.	Spencer Creek is just upstream from J.C. Boyle reservoir. Project lands addressed by the plan are currently used as open space and are zoned for forestry uses.	FERC land near Spencer Creek is used primarily for grazing and open space. Because no new Project facilities are proposed, the function of these lands would not change, consistent with the plan. The presence of J.C. Boyle reservoir provides recreational opportunities within the watershed.	
Oregon Department of Agriculture. 2001. Lost River Sub-basin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan.	No	Klamath County, OR, and Siskiyou County, CA (Lost River subbasin)	Yes	Yes	The goal of the plan is to prevent and control water pollution from agricultural activities. The plan has two objectives: (1) maximize the beneficial effects of agricultural irrigation and (2) increase awareness of water quality concerns.	The plan applies to agricultural land uses on the Klamath River from Link River dam downstream to Keno dam (including Lake Ewauna).	Existing uses on PacifiCorp land in this area are hydropower production and outdoor recreation and do not include agricultural activities. For this reason, the Project is consistent with this plan.	
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Undated. Klamath Wildlife Area – Mission and Goals.	No	Klamath Wildlife Area, southeast of Klamath Falls	Yes	Yes	The goals of the Plan target the provision of animal habitat and providing opportunities for recreational harvest of game and wildlife viewing.	The Klamath Wildlife Area is adjacent to the Klamath River, southeast of the city of Klamath Falls. The FERC boundary is at the shoreline of the river in this area, and land to the east is used as open space and zoned for open space/conservation.	The Project proposes no additions or expansions that would prevent the protection and maintenance of waterfowl and other game in the wildlife area, and therefore is consistent with the plan.	
South Central Oregon Regional Partnership. 1999. South Central Oregon Regional Partnership Strategic Plan.	No	Klamath and Lake counties, Oregon	Yes	Yes	This is an economic development plan, with occasional mention of land use and resource management.	The plan is geographically relevant, but does not contain specific goals and objectives that relate to the Project. The plan includes a strategy to encourage land development projects in order to minimize traffic congestion and maintain environmental quality and beauty.	The policies relate to future land development actions. No such actions are proposed as part of the Project. Any such actions would need to comply with county land development requirements, which are consistent with these statements.	

Table E8.3-2. Summary of relevant land use and resource management plans.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
South Central Oregon Regional Partnership. 2001. South Central Oregon Consolidated Economic Development Strategy and Regional Investment Plan 2001-2003.	No	Klamath and Lake counties, Oregon	Yes	Yes	This is an economic development plan, with occasional mention of land use and resource management.	The plan is geographically relevant, but does not contain specific goals and objectives that relate to the Project. It includes several general policies, goals, and objectives, which are generally relevant to land management and use.	The policies relate to future land development actions. No such actions are proposed as part of the Project. Any such actions would need to comply with county land development requirements, which are consistent with these statements.	
UNITED STATES								
Bureau of Land Management. 2003. Draft Upper Klamath River Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan Amendments.	No	Upper Klamath River—OR and CA	Yes	Yes	The draft environmental impact statement (EIS) considers four alternative land use allocations and land tenures. Alternative 1 (No Action) would not change existing land allocation or designations. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would expand the existing Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) to include all of the river canyon within the Redding Resource Area. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would also expand the Upper Klamath River Management Area. BLM would seek to increase public land holdings within alternative project area boundaries.	The proposed expansion of the ACEC under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would apply to the Project area from approximately the J.C. Boyle dam to the J.C. Boyle powerhouse. The expansion of the planning area lands for the Upper Klamath River Management Plan would not include any Project facilities. The acquisition of nonfederal lands would not affect Project facilities because BLM would only seek the acquisition of undeveloped lands.	The continued operation of Project facilities would not be inconsistent with any land use decisions by the BLM that would follow from the proposed alternatives.	The Draft EIS is not a decision document and does not govern activities in the project area. It will become a decision document when it is finalized. Actions evaluated in the Draft EIS will not be applicable to the Project until an alternative is selected and a record of decision (ROD) approved.
Bureau of Land Management. 2002. Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.	No	Southeast area of Jackson County, Oregon	No	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	The Spring Creek diversion project is located within the Monument boundary. Otherwise, there is no direct geographic relationship between the draft RMP/EIS and the Project.
Bureau of Reclamation. 2000. Klamath Project Long-Term Operations Plan Environmental Impact Statement—Preliminary Alternatives.	No	Klamath River Basin—OR and CA	Yes	See notes				As of June 2003, the EIS process and development of alternatives was stalled owing to Endangered Species Act issues. As of that time, a new Notice of Intent was being submitted with plans to conduct a new scoping and alternatives development process.

Table E8.3-2. Summary of relevant land use and resource management plans.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
Forest Service. Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Standards and guidelines for management of habitat for late-successional and old-growth forest related species within the range of the northern spotted owl. [NW Forest Plan]	Yes	Pacific Northwest westside forests	Yes	Yes	All 24.4 million acres of federally-administered lands within the range of the northern spotted owl are allocated to one of the six designated areas. Lands are also allocated to one of three watershed categories. Designations and categories place management requirements or emphasis on activities in those areas with the goal of protecting the northern spotted owl and its habitat.	Corners of parcels of land managed by this plan are nearly adjacent to the Klamath River, including Administratively Withdrawn Areas and Late-Successional Reserves. Administratively Withdrawn Areas are excluded from timber harvest. The objective of Late-Successional Reserves is to protect and enhance conditions of late-successional and old-growth forest ecosystems.	The continued operation of Project facilities would not affect the preservation of late-successional and old-growth forest ecosystems. The presence of Project facilities does not increase the likelihood of silvicultural activities in the area. Any future Project activities would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as mandated by the plan (in Late-Successional Reserves). For these reasons, the Project is consistent with the plan.	

Table E8.3-3. Land use and resource management plans that were reviewed and determined to not be applicable.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
CALIFORNIA								
Bureau of Land Management. 2003. Proposed Plan Amendment to the Redding Resource Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Area.	No	Redding, CA, Resource Area, Siskiyou County, CA	Yes	No	Only property contiguous to the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Area (HRWA) boundary that meets criteria for deer winter range habitat quality and manageability would be considered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for acquisition from willing sellers.	While PacifiCorp owns property contiguous with the Proposed Amendment boundary, that property is identified as having low forage and cover values for deer habitat, and may not meet the criteria for acquisition.	Not applicable. The HRWA is adjacent to the Project area on the eastern boundary of the HRWA. None of the alternatives presented would affect this boundary or bring the HRWA closer to any Project facilities without a plan maintenance action and public review opportunity.	
Forest Service. 1994. Klamath National Forest Environmental Impact Statement/Land and Resource Management Plan.	No	Klamath National Forest, CA	Yes	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	The relevant data used to analyze alternatives in the Klamath National Forest EIS were incorporated into the RMP, summarized below.
Forest Service. 1995. Six Rivers National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.	No	Six Rivers National Forest, CA	No	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Although the Klamath River flows through Six Rivers National Forest before it reaches the Pacific Ocean, the forest is located about 60 miles down river from the lower terminus of the Project study area. The plan is not geographically relevant to the Project.
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force. 1991. Long Range Plan for the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program.	No	Lower Klamath River, CA	Yes	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	This plan is primarily related to fisheries issues that are beyond the scope of this land use review. Fisheries issues related to the Project are addressed elsewhere in the license application.
OREGON								
Bureau of Land Management. 1990. Final Eligibility and Suitability Report for the Upper Klamath Wild and Scenic River study.	Yes	Upper Klamath River (OR and CA) from just below J.C. Boyle dam to just above Copco reservoir	Yes	No	The BLM determined Segments 2 and 3 of the Klamath River eligible for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic system. Both Segments meet the criteria for a scenic classification but not the criteria for a wild classification.	Not applicable	Not applicable	This document is not a resource management plan and it does not constitute a recommendation by BLM regarding congressional designation of the Upper Klamath River.
Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.	Yes	Klamath Falls, OR, Resource Area (Lakeview District)	Yes	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	The information presented in the proposed RMP/EIS was finalized in the Klamath Falls Resource Area (KFRA) Record of Decision (ROD), RMP, and rangeland program summary, discussed below.
Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Medford District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.	Yes	Medford, OR, District—including Ashland Resource Area	No	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	The information presented in the proposed RMP/EIS was finalized in the Medford District RMP/ROD, discussed below.

Table E8.3-3. Land use and resource management plans that were reviewed and determined to not be applicable.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Jenny Creek Watershed Assessment and Analysis.	No	Jackson and Klamath Counties, OR, Siskiyou County, CA (Medford District)	Yes	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	The southern tip of the Jenny Creek watershed is within FERC property. Jenny Creek empties into the Iron Gate reservoir. None of the recommendations made within the assessment are specific to the Project area or any Project facilities.
Bureau of Land Management. 2001. Klamath Falls Resource Area—Annual Program Summary.	Yes	Klamath Falls, OR, Resource Area (Lakeview District)	Yes	No				This document is not a resource management plan and does not provide additional direction related to use of lands in the KFRA. However, future actions related to the Project will be monitored for consistency and reported in future program summaries.
Bureau of Land Management. 2000. Klamath-Iron Gate Watershed Analysis—Version 1.1.	No	Jackson County, OR, and Siskiyou County, CA Ashland Resource Area (Medford District)	Yes	No				This analysis includes recommendations that address grazing, economic development, and recreation and are geared towards maintaining agricultural/timber/ recreational resources without compromising ecological integrity. However, the recommendations do not relate directly to the Project.
Bureau of Land Management. 2002. Klamath Falls Resource Area Planning Update.	No	Klamath Falls, OR, Resource Area	Yes	No				The primary purpose of the planning update is to inform the public about activities and projects in the KFRA. It also seeks to collect comments from those affected by the programs. The document does not provide recommendations or policies.
UNITED STATES								
Forest Service. Bureau of Land Management. 2000. Interior Columbia Basin Final Environmental Impact Statement/Proposed Decision.	No	Interior Columbia Basin	No	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	The plan does not apply to the Project area. Although the northeast portion of the Project is within the planning boundary for the EIS, none of the lands called out for management under the EIS are near the Project area. There are no management policies contained by the EIS that involve Project facilities. In addition, because a final ROD was never issued for the document, it is not considered officially adopted.

Table E8.3-3. Land use and resource management plans that were reviewed and determined to not be applicable.

Plan Name	FERC List	Geographic Area Covered	Geographic Area Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Plan Applicable? (If No, see notes)	Land Use/Resource Management Element	Relevance to Project	Project Consistency	Notes
National Park Service. 1994. Klamath Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Report and Environmental Assessment.	No	Upper Klamath River in OR (OR state scenic waterway)	Yes	No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	This document was prepared in response to the request by the state of Oregon to the Secretary of the Interior in April 1993 that the Upper Klamath River be designated as a national wild and scenic river. It concludes that the river should be designated as scenic. However, it is not a policy document or RMP.

The visual quality assessment of Project facilities and operations in Section E8.1.2 is conducted in terms of the BLM VRM objectives. However, because the facilities already exist and predate the RMP, a level of change is not identified. Instead, the VRMC is indicated to place the description of the facility in the context of its surroundings and the BLM visual resource management objectives. The Project is consistent with the RMP because it does not alter the existing visual quality of resources addressed by the plan.

Oregon

1. Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary. Department of the Interior, Klamath Falls, Oregon. June 1995. 86 pp. Appendices and maps.

Summary. This document is a consolidated document that includes the rangeland program summary, the ROD, and the Klamath Falls Resource Area (KFRA) RMP. The ROD approves BLM's decisions for managing 212,000 acres in Klamath County. It documents the approval and adoption of the proposed RMP, as described in the Klamath Falls Resource Area Proposed RMP/EIS. The purpose of the rangeland program summary is to inform interested parties of the implementation of the rangeland program for the KFRA. Also, the rangeland program summary provides a tracking mechanism between the KFRA ROD on the RMP and grazing decisions to be issued in the future.

Land Use Project Consistency. The Project does not propose any additional hydroelectric developments. Therefore, the continued operation of the hydroelectric facilities is consistent with the Special Area designation along the Klamath River. Outside of the Special Area, the operation of the Project's facilities would not preclude effective ecosystem management in the plan area's forest and agricultural lands. Visually, the Project facilities are located in areas that are generally more developed than the surrounding lands and are in character with their surroundings. The relicensing of these facilities will retain the character of these landscapes. The continued operation of the facilities associated with the Project would not be in conflict with the existing or proposed recreational opportunities in the RMP, and would continue to be guided by the cooperative management agreement. The continued operation of Project recreation sites is consistent with the recreation objectives of the plan. No conflicts or concerns specific to the operation of the Project's facilities were identified by the rangeland program summary.

Visual Resource Management Element. This BLM plan directs the management of all BLM-administered land to meet the established visual quality objectives (VQOs) of the four different classes. Policies related to visual resources provide additional details for the various classes of land. The two relevant classes to the Project area are Classes II and III. Class II lands are to be managed for low levels of change to the characteristic landscape. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract the attention of the casual observer. Class III lands should be managed for moderate levels of change to the characteristic landscape.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. Project facilities predate the preparation and adoption of the Klamath Falls RMP. As such, Project facilities were already a part of the landscape when that plan was prepared. For this reason, a level of change is not identified in the analysis. Instead, the VRMC is discussed to place the description of the facility in the context of its surroundings and the BLM VRM objectives. Although the existing Project facilities do not alter the quality of

visual resources addressed by the plan, several Project facilities dominate the view and for this reason do not meet the objectives of the designated VRMC.

2. Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Medford District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. June 1995. 248 pp. and maps.

This document records the decision on a preferred alternative analyzed in the Medford district proposed RMP/EIS. The Medford district proposed RMP/EIS includes lands in Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, and Josephine counties in Oregon. The proposed Project area is generally outside of the area addressed by this document. Although land management policies in the Medford district could indirectly affect downstream resources (e.g., water quality), no relation exists between the RMP and the land uses within the proposed Project area. For these reasons, this plan is not relevant to the Project.

The Spring Creek diversion facility is located in Jackson County within the Medford RMP area. As relevant, this facility will be analyzed as part of a supplement to the license application.

California/Oregon

1. U.S. Forest Service. Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old Growth Forest-Related Species within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. [NW Forest Plan.] Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior. Washington, DC. April 13, 1994. 144 pp.

Summary. This document presents a combination of land allocations managed primarily to protect and enhance habitat for late-successional and old growth forest-related species, and standards and guidelines for the management of the land allocations. It takes an ecosystem management approach to forest management, with support from scientific evidence, that balances protection of native species and riparian areas with the support of local and regional economic needs. These standards and guidelines apply to lands administered by USFS and BLM within the range of the northern spotted owl.

Project Consistency. The continued operation of Project facilities would not affect the maintenance and preservation of late-successional and old growth forest ecosystems. The presence of Project facilities does not increase the likelihood of silvicultural activities in the area. The Project does not propose the construction of any new facilities. Any future activities would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as mandated by the plan (in Late-Successional Reserves). For these reasons, the Project is consistent with the plan.

E8.3.2.2 Other Relevant Resource Plans

The land use and resource management plans discussed below are not in the FERC List of Comprehensive Plans, but were determined to be potentially relevant to land use or resource management in the Project area.

California

1. U.S. Forest Service. 1994. Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Department of Agriculture, Yreka, California. 1994. One volume and maps.

Summary. The purpose of the plan is to coordinate and disclose programmatic management direction for the Klamath National Forest. This direction will provide for multiple uses and the sustained yield of goods and services from the National Forest System in a manner that maximizes long-term net public benefits in an environmentally sound manner. The plan sets forth the preferred alternative for managing the land and resources of the Klamath National Forest. It establishes the management direction and associated long-range goals and objectives for the forest; specifies the standards, timing, and vicinity of the practices necessary to achieve that direction; and establishes the monitoring and evaluation requirements needed to ensure that the direction is carried out.

Land Use Project Consistency. Because none of the Project facilities conflict with the management direction provided by the plan, the Project is consistent with the plan. No additional actions are proposed by the Project that would affect forest conservation or production in or near lands addressed by this plan.

Visual Resource Management Element. Conservation of the naturally established scenic character of the forest environment is the primary goal of visual management. As discussed in the plan, five inventoried and adopted VQOs are used as visual yardsticks to evaluate both project impacts and forest-level effects of planning alternatives. The VQOs are Preservation, Retention, Partial Retention, Modification, and Maximum Modification. Policies contained within the plan emphasize the need for the forest to meet the established VQOs, particularly as seen from communities, high-use recreation areas, and major roads and trails. The VQOs are minimum conditions to be achieved as soon as possible in all management areas and within 3 years, with the exception of Preservation and Maximum Modification, which must be met immediately. Facilities and developments such as roads, trails, campground facilities, structures, signs, and interpretive stations are not required to meet the Management Area VQOs when viewed in the immediate foreground (300 feet).

Visual Resource Project Consistency. No Project facilities are located on land addressed by this plan. In addition, no new Project facilities are proposed. For these reasons, the Project is consistent with this plan.

2. Siskiyou County. 1973. General Plan of Siskiyou County, California. Siskiyou County Planning Department, Yreka, California. Adopted June 1973.

Summary. The General Plan includes separate elements that were adopted over the course of several years, mostly in the early 1970s. This is the most recent document available. Elements cover a range of topics including land use, noise, conservation, energy, seismic safety, geothermal energy, and housing.

Land Use Project Consistency. The Project area exists in erosion hazard, septic tank limitation, steep slope, water quality, surface hydrology, flood hazard, critical deer wintering, and wildfire hazard areas. Existing Project facilities are consistent with the policies outlined for each hazard

area, including surface hydrology areas, in which hydroelectric power facilities are one of the few uses allowed. Any new facilities also would need to be consistent with applicable policies.

Siskiyou County relies on its zoning program to ensure consistency with its Open Space Plan. See the discussion below (under #3, Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance) for the Project's consistency with Siskiyou County zoning.

None of the recommendations made in the conservation element specifically apply to the Project. Zoning and building regulations designed to preserve the scenic areas of the county would be applied to any future uses of Project lands. Because no additional facilities are proposed for the Project, current agricultural and open space uses along the Klamath River would continue within the Project area.

Visual Resource Management Element. Visual resources are indirectly protected through the plan's conservation element. An overall goal for Siskiyou County's scenic lands is to work for the conservation of the county's scenic beauty. The county's natural areas are recommended for preservation of their scenic beauty as areas of active and passive recreation.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. The Project is consistent with Siskiyou County's goal to conserve the county's scenic beauty. Because the Project does not propose the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities in Siskiyou County, it will not alter the existing visual quality of the county. The Project will not detract from the county's existing scenic beauty, and will thereby conserve the existing visual quality.

3. Siskiyou County. 1994. Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance. Siskiyou County Planning Department, Yreka, California. June 1994.

Summary. The Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance guides land development in unincorporated portions of Siskiyou County. Zones are grouped by six main uses—residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, timberland, and open space.

Land Use Project Consistency. Public utility facilities are a conditional use in each of the three zones in the Project area. All of the Project facilities are consistent with the zoning through conditional use permits. No additional facilities are proposed for this Project.

Visual Resource Management Element. The zoning code has no specific visual resource element, although elements of the code may influence the ultimate appearance of individual parcels as they are developed.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. The Project does not include any actions that require review under the Siskiyou County Zoning Code. As a result, there are no actions on which to judge project consistency. If new facilities or modifications to existing facilities are proposed in the future, they would be subject to the code.

Oregon

1. Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part I—Comprehensive Plan, Polices. Klamath County Planning Department, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Adopted November 25, 1981. Latest revision September 8, 1999.

Summary. Klamath County's Comprehensive Plan has three parts—the policies (discussed here), the atlas, and the land development code (discussed below). The goals and objectives contained within Part 1 of the plan are recommended as a broad framework for future planning and development within the county. County objectives are integrated with Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals, prepared by the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

Land Use Project Consistency. The Project area is nearly all forest land, and the Project's land uses are not retroactively subject to the provisions of the plan. To the degree that the Project lands remain undeveloped, wildlife habitat and riparian areas would be protected. No additional facilities are currently proposed for the Project that could interfere with riparian areas; therefore, the Project is consistent with the plan.

Visual Resource Management Element. Visual resource policies contained within the county's plan involve the conservation and enhancement of natural and scenic resources. To implement these policies, the county wishes to encourage the designation of scenic views for the public's information and encourage the protection of recognized scenic views. However, the county will recognize that intensive farm or forestry activities are an integral part of the community and will not restrict these activities pertaining to scenic view enhancement.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. The Klamath County Comprehensive Plan was adopted following construction of Project facilities. As a result, the visual quality of these facilities was known at the time of the plan's development and was taken into consideration. There was no expectation that those facilities would be altered as a result of the plan's adoption.

Three potential overlooks are being considered in the Project area along Ager-Beswick/Topsy Grade Road. If these overlooks are developed, they would be consistent with Klamath County's desire to encourage the designation of scenic views for the public's information.

2. Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part III – Land Development Code. Klamath County Planning Department, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Adopted November 25, 1981. Latest revision September 8, 1999.

Summary. The Klamath County land development code guides land development in unincorporated portions of Klamath County. Zones are grouped by six main uses—residential, commercial, industrial, exclusive farm use, forestry, and open space and conservation.

Land Use Project Consistency. Public utility facilities are either permitted or conditional uses (depending on the facility type) in each of the zones in the Project area. Project facilities are consistent with the zoning through conditional use permits. No additional facilities are proposed for this Project.

Visual Resource Management Element. Article 65 in the land development code addresses landscaping. Its purpose is to maintain and enhance the appearance of structures and properties, provide for visual privacy and a quality visual environment, and provide areas on sites to absorb rainfall and reduce stormwater runoff. Landscaping policies are targeted at yards, parking areas, and multifamily dwellings, and do not specifically address public facilities.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. Project facilities were constructed prior to the adoption of the county's land development code. Because the facilities existed prior to the code, they are not

retroactively subject to the requirements of the code. If modifications are made to the facilities, these modifications would be subject to the code's requirements.

3. Klamath Headwaters Agricultural Water Quality Advisory Committee. 2002. Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan: Klamath Headwaters, Excluding Lost River. Draft Version 9, May 13, 2002.

Summary. This plan provides guidance for addressing agricultural water quality issues in the Klamath Headwaters basin. The purpose of the plan is to identify strategies to reduce water pollution from agricultural lands through a combination of educational programs, suggested land treatments, management activities, and monitoring. The plan applies to all nonfederal and nontribal sovereign agricultural, rural, and forest lands drained by the Klamath River and its tributaries outside of the Lost River. The principal water bodies addressed by the plan are:

- Klamath and Agency Lakes
- Williamson River
- Wood River, Seven Mile, and minor streams on the west side of the lake
- Lake Ewauna and the Klamath River within Oregon
- Spencer Creek, Jenny Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Beaver Creek
- Major wetlands and Sycan Marsh, Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge

Project Consistency. Project lands along the Klamath River south of Keno are in current use as open space. The Project proposes no additional facilities and no changes in the open space land along this stretch of the Klamath River. Therefore, the natural open space that currently exists along the river will remain intact and can act as a riparian corridor in accordance with this plan.

4. Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District. 1990. Spencer Creek Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan. July 26, 1990.

Summary. This plan focuses on the Spencer Creek watershed, placing an emphasis on livestock, transportation, stream fisheries, recreation, forestry, and tree management. General problems within the watershed are identified, and guidance for addressing them is outlined in the form of "decisions" for each of the areas of emphasis. The plan concludes with a list of action items to aid implementation.

Project Consistency. The natural resource value of grazing and timber lands must be maintained in accordance with the plan. Project land near Spencer Creek is used primarily for this purpose. Because no expansion of Project facilities is proposed by the Project, the function of these lands would not change. The presence of J.C. Boyle reservoir provides recreational opportunities to the watershed, which are noted as lacking.

5. Oregon Department of Agriculture. 2001. Lost River Subbasin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan. March 22, 2001.

Summary. The plan applies to agricultural activities on all agricultural, rural, and forest lands within the Lost River Subbasin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area that are not owned by the federal government and are not Tribal Trust Lands. The purpose of the plan is to identify

strategies to reduce water pollution from agricultural lands through a combination of educational programs, suggested land treatments, management activities, and monitoring. The plan itself is voluntary, although as part of its implementation strategy the plan references ODA Area Rules, which are enforceable by ODA.

Project Consistency. From Link River dam to the southern limit of the Klamath Falls urban growth boundary (UGB), no agricultural uses are present. PacifiCorp land in this area is adjacent to the Link River and is zoned for public use. Between the southern limit of the Klamath Falls UGB and just before Keno dam, much of the land within ¼ mile of the Klamath River has an "exclusive farm use cropland/grazing" designation, and existing land use is a mixture of these uses. PacifiCorp owns no land in this area. In the vicinity of Keno dam, where PacifiCorp does own land, the zoning is rural residential. Existing land uses on this PacifiCorp land are hydropower production and outdoor recreation and do not include agricultural activities. For these reasons, the Project is determined to be consistent with this plan.

6. South Central Oregon Regional Partnership (SCORP). 1999. South Central Oregon Regional Partnership Strategic Plan. Lake and Klamath Counties, Oregon. Available: <http://www.sobusi.com/scorp>. Accessed: November 2000.

Summary. The SCORP plan applies to Lake and Klamath counties, Oregon. The plan describes goals for economic development; education and training; infrastructure; capacity building; housing, health, and human services; public safety and emergency response; community amenities; and natural resources.

Project Consistency. Because this document relates to future land development actions, the Project is consistent with the plan. Because any future land development actions related to the Project would be required to be consistent with applicable county requirements, such actions also would be consistent with this plan.

7. South Central Oregon Regional Partnership (SCORP). 2001. South Central Oregon Consolidated Economic Development Strategy and Regional Investment Plan 2001-2003. Lake and Klamath Counties, Oregon. Available: <http://www.sobusi.com/scorp>. Accessed: May 2002.

Summary. This plan was developed to guide funding programs for south central Oregon, including Klamath County. The plan incorporates the regional vision and goals identified by SCORP in its strategic plan.

Project Consistency. Because this document relates to future land development actions, the Project is consistent with the plan. Because any future land development actions related to the Project would need to be consistent with applicable county requirements, such actions also would be consistent with this plan.

8. Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. Klamath River Scenic Waterway Rules (OAR 736-040-0005 through 736-040-0095 and ORD 395.805 through 390.940).

Visual Resource Management Element. State scenic waterway regulations, which designate the river as "scenic," were filed as final on October 3, 2002. These rules apply to the Project where it

falls within ¼ mile on either side of the river between the J.C. Boyle powerhouse and the Oregon-California state line. The following provisions of the rules may apply to the Project:

- Structures: New structures and associated improvements shall be totally screened from view from the river by topography and/or vegetation, with some exceptions.
- Roads: New roads are permitted only when totally screened from the river by topography and/or vegetation. Where existing roads are visible from the river, major extensions, realignments or upgrades shall be totally screened from view from the river. Necessary minor road improvements shall be substantially screened from the river. When an existing road is regraded, no sidecast into or visible from the river shall be permitted.
- Trees: Visible tree harvest or other vegetation management may be permitted with certain provisions, including that the harvest or management is designed to enhance the scenic view within 5 to10 years.
- Public Recreation or Resource Protection: Improvements needed for public recreation use or resource protection may be visible from the river, but shall be primitive in character and designed to blend with the natural character of the landscape.
- Utility Facilities: Proposed utility facilities shall share existing utility corridors, minimize any ground and vegetation disturbance, and employ nonvisible alternatives when reasonably possible.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. The Scenic Waterway Rules govern the development of new facilities or modifications to existing facilities. Because the rules were developed subsequent to the construction of Project facilities in this river reach (J.C. Boyle powerhouse and the transmission line from the powerhouse, canal, and penstock), it is assumed that these facilities would continue to exist and operate. However, if the Project facilities were to be modified in the future, those modifications would be subject to the rules.

California/Oregon

1. Bureau of Land Management. 2003. Draft Upper Klamath River Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan Amendments. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Lakeview District Office, Lakeview, Oregon. Three Volumes. April 2003.

Summary. The document titled Draft Upper Klamath River Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan Amendments outlines management options and environmental consequences for managing lands administered by BLM in southern Oregon and northern California along the Upper Klamath River system. The proposed amendments would apply to both the Redding and Klamath Falls resource area management plans. The Draft EIS evaluates four alternatives with differing land use allocations and land tenure. Alternative 1 (No Action) would not change existing land allocation or designations. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would expand the existing Area of Critical Environmental Concern (Klamath River Canyon from rim to rim extending from J.C. Boyle powerhouse south to the Oregon/California state line) from the J.C. Boyle powerhouse north to the J.C. Boyle dam. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would also expand the Upper Klamath River Management Area, located in California, by 2,119 acres, 7,885 acres, and 5,462 acres, respectively. Within the proposed alternative project boundaries,

BLM would seek to increase public land holdings through retention of public lands and the acquisition of nonfederal lands by exchange, purchase, or donation.

Land Use Project Consistency. The continued operation of Project facilities would not be inconsistent with any land use decisions undertaken by BLM pursuant to the proposed alternatives.

Visual Resource Management Element. The four Draft EIS alternatives have common goals related to visual resources and some common proposed actions. The resource goals are aimed at maintaining the quality and diversity of the landscape. The goals also include enhancing the scenic quality of areas with existing hydropower facilities through the FERC relicensing process. Relevant actions common to all alternatives include (1) BLM cooperating with PacifiCorp and other private land owners to minimize the visual effects of their management activities and structures and to modify existing structures and projects for the purpose of lessening negative visual effects, and (2) pursuing river flows that improve the scenic quality. Three of the alternatives also include the objective to "require vegetative screening and other measures to mitigate hydroelectric project facilities scenic degradation." The plan assumes that all BLM-managed lands within the planning area are classified and managed as BLM VRM Class II.

Visual Resource Project Consistency. Project facilities predate this plan. The consistency of the Project's facilities with the plan's VRMC designations is therefore not applicable because no modifications are proposed to those facilities and there is no corresponding level of change. While the visual assessment describes the visual quality of each facility in terms of the BLM VRM objectives, it does not identify a level of change because the facilities predate the plan. Instead, the assessment compares each facility against the corresponding VRMC for context with the surrounding landscape and the BLM visual resource management objectives. Given that the Project does not alter the existing visual quality of resources addressed by the plan, the Project is consistent with the proposed RMP.

2. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). 2000. Klamath Project Long-Term Operations Plan Environmental Impact Statement—Preliminary Alternatives. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Basin Area Office, Klamath Falls, Oregon. September 2000.

USBR recently released a new Notice of Intent with plans to conduct a new scoping and alternatives development process. For reasons of timing, it is not included in the draft license application.

Federal

1. Bureau of Land Management. 2002. Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. Two volumes. May 2002.

Land Use/Resource Management Element. This document compares management alternatives for the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument, located in southeastern Jackson County, Oregon. Except for the Spring Creek diversion, which is located within the Monument boundary, there is no relation between the alternatives being considered for management of the monument and the

land uses within the proposed Project area. As relevant, the Spring Creek diversion will be analyzed in supplemental documents.

2. National Park Service. 1994. Klamath Wild and Scenic River eligibility report and environmental assessment. Department of Interior, Seattle, Washington. August 1994. 108 pages.

Visual Resource Management Element. This report finds that all requirements of section 2(a)(ii) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and Department of Interior guidelines have been met and recommends that the state of Oregon's application for wild and scenic river designation for the Upper Klamath River be approved. The recommended designation extends from immediately downstream of the J.C. Boyle powerhouse (river mile [RM] 220.3) to the Oregon-California border (RM 209.3). The river is recommended for designation as a National Scenic River.

Project Consistency. Because this is not a policy document for managing the river, it is not analyzed further for relation to the Project. Consistency with BLM VRM goals is addressed elsewhere in this document.

E8.3.2.3 Wetland and Floodplain Policies

Wetlands and floodplains in the Project area are subject to the regulations of federal, state, and local jurisdictions. Applicable wetland and floodplain policies contained in land use and resource management plans are reviewed in this section. Additional relevant polices and compliance related to wetlands are reviewed in the Terrestrial Resources Final Technical Report. The majority of the policies below apply to new development. However, no new Project facilities are proposed, and most of the policies are not relevant to existing development.

California

1. Siskiyou County. 1973. General Plan of Siskiyou County, California. Siskiyou County Planning Department, Yreka, California. Adopted June 1973.

Wetland/Floodplain Management Policies. The county's general plan has two policies that address development near or within floodplains:

- Land Use Element, Policy 22—No development may be allowed within the designated floodways, and any development proven to be outside the designated floodway and within the 100-year flood hazard boundary shall be in accordance with the requirements of the county's floodplain management ordinance.

- Land Use Element, Policy 24—Public or quasi-public uses only may be permitted if the requirements of Policy 22 have been met.

Relevance and Project Consistency. As a permitted facility in Siskiyou County, the Project is in compliance with these policies. Any new Project facilities would need to be constructed and operated in compliance with these policies.

Oregon

1. Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary. Department of the Interior, Klamath Falls, Oregon. June 1995. 86 pp. Appendices and maps.

Wetland/Floodplain Management Policies. The RMP has several related policies, primarily regarding wetlands. These policies include the following:

- **Wetlands**. Water Management Action—Emphasize, in accordance with the Riparian-Wetland Initiative for the 1990s, the following in management of riparian-wetland areas: protection of riparian-wetland areas and associated uplands; rehabilitation and maintenance of riparian-wetland areas; and partnership and cooperative rehabilitation and management of riparian-wetland areas.

- **Floodplains**. Water Management Action—Protect floodplains and wetlands in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 (see summary under Federal below).

Relevance and Project Consistency. The Klamath Falls Resource Area RMP applies to BLM lands in this area. The continued operation of the facilities associated with the Project would not preclude the protection and rehabilitation of riparian and wetland areas. See also discussion above under land use and resource management plans and in the Terrestrial Resources Final Technical Report.

2. Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Jenny Creek Watershed Assessment and Analysis. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. February 1995.

Wetland/Floodplain Management Policies. One policy in this plan indirectly relates to development in floodplains:

- Watershed 1. Improve aquatic ecosystem health and resiliency by restoring stream floodplains, and try to develop a long-term water management plan that restores flushing flows to Jenny Creek without introducing exotics from the reservoir.

Relevance and Project Consistency. A portion of the Jenny Creek watershed is within the proposed FERC boundary. Jenny Creek empties into the Iron Gate reservoir. The continued operation of the Project does not preclude efforts to restore stream floodplains on Jenny Creek.

3. Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part I Comprehensive Plan, Policies. Klamath County Planning Department, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Adopted November 25, 1981. Latest revision September 8, 1999.

Wetland/Floodplain Management Policies. Klamath County's Comprehensive Plan protects wetlands through the use of its Significant Resource Overlay, as described in the implementing actions of Goal 5, Policy 12:

- Goal 5, Policy 12. The county shall protect significant big game winter ranges and other significant wildlife habitat.

- Implementation 1. The Significant Resource Overlay shall be applied to big game winter ranges, the antelope range north of Bly, and the significant wetland areas.

- Implementation 5. Other wildlife habitat is protected by the riparian setback around wetland areas and the Significant Resource Overlay applied to significant wetland areas.

Relevance and Project Consistency. As a permitted facility in Klamath County, the Project is in compliance with these policies. Any new Project facilities would need to be constructed and operated in compliance with these policies.

4. Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part III—Land Development Code. Klamath County Planning Department, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Adopted November 25, 1981. Latest revision September 8, 1999.

Wetland/Floodplain Management Policies. Wetlands and floodplains are addressed as follows in two articles of the county's land development code:

- Article 57—Significant Resource Overlay. For preserving significant natural and cultural resources, addressing the economic, social, environmental and energy consequences of conflicting uses upon significant natural and cultural resources, and permitting development in a manner that does not adversely impact identified resource values. See Article 57.060 for General Review Criteria.

- Article 59—Flood Hazard Overlay. For developing areas that are subject to flooding, erosion, or similar hazards, in order to avoid or reduce losses to life and property. Existing uses are exempt under 59.070, expansions and alterations must adhere to standards in 59.090 and 59.110.

Relevance and Project Consistency. As a permitted facility in Klamath County, the Project is in compliance with these policies. Any new Project facilities would need to be constructed and operated in compliance with these policies.

5. Klamath Headwaters Agricultural Water Quality Advisory Committee. 2002. Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan: Klamath Headwaters, excluding Lost River. Draft Version 9, May 13, 2002.

Wetland/Floodplain Management Policies. The headwaters plan contains the following strategy regarding wetlands:

- Strategy 1.C.—Implement successful practices for stream bank stabilization, reduction in high summer water temperatures, restoration and enhancement of wetlands and riparian areas, and avoidance of adverse fish habitat modification.

Relevance and Project Consistency. The plan generally applies to the Klamath River south of Keno to the state line and also Keno reservoir within the Project area. The continued operation of the Project does not preclude efforts to restore and enhance wetlands on the Klamath River in this area.

Federal

None of the plan or policy documents relevant to the Project and prepared by federal government agencies contain applicable wetland or floodplain policies. However, the following Executive Orders apply to the Project.

1. Executive Order 11988: Floodplain Management (May 24, 1977).

This Executive Order applies to federal agencies and requires them to consider and minimize impacts to floodplains associated with federal actions. The Order's stated purpose is "to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct or indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative."

2. Executive Order 11990: Protection of Wetlands (May 24, 1977).

This executive order applies to federal agencies and requires them to consider and minimize impacts to wetlands associated with federal actions. The Order's stated purpose is "to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the destruction of modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative."

Relevance and Project Consistency. The executive orders are implemented through local regulations and permits governing regulated activities. By definition, the Project is consistent with these orders. Any new development that would impact wetlands or floodplains would need to be reviewed by local agencies to assure consistency.

E8.4 CONSULTATION WITH APPLICABLE AGENCIES, TRIBES, AND THE PUBLIC ON LAND USE AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Between December 2001 and November 2003, the land use work group met numerous times to review and discuss the land use, visual resources, and recreation study plans. The meetings and results as related to land use and visual resources are summarized as follows:

- **December 13, 2001.** The purpose of this meeting was to review the proposed land use and visual resources study plans. The group heard the purpose of the study, study area, existing information and hopeful outcomes of the studies.
- **January 16, 2002.** The meeting was convened to afford an opportunity for those parties interested in land use and visual resources to provide comments on proposed study plans. The purpose of each study was reviewed and meeting attendees had the chance to ask questions. The group was informed that there would be opportunity for additional comments at future work group meetings.
- **July 9, 2002.** Discussion on land use and visual resources took place within the Recreation Work Group meeting. PacifiCorp provided updates on revisions to the study plans based on group member feedback. The group approved the study plans to go to the plenary for approval.
- **August 8, 2002.** Study plans were approved by the relicensing plenary group.

- **September 2002-November 2003.** Interim results and potential enhancement measures were discussed at monthly recreation work group meetings.

For additional information about consultation with applicable agencies, tribes, and the public regarding land use, visual, and aesthetic resources, refer to Appendix E-1A of Exhibit E.

E8.5 LAND USE AND AESTHETIC RESOURCE STUDIES

E8.5.1 Studies Conducted for Relicensing

The land use and aesthetic/visual resource studies conducted to review the Project and determine consistency with plans and policies have been completed.

E8.5.2 Proposed Studies

No additional studies beyond those described elsewhere in this document are proposed.

E8.5.3 Outstanding Study Issues

In 2002, PacifiCorp conducted an initial inventory of Project-related roads and collected information on their potential impacts on surrounding sensitive aquatic and terrestrial resources. The roadway inventory data and associated GIS mapping are currently being reviewed, updated, and summarized by PacifiCorp. This task will be completed by mid-2004. The complete results of this task will not be reported until after the filing of the final license application in February 2004. The summary and analysis of the roads inventory data will include appropriate tables and GIS map sets. In addition, Project-related road management activities will be defined, including road and bridge management activities, monitoring activities, and cost-sharing responsibilities for Project-related transportation facilities. A summary of the roads inventory data and road management activities will be presented in report format (see Appendix E-8C).

E8.6 EXISTING AND PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES FOR LAND USE AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

E8.6.1 Proposed Measures for Land Use and Management

No enhancement measures related to land use are proposed.

E8.6.2 Proposed Measures for Aesthetic and Visual Resources

The following measures to enhance aesthetic and visual resources in the Project area are proposed. These measures are described in more detail in the Recreation Resource Management Plan (RRMP) and coordinated with the Vegetation Management Plan.

E8.6.2.1 J.C. Boyle

- Red Barn—The operations and maintenance building (known as the "red barn") is visible across the J.C. Boyle reservoir from Topsy Recreation Site (KOP K7) and presents a moderate degree of contrast. The visibility of the barn could be reduced through vegetative screening or painting it a more neutral color.

- Powerhouse Facilities—The J.C. Boyle power facilities present a high degree of contrast with the natural landscape. In particular, the penstock, surge tank, and powerhouse covers are painted a light tan color that is highly visible from KOP BB8 and KOP HC1. The visual contrast of some or all of these facilities could be reduced through vegetative screening and/or painting a more neutral color. The substation also is visible from KOP BB1 and HC7; visibility could be reduced through vegetative screening.

E8.6.2.2 Iron Gate

- Powerhouse Facilities—The Iron Gate penstock is painted a light tan color that contrasts with the reddish iron color of the back of the Iron Gate dam. This contrast is observed downriver from KOP IG12. The contrast could be reduced by painting the penstock and powerhouse covers a color that matches the color of the dam.

E8.6.3 Public Access Provisions and Protection of Recreation and Aesthetic Values of Impoundments and Their Shorelines

This section discusses ownership and access to Project reservoirs and their shorelines, the degree of shoreline protection afforded, and what the costs might be to include shoreline buffers in areas not owned by PacifiCorp.

The public's access to Project shorelines and PacifiCorp's ability to buffer or protect them is influenced by land ownership, developed access, and inclusion within the proposed FERC boundary. Table E8.6-1 identifies the shoreline measurements for each reservoir and the length of river and stream shorelines included within the Project boundary as proposed environmentally sensitive PM&E areas. This table also shows the total lengths of the original and proposed FERC boundaries for all projects where FERC boundaries where identified.

Table E8.6-1. Shoreline and FERC perimeter shoreline measurements[1]

	Length of Shorelines			Length of FERC Boundary		
	Reservoir (shoreline length)	River (shoreline length	Stream (centerline length)	Surrounding Sensitive Areas (Proposed Boundary)	Original FERC Boundary	Proposed[2] FERC Boundary
	Miles	Miles	Miles	Miles	Miles	Miles
J.C. Boyle	8.1			3.7	35.9	23.8
Klamath River (Copco to State Line)		11.7		12.7		12.7
Copco No. 1 and No. 2	15.5			0.7	19.1	29.1
Fall Creek	0.03				6.2	10.1
Spring Creek			0.8			1.7
Iron Gate	21.9			9.8	26.9	34.6
Jenny Creek			1.0	2.1		2.1
Bogus Creek			1.2	2.1		2.1
Shovel Creek			2.6	4.9		4.9

Table E8.6-1. Shoreline and FERC perimeter shoreline measurements[1]

	Length of Shorelines			Length of FERC Boundary		
	Reservoir (shoreline length)	River (shoreline length	Stream (centerline length)	Surrounding Sensitive Areas (Proposed Boundary)	Original FERC Boundary	Proposed[2] FERC Boundary
	Miles	Miles	Miles	Miles	Miles	Miles
TOTALS	**45.43**	**11.7**	**5.6**	**35.8**	**88.1**	**121.9**

[1] Ownership linear measurements were based on Klamath and Siskiyou counties geographic information system (GIS) parcel coverage and PacifiCorp's GIS shoreline and ownership data. Measurements are approximate because they are not based on surveyed or controlled data.

[2] Total FERC boundary length including all areas within the FERC boundary.

Table E8.6-2 provides a summary of the ownership control of land adjacent to the shorelines. The length of reservoir shorelines are shown for each category of adjacent ownership. Figure E8.1-1 illustrates the lands owned by PacifiCorp as well as major holdings by BLM and USFS. Section E8.1.1 discusses land use and management of lands within a ¼ mile of the reservoir shorelines. The river and stream shorelines slated for mitigation and enhancement have not been included in Table E8.6-2 because they are located on PacifiCorp property.

When the shoreline property is owned by PacifiCorp, public access, land management buffers, and shoreline protection are easily provided. However, when the land is privately owned, PacifiCorp has limited control over development and public access except where development crosses the proposed FERC boundary (for example, with docks, piers, irrigation structures, and diversions). Development is limited by zoning, as demonstrated in Figure E8.1-2, and by federal, state, and local environmental regulations. Land in federal, state, or other public ownership provides some degree of shoreline control, but property disposal or control cannot be guaranteed. In these situations, land use control is up to the agencies involved. Developments potentially may be allowed on non-PacifiCorp shoreline properties when they are considered a permitted use by the city or county zoning regulations or through the issuance of conditional use permits. Such developments could have adverse impacts on aesthetics, water quality, and public access.

Table E8.6-2. Shoreline ownership summary*

Project	Ownership	Shoreline Length	
		Miles	Feet
J.C. Boyle	PacifiCorp	7.4	39,111
	Federal	0.4	1,864
	State	0	0
	Other Public	0	0
	Private	0.3	1,535

Table E8.6-2. Shoreline ownership summary*

Project	Ownership	Shoreline Length	
		Miles	Feet
Copco No. 1 and No. 2	PacifiCorp	3.2	16,652
	Federal	0.1	731
	State	0	0
	Other Public	0.1	653
	Private	12.1	63,829
Klamath River	PacifiCorp	11.7	61,973
Fall Creek	PacifiCorp	0.03	158
Spring Creek Ditch	Federal	0.84	4,430
Iron Gate	PacifiCorp	20.4	107,584
	Federal	1.5	7,910
	State	0	0
	Other Public	0	0
	Private	0	0

* Ownership linear measurements were based on Klamath and Siskiyou counties geographic information system (GIS) parcel coverage and PacifiCorp's GIS shoreline and ownership data. Measurements are approximate because they are not based on surveyed or controlled data.

The delineation of the FERC boundary along the high water line of reservoirs or rivers controls the placement of docks or other structures. Table E8.6-1 shows the lengths of the FERC boundary for each of the project developments, as illustrated on the maps provided in Exhibit G of this license application. The length of the FERC boundary for J.C. Boyle, Copco No. 1 and No. 2, Fall River, Spring Creek ditch, and Iron Gate are based on the proposed FERC boundary identified in Exhibit G. Table E8.6-1 also identifies the dimension of additional boundary required to include sensitive PM&E areas (riparian and cultural) for each reservoir.

Issues and potential costs associated with providing additional buffer zones around each Project reservoir are summarized in the next sections.

E8.6.3.1 J.C. Boyle Reservoir

Approximately 92 percent of the J.C. Boyle reservoir shoreline is owned by PacifiCorp, 4.4 percent is owned by BLM, and 4.4 percent is in private ownership. PacifiCorp shoreline property provides sufficient shoreline buffer around most of the reservoir shoreline. BLM land adjacent to the FERC boundary is reserved by Secretarial Order for recreation development (Topsy Campground) and is therefore not included within the Klamath FERC boundary. The 4.4 percent of private land is private timber company land (four parcels) on the upstream end of J.C. Boyle reservoir. It is used by the public for dispersed recreation (fishing, hunting, camping). Table E8.6-3 shows the possible cost of acquiring a 50-foot buffer in fee or as a conservation easement for this private property.

E8.6.3.2 Copco No. 1 and No. 2

The greater portion of the Copco Lake shoreline is in private ownership. Parcels vary in size. Of the 294 shoreline parcels, 186 private parcels are vacant, 85 have been developed with permanent residences or vacation homes, seven are county owned, one is owned by the Copco Fire District, and one belongs to BLM. PacifiCorp has 14 parcels which border the proposed FERC boundary. Eight of these parcels include part of the reservoir itself, and seven of those eight are all reservoir (no land). The acquisition of conservation or development buffers across these parcels would be highly controversial and costly. Buffers would include backyards, landscaping, and in some cases, structures in existence for years. Table E8.6-3 shows the approximate cost of acquiring shoreline buffers in fee or as conservation easements for the private land around Copco reservoir. This is a worst case estimate and is not recommended.

E8.6.3.3 Fall Creek

No buffers are required because PacifiCorp owns the small amount of shoreline along the diversion reservoir and adjacent land along the canal, and penstock.

E8.6.3.4 Spring Creek Diversion

The Spring Creek diversion and ditch is small and the shoreline is within the proposed FERC boundary. The adjacent land is O&C reserved public land (BLM) located within the Soda Mountain National Monument. As a pre-Monument water resource, the land adjacent to the shoreline and proposed FERC boundary should be protected by the Soda Mountain National Monument management plan being developed. No additional buffer or protection should be required.

E8.6.3.5 Iron Gate Reservoir

Approximately 93 percent of the Iron Gate reservoir shoreline is owned by PacifiCorp and the remaining 7 percent is owned by BLM. The BLM parcels (three each) border the reservoir in several locations. The areas within the existing FERC boundary were withdrawn for power purposes by the current license and are still retained in public ownership. These lands are shown on license application Exhibit G sheets 2 and 3. BLM is currently managing the land it owns around the shoreline in a natural state, although the land is for sale. Table E8.6-3 shows the approximate cost of acquiring a 50-foot buffer or reservation along the BLM shoreline, and, alternatively, of buying the parcels involved.

Table E8.6-3. Estimate for shoreline buffer acquisition

Project	Development Classification[1] (potentially developable/ undevelopable)	Buffer Acreage	Estimated Acquisition Cost
		Acres	
J.C. Boyle	Potentially Developable	1.6	$2,400
	Undevelopable	0	0
Copco No. 1 and No. 2	Potentially Developable	78	$117,000.00
	Undevelopable	5	$2,500.00
Fall Creek/Spring Creek	Not Applicable		
Iron Gate	Potentially Developable	440[2]	$440,000
	• Acquisition of parcels		
	• Acquisition of 50-Foot Conservation Easement	9	$13,500

[1] Developable land includes only shoreline property that may have development potential. The remainder is suited for grazing, wildlife habitat, and open space.

[2] Assumes that entire parcels will need to be purchased, except for the reservoir.

E8.6.3.6 Proposed Shoreline PM&E Measures

FERC has stated that it is the licensee's responsibility to ensure that shoreline development activities that occur within project boundaries are consistent with project license requirements, purposes, and operations. To assist in meeting these requirements, FERC encourages the development of shoreline management plans (SMPs). The SMP is a comprehensive plan to manage the multiple resources and uses of the project's shorelines in a manner that is consistent with license requirements and project purposes. PacifiCorp commits to the completion of an SMP that ensures the following: (1) PacifiCorp shorelines are protected from incompatible use and development, and (2) public access and use is provided in areas proposed for such development and restricted from incompatible sensitive areas.

E8.6.4 PacifiCorp's Policy on Developing Shoreline Facilities on Project Lands and Waters

The permitting of shoreline facilities and other activities on Project lands to third parties is governed by PacifiCorp's "Facility Development Permit Policy for Hydroelectric Properties," published in September 1998. This policy, which currently is under revision, addresses (1) the types of property to which the policy applies and the type of development activities covered, (2) the responsibility of an applicant desiring to conduct activities on PacifiCorp's hydroelectric properties, and (3) PacifiCorp's obligations toward the applicant and federal and state regulatory entities. It is PacifiCorp's policy to attempt to (1) foster and enhance water-dependent and multiple uses, (2) provide appropriate environmental protection and enhancement, and (3) adhere to good land and resource management planning practices.

Properties subject to the permit policy include all shoreline and nonshoreline lands owned and operated by PacifiCorp that are associated with hydroelectric generation (including lands both within and outside the FERC Project boundaries). PacifiCorp has reviewed the operational requirements to verify that the proposed FERC boundary and Project lands have necessary rights. These rights are those acquired in fee title or in the right-to-use in perpetuity property considered

necessary or appropriate in the original Project license to construct, maintain, and operate the Project. Project purposes include, but were not limited to, the operation and maintenance, flowage, recreation, public and project access, protection of environmental resources, and shoreline control where deemed necessary.

PacifiCorp will evaluate the issuance of permits for the activities and facilities shown in the list below:

- Agricultural practices
- Boat docks
- Bridges
- Buildings
- Bulkheads
- Buoys
- Decks
- Drain fields
- Embankments
- Erosion control structures
- Golf courses
- Irrigation pumps/Headgates
- Landings
- Minor resource use (gravel from quarry, top soil, forest products)
- Piers
- Recreation facilities
- Resort developments
- Retaining walls
- Roads
- Septic tanks
- Storm drains
- Trespass rights
- Utilities
- Walkways
- Waterlines

PacifiCorp will review all requests for authorization within a FERC project boundary for consistency with the project license, including amendments and FERC orders as well as environmentally sensitive areas identified in Exhibit E, and technical studies. The applicant is required to obtain any required development permits and meet all other federal, state, and local requirements. PacifiCorp may authorize the following types of uses and occupancy of project lands and water without FERC approval:

- Landscape plantings
- Embankments
- Bulkheads
- Erosion control
- Noncommercial docks
- Noncommercial piers
- Retaining walls
- Other similar structures and facilities
- Noncommercial landings

A fee is charged for all permits issued. Permits are documented as development/use, easements, leases, or licenses. Most Project permits have been issued for docks and for agricultural purposes (grazing). Table E8.6-4 identifies the approximate number of docks constructed on Project reservoirs. The majority of docks were constructed on private shorelines where the FERC boundary was located at the high-water line or at Project recreation sites. Many of the dock permits have expired or were never obtained. The original Project developers (California –

Oregon Power Company [Copco] and USBR) granted uses such as public roads and rights-of-way.

Table E8.6-4. Klamath dock inventory

Project	Number of Docks/Piers	Comments
J.C. Boyle	3	One each on U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Topsy Campground and one each at PacifiCorp's Pioneer Recreation site.
Copco No. 1 and No. 2	63	Except for docks at the Mallard Cove and Copco Cove recreation sites, all docks are privately owned. Many docks have permits that have expired or have never been issued.
Fall Creek/Spring Creek	0	Not applicable.
Iron Gate	2	On developed recreation sites.

As a proposed PM&E measure, PacifiCorp will establish a new dock or shoreline structure permitting program. Residential docks, boat ramps, and other structures will be reevaluated and permits issued. Unauthorized or hazardous facilities will be evaluated and if necessary removed at the property owner's expense. Docks and other shoreline development will be evaluated for consistency with the SMP, which will be prepared as a shoreline enhancement measure as proposed in E8.6.3.

E8.6.5 Project Roads Inventory Analysis and Roads Management

In 2002, PacifiCorp conducted an initial inventory of Project-related roads and collected information on their potential impacts on surrounding sensitive aquatic and terrestrial resources. The roadway inventory data and associated GIS mapping are currently being reviewed, updated, and summarized by PacifiCorp. This task will be completed by mid-2004. When completed, the summary and analysis of the roads inventory data will include appropriate tables and GIS map sets. In addition, Project-related road management activities will be defined, including road and bridge management activities, monitoring activities, and cost-sharing responsibilities for Project-related transportation facilities. A summary of the roadway inventory data and road management activities will be presented in report format when completed (see Appendix E-8C). The results of the roadway inventory analysis and proposed roadway management actions and responsibilities will be reviewed in consultation with BLM.

E8.7 CONTINUING IMPACT ON LAND AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Impacts on land and aesthetic resources are expected to decrease with implementation of the proposed enhancement measures. Otherwise, continuing impacts would be the same as the existing impacts described in this document. For land use, most facilities are consistent with current zoning and others are allowed as conditional uses. The facilities also are consistent with agency RMPs. For visual resources, most of the Project facilities are consistent with applicable visual resource management objectives. Several facilities attract the attention of the observer or dominate the view. Visual impacts of Project operations are consistent with visual resource management objectives.

E8.8 INFORMATION SOURCES

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1990. Final Eligibility and Suitability Report for the Upper Klamath Wild and Scenic River Study. Department of the Interior, Klamath Falls, Oregon. March 1990. 131 pp. and appendices.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1993. Redding Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision. Department of the Interior, Ukiah, California. June 1993. 55 pp.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1994. Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. Department of the Interior, Klamath Falls, Oregon. September 1994. Three volumes and maps.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1994. Medford District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. October 1994. Three volumes and maps.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1995. Jenny Creek Watershed Assessment and Analysis. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. February 1995.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1995. Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary. Department of the Interior, Klamath Falls, Oregon. June 1995. 86 pp. Appendices and maps.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1995. Medford District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. June 1995. 248 pp. and maps.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2000a. Klamath-Iron Gate Watershed Analysis - Version 1.1. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. January 2000.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2000b. Klamath Falls Resource Area – Annual Program Summary. Department of the Interior, Klamath Falls, Oregon. July 2000. 139 pp.

Bureau of Land Management. 2001a. Visual Resource Inventory. BLM Manual H-8410-1. Last revised: March 22, 2001. Available: <http://www.blm.gov/nstc/VRM/8410.html>. Accessed: April 2001.

Bureau of Land Management. 2001b. Visual Resource Inventory Contrast Rating. BLM Manual 8431. Last revised March 22, 2001. Available: <http://www.blm.gov/nstc/VRM/8431.html>. Accessed: April 2001.

Bureau of Land Management. 2002a. Klamath Falls Resource Area Planning Update. Department of the Interior, Klamath Falls, Oregon. May 2002.

Bureau of Land Management. 2002b. Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. Department of the Interior, Medford, Oregon. Two volumes. May 2002.

Bureau of Land Management. 2003a. Draft Upper Klamath River Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan Amendments. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Lakeview District Office, Lakeview, Oregon. Three Volumes. April 2003.

Bureau of Land Management. 2003b. Proposed Plan Amendment to the Redding RMP and Environmental Assessment for the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Area. Department of the Interior, Redding, California. May 2003. 84 pp.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). 2002. Revised List of Comprehensive Plans. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Energy Projects, Washington, DC. April 2002. Internet access on 4/23/2002 - http://www.ferc.fed.us/Hydro/hydro2.htm.

Kier Associates. 1999. Mid-term Evaluation of the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fisheries Restoration Program. Prepared for the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force by Kier Associates, Sausalito and Arcata, California. April 1999.

Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part I – Comprehensive Plan, Policies. Klamath County Planning Department, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Adopted November 25, 1981. Latest revision September 8, 1999.

Klamath County. 1981. Comprehensive Plan for Klamath County, Oregon. Part III – Land Development Code. Klamath County Planning Department, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Adopted November 25, 1981. Latest revision September 8, 1999.

Klamath Falls. 2000. *Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan.* May 2000. Planning Department, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force. 1991. Long Range Plan for the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program. Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force with assistance from William M. Kier Associates. January 1991. Available: <http://endeavor.des.ucdavis.edu/kris/BIBLIO/KLPCOVER.HTM>. Accessed May 16, 2002.

Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District. Klamath Water Quality Plan. Plan coming from Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District.

Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District. Lost River Subbasin Water Quality Agricultural Management Area Plan. Plan coming from Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District.

Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District. Spencer Creek Conservation Resource Management Plan. Plan coming from Klamath Soil and Water Conservation District.

National Park Service. 1994. Klamath Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Report and Environmental Assessment. Department of Interior, Seattle, Washington. August 1994.

Siskiyou County. 1973. General Plan of Siskiyou County, California. Siskiyou County Planning Department, Yreka, California. Adopted June 1973.

Siskiyou County. 1994. Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance. Siskiyou County Planning Department, Yreka, California. June 1994.

South Central Oregon Regional Partnership (SCORP). 1999. South Central Oregon Regional Partnership Strategic Plan. Lake and Klamath Counties, Oregon. Available: <http://www.sobusi.com/scorp>. Accessed: November 2000.

South Central Oregon Regional Partnership (SCORP). 2001. South Central Oregon Consolidated Economic Development Strategy and Regional Investment Plan 2001-2003. Lake and Klamath Counties, Oregon. Available: <http://www.sobusi.com/scorp>. Accessed: May 2002.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). 2000. Klamath Project Long-term Operations Plan Environmental Impact Statement—Preliminary Alternatives. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Basin Area Office, Klamath Falls, Oregon. September 2000.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1995 [note: copy provided dated 1994]. Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Klamath National Forest. Yreka, California.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1995. Six Rivers National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Six Rivers National Forest. Eureka, California.

U.S. Forest Service (USFS). 1994. Klamath National Forest Environmental Impact Statement/Land and Resource Management Plan. Department of Agriculture, Yreka, California. 1994. Two volumes.

U.S. Forest Service (USFS). 1994. Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Department of Agriculture, Yreka, California. 1994. One volume and maps.

U.S. Forest Service (USFS). 1995. Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Department of Agriculture, Yreka, California. 1995. One volume and maps. [Note: copy provided is dated 1994.]

U.S. Forest Service (USFS). 1995. Six Rivers National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Department of Agriculture. Eureka, California. 1995

U.S. Forest Service (USFS). Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old Growth Forest-Related Species within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. [NW Forest Plan.] Washington, DC. April 13, 1994. 144 pp.

U.S. Forest Service (USFS). Bureau of Land Management. 2000. Interior Columbia Basin Final Environmental Impact Statement. Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior. Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, Walla Walla, Washington and Boise, Idaho. December 2000.