

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

COMPLETION AND REVIEW RECORD

District Office BOISE Original
 Plan Name [REDACTED] KUNA [REDACTED] Revision
 Area/Units Covered [REDACTED] Kuna 01-04

PLANNING DOCUMENT

Coordination 3-18-83
Date
 Staff Review 3-18-83
Date
 Decisions 3-21-83
Date
 Approval 3-22-83
Date
 Concurrence 3-30-83
Date

William D. Lagdon
Planning Coordinator
M. W. Weiland
Chief, PEA Staff
Thomas J. Oscar Anderson
Area Manager (s)
Martin Zimmer
District Manager
Carl White
State Director

REVIEWS

| Date | SO Review | Area Manager | District Manager |
|------|-----------|--------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

UPDATES

| Date | SO Review | Area Manager | District Manager |
|------|-----------|--------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

UNIT RESOURCE ANALYSIS
 COMPLETION AND REVIEW RECORD

District Office BOISE

ORIGINAL

Planning Area BRUNEAU-KUNA

REVISION

Planning Unit(s) BRUNEAU 01-11, KUNA 01-04

| | DO Completion | | SO Review | |
|--|---------------|--------------|-----------|------------------|
| | Date | Surname | Date | Surname |
| General Information (Step 1) | | | | |
| Physical Profile (Step 2) | //// | //////// | //// | //////// |
| Climate | 8-30-82 | D. Langer | 9-21-81 | K. Gutschmidt |
| Air Quality | | | | |
| Topography | 8-31-82 | M. Dorn | | |
| Geology | 8-31-82 | F. Anderson | 7/20/81 | Ch. W. |
| Soils | | | 9-22-81 | K. Gutschmidt |
| Vegetation | 8-31-82 | D. Langer | | |
| Water Resources | 8-31-82 | D. Langer | 9/22/81 | K. Gutschmidt |
| Animals | | | | |
| Fire | 7-31-82 | B. Galt | | |
| Limiting Physical Factors | //// | //////// | //// | //////// |
| Vegetation-Soil Erosion Susceptibility | 8-31-82 | D. Langer | 9/22/81 | K. Gutschmidt |
| Other Limiting Factors | 8-31-82 | P. Cingol | | |
| Developments | 8-31-82 | | | |
| Access | 8-31-82 | R. F. Hanson | | |
| Resource Data (Steps 3 & 4) | //// | //////// | //// | //////// |
| Lands | 8/21/81 | L. G. Smith | 9/2/81 | P. D. Smith |
| Minerals | 8/31/81 | F. Anderson | 9/2/81 | P. D. Smith |
| Forest and Vegetation Products | 8/21/81 | L. G. Smith | 9-22-81 | P. D. Smith |
| Range Management | 8/24/81 | B. Schley | 9/29/81 | P. D. Smith |
| Watershed | 9/3/81 | D. Langer | 9/22/81 | K. Gutschmidt |
| Wildlife - Terrestrial | 8/31/81 | R. S. Sander | 7/23/81 | P. D. Smith |
| Wildlife - Aquatic | 8/21/81 | E. L. Huan | 9-24-81 | R. F. Hanson |
| Cultural Resources | 8/31/81 | W. J. Jett | 9/25/81 | R. F. Hanson |
| Natural History | | | | |
| Recreation | 3/21/81 | W. Steyer | 4/25/81 | Richard P. Stein |
| Ecological Profile | | | | |
| Visual Resources | 8/21/81 | M. Dorn | 9/25/81 | Richard P. Stein |
| Wilderness | 8/21/81 | D. Langer | 9/29/81 | Richard P. Stein |

Chief Resources, DO
 Planning Coordinator, DO

Date _____ Signature _____
 Date 10-2-81 Signature W. M. Jett

Review:

Chief Resources, SO Date _____ Signature _____
 Chief P&EC, SO Date _____ Signature _____
 Chief Technical Services, SO Date _____ Signature _____

KUNA MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

Prepared by Terry Costello
September 1990

LANDS

Objective L-1: (Incorporated into Objective L-8.)

Objective L-2: Provide for military use of public lands in support of national defense efforts.

L-2.1 (a) Continue to allow military use of the existing 130,000-acre Idaho National Guard maneuver area as outlined in the 1979 MOU; however, the use must be in concert with WL-5.2.

(b) Reject all disposal applications within the National Guard MOU area.

(c) Withdraw the Impact Area from the 1872 Mining Laws, but not from the mineral leasing laws, provided that no surface occupancy is allowed.

Objective L-3: Review classifications and withdrawals. Restore lands to the operation of the public land laws and initiate transfer of jurisdiction where appropriate.

L-3.1 Conduct a comprehensive withdrawal review according the District's schedule. Where withdrawals overlap, retain only the underlying one that provides protection to meet existing and/or future needs.

Objective L-4: Establish and protect right-of-way corridors, reserve lands for identified R/W needs, establish or expand communication sites, and clear the records of any unnecessary R/Ws.

L-4.1 Confine major new utility R/Ws (i.e., 500 KV or larger or 24-inch pipeline) to existing corridors, as shown on Overlay L-4. The R/Ws will subject to reasonable stipulations to protect other resource uses.

Objective L-5, L-6, and L-7: (Incorporated into Objective L-8.)

Objective L-8: Determine through the land use planning process those public lands that are suitable for retention in federal ownership and those lands that are not needed to meet public land management objectives.

L-8.1 (a) Retain Category I lands (shown on Overlay D-1) except for: (1) isolated tracts of 160 acres or less that are found suitable for disposal through the land report/environmental procedures and do not conflict with specific listed criteria; (2) lands applied for under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act for unforeseen community expansion or other public purposes; and (3) exchanges that would result in a net benefit to BLM programs, are directed by specific legislation, or would aid in blocking State and federal management units.

(b) Depending on funding, staffing, and priorities, develop a comprehensive plan for exchange of private and State lands on an allotment-by-allotment basis. Area priorities and criteria for significance are provided.

(c) Within the boundaries of PLO 5777 (BOP) allow only those exchanges that specifically enhance the BOP management programs.

(d) Reject Carey Act and Desert Land Entry Act applications for lands in Category I. Priorities and further guidance are provided.

L-8.2 Category II lands (shown on Overlay D-1) are suitable for disposal, subject to detailed consideration including a land report and environmental assessment. Category III lands may become Category II after further study and public involvement.

L-8.3 Category III lands (shown on Overlay D-1) appear to be suitable for disposal but require further study in terms of site-specific analyses and public involvement. After further study, Category III lands that are found to have important public values will be changed to Category I and retained in federal ownership. Category III lands may be changed to Category II for sale if they are found to meet the sale criteria of Section 203 of FLPMA, and for agricultural development if they are found to have Class I, II, or III soils and do not have important public values. Disposal should be made in an orderly manner. Sale or exchange should be considered a priority, whenever possible, over disposal under the DLE or Carey acts. DLE or Carey act applications will be rejected in areas designated as water management areas by the Idaho Department of Water Resources unless a water permit is allowed in a reasonable time.

MINERALS

Objective M-1: Provide for maximum opportunities within the KPU for exploration and development of oil and gas and geothermal resources.

M-1.1 Allow oil and gas and geothermal leasing, except where lands are withdrawn, subject to stipulations to alleviate conflicts, as outlined in EA ID-01-246, ID-01-299, and ID-01-0-40. Allow no surface occupancy on any mineral leases within the following areas: (a) National Guard Impact area, (b) Oregon Trail and Kelton Road corridor, (c) Crater Rings, (d) Grand View Duck Ponds, (e) Essential nesting habitat in the BOP Area, (f) 1/4-mile buffer area around Lucky Peak Reservoir, (g) Tank/Cathedral and Higby caves, and (h) sites on or nominated to the National Register or Historic Places.

Objective M-2: (Combined with Objective M-1)

Objective M-3: Provide for exploration and development of locatable minerals.

M-3.1 Manage areas identified on Overlay D-4 primarily for their mineral values. Unless presently withdrawn or segregated to protect other resources or uses found to be more important, leave areas open to mineral entry, except withdraw: the Oregon Trail/Kelton Road corridor, Crater Rings, PLO 5777 (BOP Area), Grand View Duck Ponds, and the National Guard Impact Area.

Objective M-4: Provide salable minerals to meet local demands.

M-4.1 Designate FUPs up to 20 acres on 12 listed sites. Rely on existing sources where feasible. Allow private use of the FUP areas after consultation with and acceptance by permit holders.

RANGE MANAGEMENT

Objective RM-1: Increase forage vigor, density, and production. Increase total production from 61,640 AUMs to 66,732 AUMs and increase livestock use from 61,247 AUMs to 66,339 AUMs within 20 years.

RM1.1 Implement AMPs on 7 allotments and less-intensive management on 19 allotments (Overlay RM-4). Allotments are listed in priority order. Adjust management or exclude grazing on sage grouse brood-rearing areas to improve habitat. Design grazing management to improve crucial antelope winter/early spring ranges.

RM-1.2 Consider easement acquisition when physical access is blocked and cannot be maintained over existing public land.

RM-1.3 Continue to allow motorcycle races on a case-by-case basis until the ORV demand becomes a problem.

RM-1.4 Develop livestock management facilities needed to implement AMPs or grazing systems that are designed to meet all MFP objectives. Constraints include, but are not limited to:

- a. Do not develop springs that will not reasonably provide water for both livestock and wildlife. Springs developed in riparian zones will be fenced and water piped, where reasonable and economical.
- b. Prepare EAs and B/C analyses for projects on an allotment-by-allotment basis as AMPs are developed and approved.
- c. Allow no water developments within the Oregon Trail corridor unless mitigated to an acceptable level.
- d. Visual contrast ratings will be made on all improvements in VRM Class I, II, and III areas.
- e. Provide water for wildlife in pastures not being used by livestock, or provide a guzzler.
- f. Livestock management facilities in an ACEC will be compatible with the intent of the ACEC.

RM-1.5 Adjust Livestock season of use and/or implement grazing systems on spring and summer ranges to meet minimum growth needs of preferred plant species.

RM-1.6 (Rejected.)

RM-1.7 (Decision not documented.)

RM-1.8 Treat an estimated 4,600 acres (2,900 acres brush control and 1,700 acres brush control and reseeding) to reduce invasion of less desirable species, improve range condition, and increase grazing capacity, subject to the following conditions:

- a. If sprays are used, maintain a buffer of 150 feet around perennial streams and riparian habitat.
- b. Allow for a sufficient forage-to-cover ratio to meet wildlife needs in winter ranges for mule deer, antelope, and sage grouse.
- c. Design projects with irregular control lines, feathered edges, and natural contours. On sites treated by mechanical means, drainages and occasional brush islands will be left untreated.

Objective RM-2: Allocate livestock forage in each allotment in the Kuna Planning Unit so as to maintain or enhance the range and soil resources.

RM-2.1 Initial livestock use levels will be established by allotment at the five-year licensed active use levels for the years 1976-1980, or by mutual agreement. Any subsequent adjustments in AUMs through the five-year implementation schedule will be based on monitoring and will provide sufficient food and habitat for big game. An implementation schedule by allotment is recommended.

Objective RM-3: Develop a Minimal Fire Suppression Plan within the impact zone of the National Guard Maneuver Area.

RM-3.1 Continue fire suppression activities in accordance with the MOU with the Idaho National Guard until/unless modified or rescinded.

WATERSHED

Objective WS-1: Maintain stability of 251,700 acres classified as moderate, high, and critical erosion hazard by reducing or minimizing wind and water erosion.

WS-1.1 Manage all watersheds to achieve stable or moderate soil surface factor conditions and, where feasible/economical, strive for maintaining or establishing good perennial vegetation cover.

WS-1.2 Minimize soil erosion from all surface-disturbing activities through proper timing with regard to soil moisture content. Design all surface-disturbing activities to limit both on- and off-site soil erosion to a reasonable, acceptable level.

WILDLIFE (TERRESTRIAL)

Objective WL-1: Protect and/or improve endangered species habitat within the Kuna Planning Unit.

WL-1.1 Manage potential peregrine habitat consistent with the Endangered Species Act (see Overlay WL-t9).

- a. Manage the lands within Withdrawal Order 5777 consistent with the Snake River Birds of Prey Management Plan. Allow exchanges that would result in acquisition of higher-quality habitat.
- b. Allow road improvement and construction if consistent with WL-5.2 (management of the Birds of Prey Area).
- c. Enhance potential prey populations.
- d. Support reintroduction of peregrines at additional locations within the Kuna Planning Unit, consistent with other resource uses and values.

WL-1.2 Manage bald eagle habitat in the vicinity of C.J. Strike Reservoir (Overlay W/L-t9) to encourage additional use by these birds.

- a. Retain lands within PLO 5777 and manage them consistent with MFP decision WL-5.2. Allow exchanges in the public interest that would acquire higher-quality habitat within the BOP boundary.
- b. Allow road improvement and construction if consistent with the general decision above.
- c. Plant rapidly growing trees adjacent to the Reservoir to provide secure perch and roost sites.

Objective WL-2: Manage sensitive species habitat in the KPU to maintain or increase existing and potential populations.

WL-2.1 Identify the shadscale desert north of the Snake River as potential kit fox habitat. Coordinate with IDF&G to re-establish this sensitive species based on the merits of reintroduction at the time contemplated.

WL-2.2 Improve or maintain 4.2 miles of river otter habitat in the Snake River, Owyhee, and Bruneau rivers and other major creeks shown on Overlay W/L-t9.

- a. Within river otter habitat develop grazing systems/improvements that will improve riparian habitat or limit livestock access to water gaps.

- b. Develop grazing systems to improve riparian and stream habitat conditions in the headwater reaches of streams comprising river otter habitat.
- c. Cooperate with other agencies to monitor and improve the quality of river otter habitat.

WL-2.3 Maintain known ferruginous hawk nest sites and provide additional nest sites on the Snake River Plains.

- a. Retain ferruginous hawk habitat (within about 1.5 miles from nest sites) unless higher quality habitat can be acquired by exchange.
- b. Provide artificial nesting platforms in unoccupied areas with abundant prey available.
- c. Where rangelands are reseeded, include a mixture of shrubs, forbs, and grasses to support prey populations.
- d. When possible, avoid locating any new roads within 1/4 mile of nest sites. Mitigate the loss if avoidance is not possible.
- e. Avoid alignment of courses for organized ORV events within 1/4 mile of active nest sites between April 1 and June 30.

WL-2.4 Manage burrowing owl habitat on the Snake River Plains to maintain existing populations.

- a. Maintain existing nest sites whenever possible. Mitigate losses if other uses are deemed more appropriate.
- b. If major land disposals are undertaken, retain tracts of sufficient size and suitability for burrowing owl nest sites.

WL-2.5 Implement intensive livestock management or protective riparian habitat fencing to improve mountain quail habitat in Syrup Creek and its tributaries, Long Tom Creek and its tributaries, and Bennett Creek.

WL-2.6 Maintain the Sand Creek long-billed curlew nesting habitat south of Boise, allow exchanges only if higher-quality habitat can be acquired, monitor and determine this area's significance as curlew habitat, and determine what actions are necessary to improve the habitat. MFP decision WL-5.2 (BOP management) will override this decision.

Objective WL-3: Manage 207,680 acres of big game habitat in the KPU to obtain good ecological condition.

WL-3.1 Manage 2,880 acres of elk winter and spring range in the KPU to provide adequate food, cover, and water for 50 elk by 1990. The population goal is subject to review and change in consultation with the IDF&G.

- a. Monitor elk habitat to adjust livestock use to provide for 50 elk by 1990.
- b. Implement livestock grazing systems and practices to improve palatable shrub composition, reproduction, and forage availability. Adjust livestock utilization as necessary for plant production and elk food.
- c. Provide a mosaic of openings, generally no wider than 1/4 mile, in over-mature dense sagebrush communities and reseed them with grasses, forbs, and palatable shrubs, if sufficient natural regeneration is not expected.
- d. Limit vehicular travel in elk winter ranges to existing roads from 12/15 to 4/15, or close the areas if necessary.
- e. Avoid new road construction in crucial elk winter range or, if a new road is necessary, permanently close and rehabilitate at least an equivalent amount of roads in the same vicinity.
- f. Allow exchanges in elk winter range only if they would result in acquisition of higher-quality habitat. (Kelton Road has priority as stated in MFP decision R-1.1.)

WL-3.2 Manage 114,880 acres of mule deer winter and early spring range in the KPU so there is adequate food, cover, and water for 2,305 animals by 1990. The population goal is subject to review and change in consultation with the IDF&G.

- a. Habitat will be monitored to adjust livestock use to provide for 2,305 mule deer by 1990.
- b. Implement livestock grazing systems and practices to improve palatable shrub composition, reproduction, and forage availability. Adjust livestock utilization of annual production on key shrub species to provide for plant health and mule deer needs.
- c. Establish seedings or plantings of preferred species if reasonably necessary to improve forage condition on suitable sites of crucial deer winter range that presently have less than 10 per cent palatable shrub composition by weight.
- d. On crucial deer winter ranges that do not have an adequate composition of early-maturing grasses, develop small seedings of suitable grasses, generally not exceeding 1/4 mile in width. Do not allow livestock turnout in these areas earlier than the surrounding native vegetation is capable of withstanding. Design and manage vegetation manipulation projects to achieve a 60/40 ratio of forage to cover.

- e. Use prescribed burning or other suitable treatment (followed by seeding a mixture of grasses, forbs, and shrubs if necessary) to achieve a 60/40 ratio of forage to cover on winter areas dominated by tall old stands of sagebrush.
- f. Restrict/close critical deer winter ranges to vehicular travel if necessary during critical time periods, generally 11/15-4/15.
- g. Avoid new road construction in crucial deer winter range or, if a new road is necessary, permanently close and rehabilitate at least an equivalent amount of roads in the same vicinity.
- h. Retain public lands within crucial deer winter range unless exchanges would result in acquisition of higher-quality habitat. MFP decision R-1.1 (Kelton Road) has priority.
- i. Designate deer winter ranges as high priority for fire suppression, unless the area is designated for prescribed burning and the wildfire occurs under conditions similar to prescription.
- j. Consider a coordinated management plan with IDF&G, IDL, and the permittee on allotment 0823 for enhancement of mule deer range.

WL-3.3 Manage 114,880 acres of mule deer spring, summer, and fall range so there is adequate food, cover, and water for 570 deer by 1990. The population goal is subject to review and change in consultation with IDF&G.

- a. Monitor habitat to adjust livestock use to provide for 570 mule deer by 1990.
- b. On juniper and big sage sites where forage areas are inadequate, manipulate vegetation in areas generally not exceeding 1/4 mile in width, using fire as the primary tool, to achieve a 60/40 ratio of forage to cover, making use of good soils, retaining interconnecting cover to provide for adequate hiding and thermal cover, and including a mixture of palatable shrubs, forbs, and grasses in any revegetation projects.
- c. Implement livestock grazing systems and practices that will improve composition, reproduction, and forage availability of palatable forbs and shrubs in both upland and riparian habitats. Limit utilization of key shrub species by all classes of animals combined to 50 per cent of current annual growth.
- d. Avoid construction of roads within or closely adjacent to riparian habitats.
- e. Maintain water in all developed catchments, pipelines, troughs, and springs from July 15 until October 31, or where this is not feasible, consider development of wildlife guzzlers.
- f. Retain public lands within or closely adjacent to deer migration routes unless

higher-quality habitat can be acquired by exchange.

WL-3.4 Manage 109,120 acres of pronghorn habitat to provide sufficient forage, water, cover, and space for 55 animals by 1990. The population goal is subject to review and change in consultation with IDF&G.

- a. Monitor the habitat to adjust livestock use to provide for 55 pronghorns by 1990.
- b. Refer to and address the "Guidelines for the Management of Pronghorn Antelope" when making decisions that may affect antelope.
- c. Roads may be closed if necessary to protect pronghorn habitat.
- d. Manage habitat for good ecological condition where feasible/economical.

Objective WL-4: Manage upland game and waterfowl habitats in the KPU to increase populations of these highly desirable species.

WL-4.1 Improve the distribution of chukar and Hungarian partridge along the foothill areas north of the Snake River by providing more sources of water. The optimum spacing for water sources is one mile apart.

WL-4.2 Manage public lands in the vicinity of irrigated agricultural areas to maintain or improve the habitat for pheasants, Hungarian partridge, valley quail, and cottontails. Retain lands adjacent to agricultural development if significant wildlife habitat values are present or developable. Retain for wildlife habitat approximately 15 percent of blocks exceeding 160 acres being considered for DLE or Carey Act development. If necessary, enhance food and cover for upland game on isolated tracts and agricultural fringe lands. Permit other uses consistent with wildlife management objectives, retain public access to these tracts, and develop HMPs for intensive management.

WL-4.3 Manage springs, seeps, meadows, and adjacent upland areas as key wildlife habitats for upland game by controlling livestock grazing, protecting springheads and wet areas, and developing only those springs that are capable of providing adequate for both wildlife and livestock.

WL-4.4 Manage 83,600 acres of sage grouse range to improve nesting, brood rearing, and winter habitats by: (1) improving all poor and fair big sagebrush, meadow, and riparian ecological sites to good ecological condition, and (2) referring to and addressing the "Guidelines for Habitat Protection in Sage Grouse Range" as published by the Western States Sage Grouse Committee, June 1974, when making management decisions affecting areas used by sage grouse in the KPU.

WL-4.5 Provide reasonable nesting and brood-rearing habitat for waterfowl along 94 miles of rivers, streams, and reservoirs within the KPU (specific measures are listed).

- a. Manage the Grand View Duck Pond area specifically as waterfowl and upland game habitat, allowing a reasonable acreage for the Grand View Cemetery. Retain the lands in public ownership, withdraw them from mineral entry, and allow no surface occupancy for leasable minerals.
- b. On reservoir developments exceeding one surface acre, fence and pipe water if technically/economically feasible. Reservoirs may be gap fenced for access without piping.
- c. Geese nesting platforms constructed within the Birds of Prey Area must be in concert with MFP decision WL-5.2.

Objective WL-5: Maintain and/or enhance unique or special habitats to retain and/or improve their character and value for wildlife, research, and human enjoyment. Protect habitats supporting nongame wildlife with high public and/or biological interest.

WL-5.1 Protect known and suspected nests of birds of prey in the KPU. Manage the adjacent vegetative cover to provide adequate food and cover for the birds' major prey species (specific measures are discussed).

WL-5.2 Manage the Snake River Birds of Prey Area as outlined by PLO 577 for the well-being of raptors and for other compatible uses, with the following goals:

- a. Perpetuate the nesting raptor population at the minimum population levels determined for each species between 1975 and 1981.
- b. Provide for other compatible uses in the Area.
- c. Coordinate and conduct studies to support management needs.
- d. Make knowledge gained from management and research activities available to the public, other agencies, and to the scientific community.

Prepare and coordinate through public involvement a revised management plan incorporating the above mission and goals.

Designate the Snake River through the Area as a Special Recreation Management Area, incorporating the above mission and goals.

Retain all federal lands within this area unless higher quality habitat can be acquired within the boundary by exchange that is in the public interest.

Continue to support/seek legislation for the area under Title VI of FLPMA.

Seek a permanent withdrawal of BOP area from agricultural and of essential nesting habitat from all forms of mineral entry.

Allow no surface occupancy for leaseable minerals within the essential nesting habitat of

the Birds of Prey Area, as shown of Overlay D-4.

WL-5.3 Manage "stork island" on the Snake River near Grand View to retain its value as a great blue heron rookery.

- a. Discourage all public presence on the island except during the hunting season.
- b. Allow no trees to be cut on the island.

WL-5.4 Manage riparian and meadow habitats to attain and/or maintain a good ecological condition class or reasonable equivalent.

- a. Employ livestock management systems/practices/improvements including exclusion of grazing where necessary.
- b. Restore dessicated and former meadows where technically/economically feasible.
- c. Revegetate highly disturbed riparian overstory vegetation where technically/economically feasible.
- d. Designate Mapping Unit 7 (canyonlands) as unsuitable for livestock grazing except for those segments that constitute a major portion of the pasture in which they are located. If necessary, fence these areas to exclude livestock and provide water gaps only where necessary.

WILDLIFE (AQUATIC)

Objective WL(aq)-1: Improve fisheries habitat to fair and good condition by 1989 in 18 stream miles listed in Table 13. Improve water quality in stream sites to within proper tolerance levels for trout. Special priority should be given to improve habitat of the red-band trout, a sensitive species. (Fair to good habitat condition standards for fisheries are listed.)

WL(aq)-1.1 The primary management object on listed segments of Cottonwood, Syrup, and Long Tom creeks will be to upgrade the fisheries habitat condition for red-band trout and the associated riparian habitat. The specific management proposals to meet the 1990 land use plan objectives will determines as AMPs of HMPs are developed. (Potential management practices are listed.)

WL(aq)-1.2 Improve fisheries habitat condition from poor and fair to good through intensive livestock management on riparian areas of 5.5 miles of stream on public land. Goals should be directed at limiting livestock use to only light to moderate on riparian areas. (Recommended management practices and stream segments to initially consider for intensive livestock management are listed.)

WL(aq)-1.3 Work with IDF&G and IDWR to establish a conservation pool in the Mountain Home, Indian Creek, and Blacks Creek reservoirs.

WL(aq)-1.4 In cooperation with IDF&G, improve fisheries habitat on 5.3 miles of Crown and Syrup creeks (segements are specifically identified) by increasing in-stream cover by at least 50 percent.

WL(aq)-1.5 Improve fisheries habitat on 3.95 miles of West Fork of Long Tom Creek and Bennett Creek and on 158 acres of Long Tom Reservoir through cooperative management programs with the private landowners. If private lands become available, support public acquisition by exchange.

WL(aq)-1.6 Designate watershed areas draining into major or perennial streams (priority stream headwaters are listed) as special management areas for watershed stabilization. Provide adequate cover on granitic soil slopes exceeding 25 percent and on volcanic slopes exceeding 35 percent. Adjust livestock use and remove or minimize other activities to reduce soil movement to natural runoff amounts.

Objective WL(aq)-2: Protect and manage seasonal flows in perennial and intermittent streams to maintain aquatic/riparian habitat condition on 5 miles of stream in good condition. Give priority to habitat maintenance for red-band trout.

WL(aq)-2.1 Work with IDF&G and provide in-stream flow recommendations as information becomes available. Manage flows for good water quality. Do not cause any reduction in water quality or in legally established minimum flows.

WL(aq)-2.2 Work with IDF&G and provide recommendations on introduction of other

fish and/or eradication programs that might affect red-band trout populations on federal lands.

WL(aq)-2.3 Retain 36 stream miles of red-band habitat in federal ownership and pursue land exchange opportunities for blocking up valuable riparian habitat. Establish a cooperative management program with IDL, IDF&G, and the lessee on State lands to provide maintenance of listed contiguous units of riparian habitat.

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Objective CRM-1: Protect and interpret for the public all sites listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

CRM-1.1 Manage the Black Butte/Guffey Butte Archaeological District for protection of cultural resource values. (Several specific recommendations are listed, including designation of the District as an ACEC.)

CRM-1.2 (Rejected.)

Objective CRM-2: Protect and preserve historic ruins, structures, and sites for future scientific use and public enjoyment.

CRM-2.1 Manage parcels containing historic site 10-AA-155 and a 1/4-mile-wide corridor on either side of the Union Pacific (Oregon Short Line) Railroad for the protection of cultural resource values. Nominate these sites to the National Register of Historic Places, but do not designate them as ACECs. (Other recommended management is listed.)

Objective CRM-3: Achieve the best use of lava tube caves known to have been inhabited prehistorically.

CRM-3.1 Manage parcels containing lava tube caves (including Tank/Cathedral, Higby, and Kuna caves) for protection and public interpretation of the associated cultural resources. Recommended management includes: (a) Place warning signs on all caves and interpretive signs on Kuna Cave, salvage scientific information in imminent danger of destruction, and fence cave openings for protection of site, visitors, and livestock. (b) If the caves cannot be protected, consider excavation and interpretation. (c) Provide systematic patrol and surveillance, retain all lands containing lava tube caves, and nominate the caves to the National Register of Historic Places where appropriate, but do not designate them as ACECs. (d) Allow no surface occupancy for mineral leasing within 1/4 mile of Tank/Cathedral or Higby caves, or within 1/4 mile of other cave sites listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Objective CRM-4: Protect representative prehistoric sites from further deterioration.

CRM-4.1 Manage the 40-acre parcels containing listed prehistoric sites, shown on Overlay CRM-7, for the protection and preservation of their cultural values unless it is deemed necessary to interpret and/or excavate due to higher public needs/values. (Some potential management actions are listed.)

RECREATION

Objective R-1: Provide high-quality, varied recreation opportunities commensurate with public demand, placing emphasis on managing dispersed-type opportunities. Develop facilities as needed to control visitors, protect resources, and accommodate public use. Manage recreation sites to maximize benefits to the users and to ensure availability for future development.

R-1.1(1) Take the following actions on the Oregon National Historic Trail:

- a. Designate a 1/2-mile-wide corridor (depending on topography, developed private land, and location of improved roads) as a Special Recreation Management Area guided by the NPS management Plan. Preserve remnants of the Oregon Trail, maintain scenic values, and include associated cultural and historical sites. Do the same for the Kelton Road and the Goodale Cut-off.
- b. Segregate the public lands within the corridor from all forms of disposal and from the 1872 Mining Laws; allow no surface occupancy for leaseable minerals.
- c. Develop cooperative agreements with private landowners and support acquisition of easements across private and State lands.
- d. Develop public recreational facilities such as trail heads, interpretive sites, signs, and drinking water.
- e. Designate the corridor as "Limited" for ORV use, allowing motor vehicles only on designated roads and trails.
- f. Develop a cooperative agreement with Ada and Elmore counties for improvement and maintenance of the foothill road to encourage its use as an Oregon Trail Scenic Route.

R-1.1(2) Manage the Snake River Birds of Prey Natural Area as an SRMA to optimize public recreational enjoyment while protecting the habitat for the birds of prey (see WL-5.2).

- a. Provide recreational management, supervision, and facilities needed to control use, provide for public safety, inform visitors, and minimize disturbance to natural and cultural values. Protect and interpret historical, archaeological, scenic, educational, and other recreational values.
- b. Remove unnecessary man-made intrusions that have no historic value. Landscape the existing irrigation pumping sites.
- c. De-emphasize motor vehicle travel and encourage travel by foot, horseback, and float boat. Motor vehicle routes should be dead ends rather than circular.
- d. Restrict farm-related and other developments with adverse visual impacts.

Utilize the Natural Area as an environmental education area.

R-1.1(3) Withdraw the Crater Rings National Natural Landmark from all forms of disposition, including appropriation under the mining laws. Do not allow surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing, and do not designate the area as an SRMA.

R-1.2 Manage lands outside SRMAs as extensive recreation use areas, with minimal recreation management to meet BLM's basic stewardship responsibilities and to provide reasonable recreation opportunities. Do not prepare recreation management plans for these areas.

- a. Retain most of these lands in public ownership and acquire easements across private lands where needed for recreation access.
- b. Make public lands near communities available for recreation development under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.
- c. Maintain a system of well-signed roads and provide reasonable trails for non-motorized use.
- d. Consider an ORV trail network, comprised mostly of existing primitive roads, to span the entire Boise District. Provide parking areas, loading ramps, and rest stops along the trails.
- e. Provide a multiple-use (motorized and non-motorized) trail system in the foothills from Lucky Peak Reservoir to Bennett Creek, using existing primitive roads where available.
- f. Clean up unauthorized dumps on public land and prevent further dumping.
- g. Intensively manage streams with game fish populations. Provide good public access by road or foot trail to the better fisheries.
- h. Improve hunting opportunities by intensively managing livestock grazing; changing vegetative composition to improve habitat; fencing, planting, and constructing new water development near reservoirs; and working with landowners to allow public hunting on private lands in the Bennett Foothills.
- i. Optimize the viewing enjoyment of wildlife by properly managing wildlife habitat, fencing certain springs to exclude livestock, and providing hunting habitat for raptors on the plateaus adjacent to the Snake River.
- j. Allow no surface occupancy for mineral leasing within 1/4 mile of Lucky Peak Reservoir.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Objective VRM-1: Manage all public lands to protect visual qualities, provide for enhancement consistent with management policies, and rehabilitate lands which presently do not meet the visual quality standards of surrounding lands.

VRM-1.1 Do not designate any VRM Classes within the SRBOP Natural Area until after the SRMA Plan has been completed. In the interim, allow all proposed uses that would maintain or improve existing visual qualities and comply with BOP management objectives (see MFP decision WL-5.2).

VRM-1.2 Designate 77,750 acres as VRM Class II.

VRM-1.3 Designate 380,500 acres as VRM Class III.

VRM-1.4 Designate 470,700 acres as VRM Class IV.

VRM-1.5 Designate a 1/2-mile corridor on each side of U.S. Highway 68 and Swan Falls Road as a travel influence zone to preserve or enhance the scenic quality.

TRANSPORTATION/SUPPORT

Objective T-1: Provide legal access on 10 miles of existing roads across State lands in support of the recreation, wildlife , and range programs and to meet the requirements of transportation planning as soon as possible.

T-1.1 Evaluate, prioritize, and coordinate road access needs with respect to resource management needs, engineering feabilities, administrative and public demands, and type of easement, permit, or agreement needed.

T-1.2 On a priority basis immediately commence to survey existing and/or proposed road locations needed for BLM administration and public access and prepare survey plats in accordance with BLM Manual 2130 requirements.

T-1.3 Appraise and purchase easements as surveys are completed and funds become available.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

14 1983
Name (MFP)
Kunn
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 L-3 Step 3 D-1

L-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Classify or designate public lands for agricultural development. Specific management recommendations are as follows:

- (1) Classify all available public lands (those not withdrawn, classified for another use or otherwise appropriated) that have Class I, II or III soils (per system used for Agricultural EIS) as suitable for agricultural development. The classification should not preclude or segregate from disposal under any other applicable public land laws and as outlined:
 - a. All lands not presently having DLE or Carey Act applications will be closed to applications under these laws.
 - b. No land disposal will take place within the boundary of PLO 5777 until such is legally changed or dropped except:
 - 1) If exchanges will enhance the intent for which 5777 was withdrawn (see W/L-5.2).
 - 2) Disposal may be considered under the R&PP Act or FLPMA for community expansion.
- (2) Disposal should be made in an orderly manner, such as in blocks. We should coordinate with county officials, state agencies, utility suppliers and existing users to determine a proper disposal sequence in order to allow for optimum orderly development with minimum disturbance to existing users. Upon completion and identification of a new block an EIS or EA will be written. The classification system will include the same criteria as used in the Decision Document for Ag EIS area.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION L-1.1

| |
|-----------------------|
| Name (NFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Lands |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 L-3 Step 3 D-1 |

- (3) Disposal of these lands through sale or exchange under provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act should be made whenever possible. Where these actions are not feasible, continue to process Desert Land and Carey Act applications.
- (4) Coordinate all lands disposal actions with County Commissioners and Highway Department officials to insure that adequate public land is reserved for road construction to provide access to new developments and to other public land which might otherwise become isolated or inaccessible due to the new developments. Coordinate these road needs on agricultural developments at time of classification and prior to allowance.
- (5) Coordinate Ag disposal with Idaho Department of Water Resources for water availability.

Analysis:

- (1) Agricultural development is considered the highest and best use of public land suitable for this purpose if irrigation water can be delivered to these areas on an economical basis. Developing farms on the better soils first will result in the most efficient use of available water. Those agricultural developments that are the least environmentally disruptive, that constitute the higher economic return, and comprise the greatest public benefits should be given allowance priority.
- (2) Development of blocks should relieve local governments from unnecessary burdens in furnishing roads and other services, and will also allow utilities to plan and develop the needed services in an orderly manner.
- (3) Disposal through exchange or public sale is less cumbersome administratively and more economical for the Bureau to process than disposal under the agricultural land laws. High public benefits are often derived, and these lands can also be offered through exchange to acquire private lands having

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

I,-1.1

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 I,-3 Step 2 D-1

high public values (i.e., Boise Front, Oregon Trail, Birds of Prey Area). Some parcels having high amounts of Class II and III may not prove economically justifiable at 160 or 320 acre units. Then leasing or selling larger blocks (500, 1000, 1500 acres or more) may be profitable because of production in volume.

- (4) Past disposal actions have often resulted in obliteration of access roads a have prevented public use of public lands in many cases. County officials should be consulted to coordinate the proper route to serve local needs and to insure that proper widths are reserved to permit road construction which would meet county standards.

The existing case backlog is enough to keep busy for probably ten years or more.

Depending on how many of the existing applications are allowable, all water in t state may be appropriated before we finish processing the existing cases.

Decision:

This recommendation has been incorporated into Decision L-8.1 and L-8.3 as follows:

L-1.1 Item (1) - refer to L-8.3D(1).

L-1.1 item (1) - refer to L-8.1D.

L-1.1 Item (1) b. 1) - refer to L-8.1C.

L-1.1 Item (1) b. 2) - refer to L-8.1A.

L-1.1 Item (2) - refer to L-8.3D(2).

L-1.1 Item (3) - refer to L-8.3D(3).

L-1.1 Item (4) and (5) have been deleted as these actions are sufficiently covered by L-8.3D(2).

Additions to these recommendations have been added as L-8.1D (2) (3) & (4) for clarification purposes.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

NOV 13 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

02

Objective #2:

Provide for military use of public lands in support of national defense efforts.

Rationale:

The Idaho National Guard has been using public land in the Kuna Planning unit for military maneuvers for nearly 30 years. The ING schedules use of the area by other military units from all over the country. Other maneuver areas, particularly in the east, are becoming more restrictive in use because of population encroachment. The use of this area is increasing annually and will do so at an accelerating rate.

Benefits:

- Positive** - National defense effort is aided.
- Economic boost to local community is provided by non-resident units that come here to train.
- Energy is conserved because of the proximity of the area to the base facility.
- Negative** - Land remains unavailable for disposal (DLE, Carey Act, etc.).
- Impact area is hazardous to public and will get worse as Boise continues to grow.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 : Step 3

L-2.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

- (1) Designate the existing 130,000 acre Idaho National Guard maneuver area in this planning unit for a military use area and allow no incompatible uses.
- (2) Reject all applications for disposal within the National Guard MOU area.
- (3) Further withdraw the Impact Area from Mining Law of 1872 and the mining and mineral leasing laws (see M-1.1, 2.1 and 3.1).

Analysis:

Continued use of this area is essential to the Idaho National Guard's mission. This lends support to the national defense effort. This area has been used since 1953. In 1980 the area was used by 7 different state national guard units and active army units 210 consecutive days and a total of 348 days. The Idaho Guard Annual Payroll is \$8 million alone.

Decision:

- (1) Continue to allow the use of the area outlined in the 1979 MOU for military activities, however, they must be in concert with W/L-5.2.
- (2) Accept as written.
- (3) Withdraw the Impact Area from activities under the 1872 Mining Law. Do not withdraw the area from mineral leasing laws. However, there will be a no occupancy stipulation on any mineral leases issued within the Impact Area (see M-1.1).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION L-2.1

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity
Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 : Step 3

Reason:

The area has been withdrawn from DLE, Carey Act & state selection by PLO #5777 f Snake River Birds of Prey Area. Although there has not been found to be a conflict between these two uses the BOP must be recognized as the primary objective and use. Although mineral leasing (specifically only oil and gas) has not been curtailed - surface occupancy has been restricted on the lease stipulations. Oil and gas production and pumping simply is not compatible with night tank maneuvers or live military weapon firing.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MPP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

03

Objective 03:

Review classifications and restore lands in the planning unit from withdrawal that are not suited or needed for the purpose for which they were originally withdrawn. Open them to operation of the public land laws; where management could be better accomplished under another agency's jurisdiction, initiate transfer through withdrawal procedures.

Rationale:

This is a Bureau-wide lands program activity policy and objective (Sec. 202(d) of FLPMA). Step 4 URA states there may be good opportunities for withdrawal restoration. In some instances, withdrawals and classifications are outdated or no longer needed and prevent full resource utilization on the lands affected. Bureau policy is to reduce the number of existing withdrawals, or the size to absolute minimum acres necessary.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 1j-2 Step 3

L-3.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Conduct a comprehensive review of all withdrawals in the planning unit according to the district's withdrawal review schedule.

Revoke multiple overlapping withdrawals while retaining the one underlying withdrawal that provides protection adequate to meet existing and/or future agency needs.

Rationale:

A comprehensive inventory and review of all withdrawals is mandated in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. This review should reveal additional restoration opportunities and result in the elimination of all withdrawals that are not proven absolutely necessary.

Support Needs:

Resource staff input for land reports.

Multiple Use Analysis:

No conflicts associated with review of withdrawals as mandated in FLPMA. Any subsequent restoration actions will be analyzed on a case by case basis.

Support -

M-3.1, 3.2, 4.1 and 5.1 - Support because they recommend mineral development.

Conflict -

CRM-4.1(5) - involves vulnerable cultural resources whose only protection is withdrawal made for another purpose.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION L-3.1

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity
Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1-L-2 Step 3

Decision Factors -

Where an underlying withdrawal is retained, there is no conflict with cultural resources. Where withdrawals are completely lifted, it is the result of the withdrawal review process mandated by FLPMA and therefore not discretionary. If cultural resources have the dubious stature to be covered by a withdrawal made for another purpose and no longer needed, they should have their own protective designation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept as written.

Decision:

Accept as written.

Reason:

MFP III decisions should help guide the decisions of which withdrawals should be retained or revoked.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

#4 - 1

Objective #4:

Reserve suitable public lands to meet future needs for communication sites, public purpose R/Ws and cross-country utility right-of-ways through the establishment and protection of right-of-way corridors, reservation of lands for identified R/W needs, and the expansion of existing or establishment of potential communication site. Clear the records of any right-of-ways that are no longer needed.

Rationale:

It is a high Bureau priority to process energy related R/W's in an effort to help alleviate the nation's energy shortage. It is also Bureau policy to respond to all other R/W requests in an expeditious manner since they are normally concerned with public purpose needs. The communication media is expanding rapidly and competition for suitable equipment sites is expected to increase. Although no immediate needs were recognized in the PAA, with rapidly changing land ownerships and uses, suitable areas should be identified and reserved to meet future demands for various types of R/W's. The need for cross-country type utility corridors and the reservation and management for potential communication sites was also recognized in Step 4 URA. Removal of R/Ws no longer in existence or used is needed in order to reduce unnecessary land tenure encumbrances.

- * Cross-country utility corridors will help concentrate large utility projects which will reduce unsightly sprawl and environmental degradation. It will also help to eliminate unnecessary title encumbrances on any land that might go into private ownership.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Land

Overlay Reference

Step 1 L-4 Step 3

L-4.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Confine major new utility R/W's (i.e. 500 KV or larger - 24" pipeline) to existing corridors, as depicted on overlay L-4.

Analysis:

This will minimize the overall environmental effects.

Decision:

Accept with following addition:

Will be subject to reasonable special stipulations necessary to protect other resource uses.

DEC 09 1931

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (NFP)

Kona

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

05

Objective #5:

Provide lands for exchange within applicable laws and regulations.

Rationale:

Nine exchange applications are currently on the books and some are over 10 years old. These should have some kind of decision, whether positive or negative. The above recommendation is intended to accomplish that.

Benefits:

Positive - Clear up case backlog.

- Improve public relations with applicants.

Negative - Proponents turned down might be upset.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Land

Overlay Reference

Step 1 L-1 Step 3

L-5.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Classify public land on overlay #L-1 designated "PX" as suitable for exchange except as follows:

- (1) Reject PX application on lands shown on W/L MFP I overlay within long-billed curlew habitat (see W/L-2.6).
- (2) Reject PX application on lands within PLO 5777 unless higher quality raptor habitat within the study boundary is obtained (see W/L-5.2).
- (3) Continue to work on Duane Yamamoto case.
- (4) Complete work to allowance or rejection on any existing exchange proposal which has gone beyond the application stage.
- (5) Develop a comprehensive lands activity plan for exchange of private and state lands on an allotment by allotment basis considering land ownership and manageability within the following areas; from Mountain Home north to Forest Service boundary along Canyon Creek Road then west along Forest Service boundary to Blacks Creek Road then south to I-84 and back to Mountain Home.

The priority and/or criteria for establishing significance shall be:

- (1) Oregon Trail System
- (2) Mule deer crucial winter range
- (3) Mule deer winter range
- (4) Elk range
- (5) Antelope habitat

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION L-5.1

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity
Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 L-1 Step 2

Analysis:

These proposals have been on the books too long, some for over 10 years and a decision on whether to pursue them was overdue.

Decision:

Recommendation L-5.1, items 1, 2, 4 & 5 have been incorporated into Decision L-8.1. Item (3) has been incorporated into Decisions L-8.2.

NOV 13 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

#6

Objective #6:

Provide lands to meet the public demand by selling isolated tracts.

Rationale:

We occasionally receive requests from people to acquire small isolated tracts of public land. Many of these requests involve legitimate needs and lands that serve no higher and better use.

Benefits:

Positive - Improved public image.
- Satisfy a need.

Negative - Could dispose of other resource values we are unaware of.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Land

Overlay Reference

Step 1 : Step 3

L-6.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Dispose of isolated tracts of 160 acres or less by sales that are not within the following areas of criteria:

- (1) Within PLO 5777 (see L-1.1 and W/L-5.1).
- (2) Oregon and Kelton Trail corridor (see R-1.1).
- (3) Within mule deer winter habitat (see W/L-3.2).
- (4) Within antelope habitat (see W/L-3.4).
- (5) Within one mile of urban development.
- (6) Adjoining perennial streams, rivers or reservoirs.
- (7) Grand View Duck Ponds (see W/L-5.4).
- (8) Within long-billed curlew area (see W/L-2.6).
- (9) Ferruginous hawk habitat (see W/L-2.3).
- (10) Within pheasant habitat (see W/L-4.2).
- (11) Presently have R&PP applications.
- (12) Presently have applications for permits for sand, gravel or cinders (see M-4.1).

Disposal should be by public sale under provisions of FLPMA but should not preclude consideration of R&PP or exchanges.

Analysis:

- * Scattered, isolated tracts that are expensive to manage and do not have public values for retention should be considered for disposal through sale at fair market value.

Decision:

This recommendation has been incorporated into Decision L-8.1A.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

15
Jul 18 1982

Name (AUP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

07

Objective #7:

Provide opportunities for state and local governments to acquire sufficient lands to meet their needs for urban/suburban expansion, public purposes and communication needs.

Rationale:

Current growth and needs suggest that the above are adequate for meeting the anticipated growth in the near future. However, the BLM should be able to respond to unforeseen circumstances that are not of significant size or import warranting an amendment to the L.U.P. The system should provide the opportunity to respond on a case by case basis within the guidelines of the R&PP and FLMA.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 : Step 3

L-7.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Public lands within the Kuna Planning Unit will be retained and managed in federal ownership except that public lands not specifically identified for disposal may be considered under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of FLPMA for unforeseen community expansion needs or other public purposes.

Analysis:

Even though we have no proposals under the above items, we should recognize there could be in the future. The planning system must provide for their consideration on a case-by-case basis.

Decision:

This recommendation has been incorporated into Decision L-8.1.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity
Lands

Objective Number

#8

Objective #8 (Replaces Objectives #1, 5, 6 & 7)

Determine through the land use planning process what public lands are suitable for retention in Federal ownership and those lands which are not needed to meet public land management objectives.

Rationale:

Section 102(a)(1) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (Public Law 94-579) declares that it is the policy of the United States that "the public lands be retained in Federal Ownership, unless as a result of the land use planning procedure provided for in this Act, it is determined that disposal of a particular parcel will serve the national interest."

Executive Order #12348 established the Property Review Board which directed all Federal Agencies to review the assets under their jurisdiction and identify those that were excess to Federal needs. In the BLM this program is referred to as the Asset Management Initiative and involves identifying and disposing of public land that is no longer necessary to meet management objectives. Disposal of public land is authorized according to the criteria of Section 203 of FLPMA.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|------------|
| Name (MFP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Lands | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 : | Step 3 D-1 |

L-8.1: Decision (Replaces L-1.1, L-5.1(1, 2, 4 & 5), L-6.1, and L-7.1)

- A. The lands within the Kuna Planning Unit are designated for retention in public ownership (Category I on Overlay D-1) except as noted in Multiple Use Decision L-8.2 and 8.3. Category I lands cannot be considered for sale without a plan amendment, except for those isolated tracts of 160 acres or less which are found suitable for disposal through the land report - environmental assessment procedures and which do not conflict with the criteria listed in Multiple Use Recommendation L-6.1(1)-(12). However, Category I lands may be considered under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of PLPMA for unforeseen community expansion or other public purposes and for exchanges which (1) would benefit management programs of the BLM to a greater extent than would be realized through retention of the publiclands in Federal ownership, (2) instances in which the exchange has been directed by specific legislation, or (3) the exchange will aid in blocking Stateand Federal management units (see Instruction Memo W.O. 83-204). In most cases, public lands comprising important wildlife habitat (mule deer, elk, antelope, long-billed curlew, raptors, waterfowl, fisheries and upland game), the Oregon and Kelton Trail corridor, mineral resources, and similar resource values, will not be considered for exchange unless clearly in the public interest (see W/L-2.3, 2.6, 3.2, 3.4, 4.5, 4.2, 5.1; R-1.1, M-4.1). See Part C below on exchange limitations within the BOP Area, PLO 5777.

- B. As money and manpower become available, and if the priority increases due to public interest, develop a comprehensive lands activity plan for exchange of private and state lands on an allotment by allotment basis considering land ownership and manageability within the following areas; from Mountain Home north to Forest Service boundary along Canyon Creek Road then west along Fore Service boundary to Blacks Creek Road then south to I-84 and back to Mountain Home.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION L-8.1

19

| | |
|-------------------|------------|
| Name (MFP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Lands | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1. | Step 3 D-1 |

The priority and/or criteria for establishing significance shall be:

- 1 Oregon Trail System
- 2 Mule deer crucial winter range
- 3 Mule deer winter range
- 4 Elk range
- 5 Antelope habitat

C. There will be no exchanges allowed within the boundary of PLO 5777 (BOP) except those that specifically enhance the BOP management program. W/L-5.2 has identified lands within the BOP area (PLO 5777 boundary) to be retained in federal ownership and managed primarily to protect the raptors/prey base habitat.

D. Agricultural Development in Category I:

Category I land is to be retained in federal ownership and therefore should not be disposed of under the Carey Act and Desert Land Entry laws. Existing and future applications should be processed as follows:

1. No action will be taken on existing applications until actions in the Agricultural EIS area south of the Snake River have been completed. Discourage any new applications on Category I lands in the Kuna Planning Unit.
2. After high priority agricultural lands have been classified (Ag EIS Area) process existing applications as follows:
 - a. First, reject any portions of DLE and Carey Act applications within:
 - (1) Oregon Trail Corridor (see R-1.1).
 - (2) Critical deer winter range (W/L-3.2).
 - (3) Grand View Duck Ponds (W/L-4.5).

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION L-8.1

Name (MFP)
Kuna
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 : Step 2 D-1

(4) Adjacent to perennial streams and reservoirs with fish or recreation values.

(5) Identified R&PP lands for county, state and cities.

(6) Curlew habitat (W/L-2.6).

b. Second, reject all applications on Category I land within the Cinder Cone Butte Critical Groundwater Area as well as any applications in Category II or III in the Cinder Cone Butte Critical Groundwater Area if there is not a water permit issued by the Idaho Department of Water Resources.

3. Action on applications inside the BOP Area (PLO 5777) will be suspended until either Congress acts or until the Sagebrush Rebellion Inc. vs the Secretary of Interior lawsuit is decided.
4. Applications received after 11/1/82 on Category I lands can be rejected work priorities permit based upon this land use decision.
5. Any future agricultural development of Category I lands will require a plan amendment, land report, EIS or EA, and done in accordance with the criteria listed in L-8.3D.

Reason:

The lands identified for retention are those needed for multiple use management. These lands are generally in block federal ownership and include environmental and/or economic assets of national and/or local significance. Included in Category I lands are WSAs, the Birds of Prey Study Area (PLO 5777), national historic trails, archaeological districts and sites which qualify for the National Register of Historic Places, and crucial wildlife habitat, as well as other multiple use lands. Limited adjustment in land ownership is available through exchanges and the recreation and public purpose act in cases which are beneficial to BLM management programs or which are essential for some unforseeable public purposes.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION 1-28-1

| |
|---------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Lands |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 : Step 3 D-1 |

A number of exchange proposals are pending in the planning unit and these should be processed according to the above decision.

Most of the isolated tracts in the Category I area have been identified for retention because of known resource values. However, a site specific evaluation of some of these tracts may indicate that they lack important resource values and would be suitable for transfer to Category II and subsequent disposal.

The Idaho Department of Water Resources has outlined Critical Ground Water Areas since this plan was started, and they are also trying state-wide to get a handle on water allocation. Within the Critical Ground Water Area there are water permits already issued which should have priority.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|------------|
| Name (MFP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Lands | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1: | Step 3 D-1 |

L-8.2: Decision (Replaces L-5.1(3))

The lands identified as Category II on Overlay D-1 are suitable for disposal. Category III lands (see L-8.3) may become Category II lands and subject to disposal under the Bureau's Asset Management Initiative after further study and public involvement. In all cases, a detailed consideration of each individual tract, including a land report and environmental assessment, must be completed before a tract can be offered for disposal. The selected lands in the Yamamoto exchange proposal have been identified as Category II lands which can be disposed either through exchange or sale.

Reason:

The lands identified for disposal include small isolated tracts with no known public resource values and tracts of land which have been classified suitable for agricultural development and have met the criteria of L-8.3D.

Yamamoto has been leasing tracts IIA on Overlay D-1 for agricultural purposes for the past six years. Although within the BOP area, there are no apparent resource conflicts with disposal of this land either through exchange or sale. The land was being leased for agricultural use prior to PLO 5777 through a Bureau of Reclamation authorized permit. After the Reclamation withdrawal was revoked, the tracts have been leased to Yamamoto by BLM. A non-competitive sale to Yamamoto should be the first priority for disposal of this tract.

After further study, some Category III lands may be transferred to Category II. Site specific analysis of these lands was not possible during the land use planning process and therefore tracts which might contain important wildlife, cultural, mineral and other significant resource values have not yet been identified. Public input will also be considered prior to transferring any land from Category III to Category II for possible disposal.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 : Step 3 D-1

L-8.3: Decision (Replaces L-1.1 and L-6.1)

- A. Public lands which require further study in terms of site specific analyses a public involvement, but which appear to be suitable for disposal under the agricultural land laws and/or public sale laws have been identified as Category III lands on Overlay D-1.
- B. After further study, Category III lands which are found to have important wildlife, cultural, historic, recreational, mineral or other public values will be placed in Category I and retained in federal ownership (see L-8.1).
- C. Category III lands must meet the sale criteria of Section 203 of FLPMA and any of the general criteria listed below before placement in Category II for disposal:
- 1) Lands which are proximate to cities, towns, or development areas.
 - 2) Scattered non-urban tracts so located as to make effective and efficient management impractical.
 - 3) Lands designated for agricultural, commercial, or industrial development as the highest value or otherwise most appropriate use.
- D. Category III lands will be classified for agricultural development and placement in Category II as follows:
- 1) Class I, II and III soils will be classified as suitable for agricultural development in accordance with the 1980 Decision Document for the Agricultural Development EIS unless identified for retention according to part B above. Suitable lands with present DLE or CA applications will be processed first. Suitable lands without applications may be available for disposal under the public land sale laws and the Bureau's Asset Management Initiative.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION 1-8.3

| | |
|-------------------|--------------|
| Name (NPP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Lands | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 : | Step 2 (D-1) |

- 2) Disposal should be made in an orderly manner, such as in blocks. BLM should coordinate with county officials, state agencies, utility supplies and existing users to determine a proper disposal sequence in order to allow for optimum orderly development with minimum disturbance to existing users. Upon completion and identification of a new block, an EIS or EA will be written. The classification system will include the same criteria as used in the Decision Document for Ag EIS area.
- 3) Disposal of lands through sale or exchange under provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act should be considered a priority, whenever possible, over disposal through Desert Land and Carey Act applications.
- 4) Desert Land or Carey Act applications will be rejected in areas designated as water management areas by the Idaho Department of Water Resources unless the Idaho Department of Water Resources allows a water permit in a reasonable time.

Reason:

See reasons for 1-8.1 and 1-8.2.

Category III lands require site specific evaluation before determining if they should be retained or offered for disposal.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

NOV 16 1981

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

#1

Objective #1:

Provide public lands having suitable soils to meet the demand for agricultural development.

Rationale:

Idaho's economy is heavily dependent on agriculture. The Bureau's responsibility under FLPMA is to retain and manage the public lands unless it is in the National interest to dispose of them. As agricultural lands go out of production due to urban expansion (occurring at the rate of 3,000,000 acres annually nationwide), other lands will have to be brought into use if output is to remain constant. "The policy of the Idaho Water Resource Board is to seek an orderly growth of agricultural production in the state at a rate sufficient to maintain the state's current share of the national and international market." Improvements in technology might somewhat offset the acreage losses but not by much. The further development of lands for agricultural purposes in Idaho will be limited by water availability and economic feasibility. These two issues are so complex that it is virtually impossible to resolve them at this time. For example, no one knows how much more water can be taken from the Snake River before it starts hurting other irrigators or reduces power generation capability. And if power generation capability is reduced while demand increases because of the added irrigation pumps, what happens to economic feasibility when new and costlier power generation facilities (e.g. coal fired plants) are brought on line. It may be that these issues can only be resolved through the trial and error process.

Benefits

Positive - Assist in maintaining Idaho's national position in agriculture.
- May help stabilize the agricultural economy.
- Should reduce demand for Desert Land Entries.
- Might help satisfy Carey Act commitment.

Negative - Improper timing could cause instability in economy.
- Could precipitate a "land rush".
- Could adversely affect non agriculturally related areas (increased power rates, more farm subsidies, etc.).
- Could reduce land available for grazing.

OCT 30 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (NFP)

Kuna

Activity

Minerals

Objective Number

#1

Objective #1:

Provide for maximum opportunities within the KPU for exploration and development of oil and gas resources.

Rationale:

A 1603 objective is to "make energy minerals available on a managed and controlled basis, consistent with national energy policies and related demands." Actions related to this objective are high priority items. Petroleum and natural gas are minerals identified by the Directors of USGS and Bureau of Mines as a "compelling national significance." Petroleum is stockpiled by the Department of Energy. The U.S. imported between 40 percent and 50 percent of its oil in recent years. It is national policy to encourage the maximum domestic production of oil and gas and decrease dependence on foreign oil.

The Mineral Leasing Acts of 1920 allows for and promotes the development of leasable minerals and the U.S. Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 declares it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government to foster and encourage the development of domestic mineral resources and reserves.

Currently the United States imports over half of its petroleum needs and all indications suggest that oil and gas will continue to provide for the majority of the nations energy needs throughout the remains of the century. National goals are directed towards making the United States less dependent on importations of oil and gas. It is in the nations best interest to diligently explore and develop domestic sources. Managing public lands to the exclusion of mineral exploration/development would be contrary to departmental policy, multiple use objectives and national needs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name USFP

Unit

Activity

Minerals

Overlay Reference

Step 1 M-1 Step 3 D-4

M/12 1 1 1993

M-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

This combines MEP II M-1.1 and M-2.1 Recommendation.

- (1) Process lease application for oil and gas and geothermal in accordance with the Mineral Leasing Act and Geothermal Steam Act. Allow oil and gas and geothermal leasing in the unit consistent with regulations, laws and other resource uses. Apply the Idaho Standard Stipulations and any other reasonable special stipulations to minimize or alleviate conflicts, as outlined in EA ID-01-246, ID-01-299 and ID-01-0-40.

This recommendation will allow any other stipulations to be included to protect other resources/uses as deemed necessary at the time of issuance.

- (2) No land occupancy within:
 - a. NG Impact area
 - b. Oregon Trail, Kelton Road corridor
 - c. Crater Rings
 - d. Grand View Duck Ponds
 - e. Essential nesting habitat (BOP Area)

Analysis:

The necessity of energy development is becoming more apparent. It is essential that development be provided to the greatest extent possible while protecting those resources which in many cases are irreplaceable. The Idaho Standard Stipulations and Special Stipulations have been developed to protect national resource values and allow effective management of the oil and gas leasing program.

OCT 30 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Minerals

Objective Number

02

Objective #2:

Provide for maximum opportunities within the KPU for exploration and development of geothermal resources.

Rationale:

Considerable exploration and development work is required to adequately establish the commercial potential of the planning unit's geothermal resources. Demands for utilization of warm and hot water geothermal resources will markedly increase as the traditional sources of energy and fuels become more costly.

Geothermal leasing and exploration activities are governed by the regulations published in 43 CFR 3000 and 3200, 30 CFR 270, and the Geothermal Resources Operational Orders of the USGS. These regulations and orders provide for the protection of the environment and other surface resource values.

The potential to develop geothermal resources in the KPU is significant and is necessary to help supplement use of other resources to meet the nations energy needs. Development and utilization of geothermal resources will help to reduce the nations dependence on foreign sources for meeting energy needs and will also ease strain on existing oil and gas reserves.

OCT 30 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Minerals

Objective Number

03

Objective #3:

Provide maximum exploration opportunities for and development of locatable mineral deposits.

Rationale:

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1876) states that it is the "policy of the Federal Government in the national interest to foster and encourage private enterprise in (1) the development of economically sound and stable domestic mining, minerals, metal and mineral reclamation industries, (2) the orderly and economic development of domestic mineral resources, (and) reserves,..."

Industry and government mineral authorities predict that requirements and demands for mineral commodities in the future will far exceed all of the minerals consumed by mankind to date. This will necessitate the continued exploration and development of much lower grade deposits as well as those deposits which lie at greater depths and have to date been inaccessible. Uranium is identified by the Directors of USGS and Bureau of Mines as a mineral of "compelling national significance."

A domestic energy minerals shortage is quickly becoming a serious reality. More and more critically important minerals are being imported from politically unstable countries. With consumption increasing by 4 percent annually (1976 Annual Report of Mining and Minerals Policy, Dept. of Interior), mineral commodity prices increasing from 2 percent to 20 percent annually and the United States goals of attaining mineral and energy self sufficiency, increased domestic exploration, development, and production from public and federally administered lands is needed.

The Mining Law of 1872 grants to U.S. citizens the right to locate, develop, and produce minerals on public and federally administered lands. Also, the U.S. Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 declares it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government to foster and encourage the development of domestic mineral resources and reserves.

Overall Policy Objectives

Energy Minerals - Uranium

A BLM Manual 1603 objective is to "make energy minerals available on a managed and controlled basis, consistent with national energy policies and related demands." Actions related to this objective are high priority items.

Mineral Patent Applications

A BLM Manual 1693 objective is to "process mineral patent application as filed."

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Minerals

Overlay Reference

Step 1 M-1,3 Step 3 D-4

M-3.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Maintain public lands within the planning unit as open to mineral location.

Manage the area identified on overlay primarily for their mineral values.

- (1) Unless otherwise closed to protect other resources/uses found more important, leave the area open to mineral entry.
- (2) Withdraw the following from the 1872 mining laws:
 - a. Oregon-Kelton Trail corridor
 - b. Crater Rings
 - c. PLO 5777
 - d. Grand View Duck Ponds
 - e. National Guard Impact Area

Management components include:

- (1) Facilitate development of any economic deposit by expeditiously acting on mineral patent applications expected to be filed through FY-1985.
- (2) Work with mining claimants to reduce environmental impacts by the continued implementation of 43 CFR 3809 Surface Management Regulations.

Analysis:

The KPU has varying potential for the discovery of valuable locatable minerals.

It is anticipated that as lower grade uranium ore becomes economic, a discovery will be made and underground mining operations could possibly begin before the year 1990.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Instructions on reverse.

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION M-3.1

Name (BPP)

Kama

Activity

Minerals

Overlay Reference

Step 1M-1,3 Step 3 D-4

Congress has set policy (84 Stat. 1876) that the federal government is to encourage private enterprise in the development of the nation's mineral resources under the Mining Law of 1872. Closing public lands to location and restricting access is generally incompatible with this policy.

Decision:

Accept general.

Modify to read:

- (1) Unless presently withdrawn or segregated to protect other resources/uses found more important leave the area open to mineral entry.
- (2) Accept.

OCT 30 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (NFP)

Kuna

Activity

Minerals

Objective Number

#4

Objective #4: (Salables)

Provide sand, gravel, cinders, clay, bentonite, fill material, and building stone to meet the needs of local and state governments, industry, and individuals as the demand warrants.

Rationale:

A 1603 objective is to "make other (non-energy) minerals and mineral materials available for use as needed to meet market demand." Supply-demand study for sand, gravel, and baked shale indicates that there will be demands for free-use and sales of these commodities. Part of demands may relate to energy developments.

The management and sale of common variety mineral resources are authorized by the Materials Sales Act of July 31, 1947, as amended, and is encouraged by the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970.

The planning unit contains sufficient quantities of these materials to satisfy present and foreseeable future needs. By encouraging use of identified disturbed areas, environmental concerns for development in undisturbed areas can be alleviated. A well coordinated program provides for better cooperation among all users.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Minerals

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

M-4.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Designate free-use site of up to 20 acres for federal, state, county or city government needs in the following areas:

- (1) T.2E., R.6E., Section 9; W1/2NE1/4SE1/4
- (2) T.3E., R.2E., Section 14; N1/2SE1/4
- (3) T.3E., R.4E., Section 5; lots 3 & 4
- (4) T.3E., R.4E., Section 35; W1/2NE1/4NW1/4, E1/2NW1/4NW1/4
- (5) T.3E., R.6E., Section 10; W1/2SE1/4NW1/4
- (6) T.3E., R.7E., Section 5; E1/2E1/2SE1/4SW1/4, W1/2W1/2SW1/4SE1/4
- (7) T.5E., R.3E., Section 12; S1/2NW1/4SW1/4, N1/2SW1/4SW1/4, SW1/4NE1/4SW1/4,
W1/2SE1/4SW1/4
- (8) T.5E., R.6E., Section 19; N1/2NE1/4
- (9) T.3E., R.6E., Section 20; SE1/4NW1/4SE1/4
- (10) T.5E., R.6E., Section 28; SW1/4NW1/4
- (11) T.5E., R.7E., Section 24; SW1/4SE1/4NW1/4, W1/2SE1/4SE1/4NE1/4
- (12) T.5E., R.8E., Section 33; W1/2NE1/4SE1/4NE1/4, E1/2NW1/4SE1/4NE1/4

Dispense of common variety minerals under authority of the Act of July 23, 1955; 69 Stat. 367. Use existing materials sources when practical. Limit the development of new material sources when possible. Site specific field examinations

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Revisions to sheets

1 of 1 - BLM Form 1478

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

H-4.1

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Name (NFP) | |
| Kona | |
| Activity | |
| Minerals | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 3 |

by resource specialists will delineate considerations to be incorporated in the mining and rehabilitation plans required.

Analysis:

Resources on public lands, especially near population centers will be needed to satisfy increasing demand for materials.

Areas which have been proven sources of materials in the past still contain sufficient quantities which can be utilized.

In FY-1980 approximately 100,000 cu. yds. of sand and gravel were utilized by governmental agencies for public purposes. The construction material can probably be supplied from existing designated sites as they seem adequate for current existing needs.

As private reserves are depleted, additional pressures for mineral materials are anticipated on public lands. Established materials sources described in NFP 1 are likely to serve the needs for free-use permits and sales. Should the need for additional material sources be required their establishment will involve the EA/Technical Examination process.

Decision:

Accept with following: Private use can be made after consultation and acceptance of permit holders.

JUN 21 1982

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (RFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Objective Number

#1

Objective #1:

Develop range programs and management techniques to:

1. Increase the vigor, density and production of desirable vegetation on 276,336 acres within 20 years. These areas are currently in poor condition, but because of low site productivity and the lack of desirable vegetative species, improvement into the fair condition would not be anticipated.
2. Increase 46,934 acres currently in poor range condition to fair condition in 20 years. Increase 23,539 acres currently in fair condition to good condition in 20 years. Maintain the condition class of 3,330 acres currently in good condition. Maintain and/or improve 222,908 acres currently in a disturbed, burned or seeding condition. Following this 20 year period, the goal would be to improve all range to good condition.
3. Increase total forage production from 61,640 AUMs to 66,732 AUMs within a 20 year period.
4. Increase livestock use from 61,247 AUMs to 66,339 AUMs within 20 years.

Rationale:

The primary goal of the rangeland management program is to protect and manage the vegetative resource and to improve the current range condition and trend by increasing the amount and quality of desired vegetation. This objective cannot be met without effective administration and intensive management.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

NAME (MPP) ^{MAR 11 1983}
Kuna
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM-4 Step 3

RM-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

- (1) Implement intensive management (AMP's) on 7 allotments as indicated on overlay RM-4.
- (2) Implement less intensive management on 19 allotments as indicated on overlay RM-4.

Analysis:

The allotments identified as intensive management are composed primarily of public lands, have potential for increased forage production and improvement in range condition/trend, and high resource values/conflicts.

The allotments identified as less intensive have limited potential for increased forage, and lower resource value conflicts and/or high percentage of private and state land.

Decision:

Accept as written with the following additions:

- (1) The order of priority should be:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| a. Mountain Home Subunit (813) | e. Cornell (820) |
| b. Long Tom (814) | f. Martha Avenue (817) |
| c. Ditto Creek (818) | g. Dive Creek (819) |
| d. Bennett (804) | |

- (2) Livestock rest or deferment systems would be established on critical sage grouse brood rearing areas. If grazing systems do not improve habitat

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

RM-1.1

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-4 Step 2

conditions, large meadow complexes may be fenced and excluded from grazing, or have special grazing management applied (e.g. use only after seed ripe).

- (3) The improvement of crucial antelope winter/early spring ranges is recognized as a priority management need. Livestock grazing management of these antelope winter/early spring ranges will be designed (system and season of use) to improve habitat conditions for wintering antelope.

Reason:

A priority order for AMP development has been established so that allotments with high resource values or conflicts will have the first AMPs. The special management measures for sage grouse brood rearing areas and crucial antelope winter/early spring ranges were identified as mitigation measures in the Bruneau-Kuna Grazing EIS as being necessary to ensure habitat improvement or prevent potential adverse impacts.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (RFP)

Kima

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-5 Step 3

RM-1.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Dispose of isolated parcels of public land and acquire easements across private and state lands to improve rangeland administration as follows:

- (1) Dispose of 47,200 acres of isolated tracts of public lands as identified on overlay RM-5.
- (2) Acquire access across 4.75 miles of private and state lands. Retain current access across fragmented tracts of public lands that are now recommended for disposal. Access needs to be identified on overlay RM-5.
- (3) Block land ownership in allotments which contain large amounts of public, state and/or private land through exchange. Specific areas are not identified on an overlay or table. This general recommendation leaves the door open for future consideration.

Analysis:

Grazing allotments which contain small isolated parcels of public lands/grazing capacity are difficult to administer and manage plus the cost to administer these lands/allotments take as much time/money as do the larger allotments. Thus better and more efficient management can be achieved on the larger allotments where BLM has the majority of the grazing capacity.

Access to all public lands must be obtained for effective administration and management of all grazing allotments which contain public lands.

Blocking land ownership through exchange in allotments which contain large amounts of private, state and public lands will provide more efficient management of the rangeland resources.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION RM-1.2

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-5 Step 2

Decision:

Revert in preference to 1-1.1, 3.1, 6.1 and 7.1 except when physical access is blocked and access cannot be maintained over existing public land then consider easement acquisition.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

RM-1.3: Multiple Use Recommendation

ORV demand is not significant at this time. Critical time periods will be established for spring turn out of cattle and just before gathering. Motorcycle races will continue to be allowed on a case-by-case basis until the demand gets to be a problem.

Analysis:

The Step 1 Recommendation was to not allow ORV races from 3/1 to 6/15 or until livestock are removed from spring use.

In over 3 years there has not been one application for ORV races in the PU, also experience in the Bureau PU shows most conflicts can be taken care of by special stipulations and design of the track until demand becomes a problem. The demand simply has not developed.

Decision

Accept as written.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION RM-1.4

| | |
|-------------------|------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | |
| Range Management | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 3 D-3 |

Livestock water and management facilities are necessary to fully implement management systems. If properly designed, water facilities will benefit wildlife as well as livestock and recreational needs.

Decision:

Develop livestock management facilities needed for implementation of sound AMP's and/or grazing systems and are designed to reach or maintain objectives and Decisions throughout the MFP.

Specifically the major constraints are (but not limited to):

- (1) Do not develop springs that will not reasonably provide water for both livestock and wildlife. Springs developed in riparian areas will be fenced and water piped where reasonable and economical (see W/L-4.3).
- (2) As AMP's are developed and approved write EA's and do B/C analysis on projects.
- (3) No water developments will be constructed within the Oregon Trail corridor unless mitigated to the point of an acceptable level.
- (4) Visual contrast rating will be made on all range improvements in Class I, II, and III areas.
- (5) Provide water for wildlife in pastures not being used by livestock if feasible/or provide guzler.
- (6) Livestock management facilities in areas designated ACECs will be consistent and compatible with the intent for which the area was designated as an ACEC (see CRM-1.1).

Reason:

Modified to incorporate wildlife, visual and recreation.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 2 D-3

RM-1.4: Multiple Use Recommendation

Develop livestock management facilities needed for the implementation of AMPs and/or grazing systems in the intensive management category. Construction of the following range improvements will be needed to implement management plans:

1. 30 miles of fence
2. 30 spring developments
3. 20 miles of pipeline and 50 troughs
4. 40 reservoirs
5. 2 wells and storage tanks
6. 2 water catchments
7. 25 cattleguards

These figures include range projects needed in allotments in the less intensive management category.

- (1) New water sources should be developed that will satisfy upland game and waterfowl requirements. Springs developed in riparian areas should be fenced and water piped away from the fenced area. Avoid construction of reservoirs in riparian areas.
- (2) A visual contrast rating will be made on all range improvements that are proposed for development in Class I, II or III areas.
- (3) No water developments will be constructed within one (1) mile of the Oregon National Historic Trail unless mitigated to point of acceptable level.

Analysis:

Locations for these projects will be selected during formulation of activity plans and consultation with permittees.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Instructions on sheets.

Form 1650-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

RM-1.5: Multiple Use Recommendation

Adjust livestock season of use on spring and summer ranges to meet minimum growth needs of preferred plant or forage species.

Analysis:

Forage production is reduced and vigor of preferred species is adversely affected by excessive livestock use early in the growing season. Continued early livestock use on preferred species can lead to a decline in range condition. Livestock turn-on dates from April 15-30 are recommended on lower elevational ranges (shadscale type) and April 20-May 15 on mid-elevational big and low sagebrush types. On allotments where deferred or rest rotation grazing systems are implemented the above dates may be adjusted. On allotments where the preferred or key species are annual grasses, i.e. cheatgrass, considerations will be given to early intensive grazing.

Decision:

Modify to read: Adjust livestock season of use or implement grazing systems on spring and summer ranges to meet minimum growth needs of preferred plant species.

Reason:

See above analysis.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION - ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (USFS)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

RM-1.6: Multiple Use Recommendation

Reject - Stock drives have been eliminated. After getting public input it was dropped.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MPP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

RM-1.8: Multiple Use Recommendation

Treat 4,600 acres (2,900 acres brush control and 1,700 acres brush control and reseed) of potentially suitable native range to reduce invasion of less desirable brush and annual grass species, improve range condition and increase grazing capacity. These stipulations shall apply:

- (1) If pesticides/herbicides spraying techniques are used for treating native rangelands a buffer zone of 150 feet will be established around perennial streams and riparian habitat areas to ensure no chemicals effect those areas.
- (2) In areas identified as winter range for mule deer, antelope and sage grouse allow for a sufficient forage to cover ratio that will meet these species needs.
- (3) Projects will be designated with irregular control lines, feathered edges and natural contours. Drainages and occasional brush islands will be left untreated on sites treated by mechanical means.
- (4) On areas classified as primitive or semi-primitive, treatment will be conducted so that the ensuing landscape is natural appearing to the casual observer.

Analysis:

On areas in poor or fair ecological condition with suitable soils, forage production for livestock and wildlife can be increased and ecological condition improved by vegetative manipulation and/or reseeding. During the activity planning process, acreage and treatment techniques will be selected. Where feasible prescribed burning will receive first consideration for brush control. Also on allotments currently overstocked, livestock reductions can be minimized by increasing forage production as a result of vegetative treatments.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION RN-1.8

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Name (MFP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Range Management | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 3 |

Decision:

Modify RM-1.8 to read, "Treat an estimated 4,600 acres (2,900 acres brush control and 1,700 acres brush control and reseed) to..."

Stipulation 1-3 will remain as written. Reject stipulation 4.

Reasons:

The acreages proposed for treatment are only rough estimates based on soils and range condition. Specific sites and acreages will be selected after careful on the ground site inspections. More or less acreage may be treated after the development of activity plans.

Stipulation 4 was deleted in MFP II (R-1.1(3)).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

| |
|------------------|
| Name (NIP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Range Management |
| Objective Number |
| 62 |

Objective #2:

Allocate all forage for livestock in each of the allotments in the Kuna Planning Unit within the biological limits necessary to maintain and/or enhance the range and soil resource.

Rationale:

Forage consumption by livestock must be balanced with forage production in order to properly manage the range resource. This objective is designed to correct present range management problems identified in URA Step 3, that is use of preferred species above the biological limits necessary for survival and reproduction. This objective also reflects the livestock use problems identified in URA Step 4.

Once the density of preferred species i.e. plants that decrease under heavy livestock use are reduced or lost, management techniques to restore them are expensive and require long time periods to be effective. The preferred or desirable species for livestock use includes bunchgrasses and other herbaceous species.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 2

RM-2.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Allocate forage according to Table RM-2.1 HFP II.

Analysis:

The total forage production as determined by a SVIM inventory was divided between livestock, wildlife and nonconsumptive uses in ten allotments. Allowable use factors were applied to each species to account for its tolerance to grazing during the season of use. Wildlife AUM's were allocated prior to allocating AUM's to livestock. On the remaining 16 allotments in the Kuna P.U. either five year licensed use or preference was used to allocate forage. SVIM data was not used on these allotments due to large acreages burned by wildfires after the inventory was completed and the problem of adjusting cheatgrass production to a "normal precipitation year".

Decision:

Reject.

Initial livestock use levels by allotment will be established at the five-year licensed active use levels from the years 1976-80 or by mutual agreement. Any subsequent increase or reduction in AUM's through the five-year implementation schedule will be based on monitoring.

The following implementation schedule by allotment is recommended:

| Allotment | 5-Year Licensed Use | Adjustment (%) From 5-Year Licensed Use | Implementation Schedule | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| | | | Year 1 | Year 3 | | Year 5 | |
| | | | AUM's | AUM's | %* | AUM's | %* |
| 113-Mtn Home Subunit | 6,459 | + 62 | 6,459 | 7,716 | +21 | 10,354 | -31 |

* Represents increase or decrease in AUM's from previous (Year 1 or Year 3)

Note: adjustments ~~What adjustments~~ sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

RM-2.1

Name (MPP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

| Allotment | 5-Year Licensed Use | Adjustment (%) From 5-Year Licensed Use | Implementation Schedule | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|--------------------|------|--------------------|------|
| | | | Year 1 AUM's | Year 3 AUM's %* | | Year 5 AUM's %* | |
| 814-Long Tom Subunit | 2,055 | + 62 | 2,055 | 2,692 | +31 | 3,328 | + 31 |
| 815-Mud Springs | 1,308 | + 38 | 1,308 | 1,800 | +38 | 1,800 | -- |
| 816-Lockman Butte | 542 | 0 | 542 | 542 | -- | 542 | -- |
| 817-Martha Avenue | 781 | + 10 | 781 | 871 | +10 | 871 | -- |
| 818-Ditto Creek | 1,789 | + 16 | 1,789 | 2,128 | +16 | 2,128 | -- |
| 819-Dive Creek | 479 | 0 | 479 | 479 | -- | 479 | -- |
| 820-Cornell | 1,068 | - 26 | 1,068 | 921 | -12 | 774 | -13 |
| 821-Chalk Flat | 2,171 | - 1 | 2,171 | 2,171 | -- | 2,145 | - 1 |
| 822-Slater Flat | 1,200 | 0 | 1,200 | 1,200 | -- | 1,200 | -- |
| 823-McConnell | 15 | +850 | 15 | 43 | +425 | 100 | +425 |
| 824-Bonneville Point | 332 | - 5 | 332 | 312 | - 5 | 312 | -- |
| 825-Sunnyside Spring- Fall | 11,770 | + 70 | 11,770 | 14,140 | +20 | 20,065 | +50 |
| 826-Sunnyside Winter | 11,587 | + 18 | 11,587 | 13,705 | +18 | 13,705 | -- |
| 827-Rattlesnake Sood. | 1,294 | + 29 | 1,294 | 1,483 | +15 | 1,672 | +14 |
| 828-Crater Ring Sood. | 673 | - 41 | 673 | 535 | -20 | 398 | -21 |
| 829-2+ Custodial | 70 | +271 | 70 | 190 | +181 | 251 | +90 |
| 830-Section 34 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 10 | -- | 10 | -- |
| 831-Sheep Creek | 231 | + 16 | 231 | 231 | -- | 231 | -- |
| 832-Duck Ponds | 56 | 0 | 56 | 56 | -- | 56 | -- |
| 833-Section 35 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 17 | -- | 17 | -- |
| 834-Rattlesnake Creek | 204 | + 7 | 204 | 220 | + 7 | 220 | -- |
| 836-West Tacket Creek | 264 | + 5 | 264 | 270 | + 5 | 270 | -- |
| 837-Rabbit Springs | 75 | - 67 | 75 | 50 | -33 | 25 | -34 |
| 838-Section 1 | 8 | + 25 | 8 | 10 | +25 | 10 | -- |
| 872-Melba Sooding | 300 | + 7 | 300 | 322 | + 7 | 322 | -- |
| TOTAL | 44,758 | | | | | | |

* Represents increase or decrease in AUM's from previous (Year 1 or Year 3) adjustments.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION RM-2.1

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Name (MFP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Range Management | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 2 |

Provide sufficient food, cover, space and water for big game in accordance with W/L-3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 through monitoring. The monitoring will be within the key wildlife areas of the habitat.

Reason:

Since the time multiple use recommendation RM-~~3.1~~^{2.1} was made, a BLM directive (I.M. No. ID-82-297) has been implemented which states that SVIM type inventory data will no longer be used in land use planning. Therefore the initial stocking rate to begin the five year implementation period must be based on prior livestock use levels i.e. licensed use since actual use data is not available. Changes in livestock use levels would be made during Year 3 and/or Year 5 and monitored in the intervening years. The final livestock use level would be established at the end of Year 5.

Monitoring studies during the implementation period would be keyed in part to key wildlife habitat and forage requirements. Final stocking rates will be adjusted to meet the big game wildlife number identified in decision W/L-3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 and fisheries condition decisions in W/L-aq-1.1, 1.2.

The final livestock stocking rate recommended in year 5 is derived from SVIM inventory data. This livestock use level may or may not be reached depending on the results of the monitoring studies. The procedures describing the 5-year implementation schedule are in 43 CFR.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

DEC 03 1981

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Name (NPP) | Kona |
| Activity | Range Management |
| Objective Number | #3 |

Objective #3:

Develop a Minimal Fire Suppression Plan within the impact zone of the National Guard Maneuver Area.

Rationale:

The fire suppression efforts within this area are under the control of the National Guard. The majority of the fires that occur within this area are caused by the military actions of National Guard troops.

A wide cindered road is maintained by the National Guard around this zone, which helps to reduce the spread of any fires started in this area.

The remainder of the planning unit should continue to receive active fire suppression. Here soils are more erosive, the range is in poor range condition and the availability of a seed source reestablishing desirable perennial grass is lacking. The heavy population areas can also be found within this boundary. Should wildfire occur in this area, the range condition would deteriorate further and soil erosion would accelerate.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

RM-3.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Designate the National Guard use area as a limited suppression area.

Analysis:

There is a 25 year MOU on the area. This was reviewed and found to be acceptable.

Decision:

Reject as written.

Continue fire suppression activities in accordance with Memorandum of Understanding with Idaho National Guard until/unless modified or rescinded.

Reason:

See analysis above: Further there was a misunderstanding of whether fire suppression was under the complete control of Idaho National Guard. It was found that only the Impact Area was but still not a "limited" suppression as defined under Bureau terminology.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Watershed

Objective Number

#1

Objective #1:

Maintain stability of 251,700 acres of moderate, high, and critical erosion hazard classes by reducing or minimizing wind and water erosion.

Rationale:

The Snake River sediments and the granitic soils of the foothills are areas where proper grazing management could effectively protect against soil loss. The maintenance of soil stability will be of benefit to bureau grazing, recreation and fishery programs as well as having an aesthetic value.

Achievement of this objective will reduce or prevent high sediment yields and dissolved solids in runoff water. This will enhance surface water quality for a variety of uses.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------|--------|
| Name (MFP) | MAP 1 | 1983 |
| Kuna | | |
| Activity | Watershed | |
| Overlay Reference | | |
| Step 1 | | Step 3 |

WS-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Minimize erosion by maintaining good perennial vegetation cover on all sites. Perennial native range should be managed to attain good ecological range condition where possible. Good perennial vegetation cover on all rehabilitated or manipulated sites will be based on the sites potential for vegetation production (good is \geq 75% perennial vegetation composition by weight of potential production).

- (1) Do not allocate more than 50% of vegetation to consumptive use.
- (2) As a guideline 50% utilization of perennial grasses on native vegetation is recommended. Even with this it is recognized there may be special instances where more or less protection will be needed.
- (3) It is also recognized that good ecological condition may not be achievable through management or reseeding. The guide is to go for a SSF of stable to moderate.

Analysis:

Soil stability will benefit all rangeland uses. Soils are the building block for all uses.

Decision:

Minimize erosion by managing to obtain or maintain a good perennial vegetation cover where it exists and where feasible/economical strive for establishing perennial vegetation cover to benefit all uses. If not feasible/economical to establish perennial vegetation manage for stable to moderate S.S.F.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

WS-1.1

| | |
|-------------------|-----------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Watershed |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 3 |

Reason:

Good ecological range condition will not be feasible or achievable through management on all sites. Converting cheatgrass or medusa ranges to perennial vegetation can be accomplished, however, it would be very expensive. Land treatment would be required and the good ecological range condition (SCS system) could not be achieved. In all instances it could be managed for stable watershed.

Note: Attach additional sheets if needed.

Instructions on activity:

BLM-1000-21 April 1974

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

WS-1.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Minimize soil erosion of all surface disturbance activities through proper timing with regards to soil moisture content. All projects and/or authorized uses will consider soil erosion both on site and off site.

Analysis:

Proper timing of all activities with regards to soil moisture content and range readiness will serve to minimize soil erosion. Soil compaction resulting from use when soils are saturated can affect seeding establishment, reduce cover and reduce vegetation production.

Decision:

Accept as written with the following addition:

All surface disturbance activities will be designed to minimize soil erosion to a reasonable, acceptable level both on site and off site.

JUN 21 1982

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife (4350)

Objective Number

#1

Objective #1:

Protect and/or improve endangered species habitat within the KPU.

Rationale:

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 directs all federal agencies to:

1. Ensure the continued existence of listed species.
2. Pursue an active program to improve numbers or remove threats to listed species.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1W/L-t9 Step 3 D-2 |

W/L-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage potential peregrine falcon habitat in as depicted on overlay t-9 and ass with any proposed reestablishment efforts of this endangered species.

Specifically:

- (1) Retain in public ownership those lands within Withdrawal Order #5777 and manage these lands consistent with the Snake River Birds of Prey Management Plan (SRBOPMP). Allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired within the boundary and such exchanges are in the best interests of the public.
- (2) Allow improvement of existing roads if consistent with Withdrawal Order #57 and the SRBOPMP.
- (3) Enhance potential prey populations.
- (4) Support reintroduction efforts of peregrine falcons at other locations with the BPO consistent with other resource uses and values.

Analysis:

The recommendation complies with requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, as outlined in the "Rationale" above. Previous reintroduction efforts through a cross-fostering experiment from 1977 through 1979 in the Snake River Birds of Prey Natural Area (BPNNA), have demonstrated that young peregrines can be raised in an area of substantial recreational activities. Although cross-fostering was successful, the reestablishment program for peregrine falcons in the SRBOP area was discontinued in favor of an approach oriented toward saturation-reintroductions of higher priority habitats in other geographic locations. The suitability of these lands in the KPU for future reintroduction efforts is assured if they are managed for the existing raptor population which provided the original "foster parents".

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-1.1

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step W/L-t9 Step 3 D-2

Decision:

Accept recommendation with the following modifications:

- (1) Retain in public ownership those lands within PLO 5777 and manage them consistent with Wildlife Decision 5.2. Allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired.
- (2) If consistent with Wildlife 5.2.
- (3) Accept as written.
- (4) Accept as written.
- (5) Retain these lands in public ownership; however, allow exchange if higher and better habitat can be acquired.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NPP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step W/L-t9 Step 3 D-2

W/L-1.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage bald eagle habitat in the vicinity of C.J. Strike Reservoir (overlay W/L-t9) to encourage additional use by these birds. Specific management actions are:

- (1) Retain in public ownership those lands within Withdrawal Order #5777 and manage these lands consistent with the Snake River Birds of Prey Management Plan (SRBOPMP). Allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired within the boundary and such exchanges are in the best interests of the public.
- (2) Allow improvement of existing roads if consistent with Withdrawal Order #5777 and the SRBOPMP.
- (3) Plant rapidly growing trees such as cottonwood on suitable sites adjacent to the reservoir to provide secure perch and roost sites.

Analysis:

Human disturbance and the lack of perch sites are considered to be the primary factors which currently and will continue to effect the population of wintering eagles in the C.J. Strike area. Retention of public lands in this area ensures that bald eagle needs will be considered before any developments occur.

This recommendation complies with requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, for participation by the BLM in conservation programs. Because bald eagles frequent the area only during winter and early spring and recreational use is limited at that time, the potential for conflict is considered insignificant.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-1.2

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | Step W/L-1.9 Step 3 p-2 |

The purpose of management for bald eagles at G.J. Strike is more likely to enhance rather than diminish the diversity and equipment of winter recreational activities.

Management of this area consistent with the SRBOPMP will ensure that habitat for bald eagles is protected and/or enhanced.

Decision:

Accept general.

Accept with the following modification:

- (1) Retain in public ownership those lands within PLO 5777 and manage them consistent with Wildlife Decision 5.2.
- (2) Allow improvement and construction of new roads if consistent with General Decision above.

JUN 21 1982

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MPP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife (4350)

Objective Number

#2

Objective #2:

Manage sensitive species habitats in the KPU to maintain or increase existing and potential populations.

Rationale:

Sensitive species are species of wildlife mutually designated by the BLM and Idaho Department of Fish and Game for which there is concern for their continued existence. Although these species are not in as much jeopardy as endangered or threatened species, further population or habitat declines may result in the more restrictive listing.

Bureau policy (Manual 6840) is to maintain or increase current population levels of sensitive species through habitat protection or enhancement.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 W/L-r10 Step 3 D-2

W/L-2.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage the potential habitat for kit fox in the Shadscale desert north of the Snake River to retain its suitability for kit fox. Coordinate with IDF&G to reestablish this sensitive species based on the merits of such reintroduction at the time contemplated.

Analysis:

This fox historically occupied the low desert area south of the Snake River. Because of the small size of this fox, it preys largely on small rodents and will not create any degradation problem to domestic animals or game species of wildlife.

Decision:

Modify the recommendation to: Identify the area as potential kit fox habitat. Coordinate with IDF&G to reestablish the sensitive species based on its merits of such reintroduction at the time contemplated.

Reason:

The IDF&G has expressed an interest in reestablishing kit fox. However, to manage this area for kit fox prior to conducting a specific analysis is premature.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 W/L-r10 Step 2 D-2

W/L-2.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Improve or maintain 4.2 miles of river otter habitat in the Snake River. Specific management needed to obtain good ecological condition of riparian habitats and good stream habitat condition includes:

- (1) Develop livestock grazing systems which will result in improved riparian habitat conditions within all river otter habitat. Where implementation of such systems is not practical, limit livestock access to riparian habitats to those areas necessary for providing livestock water (water gaps).
- (2) Develop livestock grazing systems designed to improve riparian and stream habitat conditions in the headwater reaches of streams comprising river otter habitat (see riparian section).
- (3) Cooperate with other agencies to monitor and improve quality in the river.

Analysis:

River otters are only found along the Snake River in the KPU. Unstable stream banks and water pollution from agricultural, industrial and domestic sources have reduced the quality of river otter habitat. Increasing riparian vegetation will provide several benefits to river otter by improving cover, food supplies and lowering sediment yield.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (U/P)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step W/L-110 Step 2

W/L-2.3: Multiple Use Recommendation

Maintain known ferruginous hawk nest sites and provide additional nest sites on the Snake River Plains. Specifically:

- (1) Retain ferruginous hawk habitat in public ownership, but allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired within ferruginous hawk ranges and such exchanges are in the best interest of the public. This area extends approximately 1.5 miles from nest sites.
- (2) In unoccupied areas with abundant prey available provide artificial nesting platforms.
- (3) Where rangeland reseeding is conducted, provide for a mixture of shrubs, forbs and grasses to support prey populations for ferruginous hawks.
- (4) Provide for alternative road alignment if road construction is contemplated within 1/4 mile of nest sites to keep human disturbance problems minimized. Mitigate the loss, if the road alignment cannot be modified.
- (5) Where applications for organized ORV events are in the vicinity of nest sites during the nesting season (April 1 - June 30), realign courses to be at least 1/4 mile away from active nests.

Analysis:

Ferruginous hawks are uncommon in the KPO. To maintain these breeding birds it is necessary to manage their habitat and prey abundance; and minimize human disturbance of nest sites.

Decision:

Accept as written. Also see 1-1.1, 5-1, 6.1 and W/L-5.2.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Name (BPL#) | |
| Kann | |
| Activity | |
| Wildlife | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 2 |

W/L-2.4: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage burrowing owl habitat on the Snake River Plains to maintain existing populations of these birds. Specifically:

- (1) Maintain existing nest sites, whenever possible. Mitigate losses if other uses are deemed more appropriate.
- (2) If major land disposals are undertaken, maintain "isolated tracts" of public land suitable for burrowing owl nesting.

Analysis:

Burrowing owls are quite adaptable to many land uses (grazing, agriculture, mining, ORV's, etc.) providing a suitable burrow is available for nesting. The species will also readily adapt to "new" habitat when it is made available.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1W/1-r9 Step 3

W/L-2-5: Multiple Use Recommendation

Implement intensive livestock management or protective riparian habitat by fence to improve mountain quail habitat in the following areas:

- (1) Syrup Creek and its tributaries
- (2) Long Tom Creek and its tributaries
- (3) Bennett Creek

Analysis:

Mountain quail historically provided a great deal of hunter recreation. Present populations are so small that seeing mountain quail is a rarity.

These birds are closely associated with dense riparian habitats. Most of this type of riparian habitat in the KPU is in fair or poor condition due to the concentration of livestock. Changes in stocking rates, seasons of use, grazing systems, and management practices such as salting are needed to improve these habitats.

Decision:

Accept as written.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3D-2

W/L-2.6: Multiple Use Recommendation

Maintain the Sand Creek long-billed curlew nesting habitat south of Boise as a shortgrass habitat. Specifically:

- (1) Retain the area in public ownership but allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired.
- (2) Provide for winter grazing by livestock (preferably sheep) to reduce the average vegetative height to 2-4 inches before curlews arrive in the spring.
- (3) Limit vehicular use to existing roads and trails from March 1 to June 15.

Analysis:

Long-billed curlew habitat is significantly diminished throughout most of this species' range. Maintenance of the remaining habitats is important to the conservation of these birds.

Decision:

Retain the area in public ownership but allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired. Further that portion within PLO #5777 will override (see W/L-5.2 also L-5.1 and 6.10.

Monitor and establish this areas significance and required actions necessary for improving it as curlew habitat.

The decision for limiting vehicular use and grazing prior to 3/1 will be deferred.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

W/1-2.6

Name (NFP)

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Revisions

Step 1

Step 2

Reason:

There is a population of long-billed curlew nesting in the area. This area is also very close to Boise and is used extensively by varmit and rodent hunters. The area is primarily cheatgrass and its significance has not been established. This decision allows for retention and determining significance.

JUN 21 1982

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife (4350) |
| Objective Number | #3 |

Objective #3:

Manage 207,680 acres of big game habitat in the KPU (see overlays WL-t11 and 12) to obtain good ecological condition.

Rationale:

Elk, mule deer and antelope are the big game species in the KPU. Presently deer and antelope numbers are low compared to historical peaks. The IDFG goals are to increase the population of deer and antelope approximately 20% by 1985 in the KPU. Presently mule deer populations are increasing; antelope populations are stable. Elk occur primarily in winter in the KPU and in limited numbers.

Currently 50% of elk habitat, 88% of mule deer habitat, and 100% of the antelope habitat are in poor or fair ecological condition. Habitats in these condition classes do not supply the forage diversity necessary to provide these animals with quality diets. Improvement to good ecological condition would result in a variety of perennial forbs, grasses and palatable browse becoming available to these big game species.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BFF)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 ML-t12 Step 3 D-2

W/L-3.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage 2,880 acres of elk winter and early spring range in the KPU so there is adequate food, cover and water for 50 animals by 1990. Specifically:

- (1) In order to provide sufficient forage for elk in the KPU, allocate forage by allotment and pasture as shown in Table 1, which reflects the AUM's that are competitive with livestock.
- (2) Implement livestock grazing systems and practices that recognize the physiological requirements of shrubs. Design all systems to improve palatable shrub composition, reproduction and forage availability. Allow livestock to consume no more than 30% of the current annual production of key shrub species such as bitterbrush.
- (3) In over mature dense sagebrush shrub communities, use prescribed burning or other suitable treatment to provide a mosaic of small openings of herbaceous vegetation. These openings should be no wider than 1/4 mile and interspersed with shrub communities. Reseed with grasses, forbs and palatable shrubs, if natural regeneration is not expected.
- (4) On elk winter ranges limit vehicular travel to existing roads December 15 through April 15.
- (5) Avoid new road construction within elk winter ranges. If new roads are necessary, permanently close and rehabilitate at least an equivalent amount of existing road in the same vicinity.
- (6) On elk winter ranges retain public lands, but allow land exchanges for state and private lands if such exchanges will result in acquisition of higher quality habitat.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-3.1

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Name (NFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 W/1, -112 Step 3 D-2 |

Analysis:

The maintenance of productive elk populations is dependent upon managing for nutritionally healthy animals. With the assistance of IDP&G information was obtained on seasonal diets, average weights, and consumption rates of healthy elk. This information was used to estimate forage demand by plant class. When combined with IDP&G's projected population; the total forage demand for each seasonal use area was calculated and is shown in Table 1.

Currently 50% of the elk winter range in the KPU is in poor or fair ecological condition. It does not supply the forage diversity to provide the elk with a nutritious diet. Winter ranges in good ecological condition would support a greater variety of palatable shrub species. This is very important considering that shrubs provide 51% of the total elk diet in winter.

Decision:

Manage 2,880 acres of elk winter and spring range to provide adequate food, cover and water for 50 animals by 1990.

- (1) Reject in preference to RM-2.1. The habitat will be monitored to adjust livestock use to provide for 50 elk by 1990.
- (2) Accept with following: Adjust livestock utilization as necessary for plant production and elk food.
- (3) Accept by changing: "No wider than 1/4 mile" to "generally no wider than 1/4 mile".

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-3.1

Name (NFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step W/L-t12 Step 3 D-2

- (4) On elk winter ranges limit vehicular travel to existing roads during critical periods (usually 12/15 - 4/15) and/or close if necessary.
- (5) Accept as written.
- (6) Accept (R-1.1 Kelton Road for priority).
- (7) The population goal of 50 elk by 1990 is subject to review and change in consultation with the Idaho Fish and Game goals.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Name (MPP) | Kona |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Display Reference | Step 1 WL-t11 Step 3 D-2 |

W/L-3.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage 114,880 acres of mule deer winter and early spring range in the KPU so there is adequate food, cover and water for 2,305 animals by 1990.

Specifically:

- (1) In order to provide sufficient forage for mule deer in the KPU, allocate forage by allotment and pasture as shown in Table 1, which reflects the AUM's that are competitive with livestock.
- (2) Implement livestock grazing systems and practices that recognize the physiological requirements of shrubs. Design all systems to improve palatable shrub composition, reproduction and forage availability. Allow livestock to consume no more than 30% of the current annual production of key shrub species such as bitterbrush.
- (3) On unspecified suitable sites within crucial mule deer range that presently have less than 10% palatable shrub composition by weight of the shrub component, improve forage condition by establishing seedings or plantings of bitterbrush, four-wing saltbush or other palatable shrub species.
- (4) On crucial mule deer winter ranges that do not have an adequate composition of early maturing grass, develop small seedings (not exceeding a width of 1/4 mile) of Siberian wheatgrass and Russian wildrye to improve deer nutrition in the early spring period. Do not allow livestock turnout in these areas earlier than the surrounding native range is capable of withstanding. Design vegetation manipulation projects to maintain or achieve in the vegetative community to below a 60/40 cover ratio (a patchwork of vegetation, not canopy coverage within cover stands).
- (5) Use prescribed burning or other suitable treatment to achieve a 60/40 forage to cover ratio on winter use areas dominated by tall old stands of big

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-3.2

Name (M/F)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Geology Reference

Step 1 ML-t11 Step 2

sagebrush. Respond with seeding a mixture of grasses, forbs, and shrubs if a diversity of natural regeneration is not expected.

- (6) On crucial deer winter ranges restrict vehicular travel to existing roads from December 15 through April 15.
- (7) Avoid new road construction or upgrading of existing roads in areas identified as mule deer crucial winter range. If new road construction is absolutely necessary, permanently close and rehabilitate at least an equivalent amount of roads in the same vicinity.
- (8) Within mule deer crucial winter range, retain existing public land. Allow exchanges for State and/or private lands if such exchanges will result in acquisition of higher quality habitat.
- (9) Designate deer winter ranges as high priority fire suppression areas, unless the area is designated for prescribed burning and the wildfire occurs under similar conditions for such a burn.

Analysis:

The maintenance of productive mule deer populations is dependent upon managing for nutritionally healthy animals. With the assistance of IDFG information was obtained on seasonal diets, average weights, and consumption rates of healthy mule deer populations. This information was used to estimate forage demand by plant class. When combined with the projected population, the total forage demand for each seasonal use area was calculated and is shown in Table 1.

Allowing livestock use of up to 30% of current annual growth of bitterbrush leaves 20% of the annual production for wintering deer without damage to the plants. The 20% is considered adequate to meet deer needs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/1-3.2

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step W/1-t11 Step 3D-2

A 60/40 forage to cover ratio is considered optimum on deer winter range, and nutrients locked up in unnecessary sagebrush cover will better serve both livestock and big game if recycled into more desirable forage plants. Forage improvement should be reflected as improved adult survival and fawn production.

Open roads and ORV access to crucial winter ranges encourages use by 4x4 vehicles and snow machines. Such use, coupled with cold temperatures and the high energy demand placed on the deer in a winter situation, results in stress that can lead to death and the loss of subsequent production.

Decision:

Manage 114,880 acres of mule deer winter and early spring range so there is adequate food, cover and water for 2,305 animals by 1990.

- (1) Reject in preference to RM-2.1. The habitat will be monitored to adjust livestock use to provide for 2305 mule deer by 1990.
- (2) Accept with the following:
 - % utilization can be adjusted to provide for plant health and mule deer needs as necessary.
- (3) If reasonably necessary improve forage condition on sites with less than 10% palatable shrubs by seeding/plantings of preferred species.
- (4) Accept with the following:
 - a. Change "not exceeding" to "generally not exceeding".
 - b. Change "Siberian wheatgrass and Russian wildrye" to "Siberian wheatgrass, Russian wildrye or other suitable grasses".

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-3.2

| | |
|-------------------|------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 W/L-E11 | Step 3 D-2 |

- (5) Accept as written.
- (6) On crucial deer winter ranges restrict vehicular travel/close roads if necessary during critical time periods (generally 11/15-4/15).
- (7) Accept as written.
- (8) Accept (Kelton Road has priority). See R-1.1.
- (9) Accept as written.
- (10) Consider a coordinated management plan with Idaho Department of Fish and Game, State Lands and permittee on allotment 0823 for enhancement of mule deer range.
- (11) The population goals of 2305 mule deer by 1990 is subject to review and change in consultation with the Idaho Fish and Game goals.

Reasons:

- (10) The Fish and Game Department now owns a large block of land in the allotment and has contacted us about potential grazing problems in area.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NFD)

Fund

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Buy W/L-t11 Rev-1

W/L-3.31 Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage 114,380 acres of mule deer spring, summer and fall range so there is adequate food, cover and water for 570 animals by 1990. Specifically:

- (1) In order to provide sufficient forage for mule deer in the KPD, allocate forage as shown in Table 1, which reflects the ADM's that are competitive with livestock.
- (2) On juniper and big sage sites where forage areas are inadequate manipulate the vegetation to achieve 60/40 forage to cover ratio. Manipulations will be designed so that forage improvements make use of areas with good soil development and do not exceed one-fourth mile in width. Optimum design would retain continuous zones of interconnecting cover (600-1200 foot wide) as well as associated cover patches (6-26 acres). These cover areas should make use of existing vegetative cover, rims, canyons and riparian zones.

All range revegetation projects proposed in deer use areas, including fire rehabilitation, will include a variety of palatable shrubs, forbs and grasses. Any vegetation manipulations along migration routes will retain adequate hiding and thermal cover.

- (3) Implement livestock grazing systems and practices that recognize the physiological requirements of forbs and shrubs. Design all systems to improve composition, reproduction and forage availability of palatable forbs and shrubs in both upland and riparian habitats. Allow no more than 50% total utilization of the current annual production of key shrub species by all classes of animals combined.
- (4) To minimize human disturbance to mule deer, avoid constructing roads within or closely adjacent to riparian habitats.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-3.3

| |
|----------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 W/L-t1 Step 3 |

- (5) Maintain water in all developed catchments, pipelines, troughs and springs to meet big game needs from July 15 until October 31 of each year.
- (6) Retain all public lands within and closely adjacent to migration routes for mule deer, but allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired.

Analysis:

See W/L-3.3 Analysis and W/L-3.3, MFP I and II.

Decision:

Accept/modify/reject as follows:

Accept general as written.

- (1) Reject in preference to RM-2.1. The habitat will be monitored to adjust livestock use to provide for 570 mule deer by 1990.
- (2) Accept with following modification:
Change - "do not exceed 1/4 mile in width" to "generally not exceed 1/4 mile in width".
Add - Prescribed burn should be the primary tool.
- (3) Accept as written.
- (4) Accept as written.
- (5) Accept with the following, where this is not feasible consider wildlife guzzlers.
- (6) Accept as written.
- (7) The population goals of 570 mule deer by 1990 is subject to review and change in consultation with the Idaho Fish and Game goals.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Name (NIP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 W/L-t12 Step 1 D-2 |

W/L-3.4: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage 109,120 acres as pronghorn habitat to provide sufficient forage, water, cover, and space for 55 animals by 1990. Specifically:

- (1) To provide sufficient forage for pronghorn antelope in the BPU, allocate forage by allotment and pasture as shown in Table 1, which reflects the AUM's that are competitive with livestock.
- (2) Refer to and address the "Guidelines for the Management of Pronghorn Antelope" when making management decisions which may affect antelope. Significant among these are:
 - a. If off-road vehicular traffic causes harassment of wintering pronghorn, restrict wintering area vehicular use to existing roads annually from December 15 through March 1. Minimize off-road travel on antelope spring ranges from March 1 to June 15.
 - b. Maintain sufficient water in all artificial catchments, pipelines, troughs and spring developments to meet antelope needs from July 15 until October 31 of each year. Where it is necessary to shut down livestock water facilities prior to this date, provide big game guzzlers and/or other water storage/ supply facilities to meet antelope needs.
 - c. Provide additional watering catchments, guzzlers, etc. in allotments and pastures on warm season use areas (summer, fall) such that the distance between them throughout these areas is no more than three miles.
 - d. Large expanses of big sagebrush with a shrub canopy exceeding 30 percent and an average height exceeding 30 inches may be manipulated to improve the vegetative structure and forb composition for antelope. Prescribed burning is the preferred method but improvements may be possible with mechanical or chemical treatment. Such manipulations will be limited to

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-3.4

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step W/L-t12 Step 3D-2

areas less than 1000 acres and will maintain five to 20 percent shrub canopy cover. Canopy cover should not be confused with hiding cover (reference W/L-3.1(4) mule deer).

Habitat manipulations may exceed 1,000 acres per project if, through the EA process, the particular project will not adversely impact pronghorns, and the design of the project is compatible with pronghorn needs.

- a. All range revegetation projects proposed in antelope use areas, including fire rehabilitation, will include a variety of shrubs, forbs, and grasses.

- (3) Manage all pronghorn habitat for good ecological condition.

Analysis:

See W/L-3.3, MFP I and II.

Decision:

Accept/modify/reject as follows:

Accept general as written.

- (1) Reject in preference to RM-2.1. The habitat will be monitored to adjust livestock use to provide for 55 pronghorns by 1990.
- (2) Accept with the following addition:
 - a. Roads may also be closed if necessary.
- (3) Modify to read:

Manage habitat for good ecological condition where feasible/economical.
- (4) The population goals of 55 pronghorn by 1990 is subject to review and change in consultation with the Idaho Fish & Game goals.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Instructions on reverse

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

JUN 21 1982

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife (4350) |
| Objective Number | #4 |

Objective #4:

Manage upland game and waterfowl habitats in the KPU to increase populations of these highly desired species.

Rationale:

The upland game resources of southwestern Idaho are famous throughout the United States. An estimated 24,000 hunter-days are expended pursuing pheasants, chukar, valley quail, mountain quail, Hungarian partridge, sage grouse, mountain grouse, and cottontails each year in the Bruncau Resource Area. The demand for this type of recreation is increasing steadily, especially in areas of rapid population growth such as Ada and Canyon counties, therefore priority should be given to habitat improvement in KPU to accomodate this recreation.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (City):

King

Activity:

Wildlife

Overlay Reference:

Step 1 W/L-t13 Step 3

W/L-4.1: Multiple Use Recommendation:

Improve the distribution of chukar and hungarian partridge along the foothill areas north of the Snake River by providing more sources of water. The optimum spacing for water sources is one mile apart.

Rationale:

Presently chukar and hun hunting is quite popular in the Brucosa Resource Area with over 24,000 hunter-days occurring annually. Since the KPU is the closest unit to population centers, priority should be given to upland game habitat in KPU in order to accomodate this recreation, especially since demand for this type of recreation is expected to increase. Water developments such as gallinaceous gozziers are an inexpensive and easy mechanism for increasing populations to help meet this projected demand.

Multiple Use Analysis:

This recommendation is supported by recreation recommendations for maintenance or improvement of hunting and wildlife viewing opportunities [R-1.2(12)(13)]. There are no conflicting recommendations.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept the recommendation as written.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NFP)

Kenna

Activity

Wildlife

Decision Reference

Step 1

Step 1

W/L-4.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage public lands surrounded by and in the vicinity of irrigated agricultural areas and other isolated public land tracts to maintain or improve the habitat for pheasants, hungarian partridge, valley quail and cottontails. Specifically:

- (1) Evaluate the existing or potential upland game habitat values of any public land being reviewed for disposal that are adjacent to or surrounded by agriculture. Retain these lands if significant wildlife habitat values are present or developable. Insure that approximately 15% of the area is retained in public ownership and is managed for wildlife populations for blocks of land larger than 160 acres being considered for Desert Land Entry and/or Carey Act development. If necessary, improve the composition of shrubs, forbs and grasses on isolated tracts and agricultural fringe lands to enhance food and cover for upland game. Permit other resource uses as long as consistent with wildlife management objectives. Retain public access to these tracts. Develop habitat management plans for intensive management of these tracts.

Analysis:

Intensive farming practices in use today reduce wildlife habitat values on such farmland during the winter. Unfarmed or public lands adjacent to agriculture are "havens" for wildlife during this time. In many areas these parcels are essential to maintaining abundant upland game populations. These parcels also provide hunters with open areas to hunt.

Decision:

Accept as written - see 4-1.1.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NRP):

Kama

Agency:

Wildlife

Overlay Reference:

Step 1 W/L-114 Step 1

W/L-4.3: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage springs, seeps and meadows and adjacent upland areas as key wildlife habitats for upland game. Specifically:

- (1) Control livestock grazing on these habitats by the implementation of grazing systems, season of use and other management practices such as salting away from water sources.
- (2) If livestock overuse cannot be avoided, physically protect springheads and wet areas.
- (3) Develop only those springs which are capable of providing adequate water for wildlife and livestock.

Analysis:

Water and diverse abundant plant cover are the real keys to upland game habitat and abundance. Unrestricted livestock access to springs, meadows, and seeps leads to the denuding of these areas resulting in their becoming valueless to wildlife. Management of these areas on a case by case basis will show that some seeps are unsuitable for development as stockwater sources and should therefore be fenced off. Structured grazing systems on upland game areas around such springs and seeps should be able to result in some cover improvement for wildlife.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Name (BPP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | Step W/L-t13 Step 3 D-2 |

W/L-4.4: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage 83,600 acres of sage grouse range to improve nesting, brood rearing and winter habitats. Specifically:

- (1) To improve the quality of sage grouse nesting and brood rearing habitats, a poor and fair big sagebrush, meadow, and riparian ecological sites should be improved and managed for good ecological condition, based on the SCS ecological site classification system.
- (2) When making management decisions affecting areas used by sage grouse in the KPU, refer to and address to the "Guidelines for Habitat Protection in Sage Grouse Range" as published by the Western States Sage Grouse Committee, Jan 1974. Significant among these are:
 - a. Manage sage grouse habitat by maintaining the density of sagebrush canopy cover at 20-30% within nesting habitats and at least 20% in present wintering habitats and in areas known to have supported wintering concentrations within the previous ten years. Canopy cover should not be confused with hiding cover (reference W/L-3.1(4) mule deer).
 - b. Designate sage grouse nesting and wintering habitat as "active" wildfire suppression areas wherein fire suppression activities are geared to fire behavior and the potential resource threat from any fire after it has been initially evaluated. If significant sage grouse cover is destroyed by a fire, sagebrush seed will be included in any mixture used in fire rehabilitation projects, seeded at a rate sufficient to reestablish suitable cover for sage grouse.
 - c. In brood rearing areas where the big sagebrush canopy cover is 20% or greater improve herbaceous vegetation by sagebrush manipulation and seeding of small irregular areas. These manipulations must not however, reduce the existing sagebrush canopy below 10%. Carefully evaluate the

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-24 (April 1972)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-4.4

Name (B/F/P)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

See W/L-11 Step 2

sage grouse response of these habitat manipulations before expanding the program to a large scale. Prescribed burning in most cases will be used for the cover alteration.

- d. No rehab projects will be implemented where live sagebrush crown cover is less than 20%, or on steep upper slopes (20% + gradient) where big sagebrush is 12 inches or less in height.
- e. Range vegetal control/rehab projects within two miles of known strutting grounds will be limited to practices which also enhance sage grouse habitat since this area constitutes the breeding complex for sage grouse.
- f. No vegetatal control using herbicides will be conducted along streams, meadows or secondary dry/intermittent drainages. A minimum of a 100 yard strip of living sage will be retained on each edge of meadows and drainages.
- g. Restrict during March-May any intensive disturbance activities such as gravel pit operation or ORV races within 2 miles of sage grouse strutting grounds and avoid the establishment of major roads within 1/2 mile.
- h. Restrict vehicular traffic to existing roads from November 1 to February 28 in sage grouse wintering habitats.
- i. Retain in public ownership all tracts of land on which strutting grounds are located and all lands within a two-mile radius of those strutting grounds, but allow exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired and such exchanges are in the public interest.
- j. Prescribed burning shall be the primary tool for habitat improvement.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-4.4

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Name (RPP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 W/L-4.4 Div 3 |

Analysis:

The Sage Grouse guidelines were developed by professionals from State and Federal Wildlife agencies throughout sage grouse ranges in the west. Because of the amount of habitat conversions occurring on native rangelands, grouse populations were being impacted dramatically. Game and Land managers needed a comprehensive framework within which management for other resources could be conducted while either minimizing damage to or actually improving sage grouse habitat, and the "Guidelines" resulted.

Sage grouse ranges must provide adequate forage and cover at all times of year, and ecological sites in good condition generally satisfy these requirements. The birds also need protection from ORV and other types of harassment at critical times of year such as during winter or breeding seasons, or they will abandon traditional use areas for unsuitable habitats and subsequent demise. Any disturbance in the breeding complex adversely affects reproduction. Riparian and meadow vegetation are important brooding areas if suitable adjacent protective cover is present. Without such cover, total habitat and thus the potential population is adversely affected. Wildfires also contribute to habitat loss.

Decision:

Accept as written.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step W/L-113 Step 3 D-2

W/L-4.5: Multiple Use Recommendation

Provide reasonable nesting and brood rearing habitat for waterfowl along 94 miles of river and streams and reservoirs within the KPU. Specifically:

- (1) Manage the Grand View Duck Pond area specifically as waterfowl and upland game habitat and retain in public ownership (see L-6.1).
- (2) Insure that waterfowl benefits are incorporated in all reservoir developments exceeding one surface-acre. Specifically, fence these areas, develop nest islands and/or structures, and pipe water away from the reservoir for livestock use. Implement livestock grazing systems and practices and/or improvements that will improve upland and riparian cover to form around all potential and existing waterfowl nesting areas. On key reservoirs, streams and canals that have been heavily disturbed and where there is a lack of vegetation, protect and re-establish vegetation such as bullrush and pondweed, and an upland mix of grasses, forbs and shrubs that provides good waterfowl nesting cover and food. In some instances, and on a case by case basis, it may be desirable to introduce native aquatic and terrestrial plants in an effort to accelerate succession toward quality waterfowl habitat.
- (3) Construct nesting platforms for canada geese at suitable sites along the Snake River to increase nesting opportunities and improve nest security.

Analysis:

Reservoirs exceeding one surface-acre offer excellent waterfowl nesting and brood habitat provided certain characteristics exist. The value of dense vegetation adjacent to aquatic habitats has been pointed out in the URA, as has the conflict with livestock overutilization (resulting in a much reduced vegetative cover) in these areas. Fencing areas and piping water to alternate sites for

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-4.5

Name (BPP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 W/L-t13 Step 3

livestock use will alleviate this problem. In some cases construction of islands may be accomplished with a minimum of additional cost. These islands provide high security nesting habitat for many species of waterfowl (including Canada geese). The Grand View Duck Ponds is currently managed as a waterfowl area and provides substantial recreation opportunities for the public.

Decision:

Accept/modify as follows:

Accept general.

(1) Modified by allowing a reasonable amount of acreage for Grand View Cemetery (L-6.1). Withdraw the land from mineral entry and allow no surface occupancy for leasable minerals (see M-1.1, 3.11).

(2) Accept with the following addition:

On those reservoirs exceeding one-surface acre fence and pipe water if technically/economically feasible. Reservoirs may be gap fenced for access without piping.

(3) Accept with following:

In Birds of Prey Area they must be in concert with W/L-5.2.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

JUN 21 1982

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife (4350)

Objective Number

#5

Objective #5:

Maintain and/or enhance unique or special habitats to retain and/or improve their character and value for wildlife, research, and human enjoyment. Protect habitats supporting other species of nongame wildlife with high public and/or biological interest.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BPP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 2

W/L-3.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Protect known and suspected nests of birds of prey in the resource area. Manage the adjacent vegetative cover to provide adequate food and cover for the birds' major prey species. Specifically:

- (1) Within a one half mile radius of any active nest or eyrie, consider authorization of construction, O&V events, or site occupancy on a case-by-case basis between March 1 and August 15.
- (2) Habitat alteration within three miles of any golden eagle or prairie falcon eyrie will be designed to accommodate the prey habitat needs for these species.
- (3) Plant native tree species suitable for raptor nesting in depleted areas so these areas can provide adequate raptor roosting and nesting sites (primarily for accipiters and owls) as well as food and cover for their major prey species.

Analysis:

Raptors are an abundant and very important nongame species inhabiting the resource area. The URA has recognized that in order to maintain and/or increase the number of breeding birds, it will be necessary to: 1) manage their habitat in order to maximize the prey species; and 2) minimize the human disturbance to nesting birds.

- (1) Birds of prey are very sensitive to human disturbance during their nesting period (March 1 - August 15) and require a certain degree of solitude during this time if their nesting effort is to be successful.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-5.1

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Name of Project | |
| Kama | |
| Activity | |
| Wildlife | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 2 |

- (2) Raptor species are dependent upon the existing vegetative habitat to produce the small mammals they feed upon. Research biologists calculate 27 square miles are utilized by prairie falcons and golden eagles for foraging. These areas can be various shapes but for descriptive purposes and because of a lack of specific research, known areas are shown as circles on all overlays.
- (3) Certain species of owls and accipiter hawks are totally dependent upon riparian habitats for nesting, roosting and food production. Presently many riparian habitats are in poor condition and do not provide adequate resources for these birds. Recommendations for riparian habitat management will significantly improve the habitat for these species.

Decision:

Accept as written.

MAR 23 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Name (NFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference | Step W/L-110 Step 3 D-2 |

W/L-5.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage all public lands within Withdrawal Order #5777, the proposed Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area, in the same manner as if it were a designated National Conservation Area under Title VI of FLPMA. Maintain minimum raptor population levels as identified in the 1979 Snake River Birds of Prey Special Research Report to the Secretary of the Interior. Retain all federal land within this area and manage these lands in accordance with the multiple-use principles outlined in the Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement on Birds of Prey and follow-up decision documents, but allow land exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired within the boundary and such exchanges are in the best interests of the public.

Analysis:

The proposed Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area boundary is based on scientific research that has identified the habitat area needed to protect this unique ecosystem. Designation of the Birds of Prey Area as a National Conservation Area is supported by many differing interest groups.

Decision:

Manage the Snake River Birds of Prey Area as outlined by PLO 5777 under the following Mission and Goals:

Mission:

Manage the area for the well-being of raptors and for other compatible uses.

Goals:

- (1) Perpetuate the nesting raptor populations at the minimum population levels determined for each species between 1975 and 1981.
- (2) Provide for other compatible uses in the Area.
- (3) Coordinate and conduct research and studies to support management needs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-5.2

| |
|-------------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Wildlife |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step B/L-110 Step 3 D-2 |

(4) Make available to the public, other agencies, and the scientific community knowledge gained from management and research activities.

Prepare and coordinate through public involvement a revised management plan incorporating the above Mission and Goals.

Designate the Snake River through the Area as a SRMA also incorporating the above Mission and Goals.

Retain all federal lands within this area but allow land exchanges if higher quality habitat can be acquired within the boundary and such exchanges are in the public interest.

Continue to support/seek legislation for the area under Title VI of FLPMA.

In order to protect the raptor prey base, seek a permanent withdrawal of the BOP area from agricultural entry and all forms of mineral entry on essential nesting areas (also see H-3.1, L-8.1).

No surface occupancy for leaseable minerals will be permitted within the essential nesting habitat of the Birds of Prey Area as Identified in D-4 Decision Composite overlay.

Reason:

Although legislation (HR7359/S2683) was introduced in the 96th Congress in accordance with Title VI of FLPMA it was not introduced in the 97th Congress. Thus the MFP II Recommendation is no longer meaningful. The context of P.L.D #5777 and this decision gives precedence to raptor/prey base habitats over other uses but still recognizes other uses and values.

The uniqueness of the Area is well documented and recognized by experts in the field as well as many national organizations and individuals which support the concept. The uniqueness and importance of the area requires more than just the

Note: Attach additional sheets if ~~ordinary protection~~ provided under Section 302 of FLPMA.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kana

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 2

W/L-5.3: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage "stork Island" on the Snake River near Grand View to retain its value as a great blue heron rookery.

- (1) Except during the hunting season, discourage all public presence on the island.
- (2) Allow no trees to be cut on the island.

Rationale:

A large nesting colony of great blue herons is dependent upon the trees on stork island. These birds have a high public viewing value. Conserving their nesting habitat is essential to their continued abundant presence along the Snake River for many miles upstream and downstream from the rookery. One duck-hunting blind is presently on the downstream end of the island and valid hunting has not effect on heron reproduction.

Analysis:

This recommendation is supported by recreation [R-1.2(13)] to optimize the public's opportunity for viewing enjoyment of wildlife. There are no conflicting recommendations.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-5.4

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 4

Step 3

Decision:

Accept/modify as follows:

Modify to read:

To enhance wildlife diversity and abundance, riparian and meadow habitats will be managed to attain and/or maintain a good ecological condition class (SCS Site System) or reasonable equivalent.

- (1) Employ livestock management systems/practices/improvements including exclusion of grazing where necessary.
- (2) Restore denuded and former meadows where technically/economically feasible.
- (3) Revegetate highly disturbed riparian overstory vegetation where technically/economically feasible.
- (4) Accept as written.

Reasons:

Attainment of good ecological (SCS System) condition may not be obtainable. Use of non-native species may be required, technically and economically thus still enhance values.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

MAR 10 1982

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife-aquatics |
| Objective Number | #1 |

Objective #1:

Improve fisheries physical habitat to fair and good condition by 1989 in 18 stream miles that are in poor or fair condition (see Table 13 and good habitat condition standard below). Improve water quality in stream sites to chemical constituent levels that are within proper tolerance levels for trout (see Appendix 2). Special priority should be given to improve habitat of the red-band trout, a sensitive species.

Fair to good habitat condition standards for fisheries are as follows:

- 1) High streambank cover should provide 60 to 80 percent shading to a stream.
- 2) Low streambank vegetative cover should be mostly over 4 inches in height; sod should be intact with less than 10% bare soil with broken sod.
- 3) No more than 10 percent of the streambanks in any stream reach should be actively eroding.
- 4) No more than 5 percent lateral channel movement in any stream reach. There should also be minor channel scouring or changing channels within the streambed (unless a natural condition).
- 5) No more than 10-15 percent of the stream channel bottom should be covered by fine sediments.
- 6) Between 25 to 50 percent of the stream channel should contain in-stream fish cover which would include deep pools, undercut banks, boulders, debris, overhanging vegetation, velocity breaks or turbulence.

Rationale:

Riparian habitat improvement would enhance fishery production and water quality in the KPU. Red-band trout and rainbow trout are two of the major species benefited by the proposed habitat improvement. Increasing the supply of trout will improve the trout fishery in the planning unit. The red-band trout is listed as a sensitive species by the Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game and BLM (1977) and is also designated of special concern by the American Fisheries Society (1979). BLM Manual 6840-6 policy states that crucial habitats of sensitive species will be managed and/or conserved to minimize the need for future listing of those species on federal and state lists. This includes the objective of maintaining or increasing current population levels of sensitive species through early habitat protection or enhancement (6840.31).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

MAR 25 1983

Name (BMP)
Kuna
Activity
Wildlife-aquatics
Overlay Reference
Step ML-q-8 Step 1 D-3

W/L-aq.-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Improve on-site fisheries habitat from poor to fair and good condition on 13 public stream miles. The areas specifically listed are designated as high priority fisheries habitat. Exclusion of livestock grazing is in all probability the only method of bringing the habitat to an upward trend and fair to good condition. Although this could be accomplished by gap fencing the placement will be evaluated on a case by case basis using an interdisciplinary approach. Livestock may be reintroduced as long as habitat conditions are maintained to an upward trend and fair to good condition. Initially, the following streams need improvement through fencing practices:

| Stream | Location | | | Public Stream Miles |
|------------------|----------|----|-------------------|---------------------|
| | T | R | Sec | |
| Cottonwood Creek | 13 | 7E | 8, 9 | 1.49 |
| Crown Creek | 18 | 6E | 2, 11, 14 | 3.25 |
| Syrup Creek | 18 | 6E | 13 | |
| Syrup Creek | 15 | 7E | 7, 8, 9, 18 | 2.63 |
| Long Tom Creek | 15 | 7E | 31, 32 | |
| Long Tom Creek | 25 | 7E | 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10 | 5.75 |
| | | | | 13.12 |

Analysis:

Livestock grazing is one of the major conflicts to fisheries in streams. Loss of riparian habitat adversely affects habitat factors such as channel bottoms from excessive fine sediments, channel movement, and increased water temperatures.

Decision:

Modify to read as follows:

Upgrading fisheries habitat condition for red band trout and riparian associated wildlife will be the primary management objective on these stream miles. The specific management proposal to meet the 1990 land use plan objectives will be determined as allotment management plans or wildlife habitat management plans

MAR 23 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-aq-1.1

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife-aquatics |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 W/L-aq-8 Step 3 D-3 |

are developed. The following management practices could be initiated on these stream miles in order to ensure their improvement:

- 1) Grazing exclusion,
- 2) rest rotation or deferred rotation grazing systems,
- 3) limited season-of-use
- 4) placement of juniper trees along stream banks to increase cover and reduce livestock trampling,
- 5) salting livestock away from riparian areas, and
- 6) increased water development away from riparian zones.

It is anticipated that grazing exclusion is the only practical method to accomplish riparian habitat improvement on these streams. This could be accomplished primarily through gap fencing of livestock access points.

If intensive livestock management practices are implemented as the primary method to improve fisheries habitat condition resource response would be carefully monitored. If habitat condition objectives are not being met, livestock would be excluded. Where grazing is excluded livestock use could be reintroduced after the time period required to bring habitat conditions to an upward trend and fair to good condition. Livestock use could then continue as long as these conditions were maintained.

Reason:

The multiple use recommendation has been reworded for clarity. This wording corresponds with the wording used in the Bruneau-Kuna Grazing EIS Proposed Action.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife-aquatics

Overlay Reference

Step W/L-aq-B Step 2 D-3

W/L-aq.1.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Improve fisheries habitat condition from poor and fair to a good condition through intensive livestock management on riparian areas of 5.5 stream miles on public lands. Intensive livestock management should be applied with goals directed at insuring that riparian areas receive only light to moderate livestock use to attain good habitat condition standards.

Intensive livestock management of riparian areas to minimize damage to the fisheries resource should contain combinations of (but not limited to) the following practices:

- (1) Change the present grazing systems in riparian areas to rest rotation, deferred grazing, or exclusion to allow management of these pastures with emphasis on attaining good habitat condition for fisheries.
- (2) Reduce livestock stocking rates in riparian pastures.
- (3) Limit the season of use to accommodate vegetative regrowth.
- (4) Re-distribute cattle away from riparian areas through the use of raised juniper structures placed perpendicular to the stream, and require the placement of salt away from riparian areas through license stipulations.
- (5) Increase water developments away from streams.

Intensive livestock management should be applied on a priority need basis in riparian areas. Initial streams which can be improved through intensive livestock management include:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-aq-1,2

| |
|----------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kama |
| Activity |
| Wildlife-equation |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step W/L-aq-8 Step 3 |

| Stream | Location | | | Public Stream Miles |
|-------------------|----------|----|----------------|------------------------|
| | T | R | Sec | |
| Bennett Creek | 38 | 88 | 12, 13, 24, 25 | 2.50 |
| Pole Creek | 26 | 78 | 1 | 1.20 |
| Rattlesnake Creek | 28 | 88 | 31 | |
| Rattlesnake Creek | 38 | 78 | 9, 10 | 1.82 |
| | | | | 5.52 |

Analysis:

Livestock grazing is one of the major conflicts to fisheries in KPA streams. Loss of riparian vegetation adversely affects many of the other habitat factors which provide good overall production and stability in a stream. Fisheries habitat condition of streams listed in this recommendation range from poor to fair. It has been identified that generally riparian areas receive very concentrated livestock use. Because of the geology and past history of use of the areas, it is felt that livestock use can be controlled by intensive management practices and fencing is not required at this time.

Decision:

Accept as written (also see W/L-aq.-1.1).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

MAR 21 1983

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Name (NFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife-aquatics |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | W-aq-Subj. 3 B-3 |

W/L-aq.-1.3: Multiple Use Recommendation

Work with Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Department of Water Resources to establish a conservation pool in the following reservoirs:

| Reservoir | Location | | | Acres Benefited | Fish Benefitted |
|--------------------|----------|----|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| | T. | R. | Section | | |
| Mountain Home Res. | 3S | 7E | 8,17,18,19,20 | 376 | Rainbow trout |
| Indian Creek Res. | 1N | 4E | 29, 30 | 100 | Crappy, Bass, Bullhead |
| Black Creek Res. | 1N | 3E | 31 | 70 | Crappy, Bass, Perch |

Analysis:

Annual drainage of reservoirs for irrigation limits the size potential of catchable fish, and also limits spring spawning in reservoirs and streams feeding these reservoirs. Hold over capabilities would provide habitat to develop large size fish and would improve opportunities for spring spawning (hatchery rainbows are fall spawners but after planting will revert back to spring spawning).

Decision:

Accept as written.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Name (NFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Wildlife-aquatics |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 WL-aq-85 Step 1 D-3 |

W/L-aq.-1.4: Multiple Use Recommendation

Improve fisheries habitat on 5.3 public stream miles by increasing in-stream cover by at least 50% in the streams listed below. In-stream cover can be increased through the addition of juniper trees along cut banks, placement of large boulders and/or debris jams, and excavation to create pools in stream segments where instream cover is not adequate.

| Stream | Location | | | Miles of Improvements |
|-------------|----------|----|-----------|-----------------------|
| | T. | R. | Section | |
| Crown Creek | 15 | 6E | 2, 11, 14 | 3.00 |
| Syrup Creek | 15 | 6E | 13 | |
| Syrup Creek | 15 | 7E | 7, 8, 18 | 2.30 |

Analysis:

Stream segments impacted by concentrated livestock use and in combination with natural erosive soil conditions contribute excessive silt loads downstream, and experience vegetative cover loss. Large amounts of silt fill and remain in downstream pool areas where current flows are reduced.

Although fencing and increased livestock management projects will result in improvement of in-stream cover of streams, additional rehabilitation is necessary in stream segments to restore good fishery habitat condition. With improvement of in-stream cover, overall increases in productivity of trout in these streams can be expected as adequate in-stream cover is identified as an important habitat requirements for fish (BFA-3).

Decision:

Accept with following addition:

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife-aquatics

Overlay Reference

Step 4H,-aq-8 Step 3 D-3

W/L-aq.-1.5: Multiple Use Recommendation

- (1) Improve fisheries habitat on 3.95 stream miles and 158 reservoir acres through cooperative management programs with the private landowners on the following streams and reservoir:

| Stream/Reservoir | Location | | | Miles | Acres |
|-----------------------|----------|----|---------|-------|-------|
| | T. | R. | Section | | |
| W. Fk. Long Tom Creek | 15 | 7E | 24 | | |
| W. Fk. Long Tom Creek | 13 | 8E | 19, 30 | 3.2 | 800 |
| Bennett Creek | 25 | 8E | 21 | 0.75 | 280 |
| Long Tom Reservoir | 15 | 7E | 35, 36 | | 160 |

- (2) If private lands become available through exchange support public acquisition.

Analysis:

Private stream segments impacted by concentrated livestock use and/or in combination with natural erosive soil conditions contribute excessive silt loads downstream on public lands. Cooperative programs are necessary to restore good fishery habitat condition on contiguous stream segments of private/public lands. With improvement of in-stream cover, overall reduction in siltation will occur and increases in productivity of trout in these and adjoining stream segments can be expected.

Cooperative programs on private lands within and adjoining Long Tom Reservoir will increase management options such as boat access and improved fishing opportunities. Additional benefits would accrue if a conservation pool is established.

If cooperative programs are not achieved and the private lands become available through exchange support the public acquisition of these lands (1,240 acres).

Decision:

Accept as written.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|------------|
| Name (NPL) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Wildlife-aquatics | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 2 D-3 |

W/L-aq.-1.6: Multiple Use Recommendation

Designate watershed areas which drain into major or perennial streams as special management areas to be managed for watershed stabilization. Steep sloped watershed areas which are $\geq 25\%$ in granitic areas and $\geq 35\%$ in volcanic areas should be stabilized by minimizing gully and sheet erosion through providing adequate vegetative cover on slopes. Livestock use of these watershed areas should be adjusted in areas of high erosion susceptibility to reduce soil movement to natural runoff amounts. Any other activities which would reduce vegetative cover on these watershed areas should be removed or minimized.

Priority areas include the headwaters of the following streams:

| <u>Streams</u> | <u>Location</u> |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Pole Creek | Headwaters |
| Syrup Creek | Headwaters |
| Crown Creek | Main Branch |
| Long Tom Creek | Main Branch |

Analysis:

Evidence of gully and overland erosion is present in the KPD. Siltation has been identified as a present major conflict to fisheries (URA 3). Stabilizing the watershed areas above perennial and feeder streams would reduce the amount of silt entering these systems and improve fisheries habitat in conjunction with other riparian vegetative improvements.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

MAR 10 1982

| |
|-------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Wildlife-aquatics |
| Objective Number |
| 02 |

Objective #2:

Protect and manage seasonal flows in perennial and intermittent streams to maintain aquatic/riparian habitat condition on 5 stream miles in good condition. Priority consideration should be given to habitat maintenance for red-band trout.

Rationale:

Reproduction and survival of aquatic flora and fauna is directly associated with differing levels of stream flows. Aquatic and stream side vegetation, invertebrates, and fish all respond to changes in the amount of flow, velocity, and water quality. Aquatic organisms require adequate seasonal flows that maintain proper depth and velocity components necessary to provide food producing and reproduction sites. Adequate flow amounts are those that will maintain the habitat (including reproduction and food production) necessary for the sustenance of the fish species present (in this case the red-band trout).

This objective is in compliance with the BLM and the Idaho Department of Water Resource Memorandum of Understanding (ID-79-141), the agreement between EPA and BLM of 1976, the agreement for the protection of water and air resources between BLM and the State Department of Health and Welfare, Executive Orders 12088, 11514, 11990, 11987, 11988 and 11644, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, Water Quality Act of 1965, Water Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, the Federal Pollution Control Act of 1965 and 1972, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1953, Sikes Act of 1974, and the National Environmental Policy and Management Act of 1969.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION W/L-aq-2.1

Name (AFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife-aquatics

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Decision:

Modify to read:

Work with and provide flow recommendations to the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, as information becomes available. Manage flows for a good water quality.

Reason:

By statute the State of Idaho controls water rights and minimum flows, also the Fish and Game controls the fish. Therefore the Bureau should only be in a support/recommendation role. However, we should not cause any action to reduce legally established minimum flows or quality degradation.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Name (NFP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Wildlife-aquatics | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 1 |

W/L-aq.-2.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Maintain present red-band trout populations by encouraging federal and state agencies to maintain the policy of excluding introduction of other fish species into red-band trout drainages and by discouraging fish eradication through chemical treatment where red-band trout populations are present in streams. Install fish barriers on reservoirs planted to hatchery rainbow trout.

Rationale:

It is not presently known how much other fish species (including other trout) would be serious competitors with red-band trout for food and space besides being predacious on red-band trout. It also is not known to what extent other trout species would hybridize with red-band trout. If hybridization were to occur, the gene pool of red-band trout could be lost, thus the species. Fish eradication programs using chemicals can also have detrimental affects on the stream biological community upsetting habitat factors which red-band trout require. Also, elimination of red-band trout could occur through accidents associated with chemical eradication programs.

Decision:

Modify to read:

Work with and make recommendations to Idaho Department of Fish and Game on introduction of other fish and/or eradication programs which might effect red-band trout populations on federal land.

Reason:

By statute the State of Idaho has control of fish and as such should be the controlling factor. However, we should provide information and make recommendations because red-bands are a sensitive species.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Revisions in reverse

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Wildlife-aquatics

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

W/L-84-2.3: Multiple Use Recommendation

Retain federal ownership of riparian areas in red-band trout habitat (36 stream miles). Provide opportunities for land exchanges where valuable riparian habitat can be blocked up for consistent management. Establish a cooperative management program with the State Department of Lands, Department of Fish and Game, and lease on those state lands to provide maintenance of the following contiguous units of riparian habitat:

| Stream | Location | | | Acres |
|------------------|----------|----|------|-------|
| | T. | R. | Sec. | |
| Bennett Creek | 25 | 8E | 16 | 640 |
| Long Tom Creek | 13 | 7E | 36 | 520 |
| Cottonwood Creek | 13 | 7E | 16 | 640 |

Analysis:

Cooperative programs on non-federal riparian lands would allow for more effective management of streams for red-band trout. Drainages should be managed as integrated units since stream ecosystems are continuous. The above recommendation would allow for management of drainages as integrated units, instrumental in accomplishing overall fisheries management objectives 1-3. If cooperative programs are not achieved and these state lands become available through exchange support the public acquisition of these lands (1,800 acres).

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

OCT 19 1991

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Cultural Resource

Objective Number

#1

Objective #1:

Protect and interpret for the public all sites listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Rationale:

The body of legislation passed in the 1960's and 70's bears testimony to the American public's concern for the preservation of their heritage. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established a National Register to list sites, buildings, structures and objects of importance in American history. It also created a national advisory council to provide guidance. Section 106 of the act required consultation with this advisory council prior to undertaking any action that would affect a National Register property. Executive Order 11593 and 36CFR800 further defined the responsibilities of federal agencies to identify and protect National Register eligible properties.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

MAR 14 1983

| |
|-------------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Cultural Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 CRM-7 Step 3 D-3 |

CRM-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage the Black Butte/Guffey Butte Archaeological District for the protection of cultural resource values.

Recommendation components include the following:

- (1) Preparation of a detailed cultural resource management plan.
- (2) Systematic patrol and surveillance.
- (3) Salvage excavation of sites in imminent danger of destruction.
- (4) Placement of interpretive/warning signs at key sites receiving heavy visitor use (Guffey Bridge, Wees Bar Petroglyphs, Big Foot Bar Settlement, Swan Falls Dam, etc.)
- (5) Stabilization of and assignment of government property numbers to all historic structures.
- (6) Closure of alternate trails created because of temporary poor road conditions.
- (7) Fencing of sites undergoing significant impacts from wildlife and livestock use.
- (8) Retain all lands located within the archaeological district.
- (9) Designation of the site district as an ACEC

Analysis:

The site district corresponds with the boundaries of the BPNA established in 1971

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION CRM-1.1

| |
|-------------------------|
| Name (BPP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Cultural Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 CRM-7 Step 3 |

and was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979. A total of 114 sites are included in the site district and represent a wide range of prehistoric and historic occupation in the Snake River Canyon. The formal designation already accorded the archaeological district underscores its national significance and represents one of the chief criteria for ACEC designation.

Decision:

Accept general as written.

- (1) Accept with the following:

To be incorporated into SRMA plan (see R-1.1 & W/L-5.2).

- (2) Accept.

- (3) Accept with the following:

Rehabilitate in accordance with BOP Natural Area 1971 withdrawal and SRMA plan (see R-1.1 & W/L-5.2).

- (4) Reject - covered under (1) above.

- (5) Accept.

- (6) Reject - the area is already closed except on designated roads.

- (7) Accept - incorporate in SRMA plan (see R-1.1 & W/L-5.2).

- (8) Accept.

- (9) Accept.

Note - Attach additional sheets if needed.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION CRM-1.1

Name (NFP)

Kana

Activity

Cultural Resource Mgmt.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 CRM-7 Step 1

Reasons:

See analysis.

I. NAME: Black Butte/Guffy Butte Archaeological District - an Area of Critical Environmental Concern

II. MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES:

Protect and interpret important prehistoric and historic sites within this area.

III. DESCRIPTION:

A. Relevance

This area satisfies the criteria of relevance because it contains important historic and cultural values.

B. Importance

The 32,000 acre Black Butte/Guffy Butte Archaeological District (Overlay D-3) has long been recognized as an area of intense prehistoric occupation, capable of providing valuable information for the Snake River region. In recognition of its significance the area was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978. Boundaries of the site district correspond with the existing Snake River Birds of Prey Natural Area boundaries. The 114 sites which comprise the site district include a wide diversity of prehistoric sites and important historic sites such as Swan Falls Dam, Guffey townsite and railroad bridge, and the Halverson Bar mining settlement. Important prehistoric sites include a spectacular rock art site known as the Wees Bar petroglyph field and Shellbach Cave, the first scientifically excavated site in Idaho.

C. Criticalness

The sites in the area have been subjected to vandalism for decades but surveys conducted in 1959, 1971 and 1977 indicate that adverse impacts to these sites have accelerated. Since designation of the Birds of Prey Natural Area in 1971, an estimated 15,000 visitors are expected in 1983. Indirect impacts to these sites are also occurring due to vehicle use, camping activities and livestock use. Archaeological sites represent a finite number of fragile, non-renewable resources which are under continual threat of damage or destruction by vandalism and proposed agricultural developments.

D. Protectibility

Effective visitor management of the Birds of Prey area can substantially reduce most of the adverse impacts. Education, closer supervision and law enforcement would be important components of a cultural resource management plan.

IV. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

A. Complete a cultural resource management plan to serve as the activity plan for the ACEG. This plan would identify specific site protection requirements.

- B. Implement interpretive measures such as signs, brochures, etc.
- C. Develop a use supervision program that is coordinated with the wildlife and recreation programs.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

The State Historic Preservation Office favors designation of the archaeological district as an ACEC to strengthen BLM's commitment to manage and protect these important sites.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Name | CRPPs |
| Kind | |
| Activity | Cultural Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 CRM-7 | Step 3 D-3 |

CRM-1.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage a 1/2 mile average width corridor which includes the existing ruts of the Oregon Trail and Kelton Road for protection and visitor enjoyment of these historic properties.

Recommendation components include the following:

- (1) Placement of interpretive signs in coordination with the general recreation program.
- (2) Designation of the Oregon Trail and Kelton Road as ACEC's.
- (3) Retain all lands containing historic ruts.
- (4) Prohibition of disturbance or intrusion within the protective corridor, including road maintenance and firebreak construction.
- (5) Preparation of a detailed historic management plan.
- (6) Formal withdrawal for the protection of historic values.
- (7) Support the public acquisition of Oregon Trail/Kelton Road remnants, making the acquisition of Register Rock and the Hot Springs site a high priority.

Rationale:

The Oregon Trail is recognized as a nationally significant historic property. Portions of it are on the National Register, and all existing ruts have been formally determined eligible for listing as have portions of the Kelton Road. Formal designation as a National Historic Trail clearly qualifies the Oregon Trail as an ACEC.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION CEM-1.2

| |
|-------------------------|
| None (N/A) |
| Kind |
| Activity |
| Cultural Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 CRM-7 Step 1 |

The National Park Service has formally recommended public acquisition of segments of the Oregon Trail with Register Rock being a top priority.

Decision:

Reject in preference to R-1.1(1).

Reason:

R-1.1(1) covers same recommendation.

OCT 20 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

| |
|------------------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Cultural Resource Management |
| Objective Number |
| #2 |

Objective #2:

Protect and preserve historic ruins, structures and sites for future scientific use and public enjoyment.

Rationale:

All historic sites more than fifty years old may be regarded as significant; many of less antiquity are considered significant because they are associated with a unique person or event. Some historic sites contain valuable scientific information about a recent but not completely known way of life.

Substantial historic occupation sites including structures are very rarely controlled by BLM. These are usually in private ownership and are not always owned by those sympathetic to their preservation. Historic sites represent a part of a fairly recent heritage and are important to many of the descendants of early settlers.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Name | MAR 21 1983 Kuna |
| Activity | Cultural Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 GRM-7 Step 2 D-3 |

GRM-2.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage parcels containing identified historic sites for the protection of cultural resource values. Coordinate fencing in riparian/cultural site areas to achieve both purposes effectively.

Recommendation components include the following:

- (1) Salvage of information through historical architectural study, oral history collection and archival research.
- (2) Stabilization of historic structures and assignment of BLM property numbers.
- (3) Posting of warning/interpretive signs.
- (4) Systematic patrol and surveillance.
- (5) Retain all lands containing significant historic sites.
- (6) Fencing of sites undergoing impacts from wildlife or livestock use.
- (7) a. Nominate the Oregon Short Line railroad to the National Register. There is not enough evidence to warrant ACEC for special protection at this time.

b. Designate the other 3 sites as ACEC's and where appropriate nominate to National Register.

Specific historic sites are shown on Overlay #GRM-7 and include the following:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 10-AA-131 | 10-EL-2 |
| 10-AA-155 | 1/4 mile wide corridor either side of the Union Pacific (Oregon Short Line) Railroad. |

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

CRM-2.1

Name (BPP)

Kana

Activity

Cultural Resource Mgmt

Overlay Reference

Step 1 CRM-7 Step 2 D-3

Analysis:

Significant historic sites are rarely found on public land so protection of these few sites should be of high priority. Antiquities laws protect many of these sites from vandalism and from alteration or destruction by the managing federal agency. Stabilization of historic sites or structures does not generally preclude other uses or involve any substantial amount of land.

Historic sites cannot be protected under federal laws once they pass out of federal ownership. Retention is compatible with recreation, visual resource and wildlife habitat concerns.

Decision:

Accept as written with the following change:

Reject 10-AA-131 and 10-EL-2 in preference to R-1.1. However, nominate to National Register.

Do not designate as ACEC's.

Reasons:

Sufficient protection is already afforded under antiquities laws which is also enhanced by National Register listing, therefore ACEC is not needed or required.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

OCT 20 1981

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Cultural Resource Managem

Objective Number

03

Objective #3:

Achieve the best use of lava tube caves known to have been inhabited prehistorically.

Rationale:

Such sites are fairly rare and poorly understood at present. The possibility of finding undisturbed cultural deposits is good as is the likelihood perishable items will be preserved. These sites are also capable of providing paleoenvironmental data. Proposed uses of these sites vary depending on site condition and accessibility.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (B/F/P)

Kuna

Activity

Cultural Resource Mgmt.
Overlay Reference

Step 1 CRM-7 Step 3

CRM-3.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage parcels containing lava tube caves for the protection and public interpretation of cultural resources associated with these unique natural features.

Recommendation components include the following:

- (1) Placement of interpretive/warning signs.
- (2) Salvage of scientific information in imminent danger of destruction.
- (3) Fencing of cave openings for protection of site, visitors and livestock.
- (4) Prohibit active military use of these parcels by adjusting the Memorandum of Agreement, if feasible.
- (5) Systematic patrol and surveillance.
- (6) Retain all lands containing lava tube caves.
- (7) Designate the tube cave sites as ACEC's and where appropriate nominate to the National Register of Historic places.

Specific lava tube cave sites are shown on Overlay #CRM-7 and include the following:

Tank/Cathedral Cave (10-AA-74)

Higby Cave (10-AA-60)

Kuna Cave (10-AA-37)

MAR 23 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION CRM-3.1

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Name (NFP) | Kunt |
| Activity | Cultural Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 CRM-7 Step 1 |

Analysis:

Lava tube cave sites known to have been inhabited prehistorically are fairly rare and poorly understood at present. They exhibit high potential for providing significant cultural and paleoenvironmental data.

Lava tube cave sites warrant protection for their rarity and potential for providing valuable information. In addition, the public is entitled to interpretation of these important cultural and natural values. Retention of these lands in federal ownership poses no conflict since most of the sites are not within isolated tracts. Measures suggested to protect or interpret lava tube cave sites should have no effect on other present uses.

Decision:

Accept with the following changes:

- (1) Do not place interpretive signs on Tank/Cathedral or Higby Caves.
- (4) If the caves cannot be protected consider excavation and interpretation.
- (7) Do not designate an ACEC's.
- (8) No surface occupancy within 1/4 mile of Tank Cathedral or Higby Cave for mineral leasing or sites currently on or nominated to the National Register of Historic Places (N-1.1).

Reasons:

The area has been used by the National Guard and Active Military since 1953 and will continue if in concert with Birds of Prey Management (see W/L-5.2). These sites should not be identified for general public use because of imminent danger from military operations.

Note: Attach additional sheets if needed.

3-11-83 (Rev. 10-1-82)

Final Form 1-1 April 1974

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

OCT 20 1981

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Cultural Resource Managem

Objective Number

04

Objective 04:

Protect representative prehistoric sites from further deterioration.

Rationale:

The cumulative effect of the loss of individual sites represents a great impact on the resource base. Cultural sites are finite in number and fragile in nature. Some sites of all types should be preserved for future study and interpretation.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| |
|-------------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Cultural Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 CRM-7 Step 3 D-3 |

CRM-4.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Manage the 40 acre parcels containing the identified prehistoric sites for the protection and preservation of their cultural values.

Recommendation components include the following:

- (1) Placement of interpretive/warning signs at rock art sites.
- (2) Fencing of sites undergoing impacts from wildlife and livestock use.
- (3) Systematic patrol and surveillance.
- (4) Test excavation of problematic sites.
- (5) Retain all parcels containing significant prehistoric sites.

Specific site areas are depicted on Overlay #CRM-7 and include the following:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 10-EL-2 | 10-EL-186 |
| 10-EL-176 | 10-EL-588 |
| 10-EL-152 | 10-EL-590 |
| | Snake River Archaeological District (proposed)(1/4 mile north of River outside BPNA) |

Analysis:

Effective management of those sites along the Snake River is especially critical because so few of them are under BLM jurisdiction. Natural forces exert a strong influence in this area and competition for other uses of this land base is keen. These sites represent substantial occupation and vandalism is a serious problem (see Objective 4 for additional rationale).

(Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed)

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1978)

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION CRM-4.1

Name (NFP)

Kana

Activity

Cultural Resource Mgmt.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 CRM-7 Step 3 D-3

Decision:

Manage the identified sites for the protection and preservation of their cultural values unless deemed necessary to interpret and/or excavate due to higher public needs/values.

Components may include but not limited to the following:

- 1) Interpretive/warning signs
- 2) Fencing
- 3) Patrol and surveillance
- 4) Text excavation
- 5) Inclusion in Oregon Trail SRMA plan
- 6) Retention in Federal ownership
- 7) Establishing Archaeological District

Specific sites are:

- 10-EL-2 (see R-1.1 and CRM-2.1)
- 10-EL-176 (see R-1.1)
- 10-AA-152
- 10-EL-186
- 10-EL-588
- 10-KL-59
- Possible Archaeological District (see CRM-7 overlay)

Reason:

Fourty acre parcels may or may not be needed, there may in fact be more than 40 acres required for reasonable protection. Some of the sites are covered under the Decision for Oregon Trail Corridor and Related Historic Sites future management plan. This also borders on Policy.

DEC 07 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

| | |
|------------------|------------|
| Name (MFP) | Bruneau |
| Activity | Recreation |
| Objective Number | #1 |

Objective #1 - Recreation Management:

Provide high quality recreation opportunities commensurate with present and future demand. Manage public lands to provide varied opportunities for recreation experiences in mostly undisturbed settings. Emphasis will be placed in managing the area for dispersed-type recreation opportunities.

Recreation sites and facilities will be developed as needed to control visitors, protect resources, and accommodate public use. Existing developed and undeveloped recreation sites will be managed to provide maximum benefit to the user and to assure availability for future recreation developments.

Rationale:

1. The 1977 Idaho State Outdoor Recreation Plan estimates that recreation demand within the ten counties of southwestern Idaho will increase from 77 million activity occasions in 1980 to 136 million activity occasions by the year 2000.
2. It is Bureau policy to provide for an adequate variety and supply of outdoor recreation opportunities on public lands commensurate with public needs and resource potentials and consistent with a quality environment.
3. A wealth of varied recreation resources and opportunities are found in the area, including such nationally recognized resources as the Oregon National Historic Trail and the proposed Bruneau and Owyhee National Wild and Scenic Rivers.
4. The 1976 study, Public Preferences Towards Natural Resources Use in Idaho, found that Idahoans favored more isolated types of recreation experiences.
5. Section 102(a)(8) of FLPMA provides that public lands will be managed in a manner that will provide the public with outdoor recreation opportunities. Section 103(c) of FLPMA provides that outdoor recreation is one of the major uses considered in planning along with the other resources the Bureau manages.
6. There is one developed BLM recreation site in the area, the Cove Recreation Site. Several undeveloped sites are heavily used, such as Indian Bathtub.
7. Properly designed, developed, located, and maintained sites and facilities provide for visitor enjoyment and resource protection.
8. The 1977 Idaho Outdoor Recreation Plan estimates that there will be the following deficiencies in outdoor recreation facilities by 1980 in the ten counties of southwestern Idaho:

Picnic Units

Developed - 1,226

Undeveloped - 2,278

DEC 08 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

| | |
|------------------|------------|
| Name (MFP) | Bruneau |
| Activity | Recreation |
| Objective Number | #1 (cont.) |

Camp Units
Developed - 2,028
Undeveloped - 4,731

Boat Access
Ramps - 158

9. Draft Bureau recreation policy states:

"Facilities may be provided in accordance with land-use plans where the Bureau has problems or special management areas. Resource protection, visitor safety, or making special and unique recreation opportunities available to the public will be the major purpose for facility provision. The emphasis in Bureau investments will be in those types of facilities needed to make public resources available to the public."

"All Bureau recreation investments will be maintained in compliance with health and safety regulations prescribed by local, State and Federal regulations."

MAR 14 1993

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Recreation |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1R-7, 8, 9 Step 3 |

R-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Areas where congressionally recognized recreation values exist or where significant public recreation issues or management concerns occur will be managed as special recreation management areas. Recreation use and management and protection of recreation resources within these areas will be guided by recreation area management plans. The following 3 areas are identified as special recreation management areas:

- (1) Oregon National Historic Trail and associated historic routes
- (2) Snake River Birds of Prey Natural Area (see W/L-5.2)
- (3) Crater Rings National Natural Landmark

All Bureau lands in the above areas will be retained in public ownership.

Further, the following actions apply to the various types of special recreation management areas:

(1) Oregon National Historic Trail and associated historic routes

- a. As guided by the Comprehensive Management and Use Plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail prepared by the National Park Service, preserve remaining remnants of the Oregon Trail and associated sites for public recreation use, and maintain scenic corridors with an average total width of one-half mile along remnants in a natural condition. Do the same for the Kelton Road and Goodale Cut-off. The corridor may be wider or narrower than 1/4 mile on each side of historic ruts depending on topography, the presence of developed private land, or the location of improved roads.
- b. Segregate public land within 1/4 mile of the Oregon Trail, Goodale Cut-off and Kelton Road corridors from all forms of entry, sale or other disposi-

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

BLM FORM 1000-108 (11/82)

Form 1000-21 (April 1975)

MAR 23 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

| |
|---------------------------|
| Name (MPL) |
| Kona |
| Activity |
| Recreation |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 R-7, B, Step 2 D-3 |

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION R-1.1

tion under the public land laws and from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and allow no surface occupancy for leaseable minerals.

- c. Develop cooperative agreements with private landowners and support acquiring easements from private and state lands.
- d. As guided by the Comprehensive Management and Use Plan prepared by the National Park Service, develop public recreation facilities along the Oregon Trail, including such facilities as trail heads, interpretive sites, signs, and drinking water.
- e. Change to "Designate remnants of the Oregon Trail, Kelton road and Gondale Cut-off and the associated corridors as "limited" to ORV use, allowing motor vehicle travel only on designated roads and trails."
- f. Change to "Develop a cooperative agreement with Ada and Elmore County for improvement and maintenance of the foothill road to encourage the roads use as an Oregon Trail scenic route."

Analysis:

The Oregon Trail was included within the National Trails System as an Historic Trail by PL 95-625 (11/19/78). The NP Service prepared and submitted a management plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail to Congress in 1981.

Protective withdrawals are necessary to assure protection and retention of these national historic values.

Decision:

Accept as written except:

- a. Include associated cultural and historical sites (see CRM-2.1).

ote: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| |
|-------------------------|
| Name (RFP) |
| Kama |
| Activity |
| Recreation |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 R-7, 8, 9 Step 3 |

R-1.1(2): Multiple Use Recommendation

(2) Snake River Birds of Prey Natural Area

- a. Accomodate recreation use in a manner which will optimize public enjoyment while the #1 priority is protecting the habitat for the birds of prey (see W/L-5.2). Recreation facilities needed to control use, for public safety, to inform visitors, and to minimize disturbance to natural and cultural values will be provided. Historical, archaeological, scenic, educational, and other recreation values will be protected and interpreted for public enjoyment.
- b. Improve management and supervision of public recreation use to optimize visitor understanding and enjoyment of the resources and to diminish damage to natural and cultural values and improvements by increasing BLM presence to monitor use and assist visitors.
- c. To enhance scenic values, provide the opportunity to remove existing man-made intrusions that are no longer needed and have no historic value. Landscape the existing irrigation pump sites.
- d. Place less emphasis on access through the area by motor vehicle as primary mode of travel, while encouraging more movement by passive means, such as foot, horseback, and float boat.
- e. Motor vehicle routes should not be circular, but should be spur roads where visitors return the way they came in.
- f. Restrict farm-related developments, such as irrigation pumps, and other development with adverse visual impacts.
- g. Utilize the Natural Area as an environmental education area.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

BLM Form 100-108 (Rev. 10/67)

Form 100-21 (April 1973)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION R-1.1(2)

Name (AFP)

Kuna

Activity

Recreation

Overlay Reference

Step 1 R-7, 8, 9 Step 3

h. Support public acquisition of private and state lands.

Analysis:

Recreation - hunting - fishing etc. can be accommodated as a secondary priority for use within the area. See W/L-5.2.

Decision:

Accept as written.

MAR 21 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kama

Activity

Recreation

Overlay Reference

Step 1R-7, 8, 9 Step 3D-3

R-1.1(3). Multiple Use Recommendation

(3) Crater Rings National Natural Landmark

Withdraw the area from all forms of entry, sale, or other disposition under the public land law and from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and no surface occupancy from oil and gas leasing. Do not designate as a SMOA.

Analysis:

This Area has been congressionally designated, however, this designation does not protect it from the mining laws and oil and gas drilling nor specifically put it under 3809 for NOI or plan of operation. Although there is very little if any known mineral material its national significance should be assured.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| |
|------------------------|
| Name (MFP) |
| Kuta |
| Activity |
| Recreation |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1g-1, 2, 3 Step 3 |

R-1.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Land not included within special recreation management areas will be managed as an extensive recreation use area where recreation management is minimal and implemented through the Bureau's basic stewardship responsibilities. Reasonable recreation opportunities will be provided for in this area. Recreation management plans will not be prepared for extensive recreation management areas or portions thereof.

The following actions should be considered in managing the extensive recreation management area within the Kuta Planning Unit.

- (1) Retain most lands in public ownership.
- (2) Where legal access to the public is denied, support acquiring access easements across private land to allow use of adjacent public lands and of existing roads and trails needed for public recreation use.
- (3) Make public lands near communities and urban areas available for recreation development by state and local agencies and organizations through the R&PP program.
- (4) Maintain a system of well-signed roads.
- (5) Clean up unauthorized dumps on public land and prevent further garbage disposal.
- (6) Provide reasonable non-motorized trails.
- (7) To maintain or improve ORV opportunities:
 - a. Utilizing mostly existing primitive roads, consider an ORV trail network for motorcycles and four-wheel drives including segments of one or more

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

2025 RELEASE UNDER E.O. 14176

Form BLM-21 (April 1973)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MPP)

Activity

Recreation

Overlay Reference

Step 1, 2, 3 Step 1

_____ B-1, 2
trails spanning the entire Boise District. Provide areas for parking,
loading ramps, and rest stops along the trails.

- b. Utilizing existing primitive roads when available, provide a multiple-use trail system (motorized and non-motorized) in the foothills from Lucky Peak Reservoir to Bennett Creek.

(8) To maintain or improve fishing opportunities:

- a. Intensively manage streamside zones of those streams with game fish populations to enhance the fishery habitat.
- b. Provide good public road or foot access to better fisheries.

(9) To maintain or improve hunting opportunities:

- a. Intensively manage livestock grazing to improve wildlife habitat.
- b. Change vegetative composition of range where necessary to improve wildlife habitat.
- c. Encourage waterfowl use of some reservoirs by fencing and vegetative planting and by providing livestock water at specific points on reservoirs or away from reservoirs.
- d. Work with private landowners to encourage public use of private ownerships in Bennett Foothills for big game and upland game hunting.

(10) To optimize viewing enjoyment of wildlife:

- a. Properly manage habitat to maintain or increase wildlife populations.
- b. Fence certain springs to exclude livestock.

Note: Attach additional sheets if needed.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION R-1.2

Name (M/F)

Kunt

Activity

Recreation

Overlay Reference

Step 1R-1,2,3 Step 3

- c. Manage the plateaus adjacent to the Snake River to provide hunting habitat for raptors.

Analysis:

- (1) Public ownership is unnecessary to assure availability of lands for existing and future recreation use.
- (2) Access to some recreation resources on public lands is across private lands. Recreation opportunities are also found on private land.

- (3) Bureau recreation policy states:

"Recreationally valuable public lands, with the exception of special recreation management areas, may be transferred (exchange, sale, lease) in accordance with decisions arrived at in the planning process for the development of recreation areas."

- (4) Driving for pleasure and sightseeing are popular recreation activities. Good access is necessary to optimize use of recreation opportunities.
- (5) Viewing raptors is a significant recreation activity. Protection of the hunting habitat is necessary to maintain present raptor numbers.
- (6) Unauthorized dumps are found in many locations on public lands.
- (7) Idaho has the highest per capita ownership of motorcycles in the nation with about 9 owners per 100 population. Ownership of 4-wheel drive vehicles is also common.
- (8) When no acceptable damage to resources result, ORV users should have the opportunity to use public land as other recreationists and resource users.

MAR 23 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION 3-1.2

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Recreation

Overlay Reference

Step 4-1,2,3 Step 2

- (9) The 1980 Idaho Recreation Trails Plan states that since 63.9% of the land in Idaho is managed by the federal government and since 68% of ORV recreation use occurs on these lands, a major portion of ORV planning and funding should be direct to the federal lands that provide ORV recreation resources.

Decision:

Accept as written. Also:

- (1) No surface occupancy within 1/4 mile of Lucky Peak reservoir for mineral leasing (M-1.1).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

JUN 23 1982

| | |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Visual Resource Mgmt. |
| Objective Number | #1 |

Objective #1:

Manage all public lands in a manner which will protect and maintain the existing visual qualities, provide for enhancement where consistent with management policies, and provide for rehabilitation of land which presently do not meet the visual quality standards of surrounding lands. Use VRM contrast rating and project application design process for all management activities without unduly reducing commodity production or limiting program effectiveness.

Rationale:

Visual resource values have been recognized as important elements of the human environment. Degradation of the visual resource represents an adverse impact to the human environment.

Public Law 91-190, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, states in part "...assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surrounding..."

Public Law 94-579, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, states in part that "the public lands be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental...values;" (Sec. 102(a)(8)) and "regulations and plans for the protection of public land areas of critical environmental concern be promptly developed;" (Sec. 102(a)(11)).

BLM Manual 1603 states that visual resource management should be applied to all Public Lands through the planning system. These same techniques should be utilized in the analysis of specific development proposals initiated by the BLM or under permit.

An inventory of scenic quality in the planning unit was completed in 1980 in accordance with BIM Manual 8411 - Upland Visual Resource Inventory and Evaluation. Results of this inventory identified scenic quality (A, B, or C) throughout the planning unit and is documented in URA Step 3 for Visual Resource Management.

Additional procedures, as outlined in the 8411 manual were completed before delineating the VRM Classes which form the basis for the following recommendations. These procedures include a seen-area analysis, distance zone mapping, and traffic volume. This information is shown on a URA 3 map. Chart ___ shows how the recommended Visual Resource Management Classes were developed.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| |
|-----------------------|
| Name (NFP) |
| Kuna |
| Activity |
| Visual Resource Mgmt. |
| Overlay Reference |
| Step 1 VRM-4 Step 3 |

VRM-1.1: Multiple Use Recommendation

Do not designate any VRM class designation on SRBOP Natural Area until after the Special Recreation Management Plan has been completed. In the interim, all proposed uses will be allowed which maintains or improves the existing visual qualities and are consistent with BOP management objectives (see W/L-5.2).

Analysis:

Classification through BLM Manual 8431.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Visual Resource Mgmt.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 VRM-4 Step 3

VRM-1.2: Multiple Use Recommendation

Designate 77,750 acres as VRM Class II.

Analysis:

Classification through BLM Manual 8431.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Visual Resource Mgmt.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 VRM-4 Step 3

VRM-1.3: Multiple Use Recommendation

Designate 380,500 acres as VRM Class III.

Analysis:

Classification through BLM Manual 8431.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Visual Resource Mgmt.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 VRM-4 Step 3

VRM-1.4: Multiple Use Recommendation

Designate 470,700 acres as VRM Class IV.

Analysis:

Classification through BLM Manual 8431.

Decision:

Accept as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Visual Resource mgmt.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 VRM-4 Step 3

VRM-1.5: Multiple Use Recommendation

Designate 1/2 mile each side of U.S. 68 and Swan Falls Road as traffic influence zone to preserve and enhance existing quality.

Analysis:

Classification through BLM Manual 8431.

Decision:

Accept as written.

NOV 24 1981

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

| | |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Transportation/Support |
| Objective Number | #1 |

Objective T-#1:

Provide legal road access over 10 miles of existing roads across state land in support of the recreation, wildlife habitat, and range resource disciplines and to meet the requirements of transportation planning as soon as possible.

Rationale:

The Kuna Transportation Plan includes 13 roads totaling 129 miles of which only 6 roads totaling 52 miles have unrestricted legal access. Within 6 road systems totaling 76 miles, 10 miles cross Idaho state land without permit. The lack of easements or permits to use these road segments implies that travel or maintenance could be restricted at any time by the state. The impacts of the sudden closure of these roads cannot be quantified realistically, but public indignation and disrupted BLM programs would be forces to reckon with. Furthermore, no appropriated money may be spent for road maintenance or construction on state land unless the road is covered by an easement.

MAR 22 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Kuna

Activity

Transportation/Support

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation T-1.1:

Evaluate, prioritize, and coordinate road access needs with respect to:

1. Resource management needs
2. Engineering feasibilities (location, costs)
3. Intra-agency and/or other user demands
4. Type of easement, permit, or agreement needed

Rationale:

Because historically BLM has enjoyed relatively unrestricted ingress and egress across existing private roads, little attention has been focused on legal access or engineering standards. Jurisdiction for road control and maintenance responsibility is conveniently uncertain in most instances except dedicated county roads.

Support Needs:

1. Resource specialists and access specialists

Multiple Use Analysis:

Inter-discipline coordination, including engineering input, will lead to the identification and prioritization of specific access needs to interconnect the transportation plan road system while minimizing resource conflicts and maximizing benefits.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Same as Step 1.

Decision:

Accept M.U. Recommendation.

MAR 22 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Name (MFP) | |
| Kuna | |
| Activity | |
| Transportation/Support | |
| Overlay Reference | |
| Step 1 | Step 3 |

Recommendation T-1.2:

On a priority basis immediately commence to survey existing and/or proposed road locations needed for BLM administration and public access and prepare survey plats in accordance with BLM 2130 Manual requirements.

Rationale:

Survey and platting is the first step in the easement acquisition process. This can be a time-consuming step and survey problems commonly delay the easement acquisition process. However, survey notes and easement plats can easily be retained pending the appropriation of money for the steps of appraisal and purchase of easements.

Support Needs:

1. Cadastral survey
2. Operations survey

Multiple Use Analysis:

No resource conflicts identified.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Same as Step 1.

Decision:

Accept M.U. Recommendation.

MAR 22 1983

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| Name (MFP) | Kuna |
| Activity | Transportation/Support |
| Overlay Reference | Step 1 Step 3 |

Recommendation T-1.3:

Appraise and purchase easements as surveys are completed and funds become available.

Rationale:

Appraisal and easement purchase must be completed in close sequence to bring the easement acquisition to a successful conclusion.

Support Needs:

1. State Office appraisal staff
2. District access specialist

Multiple Use Analysis:

No conflicts identified.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Same as Step 1.

Decision:

Accept M.U. Recommendation.