

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-2.3 Step 3

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-2.3 -
Treat the areas in the following priority, eliminating those in the Drop category. Refer to the Multiple Use Analysis for rationale. All accepted treatments will be modified as shown in the Impact Analysis for RM-2.3, except WS-2.1. The treatments that are on severe erosion-susceptible soils will be examined during project design and layout for steepness of slope and present conditions. Areas that can be improved for watershed stability will be included in treatment.

Reasons:

These treatments can all be implemented without causing resource conflicts and there is site potential for increased forage production. There is an anticipated increase in future demand for all the resource values. The sites that are improved and maintained best meet current demands and are in a position to better meet future demands. The acres shown are modified from the proposals to meet other resources needs, especially wildlife habitat and visual.

No.	Name	Acres	Increase AUM's
Priority #1			
4038	Kerr-Lost Creek	432	199
4106	Salmon Tract	150	38
4101	Magic Common	1,000	620
Priority #2			
4098	Schnell-Salmon	620	293
4042	Horse Creek	73	29
4044	South Mule Creek	285	138
4119	Ridge	230	102
Priority #3			
4034	Point Ranch	277	131
4035	Whiskey Creek	987	835
Drop			
4003	Ellis-Tews Berger		
4019	Wrigley Berger		
4053	Hub Butte-WSGA		
4055	Hub Butte-Davis		
4131	Western Stockgrowers		

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

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-2.3 Step 3

Support Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit-cost analysis.

R. A. Staff -
Planning layout, survey, design,
develop AMPs.

Advance coordination with IDFG.

Operations -
Treatment, cost data, survey,
design contracting.

Administration -
Contracting, procurement.

Archaeologist -
Cultural examination.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject RM-2.3.
2. Accept RM-2.3.
3. Make additional or different modifications.

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation to use any best method or combination of treatment methods that will meet the stated management objectives. When chemical treatment is selected it will be carefully studied and coordinated with user groups and in consultation with all interested groups.

Rationale:

These proposals will be closely coordinated with other resource values in each area. Emphasis will be to coordinate with identified wildlife habitat values in the areas. Watershed values are also high in some of these areas. Wherever watershed values (soil erosion) can be enhanced they will be given highest priority for improvement or protection. The acreage values are results of the conflict analysis and provide for all the resource values in each of the proposal areas.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 197

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 RM-2.4 Step 3

Recommendation:

RM-2.4 Burn and seed 14,922 acres of native rangeland to increase production of livestock forage and improve grazing condition on the areas described below:

Rationale:

The treatments included in this recommendation will help to offset existing forage deficiencies and will help to meet the increases in demand for AUM's predicted for the next 20 years.

#	Name	Acres	AUM's	
4001	Buhl Group-Berger*	402	141	Removal of sagebrush will reduce the brush competition of the vegetation and release moisture, space and light.
4012	Lanting-Berger*	110	50	
4013	Martens-Berger*	124	54	Seeding will provide the desirable forage species not present in the existing composition.
4015	Parrot-Berger	76	30	
4016	PVGA-Berger*	345	158	The expected increases in capacity were determined by comparing the existing production of the proposed treatment areas with the production of similar seeded sites in excellent condition.
4018	Smith-Berger	38	21	
4031	Western Stockgrowers	155	63	
4034	Point Ranch	2163	876	
4035	Whiskey Creek	3599	1544	
4044	South Mule Creek	295	153	
4049	Peters	413	155	
4066	Barton-Schutte	47	22	
4074	Amsterdam-Kunkel	567	206	
4098	Schnell-Salmon	3237	1508	
4108	Lost Creek-U2*	79	20	
4109	Salmon Tract-U2	280	84	Burning is less controversial than spraying.
4114	Squaw Joe	1140	313	
4120	Gravel Pit-Salmon	700	97	
4121	Section 22	160	43	
4119	Ridge	269	139	
4122	Highway Unit	113	43	
4125	ISO Tract Kunkel	70	27	

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Layout)
Fire Crew: (Burning)
Administration: (Contracting)
Operations: (Seeding)
Archeologist: (Cultural Clearance)

*Allotments with forage deficiencies

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Ranch Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 RM-2.4 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

- Drop 4109 Salmon Tract-U2 -
4121 Section 22 -
4122 Highway Unit -
4125 Isolated Tracts-Kunkel -

These allotments are not in grazing management systems or proposed for grazing management systems. If a grazing management system were developed that provided for the physiological needs of the desirable vegetative species they would be moved up to priority 3.

- 4074 Amsterdam-Kunkel -

Analysis of the cost of the projects required to implement the system proposed in RM-1.1 showed that it was excessive since the allotment is currently producing at a level exceeding the grazing preference. The proposed system was dropped and recommended for continued seasonal use management.

- 4001 Buhl Group-Berger -
4012 Lanting-Berger -
4013 Martens Berger -
4014 Noh-Berger -
4015 Parrot-Berger -
4018 Smith-Berger -

These allotments are crested wheatgrass seedings and the recommended treatments are on islands of brush that were too shallow and rocky for plowing treatment in the initial projects. These areas should be left in sagebrush cover to help keep a desirable vegetation complex and avoid developing a biological desert. Leaving these island will help meet Wildlife and Visual Resource needs in the Berger treatment area.

- 4031 Western Stockgrowers -
4034 Point Ranch -
4044 South Mule Creek -

Projects numbered 20, 80 and 82 on Range URA 4 overlay 1.2 treatments are dropped as shown in the RM-2.4 Impact Analysis. Project 20 is a severe erosion-susceptible soil, project 80 is severe erosion-susceptible soil and sagegrouse winter range, project 82 is sagegrouse winter range and Visual Resource Management Class III.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reasons:

Modify RM-2.4 -
Treat the areas in the following
priority and drop the ones in the Drop

These proposals add to the total
management of these allotments. The
acres shown are estimates and are

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1977)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 RM-2.4 Step 3

Multiple Use Recommendation (cont.):

category. Refer to the Multiple Use Analysis for rationale. All accepted treatments will be modified as shown in the Impact Analysis for RM-2.4.

No.	Name	Acres	Increase AUM's
Priority #1			
4016	PVGA-Berger	340	113
4049	Peters	207	78
4066	Barton-Schutte	47	22
4108	Lost Creek-U2	80	20
4114	Sauaw Joe	570	157
4120	Gravel Pit-Salmon	500	84

Priority #2			
4098	Schnell-Salmon	1,618	754
4119	Ridge	202	104

Priority #3			
4035	Whiskey Creek	1,800	772

Drop			
4001	Buhl Group-Berger		
4012	Lanting-Berger		
4013	Martens-Berger		
4014	Noh-Berger		
4015	Parrot-Berger		
4018	Smith-Berger		
4031	Western Stockgrowers		
4034	Point Ranch		
4044	South Mule Creek		
4074	Ansterdam Kunkel		
4109	Salmon Tract-U2		
4121	Section 22		
4122	Highway Unit		
4125	Isolated Tract-Kunkel		

Reasons (cont.):

reduced from the proposal to improve other resource values in the allotments, especially wildlife habitat and visual resource needs.

Supports Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit cost analysis.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject RM-2.4.
2. Accept RM-2.4.
3. Different amounts of the recommendation.

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 (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Panda Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM-2.4 Step 3

Supports Needs (cont.):

R. A. Staff -
AMP development, project planning,
layout, design.

Operations -
Treatment, cost-data, survey,
design, contracting.

Administration -
Contracting and procurement.

Archaeology -
Cultural examinations.

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation to use any best method or combination of treatment methods that will meet the stated management objectives.

Rationale:

These proposed projects will be coordinated with identified wildlife and watershed values to assure that all the identified values are provided for or improved. The acreages are estimates derived through the conflict analysis to mitigate adverse impacts on all identified resource values in each of the treatment sites.

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

Name	W-11
	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 RM-2.5 Step 3

Recommendation:

RM-2.5 Plow and seed 638 acres of native rangeland to increase production and grazing condition on the areas described below:

#	Name	Acres	AUM's
4034	Point Ranch	362	185
4124	Highway-Kunkel	276	107

Rationale:

The treatments included in this recommendation will improve the grazing condition of the areas included. These areas currently dominated by big sagebrush, cheatgrass, and Sandberg's bluegrass. Implementation of grazing systems will not improve the condition of these areas.¹ Land treatments will provide for productive perennial forage species. The permittees involved have expressed a desire to treat the areas with plowing and seeding.

The expected increases in capacity were determined by comparing the existing production of the proposed treatment areas with production of similar seeded sites in excellent condition.

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Layout)
Archeologist: (Cultural Clearance)

1. Hironaka, M. and Fosberg, M.A., 1971. Non Forest Habitat Types of Southern Idaho Interior Report. V of I Forest. Wildlife Range Experiment Station.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Range Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM-2.5 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

The analysis for this recommendation is the same as shown in RM-2.3 which says that the sites have potential to produce and can be planned and developed in a manner that does not conflict with other resource uses. If these proposals have a positive benefit-cost ratio and funding is made available they would benefit the human environment. The benefit is not significant by itself, but if enough insignificant benefits are added together they do contribute to the whole.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-2.5 -
Implement the recommendations with the modifications shown in the Impact Analysis for RM-2.5.

4034 Point Ranch 181 acres
4124 Highway-Kunkel 235 acres

Reasons:

The sites have the potential to produce and can be developed to benefit wildlife at the same time. About 75 percent of the area can be treated in a broken irregular pattern to create "edge."

Support Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit-cost analysis.

R. A. Staff -
Planning, design, layout.

Operations -
Cost-data, design, layout, treatment, contracting.

Administration -
Contracting, procurement.

Archaeologist -
Cultural examination.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject RM-2.5.
2. Accept RM-2.5
3. Additional acres.
4. Other treatment methods.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1500-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	Step IRM-2.6 Step 3

Recommendation:

RM-2.6 Seed 600 acres of cheatgrass range located in 4031 Western Stockgrowers.

Rationale:

The proposed treatment will improve the grazing condition of 600 acres burned in the Cottonwood fire of 1973. The area was scheduled for rehabilitation after the fire, but was never reseeded. In addition to improving grazing condition, the fire hazard inherent in pure stands of cheatgrass will be reduced by replacement with less volatile perennial species.

The expected increase in capacity was determined by comparing the existing production of the proposed treatment area with production of similar seeded sites in excellent condition.

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Layout)
Operations: (Seeding)
Archeologist: (Cultural Clearance)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Range Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM-2.6 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

The area burned in 1973 was scheduled for rehabilitation, but the Bureau ran out of seed. The site has potential to produce additional livestock and wild-life forage. Perennial vegetation would add to the stability of the soils from year to year. The increased forage would support facilitation of the proposed grazing system in the Western Stockgrowers Allotment and help reduce the grazing on McMullen Creek wetland/riparian habitat.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reject RM-2.6 -
Drop the proposal and leave the area as is unless future analysis shows that more forage is needed to help keep stock out of McMullen Creek or the watershed and wildlife resource values are needed.

Reasons:

Analysis of the costs of projects needed to implement the proposed system are too costly for the benefits that would be gained. Resource objectives should be achieved by continuing good management practices as described in RM-1.1 modification.

Support Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit-cost analysis.

R. A. Staff -
Project planning, layout, design.

Operations -
Survey, design, treatment.

Administration -
Procurement.

Archaeologist -
Cultural examinations.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept RM-2.6.
2. Reduced acreage.
3. Add tillage.
4. Add acreage.

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 (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step RM-2.6 Step 3

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation. Evaluate the site to determine if the watershed problem would be improved by seeding perennial species on the unstable soils. Seed perennial species that will stabilize or increase the stability of these soils.

Rationale:

Soils are the most important resource we manage and should be protected whenever there is an opportunity.

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

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Range Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM2.7 Step 3

Recommendation:

RM-2.7 Initiate limited fire suppression on 49,769 acres included in recommendations RM-2.1 and RM-2.4, with limited suppression defined as "taking whatever precautions the ~~fire technician as~~ fire boss deems necessary to contain the fire within the boundaries of the proposed project."

Support:

Fire Organization

Rationale:

The areas included in this recommendation have been recommended for treatment by controlled burning. By allowing wildfire to accomplish the treatment, money will be saved.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation is made to include the existing seedings. It will be on the areas maintained as seedings and the areas that are proposed for conversion to seedings, RM-2.3, RM-2.4 and RM-2.5. These recommendations

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-100 April 1971

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-2.7 Step 3

have been modified to contain areas that are not to be converted from sagebrush cover. In the existing seedings (RM-2.1) it is planned to keep the areas of sagebrush that were omitted from treatment in the original project. In the proposed burn and seed projects (RM-2.4 as modified) it is proposed to leave areas untreated by omitting strategic areas and by strip spraying. The Multiple Use Recommendations for RM-2.3, RM-2.4 and RM-2.5 have dropped some projects and been modified to eliminate wildlife and visual conflicts.

The limited suppression areas should include the existing seedings and the areas proposed for vegetation conversion. In the various wildlife areas, fire control measures will be taken to protect the important wildlife values that have been identified such as deer winter range, sagegrouse winter habitat, pheasant escape and winter habitat, sagegrouse nesting habitat, stream bank woody habitat, antelope winter range, and mule deer fawn rearing habitat.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-2.7 -
Practice limited fire suppression on the existing seedings and proposed seedings with modifications as shown in RM-2.3, RM-2.4 and RM-2.5 Multiple Use Recommendations that provide for normal fire suppression on sage grouse ranges, antelope and mule deer winter ranges, mule deer critical summer range and isolated tracts.

Reasons:

Some of the existing seedings need maintenance and others will on a recurring sequence. New projects will need periodic maintenance to maintain the resource management objectives. If wildfires start on these areas and can be managed to achieve these objectives the cost of the projects should be reduced significantly. Analysis of existing seedings that have had wildfires shows that fire is an effective seeding maintenance tool.

Support Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit-cost analysis.

R. A. Staff -
Fire Management Activity Plan.

Operations -
Fire Management Activity Plan.

Administration -
Procurement of seed for rehabilitation projects.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Total suppression.
2. Total area in limited suppression.
3. Do not consider wildlife habitat.

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1 RM-2.8 Step 3	

Recommendation:

RM-2.8 Treat existing seedings not included in recommendation RM-2.1 and any future seedings as the percent composition of sagebrush exceeds 20%.

Rationale:

This recommendation provides for future successional changes which will decrease the forage production as sagebrush increases.

Implementation of this recommendation will protect the existing and future public and private investments in land treatment involved.

Using the 20% sagebrush composition as the treatment criteria will ensure that sufficient perennial forage species are present to provide for natural reseeding.

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Monitoring, Layout)
Fire Crew: (Burning)
Archeologist: (Cultural Clearance)

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 RM-2.8 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

Experience in seeding management in the Twin Falls Planning Unit is showing that periodic maintenance will be needed to keep the sagebrush from reestablishing in most treatment areas. Studies in the Berger area show that sagebrush comes back into the areas no matter what the grazing treatment is. Sagebrush often comes back in areas totally excluded from grazing more rapidly than in many of the grazed areas. The method of treatment appears to influence how long it takes for sagebrush to come back. The plowed areas take longest to convert back to brush and the sprayed areas seem to convert back the quickest. The areas that were treated and a few years later were burned maintain the grass type the longest. Range studies and observations are showing that the climatic conditions during the 1970's have been conducive to sagebrush establishment at the cost of the grass species. There have been two years of extreme drought, 1977 and 1979. Grazing use was reduced in these years but percent utilization was high, and in 1977 areas of crested wheatgrass actually died and had to be reseeded. In 1980 areas were observed with thick stands of sagebrush that is about 7 to 10 inches in height and thick stands about 1 to 4 inches in height. These invasions often occur in areas that have sparse scatterings of mature sagebrush plants.

It has been determined that if forage production is to continue at a level that will satisfy the dependency shown by the grazing preference, periodic maintenance will be needed to keep the sagebrush from reestablishing and replacing the crested wheatgrass. There are studies (ARS) in the area that show the relationship of diminishing pounds of grass production as sagebrush cover increases. Decisions were made in the past to convert suitable sites to a vegetative complex consisting predominantly of crested wheatgrass. In the Berger area most of the treatment cost was funded under an agricultural program to reduce the beet-leaf hopper insect that was a menace to some agricultural crops. The subsequent forage production has been formally adjudicated as grazing preference and allocated to livestock grazing on a sustained yield basis managed according to the principles of range management and directed through the initiation and administration of allotment management plans. Through this process the affected ranching operations have developed a dependency on this forage production as demonstrated by the currently recognized grazing preference. As intensive seeding management areas need maintenance to meet resource management objectives, an interdisciplinary team approach should be used to ensure that all resource needs continue to be satisfied in the best way.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-2.8 -
Treat existing seedings as needed to keep sagebrush reduced so that the

Reasons:

The multiple resource objectives need to be maintained and experience has shown that sagebrush conversion to

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (WFO)	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Objective Number	RM-3

Objective:

Allocate, over the next 5 years, livestock forage to livestock operators currently using 75 allotments in the Twin Falls Planning Unit within the limits necessary to maintain the vegetative and soil resources.

Rationale:

Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations, Subpart 4110.2-2(a) states that "Grazing preference shall be allocated to qualified applicants following the allocation of the vegetation resources among livestock grazing, wild free-roaming horses and burros, wildlife and other uses in the land use plans".

Section 2 of the Taylor Grazing Act provides in part that the Secretary of the Interior shall regulate occupancy and use within grazing district to preserve the land and its resources from destruction or unnecessary injury, to provide for orderly use, improvement and development of the range.

This objective is designed to correct present range management problems, brought out in URA Step 3, caused by use of the vegetative resource at a level which does not provide for meeting phenological needs.

This objective reflects the livestock use identified in URA Step 4.

Heady¹ described the consequences of over utilization as, "the individual plant responds with fewer and smaller leaves, stems, seed stalks, and roots. Energy capture and flow are interrupted, as also is the accumulation of carbohydrates. Destruction of vegetation, where plants die and their replacement falters, continues".

Once the forage resource is lost, it may well prove uneconomical to ever restore the production to normal levels. By maintaining the resource at present levels, no further degradation will occur.

The desirable livestock forage species include bunchgrass and other herbaceous species. The undesirable species include shrubs and forbs. The objective is to at least retain the present production of these herbaceous species.

¹Heady, H.F. 1975. Range Management, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Activity	Twin Falls
Overlay Reference	Range Management
Step 1	RM-3.1
Step 3	

Recommendation:

RM-3.1

Allocate forage on 75 allotments in the Twin Falls Planning Unit as follows:

(See attached "Forage Allocation" table).

Support:

District Manager: (Decisions)
Resource Area Staff: (Consultations and Monitoring)

Rationale:

The allocations listed are made in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.2-2(a). These allocations will allow for use of available forage by livestock within the limits necessary to maintain the vegetative resource.

The livestock forage allocations were derived from the SVIM inventory, actual use, utilization and trend data. The 22 allotments included in the Berger Resource Conservation Area were not included in the SVIM inventory. Allocation is based on actual use and utilization corrected for proper use from 1975-1980. The same is true for the Baker-Deep-Creek allotment.

Forage allocations for 4049 Peters, 4055 Hub Butte, 4057 Fuller and 4079 Lilly Grade were based on two years of actual use utilization due to large discrepancies between SVIM inventory figures and actual use-utilization studies.

The forage allocation for 4054 Salmon Tract Isolated was increased from 4 AUM's as determined from the SVIM inventory to 10 AUM's. This increase was based on inclusion of approximately 3 acres of riparian area not included in the SVIM inventory mapping.

Allotment 4021 Whiskey Creek Buffer is a buffer pasture which is used in emergencies. No privileges will be allocated in this allotment.

The forage allocation for 4031 Western Stockgrowers is based on suitable AUMs. An additional 893 AUMs are potentially suitable due to lack of water.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM-3.1 Step 3

Number	Name	Active Preference	6 year Average Use	Allotment Production	% change from Priv.	% change Actual Us
4000	Babcock-Berger	420	336	448	+6	+33
4001	Buhl Grp-Berger	1904	1290	1753	-8	+36
4002	Kerr-Berger	1500	1285	1365	-9	+6
4003	Tews-Berger	5000	4357	4933	-1	+13
4004	Chadwick-Berger	900	889	1104	+23	+24
4005	Koch-Berger	660	506	687	+4	+36
4006	Kaster-Berger	910	670	768	-16	+15
4007	Kunkel-Berger	825	733	947	+15	+29
4008	Lassen-Berger	420	324	363	-14	+12
4009	Lierman-Berger	420	340	545	+30	+61
4010	M.Lierman-Berger	425	283	425	0	+50
4011	Lierman-Wegener	1050	908	1035	-1	+14
4012	Lanting-Berger	2000	1434	1486	-26	+4
4013	Martens-Berger	400	357	318	-21	-11
4014	Noh-Berger	3223	2734	2590	-20	-5
5	Parrott-Berger	798	789	790	-1	0
	PVGA-Berger	3520	2750	2847	-19	+4
4017	Schnitker-Berger	217	153	194	-11	+27
4018	Smith-Berger	210	144	208	-1	+44
4019	Wrigley-Berger	915	573	763	-17	+33
4020	Skeem-Berger	215	164	160	-26	-2
4021	Whiskey Cr. Buffer	0		289	0	
4023	J.E. Baker Dp. Cr.	619	741	801	+29	+8
4024	J.E. Baker Lost Cr.	296	353	480	+63	+36
4031	Western Stock Gr.	2181	2600	4537	+67	+40
4034	Point Ranch	3580	4221	5427	+52	+29
4035	Whiskey Creek	1976	4209	4481	+127	+6
4036	Moore Lost Cr.	20	20	30	+50	+50
4037	North Big Cr.	40	160	282	+605	+76
4038	Kerr Lost Cr.	627	2379	1683	+168	-29
4039	Noh-White Rock	333	253	313	-6	+24
				66 SD		
4040	Noh-Sections	220	291	462	+110	+59
4041	Mule Cr.-PVGA	430	1177	1422	+231	+21
4042	Horse Cr.-PVGA	637	1015	746	+17	-26
4043	Frahm-PVGA	36	157	143	+297	-9
4044	S. Mule Cr.	226	257	323	+43	+26
4046	Griff	592	1280	1404	+137	+10
4049	Peters	298	405	515*	+73	+27
4050	Coiner	50	50	180	0	0
4051	Courtney	68	102	145	+113	+42
	Hub Butte-WSGA	576	1142	1284	+123	+12
				120 SD		
4054	Salmon Tract Iso.	10	8	10	0	+25
4055	Hub Butte	180	196	156*	-13	-20

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 (MFP)
Twin Falls
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM-3.1 Step 3

Number	Name	Active Preference	6 year Average Use	Allotment Production	% change from Priv.	% change Actual Use
4057	Fuller	354	353	300	-15	-15
4059	Green Private	48	48	118	+146	+146
4060	Salmon Tract	4	6	5	+25	-17
4063	Soldier Creek	22	49	34	+55	-31
4066	Barton-Schutte	121	312	483	+299	+55
4071	Jones-Goat Spring	66	478	441	+568	-8
4072	Kinsey-Lost Creek	50	40	40	-20	0
4073	West Kunkel	151	690	723	+379	+5
4074	Amsterdam-Kunkel	46	142	175	+280	+23
4076	Loughmiller	255	610	726	+185	+19
4077	Salmon Tract Ind.	10	10	14	+40	+40
4079	Lilly Grade	330	266	227	-31	-15
4085	Salmon Tract-McCoy	5	5	16	+220	+220
4092	South Big Creek	65	65	246	+278	+278
4095	Randall Isol.	30	31	10	-67	-68
	Lemmon-Ring	30	24	29	-3	+21
	Cameron	235	188	160	-32	-15
4098	Schnell-Salmon	1535	4633	4061	+165	-12
4101	Magic Common	480	723	890	+85	+23
4102	Sharp Lost Creek	120	378	319	+166	-16
4106	Salmon Tract Isol.	50	50	24	-52	-52
4108	Lost Creek-U2	380	381	335	-12	-12
4109	Salmon Tract-U2	30	49	72	+140	+47
4114	Squaw Joe	476	898	577	+21	-36
4114	Squaw Joe Isol.	204	240	240	+18	0
4119	Ridge	999	882	1140	+14	+29
4119	Ridge Isol.	126	126	126	0	0
4120	Gravel Pit-Salmon	170	153	249	+46	+63
4121	Sect. 22-Salmon	40	44	44	+10	0
4122	Highway Unit	11	18	16	+45	-11
4123	East Kunkel	13	92	80	+515	-13
4124	Highway-Kunkel	16	86	65	+306	-24
4125	Kunkel Isol.	30	108	77	+157	-29
4128	Hot Creek	0	47	94	---	+100
	Tews Isol.	0	0	194	---	----
	Big Creek Isol.	0	0	89	---	----

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 RM-3.1 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis (cont.)

- 4098 Schnell-Salmon - The actual use and SVIM are about the same. There are 429 AUMs of stock driveway and 106 AUMs Rogerson holding pasture that are not to be allocated but are used by Schnell according to valid agreements made in the past. The agreements make the forage available to him that is not needed for stock driveway use by trailing stock.
- 4119 Ridge - Allocate present preference 999 AUMs.
Ridge Isolated - Allocate present preference 126 AUMs.
The preference, actual use, and utilization are nearly equal so there is no reason to change the allocation from the currently recognized preference.
- 4120 Salmon Tract Gravel Pit - The current preference is more than the average licensed use and less than the SVIM inventory. Based on these differences the current preference will remain unchanged. If additional forage is available it can be licensed on a temporary non-renewable basis.
- 4121 Salmon Tract-Section 22 - The preference (40 AUMs) nearly equals the average licensed use and SVIM inventory (44 AUMs). The current preference will remain unchanged and the 4 AUMs will be a buffer to climatic and management extremes.
- 4123 East Kunkel - This allotment produces 80 AUMs according to SVIM and 92 AUMs according to actual use. There are 13 AUMs of preference attached to this allotment and the remainder is withdrawn for stock driveway. The license can continue to use all the forage that is not needed for trailing livestock. His use in excess of 13 AUMs should be on a temporary non-renewable license.
- 4135 Tews Isolated - The tracts have been licensed on a temporary non-renewable license for several years and should be changed to preference.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-3.1 -
Allocate forage to grazing livestock as shown in the table on the following page.

Reasons:

This allocation satisfies as much grazing preference as possible and still maintains a small margin that allows for climatic extremes and management needs.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 April 1977

MFP Step 2
Range Management

RM-3.1

Allotment	Proposed Livestock Grazing Use						Proposed Livestock Adjustments(%)				Proposed Wildlife Use (AUMs)	
	Authorized Livestock AUMs	6 Year Average Licensed Use	Short-Term Initial Forage Allocation	Additional AUMs Available From:		Long-Term Total AUMs Available	From Author-ized Use:		From 6-Year Average:		Initial	Long Term
				New Projects	Maintenance		Short Term	Long Term	Short Term	Long Term		
Bancroft-Berger	420	336	417		79	496	-1	+18	+24	+48		
Buhl Group-Berger	1,904	1,290	1,775	80	449	2,304	-7	+21	+38	+79		
Kerr-Berger	1,500	1,285	1,365		485	1,850	-9	+23	+6	+44		
Ellis/Tews-Berger	5,000	4,357	4,933		1,196	6,129	-1	+23	+13	+41		
Madwick-Berger	900	889	1,104		50	1,154	+23	+28	+24	+30		
Koch-Berger	660	506	687		34	721	+4	+9	+36	+42		
Kaster-Berger	910	670	768		124	892	-16	-2	+15	+33		
Kunkel-Berger	825	733	964		80	1,044	+17	+27	+32	+42		
Lassen-Berger	420	324	363		25	388	-14	-8	+12	+20		
Lierman-Berger	420	340	545			545	+30	+30	+65	+60		
M. Lierman-Berger	425	283	425			425	0	0	+50	+50		
Lierman/Wegener-Berger	1,050	908	1,035		46	1,081	-1	+3	+14	+19		
Lanting-Berger	2,000	1,434	1,486		253	1,739	-26	-13	+4	+21		
Martens-Berger	400	357	318		50	368	-21	-8	-11	+3		
Non-Berger	3,223	2,734	2,590		210	2,800	-20	-13	-5	-2		
Parrott-Berger	798	789	790		252	1,042	-1	+31	0	+32		
PVGA-Berger	3,520	2,750	2,847	113	594	3,554	-19	+1	+4	+29		
Schnitzer-Berger	217	153	194		120	314	-1	+45	+27	+105		
Smith-Berger	210	144	208			278	-1	-1	+44	+44		
Wright-Berger	945	573	648		341	989	-31	+5	+13	+73		
Skeem-Berger	215	164	160			160	-26	-26	-2	-2		
J. E. Baker-Deeo Creek	619	953	741		362	1,133	+15	+78	-23	+16		
J. E. Baker-Lost Creek	296	353	353		356	709	+19	+140	0	+201	43	46
Western Stockrowers	2,114	2,600	2,600	850	301	3,751	+23	+77	0	+44	1,544	2,977
Point Ranch	3,560	4,221	4,221	374		4,595	+12	+28	0	+9	127	217
Whiskey Creek	1,975	4,209	4,209	1,157	811	6,177	-113	+213	0	+47		
Moore-Lost Creek	20	20	30		12	42	-50	+110	+50	+110	5	5
North Big Creek	40	160	282			282	+605	+605	-76	+76	20	23
Kerr-Lost Creek	627	2,379	1,683	316	1,063	3,062	+168	+388	+29	+29	12	18
Non-White Rock	333	253	333	15	104	452	0	+36	+32	+79	19	27
Non-Sections	220	291	291	28		319	+32	+45	0	+10	48	55
Mule Creek-PVGA	430	1,177	1,326	139	281	1,746	+208	+306	+13	+48	72	96
Horse Creek-PVGA	637	1,015	746	20	277	1,043	+17	+64	-27	+3	40	51
Frank-PVGA	36	157	143			143	+297	+297	-9	-9	39	39
South Mule Creek	225	257	257	176	26	459	+14	+103	0	+79	59	76
Griff	592	1,280	1,280			1,280	+116	+116	0	0		
Peters	298	405	405	96		501	+36	+68	0	+24		
Rock Creek-Coiner	50	50	50			50	0	0	0	0		
Courtney	68	102	102			102	+50	+50	0	0		
Hub Butte-WSGA	576	1,142	1,142	50	561	1,753	+98	+204	0	+54		
Salmon Tract Iso. (Danos)	10	8	10			10	0	0	+25	+25		
Hub Butte Davis	180	196	156	16	129	301	-13	+67	-20	+54		
Fuller	354	353	300	21	265	586	-15	+66	-15	+65		
Greene Private	48	48	118			118	+146	+146	+146	+146	19	30
Salmon Tract-Stewart	4	6	5			5	+25	+25	-17	-17		
Soldier Creek	22	49	34	12		46	+55	+109	-31	-6	10	14
Barton-Schutte	121	312	312	51		363	+158	+200	0	+16		
Jones-Goat Spring	66	478	441		263	704	+568	+1,067	-8	+47		
Kinsey-Lost Creek	50	40	40			40	-20	-20	0	0	5	5
West Kunkel	151	690	690		150	840	+357	+456	0	+22		
Amsterdam-Kunkel	46	142	142			142	+209	+209	0	0		
Loughmiller	255	610	610			610	+139	+139	0	0		
Salmon Tract Ind.	10	10	14			14	+40	+40	+40	+40		
Lilly Grade	330	266	227	13	218	458	-31	+39	-15	+72		
Salmon Tract-McCoy	5	5	16			16	+220	+220	+220	+220		
South Big Creek	65	65	246	130		376	+278	+478	+278	+478	7	7
Randall Iso.	30	31	10			10	-67	-67	-68	-68		
Lenmon-Ring	30	24	30			30	0	0	+25	+25	15	19
Cameron	235	188	160			160	-32	-32	-15	-15	50	39
Schnell-Salmon Tract	1,535	4,633	3,526	1,062	92	4,680	+130	+205	-24	+1	28	39
Maic Common	480	723	723	668		1,391	+51	+190	0	+92	54	83
Sharp-Lost Creek	120	378	319	15	110	444	+166	+270	-16	+17	35	53
Salmon Tract Iso. (Stewart)	50	50	24	38		62	-52	+24	-52	+24		
Lost Creek-U2	380	381	335	100		435	-12	+14	-47	+14	110	148
Salmon Tract-U2	30	49	72			72	+140	+140	+47	+47		
Squaw Joe	476	898	577	208	188	973	+21	+104	-36	+8	68	86
Squaw Joe Iso.	204	240	240			240	+18	+18	0	0		
Ridge	999	882	999	206		1,205	0	+21	+13	+37	222	222
Ridge Iso.	126	126	126			126	0	0	0	0		
Gravel Pit-Salmon Tract	170	153	170	84		254	0	+49	+11	+66		
Section 22-Salmon Tract	40	44	40			40	0	0	-9	-9		
Highway Unit	11	18	16			16	+45	+45	-11	-11		
East Kunkel	13	92	13		48	61	0	+369	-86	-34		
Highway-Kunkel	16	86	65	91		56	+306	+875	-24	+81		
Kunkel Iso.	30	108	77			77	+157	+157	-29	-29		
Hot Creek	0	47	94			94	---	---	+100	+100	10	10
Tews Iso.	0	0	194			194	---	---	---	---		
Big Creek Iso.	0	0	89			89	---	---	---	---		
TOTALS	45,392	54,472	55,076	6,129	10,005 ¹	71,210	+21	+57	+1	+31	2,661	4,405

¹ An increase of 161 AUMs would result from maintenance of an existing land treatment on the Whiskey Creek Buffer Pasture. (10,166 AUMs total increase from maintenance.)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 RM-3.1 Step 3

Multiple Use Recommendation (cont.):

The 1,280 acres of Buffer Pastures will not be allocated to grazing preference. These four pastures will be managed for emergency use as needed within the District. Examples of emergencies are an allotment or pasture with the annual forage destroyed by fire, an allotment with a forage shortage caused by drought, or an allotment or pasture in non-use status for rehabilitation.

Whiskey Creek Buffer Pasture	640 ac.
Berger Buffer North	160 ac.
Berger Buffer West	320 ac.
Berger Buffer South	160 ac.

Support Needs:

Complete EIS.
Implement decisions.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept RM-3.1.
2. Reject RM-3.1 and make no changes.
3. Maximize the forage allocation to livestock.
4. Minimize the allocation to livestock.

Decision:

Accept the multiple use recommendation.

Rationale:

Through the inventory, planning, and EIS efforts it has been determined that the following table portrays the best forage allocation according to present production and long-term potential as evaluated through the public participation process.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1967)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls	
Activity	Range Management	
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	3.2	Step 3

Recommendation:

RM-3.2 Continue to use the existing with-drawn stock-driveways for trailing live-stock herds. Maintain all existing with-drawals on these driveways.

Rationale:

During FY-1980 a total of 5925 sheep and 7868 cattle were trailed along the with-drawn stock-driveways in the Twin Falls planning unit. These trails provide access not only to allotments within the planning unit, but also to adjacent allotments in the Jarbridge resource area and the Elk District in Nevada.

It is expected that as fuel costs continue to raise, more use will be made of the stock-driveways in lieu of trucking live-stock.

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Issuance of Trail Permits)

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 (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Range Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 RM-3.2 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

Livestock trailing on existing withdrawals has occurred each year. During the last two seasons the trailing use has increased and may continue to do so as long as fuel prices continue to increase.

One isolated tract of 40 acres (T. 11 S., R. 18 E., Sec. 35: SW1/4 NE1/4) is removed from normal trail routes and is not needed for a stock driveway any longer.

The area described T. 14 S., R. 16 E., Sec. 10: N1/2 SW1/4 and SW1/4 SW1/4 is allocated as part of the Lost Creek-U2 (4108) allotment and has not been used for stock driveway purposes. The allotment is recommended to have a rest-rotation grazing system implemented (RM-1.2).

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-3.2 -

Continue to use the existing established stock driveways. Maintain all existing stock driveways except T. 11 S., R. 18 E., Sec. 35: SW1/4 NE1/4 and T. 14 S., R. 16 E., Sec. 10: N1/2 SW1/4, and SW1/4 SW1/4. If the withdrawals are revoked these driveways need to be segregated by classification or designation through this MFP.

Reasons:

Stock driveways are needed for moving livestock across the county. The forage and water are used by trailing livestock. The tracts described to drop from the withdrawal are no longer used for stock driveway.

Support Needs:

R. A. Staff -

Manage the driveways to protect the resource and issue trail permits.

Realty -

Withdrawal review.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject RM-3.2.
2. Add to RM-3.2.
3. Reduce RM-3.2

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name	WL-1
Activity	Twin Falls
Objective Number	Wildlife - Big Game
	WL-1

OBJECTIVE:

Improve and maintain terrestrial habitat for big game throughout the Planning Unit.

RATIONALE:

Basic Guidance (1602.13A) states that the Bureau, in deciding among alternative uses of available resources and among management alternatives, will utilize both physical and social data in evaluating the immediate and long-range impact of proposed actions on environmental quality and ecological balance and will strive to maintain and enhance environmental quality.

The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) indicates that by 1995 the demand for big game hunter days on public land in the Planning Unit will increase 81 percent from the current level. In 1995, it is estimated that the gross value of hunter days attributable to public land wildlife habitat in the Planning Unit for big game hunting will be \$91,731.80.

BLM's Wildlife Program Activity Policy Statement (1603.12D) describes in the following narratives, rationale for managing wildlife and their habitats.

1. Description of Program Activity. The Wildlife Program is primarily concerned with the protection and use of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fishes, and invertebrates through the enhancement and maintenance of their habitat components. The program activity is closely coordinated with State wildlife agencies.

2. Long-Term Objectives.

a. Maintain a maximum diversity of wildlife species in sufficient numbers to meet public demands. This will be accomplished by means of habitat management.

b. Sponsor or conduct the research, studies, and inventories necessary to insure adequate data for decision making relating to the maintenance of habitat expressed in a. above.

3. Major Principles and Standards.

a. Maintain cooperative relations with States, other Federal Agencies, public interest groups, and individuals interested in or responsible for wildlife use, protection, and habitat management.

b. The essential requirements of wildlife -- food, cover, and water -- will be maintained so as to provide optimum "edge effect" and interspersions of habitat components in important wildlife areas.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Big Game
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-1.1 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Allocate the following AUM's to mule deer and pronghorn antelope during their seasons of use in 26 livestock grazing allotments for the present populations and as the populations increase to a 1990 level. See the attached AUM allocation tables.

SUPPORT:

Range - Allocation of AUM's to deer and antelope and a reduction in livestock numbers and/or use if a conflict arises.

Wildlife-Management of habitat to sustain optimum populations.

RATIONALE:

BLM and IDFG fully concur with the figures on the following table. See the letter from Region IV-IDFG, 1/9/81, in the Twin Falls Public Participation Plan. The Forest Service, Region IV-IDFG and Burley District BLM jointly concur that the deer herd associated with the forest in Game Management Unit #54 can be doubled by 1990 with proper management (Gary Will, Region IV-IDFG, 1/14/80, Personal Communication). This deer herd winters on public land.

Game Management Unit #54 in the Twin Falls MFP area is extremely popular for mule deer hunting. Approximately 28 percent of the mule deer habitat and 6 percent of the hunting days are attributable to public land in the Planning Unit. The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows an 81 percent increase in the number of hunter days from 1975 to 1995. BLM habitat includes 72 percent of the critical summer and winter range for Unit #54. Therefore, the population increase or decrease is directly proportional to management of these critical habitats. Improved fawn survival in conjunction with present harvest programs and other management efforts, should, under current management levels and habitat trends, provide for a steady rebuilding of mule deer numbers and harvest through 1990. Success rates, while initially lower, will, by 1985, improve over those currently existing.¹ The PAA shows that \$11,605.60 was spent in 1980 in the Planning Unit hunting mule deer on BLM land. This will increase to an estimated \$91,731.80 by 1995. Forage competition between antelope and other wildlife and/or domestic livestock does not appear to be a major pro-

¹ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOAL'S, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. IDFG. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Big Game
Overlay Reference	Step WL-1.1 Step 3

RATIONALE (cont.):

blem. Nearly all of the land in the Planning Unit designated as habitat expansion and habitat improvement areas is public land, therefore, antelope would be a desirable species for which to manage.

Pronghorn antelope were not included in the Twin Falls Planning Area Analysis (PAA) due to insufficient data. Currently, the demand for antelope far exceeds the supply. Game Management Unit #47 will be closed to antelope hunting starting in 1981 due to low antelope numbers. Every effort should be made to build up the antelope herd so an allowable harvest will once again be available to the hunter. Region IV-IDFG fully supports an antelope transplant (Gary Will, 4-4-80, Personal Communication). Through management practices, antelope numbers will never exceed 150 animals over the total range. This would result in a density of 2 animals per section of public land in the designated antelope range. Hunter demand in the Planning Unit will increase in the future.

Multiple Use Analysis

Mule deer and pronghorn antelope numbers and forage demands by AUM's have been determined for each allotment by a cooperative effort of the Magic Resource Area wildlife biologist and Region IV of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. The basis of the information for mule deer are aerial surveys, winter counts, on the ground observations and demand projections to 1990. Carrying capacity data shows adequate forage overall by allotment to support present and projected deer demand. (Refer to WL-1.4 and WL-1.5 for detail.) Pronghorn antelope demand and carrying capacities were determined the same as were mule deer. There are sufficient AUM's to support present and projected antelope demand. (Refer to WL-1.7, WL-1.8 and WL-1.9 for detail.)

Data presented at a public meeting on March 31, 1980 in Twin Falls and on April 1, 1980 in Buhl for both present and projected mule deer and antelope AUM's by allotment was acceptable by other agencies and the public represented.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-1.1 Step 3

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

Accept WL-1.1 -
Allocate the following forage to mule deer and pronghorn antelope for present numbers and allow increases to the projected AUM's.

A SVIM conducted in 1979 shows adequate forage overall by allotment for both present and projected mule deer and antelope numbers.

Mule Deer

No.	Allotment	Present 1980 AUMs	Projected 1990 AUMs
4024	J.E. Baker-Lost Creek	43	46
4031	Western Stockgrowers	1,544	2,977
4034	Point Ranch	120	204
4036	Moore-Lost Creek	5	5
4037	North Big Creek	20	23
4038	Kerr-Lost Creek	12	12
4039	Noh-White Rock	19	27
4040	Noh Sections	48	55
4041	Mule Creek-PVGA	72	96
4042	Horse Creek-PVGA	40	51
4043	Frahm-PVGA	39	39
4044	South Mule Creek	59	76
4059	Greene Private	19	30
4063	Soldier Creek	10	14
4072	Kinsey-Lost Creek	5	5
4092	South Big Creek	7	7
4096	Lemmon-Ring	15	19
4097	Cameron	50	50
4098	Schnell-Salmon Tract	28	35
4101	Maqic Common	54	76
4102	Sharp-Lost Creek	35	53
4108	Lost Creek-U2	110	148
4114	Squaw Joe	68	86
4119	Ridge	222	222
4128	Hot Creek	10	10

Pronghorn Antelope

No.	Allotment	Present 1980 AUMs	Projected 1990 AUMs
4034	Point Ranch	7	13
4035	Whiskey Creek	---	9
4038	Kerr-Lost Creek	---	6
4098	Schnell-Salmon Tract	---	4
4101	Maqic Common	---	7

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 (WFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Big Game
Overlay Reference	Step WL-1.2 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Permit oil and gas leasing, and vehicular traffic to existing roads and trails that have been established and/or used via actual management intent. Allow off-road vehicle use on present and future big game winter range areas from 5/1 to 10/31 and in fawning areas from 6/15 to 4/15 as they become identified.

SUPPORT:

- Minerals - Restriction of oil and gas leasing at critical times of the year.
- Recreation - Minimization and/or restriction of ORV use at critical times of the year.
- Wildlife - Designation of restricted areas and specific time frame.
- IDFG - Coordination with BLM in designation of restricted areas.

RATIONALE:

Mineral development and recreational uses have an adverse effect on big game during the winter months and the fawning season. Access roads have been developed over a period of years by ranchers, hunters, other recreational users and through BLM developments. Oil and gas leasing will bring about even more access roads. The existing roads already open up a wide area that has previously been fairly inaccessible. They create a situation where big game are quite vulnerable to human intrusion and harassment, especially during the winter months when they are already stressed because of adverse weather conditions. Stress during the fawning period could cause a population to decrease through die-offs from stress and loss of fawns.

There should be close coordination with IDFG. IDFG actively supports the preservation and protection of critical mule deer habitat through restricting and/or minimizing use on critical ranges at various times of the year.¹

¹ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOAL'S, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES 1975-1990. IDFG. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-1.2 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with minerals recommendations for minerals exploration and development throughout the Planning Unit in that exploration often requires off road travel. Conflicts with recreation center around ORV use at any time anywhere on the public lands. The recommendation calls for limiting all use to existing roads and trails and closing ORV use on deer from winter range 11/1 to 4/30 and fawning areas from 4/15 to 6/15. The current existing non restricted use has not been closely studied enough to actually determine affect of ORV use on the survival of mule deer.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows:
Allow oil and gas exploration and development activities and vehicle use on existing roads and trails on critical big game winter ranges from November 1 to April 30 and on deer fawning areas from April 15 to June 15. If future studies produce evidence that the herd populations are adversely affected an activity plan will be developed and implemented to manage the resource uses as determined to meet the wildlife needs.

Reason:

In order to prevent undue harassment and stress to mule deer, vehicular traffic should be retracted to existing roads and trails during critical times of the year. There is reason to suspect that harrassment is occurring to a limited extent. There is no real evidence to show that it is a real problem to the deer herds at this time. This recommendation will be coordinated through M-2.1.

Support Needs:

Wildlife --
Monitor mule deer activities to determine location and times of deer concentrations on winter range.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept WL-1.2.
2. Reject WL-1.2.
3. Leave entire area open.

Recreation --

Monitor ORV use to identify any problems resulting from open designations in the planning unit.

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step 1.2 Step 3

Decision:

Modify the multiple-use recommendation, allow vehicular use, and oil and gas exploration without restriction except during:

1. November 15 to April 30 on big game critical winter range.
2. April 15 to June 15 on deer fawning areas.

During these periods, and in the applicable areas, vehicular travel will be restricted to existing roads and trails.

Rationale:

This action will allow unrestricted vehicular use all the time except the periods November 15 to April 30 on big game critical winter range and April 15 to June 15 on deer fawning range. These restrictions will protect the deer needs during these critical periods of their annual life cycles.

The restrictive date was modified to allow vehicle use to continue through the hunting season.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/F/P)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Big Game
Overlay Reference	Step 1WL-1.3 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Improve mule deer and antelope habitat by making all existing and future livestock water available to these species. Lower existing livestock troughs in antelope range to allow antelope fawn use. Provide water even when livestock are not using the water systems. Provide water for exclusive use by big game. Install 12 big game guzzlers in the critical mule deer summer range and present and expansion antelope range. Construct a 30-inch high barbed wire antelope fence around the big game guzzlers.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Assistance in livestock trough modification and use of troughs by big game when livestock are not present.
- Operations - Modification of existing livestock troughs for use by big game. Construction and installation of big game guzzlers.
- Recreation - Assistance in layout to complement the landscape.

RATIONALE:

Before deer can be expected to permanently establish in an area, dependable water must be available. Guidelines outlined in BLM Technical Note T/N 305 should be followed.¹

Pronghorn antelope densities are highest on well watered ranges. The availability of water every mile will improve habitat for an increasing herd. Antelope water at least once each day and often twice. Antelope cannot be re-established without permanent water sources. Free water can be very important to antelope during the summer and fall.²

The development of big game guzzlers would provide a permanent water supply for big game during the spring, summer and fall periods. These water developments will improve mule deer and antelope habitat and allow them to make better use of their range in the dry season. Protective fencing would prevent trampling damage or competition for use of water by livestock.

- ¹ Wilson, L.O. 1977. GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DESIGN AND MODIFICATION OF LIVESTOCK WATERING DEVELOPMENTS TO FACILITATE SAFE USE BY WILDLIFE. Technical Note Number T/N 305. U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management. Denver Service Center. Denver, Colorado.
- ² Sundstrom, C. 1968. WATER CONSUMPTION BY PRONGHORN ANTELOPE AND DISTRIBUTION RELATED TO WATER IN WYOMING'S RED DESERT. Antelope States Workshop Proceedings. 4:39-46.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

Form 1000-11-11

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/F)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Big Game
Over by Reference	WL-1.3
Step	Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

Wildlife - Layout and design of big game guzzler locations and live-stock trough modification areas in coordination with range and operations. Preparation of EA's.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. Increasing available water for big game will improve habitat conditions and provide water for other wildlife at the same time. Pipelines in existing and future antelope areas are operated and maintained by livestock operators. Leaving water in the pipeline after livestock have left would need to be coordinated with the users.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-1.3 with the following modifications -

As wells are shut down, troughs should be left full of water. Add wildlife facilities to systems if it is less expensive than altering existing facilities or will avoid creating a competitive conflict for water. Install big game guzzlers as described.

Reasons:

Providing water for big game animals will improve habitat conditions and provide benefits to other wildlife species.

Support Needs:

Wildlife -
Inventory existing water facilities and determine needed modifications. Coordinate with users in regards to leaving water in pipelines after livestock have left.

Operations -
Modify existing troughs as needed.
Install big game guzzlers.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL-1.3.
2. Modify WL-1.3 to add guzzlers, and not leave water in existing systems.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-111-11 April 1977

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BIF)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Mule Deer
Overlay Reference	WL-1.4
Step 1	Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

RATIONALE:

Implement livestock grazing systems to insure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer.

The grazing dates for the following allotments which lie in critical mule deer winter range should not be extended past 9/30:

4031	-	Western Stockgrowers	4/16	-	5/26
4036	-	Moore - Lost Creek	5/1	-	5/31
4063	-	Soldier Creek	6/15	-	8/14
4097	-	Cameron	7/1	-	9/15

Restrict livestock use after 9/30 in that portion of the following allotments which lie in critical mule deer winter range:

4034	-	Point Ranch	3/1	-	2/28
4037	-	North Big Creek	4/1	-	11/30
4040	-	Noh Sections	5/5	-	11/21
4043	-	PVGA - Frahm	5/1	-	10/31
4098	-	Schnell-Salmon Tr.	3/1	-	2/28
4108	-	Lost Creek - U2	4/20	-	1/7
4114	-	Squaw Joe	3/1	-	2/28
4119	-	Ridge	5/1	-	11/30

Limit livestock utilization of important winter forage shrubs to less than 20 percent of the annual growth on mule deer winter ranges.

No domestic livestock grazing should be allowed on native ranges prior to 5/15 each spring on the critical mule deer summer range located in the following allotments:

4034	-	Point Ranch	3/1	-	2/28
4041	-	PVGA - Mule Creek	5/1	-	11/30
4119	-	Ridge	5/1	-	11/30

The turn-out date for 4102---Sharp-Lost Creek 5/20-11/19 should not be made any earlier.

The management of livestock grazing has the greatest potential for affecting mule deer habitat. Intensive grazing systems combined with moderate stocking rates are needed to insure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer.

Domestic livestock often compete with mule deer for forage. Cattle use of browse during later summer and fall can result in a shortage of deer winter forage. Management should be aimed at providing maximum vigor and production of browse species on deer winter range areas. Excessive grazing can also eliminate grass and forbs that provide important spring and early summer deer forage. Restriction of livestock use on native summer ranges until after 5/15 will allow the vegetation to be more developed and will serve to reduce grazing pressure on important forage shrubs later in the grazing season. Management should be aimed at providing the maximum succulent forage possible during the spring/summer period.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WL-1.4 step 3

Support (cont.):

Range - Livestock management on the above allotments to agree with the corresponding dates.

Wildlife - Coordination with range on designation of critical ranges which need livestock management.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with the existing fall use made on eight other allotments which include Point Ranch, North Big Creek, Noh Sections, PVGA-Frahm, Schnell-Salmon Tract, Lost Creek U2, Squaw Joe and Ridge. The portion of the recommendation which calls for no use on mule deer summer range before 5/15 does not conflict with any existing or proposed use. An analysis of available forage based on biological use levels of forage and dietary requirements of cattle and deer showed 34 competitive AUMs between 1980 deer numbers and livestock. An additional 37 competitive AUMs result from the projected mule deer population increase by 1990. Mule deer will receive the AUMs through the forage allocation recommendation RM-3.1 and WL-1.1.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

Modify the recommendation as follows:
Implement livestock grazing systems to insure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer on their critical winter ranges. These systems will be designed to eliminate or minimize grazing after September 30. Limit livestock utilization of important winter forage shrubs to less than 20 percent of the annual growth on mule deer winter range. No domestic livestock grazing will be allowed on native range prior to 5/15 each spring on the critical mule deer summer range.

Intensive management systems will help to ensure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer. Eliminating or minimizing grazing on critical winter ranges along with the AUM computations used to determine competitive AUM's between cattle and deer were based on 20 percent biological use levels for shrubs. The competitive AUM's will be allocated to deer, so 25 percent use by cattle will not conflict with existing or projected deer numbers. This allocation process also insures that livestock using critical deer winter range after 9/30 do not use more than is necessary to sustain wintering mule deer.

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

Name (M/P)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife - Mule Deer

Overlay Reference

Step WL-1.5 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Multiple Use & Recreation*) RATIONALE:

Provide high quality mule deer forage on public land by:

- (1) maximizing the "edge" effect;
- (2) planting wheatgrasses, alfalfa, four-wing saltbush and bitterbrush as the primary plants used in all reseeding efforts on mule deer range.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Provide the "edge" effect in all land treatments and the above seed mixture on all re-seeding efforts on mule deer range.
- Lands - Inclusion of seeding mixture and "edge" effect in all land reports and EA's dealing with vegetative manipulation on mule deer range.
- Operations - Layout and design, contract work, and on-the-ground work involving vegetative projects on mule deer range should include the "edge" effect and above seed mixture.
- Recreation - Assistance in design to complement the natural landscape characteristics.
- Wildlife - Designation of "edge" effect areas within a land treatment area. Identification of specific types and pounds of seed for the seed mixture. Close coordination with lands, range and operations in applying the above recommendation.

Land treatments are needed to set back plant succession to a more "desirable" community with respect to mule deer. Great plant species diversity is created when extensive big sagebrush stands and/or monotypic stands of crested wheatgrass seedings are altered. When done properly there is an increased "edge" effect. The size and shape of the treated area has a significant effect on the subsequent use of the area by mule deer. Specific guidelines are outlined in the URA Step IV opportunities wildlife narrative entitled "B.1. Mule Deer".

The recommended seed mixture should be used for the purpose of supplying succulent forage over a longer period. Sagebrush may have to be reseeded for range rehabilitation on some winter ranges. Additional important forage species have been identified in the URA Step III present situation wildlife narrative entitled "A.1. Mule Deer".

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-11-A-10-1073

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Mule Deer
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-1516 p 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Acquire the following parcel of land to provide additional critical mule deer winter range habitat:

T. 12 S., R. 18 E. - South Hills Strip
Sec. 15: E1/2 E1/2

SUPPORT:

- Lands - Preparation of land report and EA for land acquisition.
- Range - Assistance in acquisition for range benefits.
- Watershed - Assistance in acquisition for watershed benefits.
- Recreation - Assistance in acquisition for hunter day benefits.
- Wildlife - Assistance in acquisition.

RATIONALE:

Acquisition of this 160 acre parcel of land will preclude any future private development on this critical mule deer winter range.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-579, Title II, Section 205(a) states that "Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary with respect to the public lands, is authorized to acquire pursuant to this Act by purchase, exchange, donation, or eminent domain, lands or interests therein..."

Multiple Use Analysis

This parcel of land identified for acquisition is located on critical mule deer winter range. It is important that this parcel of land remain in its natural condition, free from developments which would deter mule deer use on and around the area. The spring which exists is an important habitat component of mule deer. The lands recommendation L-7.2 identified this parcel as a proposed exchange. Acquisition of this parcel through an exchange supports this wildlife recommendation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-1.6 --
Acquire through purchase or exchange this 160 acre parcel of private land for critical mule deer habitat needs.

Reason:

BLM ownership and administration will insure that the land use and wildlife benefits provided will remain available.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

8208 #
4/2001

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Name: HPP
Twin Falls
Activity: Wildlife - Antelope
Overlay Reference: WL-1.7 Step 3

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

RATIONALE:

Maintain and enhance the existing habitat for the introduction of antelope in the following allotments:

Pronghorn antelope numbers are below optimum in the Twin Falls Planning Unit. The available habitat is not being utilized due to the low antelope population. Region IV-IDFG fully supports an antelope transplant (Gary Will, 4-4-80, Personal Communication). By transplanting antelope, the available habitat would be more fully utilized since the antelope is a desirable species for which to manage. Currently, the demand for antelope exceeds the supply. Every effort should be made to build up the antelope population in Game Management Unit #47 so an allowable harvest will be available to the hunter. Unit #47 will be closed to antelope hunting starting in 1981 due to low antelope numbers. Hunter demand in the Planning Unit will increase in the future.

- #4034 Point Ranch
- #4035 Whiskey Creek
- #4038 Kerr-Lost Creek
- #4098 Schnell-Salmon Tract
- #4101 Magic Common

*Basin well
16517E sec 9
4*

SUPPORT:

- Range - Management of allotments to benefit antelope transplants.
- Recreation - Assistance with HMP and EA since an increase in hunter days will come about.
- IDFG - Transplanting of antelope into designated areas.
- Wildlife - Inventory of transplant areas, preparation of HMP and EA, and coordination with range and IDFG.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with Fire Management F.I.5, however, WL-1.8 is based on a need for high concentrations of forbs for spring and early summer antelope use. One of the primary results of fire is an increase of forb production for several years. The chances of the entire area burning off are relatively small in any given year. Additionally, burning enhances growth of rabbitbrush which is listed as a primary browse species for antelope. Proposed and existing grazing management systems will be expected to maintain and enhance habitat for antelope.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Name: WFL
Twin Falls

Wildlife - Antelope

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Overlay Reference
Step WL-1.8 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Implement grazing systems on current and future antelope ranges which emphasize increasing the composition of forbs. No livestock grazing should occur from 4/15 to 6/15 in specific areas where forbs are present.

SUPPORT:

Range - Design grazing systems to deter livestock use in areas of forbs from 4/15 to 6/15.

Wildlife - Inventory and designate forb concentration areas. Coordinate livestock non-use areas from 4/15 to 6/15 with range.

RATIONALE:

Antelope depend on areas where a high concentration of forbs can be found in the spring and early summer. Forbs and browse species should be considered when establishing grazing systems for livestock since they are key species for antelope. Livestock grazing systems which restrict, alter, limit or deleteriously affect the habitat requirement of antelope should be minimized and alternate procedures developed to enhance antelope habitat. Prescription grazing by livestock should be practiced in seedings and certain native ranges where high antelope habitat values exist.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation could conflict with existing livestock use on four allotments based on 4/15 to 6/15 deferrment in "forb areas." Wildlife URA III states that "The antelope-cattle conflict is very slight with respect to forage competition. The existing pasture of native vegetation should not be subject to any mechanical treatments to ensure adequate forage for antelope." Based on the current use made by antelope and the dietary preference stated in Wildlife URA III a total of 2064 pounds of browse, 2256 pounds of forbs, and 280 pounds of grass are needed to meet the existing needs of antelope in the planning unit. Projected 1990 population levels would require 17,696 pounds of browse, 11,952 pounds of forbs and 1552 pounds of grass for one year. This needed forage is not competitive with proposed livestock allocations. All of the allotments containing existing or potential antelope range have been proposed for intensive management to improve and maintain range condition.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WL-1.8 Step 3

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows:
Implement grazing systems on current and future antelope range which will emphasize increasing the composition of forbs. Maintain and improve range condition with emphasis on increasing the composition of forbs. Range improvement projects on the antelope ranges will be done in irregular patterns to increase edge and forbs will be included in seed mixtures in areas to be seeded.

Reason:

A good management system will provide for a balance of vegetative species including browse, grass and forbs. The deferred use on "forb areas" was modified. Wildlife URA III stated that any conflicts between antelope and cattle were "very slight."

Support Needs:

Range -
Design grazing systems to maintain and improve range condition.

Wildlife -
Develop management plan for the introduction of antelope. Inventory potential introduction areas to determine if possible habitat components are lacking.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept WL-1.8.
2. Reject WL-1.8.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Rationale:

Information in the URA indicates that sufficient forage currently exists to satisfy both the current and projected number of antelope. A good management system will insure that this situation is maintained or improved.

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	WLP
	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Antelope
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-1.9 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Improve existing and future antelope habitat by interseeding monocultures of crested wheatgrass seedings with forbs and shrubs. Improve dense stands of sagebrush in selected areas (draws out of wind, etc.) in areas of crested wheatgrass seedings. Include a minimum of six species each of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in all rehabilitation efforts. Do not consider sagebrush reduction projects in proposed antelope introduction sites, at this time, so as to maintain adequate winter forage, fawning sites and fawn cover areas.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Coordinate all land treatments with wildlife.
- Watershed - Assistance in all land treatment projects to help protect the watershed.
- Wildlife - Inventory and designation of areas to be seeded with forbs and shrubs, areas of sagebrush protection and improvement and seed mixtures.

RATIONALE:

An increase in the forb component of the vegetative composition in the existing antelope habitat and expansion areas would improve the spring and summer use areas for antelope. The forb component is very important for antelope in the spring and early summer. In the large stands of crested wheatgrass seedings this important component is quite limited. Antelope ranges having insufficient native plants for natural reproduction need to be seeded. High antelope densities are found in those areas associated with big sagebrush and/or silver sagebrush communities. A lack of cover in draws and similiar areas is a limiting factor to antelope in the winter in large crested wheatgrass seedings. Seeding mixtures of a variety of plant species have often proven beneficial to antelope, especially when legumes have been planted. All habitat components must exist in an area if wildlife species are going to do well. The fact that antelope exist in the Planning Unit indicates that the habitat is somewhat suitable. We still need more detailed information on important use areas, migration routes between Idaho and Nevada and between the Burley District and Boise District, etc.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with Fire Management 1.5, however, WL-1.8 and part of 1.9 are based on increasing the forb component of the areas involved. One of the primary results of fire is an increase in forb production for several years. Given the existing livestock use and fuel availability, the chances of the entire area burning off in one year are very small. The conflicts with range management center around that portion of the recommendation dealing with no sagebrush reduction projects in proposed antelope introduction areas and interseeding existing seedings with forbs and shrubs. These seedings were made to reduce brush competition.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reports

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WL-1.9 Step 3

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

Modify the recommendation as follows:

1. Improve existing and future antelope habitat by interseeding crested wheatgrass seedings with forbs and shrubs or allow some areas to revert to brush if inventories and studies show a definite lack of browse available for antelope.
2. Include a mixture of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in rehabilitation efforts.
3. Include a sizeable leave area in new land treatment projects to increase edge effect.
4. Improve dense stands of sagebrush in selected areas (draws out of wind, etc.) in areas of crested wheatgrass seedings.

Interseed crested wheatgrass seedings when a definite lack of forbs and shrubs is noted. A mixture of grasses, forbs and shrubs in rehabilitation projects will improve conditions for both cattle and wildlife. Mixtures for each site should be determined based on physical conditions of the site.

Inclusion of leave areas and improvement of sagebrush areas will increase the edge effect and improve habitat conditions for not only antelope, but other wildlife species as well.

Support Needs:

Alternatives Considered:

- Range -
Coordinate all treatment project with wildlife to determine leave areas.
- Wildlife -
Inventory proposed introduction areas to determine the amount of forage deficiencies for antelope that do exist. Coordinate all interseeding projects with range.

1. Accept WL-1.9.
2. Reject WL-1.9.
3. Reject F-1.5.
4. Reject all proposed range treatments in areas included in WL-1.9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 April 1977

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: Twin Falls

Activity: Wildlife - Antelope

Overlay Reference:
Step WL-1.10 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: *(Decision)*

Improve current and future antelope habitat by modifying existing fences and constructing new fences to conform to the current antelope fence specifications.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Assistance in identification of existing and future fence modifications.
- Operations - On the ground modification of fences which should conform to Bureau standards.
- Recreation - Assistance in fence project work in order to accommodate the visual resource.
- Wildlife - Inventory, identification and preparation of EA for antelope fence projects. Coordination with range and operations on locations.

RATIONALE:

All existing fences in the present antelope range and antelope expansion areas that impede antelope movement should be modified. Antelope mortality due to too many fences and/or improperly constructed fences is well documented in other states. Construction of fences to present Bureau standards will allow for passage and movement of, not only antelope, but other wildlife species as well.

Multiple Use Analysis

The existing livestock fences in current and future antelope range areas were constructed prior to the time when standardized antelope design fences became mandatory. It is important to identify areas where antelope movement does and will occur. These selected sections of fence should then be modified to allow antelope unrestricted movement.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Instructions on reverse.

Form 1-66 (Rev. April 1974)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (W/P):	Twin Falls
Activity:	Wildlife - Big Game
Overlay Reference:	
Step:	WL-1.11 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Provide habitat for the introduction of bighorn sheep in Salmon Falls Canyon from Salmon Falls Dam downstream to Lilly Grade.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Elimination of livestock grazing in the designated bighorn sheep introduction area in Salmon Falls Canyon.
- Archaeology - Protection of cultural resources.
- IDFG - Introduction of the bighorn sheep into the canyon.
- Wildlife - Inventory of introduction area, preparation of HMP and EA and coordination with range and IDFG.

RATIONALE:

Historically, bighorn sheep inhabited Salmon Falls Canyon. "Bighorn sheep were common in southwestern Idaho prior to settlement by the whiteman. Archaeological excavations and occasional sightings of sheep skulls indicate bighorns were found in Salmon Falls Creek, . . . In 1972, a rancher living in Oneal Basin unearthed a cache of bighorn skulls on the South Fork of Salmon Falls Creek. This site is approximately 20 miles south of the Idaho border in Nevada."¹

Currently, IDFG notes that the demand for bighorn sheep exceeds the supply.² IDFG considers the area to be a prime candidate for a transplant (Gary Will, Regional Wildlife Manager, Region IV-IDFG, 4-3-80, Personal Communication). The URA Step IV opportunities narrative provides for improvement and maintenance of the habitat in order to support a bighorn sheep population. An intensive inventory is needed to determine the range condition, trend, species composition, etc.

to be in line with IDFG goals, only bighorn sheep should be released. The sheep would be released in groups of 10-20/site.

¹ Hanna, P. and Rath, M. 1976. A SUCCESSFUL BIGHORN SHEEP REESTABLISHMENT PROGRAM IN SOUTHWESTERN IDAHO. IDFG and BLM. Boise, Idaho.

² Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. IDFG. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step WL-1.11 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

An intensive inventory needs to be conducted by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and BLM to determine the feasibility of a bighorn sheep introduction. Historically, bighorn sheep inhabited Salmon Falls Canyon. IDFG has shown an interest in the possibility of an introduction. It may be several years before the project would be approved and funded. If recreation developments mentioned under R-1.2f, R-1.11 and NH-1.1 occur, there would be a conflict. If recreation designates the area as a "Natural Area" with no developments, there would be no conflict. The presence of bighorn sheep would enhance the natural area and compliment the recreational experiences.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

Accept WL-1.11 -
Study the feasibility of bighorn sheep introduction into Salmon Falls Canyon. Complete a management plan before introduction.

A study will allow a thorough analysis for determination of feasibility of an introduction.

Proceed with the introduction if the habitat is suitable and the benefits of bighorn sheep exceed the benefits of the resource values foregone.

Support Needs:

Alternatives Considered:

Feasibility study.
Coordination with IDFG.
Introduction.

1. Reject WL-1.11.
2. Disregard R-1.2 and R-1.11.
3. Modify NH-1.1.

Decision:

Rationale:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Bighorn sheep introductions into Salmon Falls Canyon should be proceeded by adequate feasibility studies and a habitat management plan.

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 (M/F/P)	Twin Falls	
Activity	Wildlife - Upland Game	
Overlay Reference	WL-2.1 Step 3	

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Acquire the following parcel of land to provide additional upland game habitat:

T. 10S., R. 18 E. - Springtown
Sec 11: N 1/2 N 1/2 SE 1/4 Lane

SUPPORT:

- Lands - Preparation of land report and EA for land acquisition.
- Recreation - Assistance in acquisition to provide sportsman access.
- Archaeology - Assistance in acquisition to provide access to Springtown.
- Wildlife - Assistance in acquisition.

RATIONALE:

Acquisition of this 40 acre tract of land will allow for continuous "rim-front" public land for over two miles. It will also allow public access to a now "inaccessible-to-the-public" portion. Currently, the adjacent public lands are Sikes Act tracts. The Sikes Act (PL 93-452) authorizes the BLM to jointly develop and carry out wildlife programs with state wildlife departments on federal lands. This parcel would also be included in the Cassia-Twin Falls Sikes Act Isolated Tracts Habitat Management Plan.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-579, Title II, Section 205(a) states that "notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary, with respect to the public lands, is authorized to acquire pursuant to this Act by purchase, exchange, donation, or eminent domain, lands or interests therein . . ."

Multiple Use Analysis

This 40 acre parcel of land was identified for acquisition because it would serve the public need for access. Acquisition of this parcel would provide the following benefits: (1) continuous "rim-front" public land for over two miles; (2) public access to a now "inaccessible-to-the-public" portion of public land; (3) inclusion into the Sikes Act program; (4) CRM-1.1 and CRM-1.8 --access and further preservation of Spring Town; and (5) R-1.8 and R-2.2 -- protection, preservation and interpretation of Spring Town.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-2.1 -
acquire this 40acre parcel of private land.

Reason:

BLM ownership and administration will insure that the land use and wildlife benefits provided will remain available.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Upland Game
Objective Number	WL-2

OBJECTIVE:

Improve and maintain terrestrial, aquatic and wetland-riparian habitats for upland game species throughout the Planning Unit.

RATIONALE:

Basic Guidance (1602.13A) states that the Bureau, in deciding among alternative uses of available resources and among management alternatives, will utilize both physical and social data in evaluating the immediate and long-range impact of proposed actions on environmental quality and ecological balance and will strive to maintain and enhance environmental quality.

The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) indicates that by 1995 the demand for big game hunter days on public land in the Planning Unit will be 10,454 days. In other words, overall hunter days will increase 44 percent from the current level. In 1995, it is estimated that the gross value of hunter days attributable to public land wildlife habitat in the Planning Unit for upland game hunting will be \$2,543,980.90.

BLM's Wildlife Program Activity Policy Statement (1603.12D) describes in the following narratives, rationale for managing wildlife and their habitats.

1. Description of Program Activity. The Wildlife Program is primarily concerned with the protection and use of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fishes, and invertebrates through the enhancement and maintenance of their habitat components. The program activity is closely coordinated with State wildlife agencies.

The Sikes Act (P.L. 93-452) authorizes the BLM, to jointly develop and carry out wildlife programs with State wildlife departments on Federal lands. Currently, in the Twin Falls Planning Unit, the Sikes Act program covers the Cassia-Twin Falls Sikes Act Isolated Tracts and the Milner Habitat Management Plans.

2. Long-Term Objectives.

a. Maintain a maximum diversity of wildlife species in sufficient numbers to meet public demands. This will be accomplished by means of habitat management.

b. Sponsor or conduct the research, studies, and inventories necessary to insure adequate data for decision making relating to the maintenance of habitat expressed in a. above.

3. Major Principles and Standards.

a. Maintain cooperative relations with States, other Federal Agencies, public interest groups, and individuals interested in or responsible for wildlife use, protection, and habitat management.

b. The essential requirements of wildlife -- food, cover, and water -- will be maintained so as to provide optimum "edge effect" and interspersion of habitat components in important wildlife areas.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: WFB
Twin Falls

Activity: Wildlife - Upland Game

Overlay Reference
Step 1 WL-2.2 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: *(Decision)*

Provide upland game habitat, primarily pheasants and public hunting areas, by: maintaining small isolated parcels of public land which are surrounded by private land in public ownership (these tracts must be in legal subdivision); in all future desert land entries, Carey Act, public sales, land exchanges, etc.; retain a minimum of 15 percent of the land in public ownership; retain the following isolated parcels in public ownership and maintain them in their present condition until such time when the surrounding private land goes into agriculture.

T. 12 S., R. 15 E.

Sec. 24: SE1/4SE 1/4

- Hollister West

T. 12 S., R. 16 E.

Sec. 19: Lot 4, SE1/4SW 1/4

T. 12 S., R. 16 E.

Sec. 19: SE1/4SE1/4 - Hollister East

RATIONALE:

Isolated parcels of public land adjacent to private land are extremely important as upland game habitat. These areas provide the required food and cover which cannot always be found on private land. According to the Twin Falls Survey, 51.8 percent of the people surveyed feel that the BLM should continue to hold isolated tracts of undeveloped public land and to manage these tracts to help offset shrinking pheasant habitat.¹ This survey shows the importance of maintaining and managing these isolated parcels for upland game. As they become identified these parcels should be included in the Cassia-Twin Falls Sikes Act Isolated Tracts Habitat Management Plan.

Criteria for land retention is consistent with the principals developed in the Agricultural Development EA and Boise District Agricultural Development EIS for Southwest Idaho.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Development of grazing systems on those parcels with grazing to maintain them in good condition.
- Lands - Retention of 15 percent of public land in all land disposal actions.
- Recreation - Assistance in implementation of recommendation for the benefit of sportsmen.
- Archaeology - Assistance in retention of parcels for protection of cultural resources.

¹ Burley District Memo. 1607. RESULTS OF THE TWIN FALLS SURVEY. November 19, 1980.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/F)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Upland Game
Overview Reference	
Step	WL-2.3 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Improve upland game habitat by making all existing and future water developments available to all upland game birds. Improve the chukar habitat by installing permanent water sources in chukar range. Construct and install bird guzzlers along Salmon Falls Creek rim for chukar and near the juniper trees by Mule Creek for quail. Install additional guzzlers as locations become identified.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Identification of existing and future livestock water to modify for upland game birds.
- Operations - Construction, installation, and modification of water developments for upland game birds.
- Recreation - Assistance in implementing recommendation to provide pleasing aesthetic values.
- Wildlife - Location of future water developments for upland game birds. Coordination with range and operations on design.

RATIONALE:

Water is an essential requirement of all upland game. Improved water distribution is important for sage grouse. They normally select areas near water for rearing broods and spending the summer. Water is important to the pheasant for survival. Quail require water daily. It is an essential part of their habitat. Watering places should be widely distributed, preferably within one-half mile of each other. Doves require water daily. Water availability is the only limiting factor for this highly adaptable species. For the chukar, water is a limiting factor and has a great effect on distribution, particularly during the summer. The chukar would benefit from any water development in its range since it is not regularly seen more than one mile from water during hot, dry summers. IDFG fully supports the development of additional water sources to increase chukar distribution and numbers over their current range.¹ The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows that 68 percent of the chukar habitat in the Planning Unit is on public land with 7 percent of the hunting days taking place on public land. From 1975 to 1995 hunter days are expected to make a 97 percent increase on public land. In 1980, \$5,719.77 was spent hunting chukar on public land in the Planning Unit. This will increase to an estimated \$72,274.95 by 1995. It is projected that under current management levels and habitat trends chukar populations will continue to decline in Idaho. Increased demand will result in harvest levels remaining essentially constant while success rates drop. At current success rates, demand will exceed supply by 1985. By improving and maintaining chukar habitat in optimum condition, an increase over the current levels of the chukar population, harvest and success rate will occur.¹ Water developments should be designed for exclusive use by upland game.

¹ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (B/L/P)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife - Upland Game

Overlay Reference

Step IWL-2.4 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Maintain existing islands of brush in all crested wheatgrass seedings to provide cover and food for upland game. Retain brush islands in all land treatment areas. Protect brushy cover on public land adjacent to private land. No sagebrush eradication of any type such as burning, spraying, chaining, etc. should take place on areas of public land within 1/4 mile of private land within the pheasant habitat range. A one-half mile perimeter of vegetative cover should be maintained around the Berger Resource Conservation Area. Provide "travel lanes" for pheasants to move between cover, food and water sources if these components are as far as one-fourth to one-half mile apart by protecting fence-rows, waterways, ditchbanks, field borders, odd areas, weed patches, etc.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Provide required "vegetative" areas for upland game in the preparation of EA's involving land treatments. Coordination with wildlife.
- Operations - Coordination with wildlife in design and location of leave areas in all land treatment projects.
- Archaeology - Assistance in layout of projects to protect cultural resources.

1 U. S. Department of Agriculture. 1976. Conservation Service. Boise, Idaho.

2 Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

RATIONALE:

Islands of brush in monotypic stands of crested wheatgrass seedings and the retention of brush islands in all land treatments is important in the maintenance of optimum upland game habitat. Nuttall's cottontail and pygmy rabbits inhabit brushy areas. They are highly dependent on cover for protection from predators.¹ The existing Nuttall's cottontail and pygmy rabbit habitat (i.e. "brushy" cover) must be improved and maintained so as to support a population of 19,855 animals on public land in the Planning Unit by 1995. The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows that in the Planning Unit 30 percent of the cottontail/rabbit habitat is found on public land and 31 percent of the hunting days take place on public land. From 1975 to 1995 hunter days are expected to make a 92 percent increase on public land. The PAA reflects the importance of these species as upland game in the Planning Unit. It is reflected in the expenditure of \$33,657.15 spent in 1980 in the Planning Unit hunting cottontails/rabbits on public land. This will increase to an estimated \$549,971.00 by 1995. Cottontail and pygmy rabbit populations fluctuate on an approximate 10-year cycle. Allowing for these cyclic fluctuations, populations have remained essentially stable from 1960 through 1975 and, under present management levels and habitat trends, are projected to maintain past and present levels through 1990. With increasing numbers of hunters, some additional interest in cottontail and pygmy rabbit hunting is foreseen and harvests and success rates should increase over past and present levels.²

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

Form BLM-11 Apr 77

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/F):

Twin Falls

Activity:

Wildlife - Sage Grouse

Overlay Reference:

Step WL-2.4 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (con't):

- Recreation - Assistance in design of areas to provide aesthetically pleasing landscape values and for consumptive and non-consumptive recreation values.
- Watershed - Assistance in design of projects to protect watershed.
- Wildlife - Location and design of leave areas for upland game.

RATIONALE (con't):

Ring-necked pheasant use of public land is largely limited to the cropland/wildland interface. Brushy cover on public land adjacent to cultivated land is critical to pheasant populations in many locals and they are increasing in importance. Sagebrush eradication in these areas eliminates critical winter habitat, escape and nesting cover. "Travel lanes" are important in assisting the birds in fulfilling their daily requirements. Existing pheasant habitat must be improved and maintained so as to support a population of 2,166 birds on public land in the Planning Unit by 1995. The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows that in the Planning Unit only 11 percent of the pheasant habitat is on public land, and, smaller yet, 5 percent of the hunting days take place on public land. All of the pheasant habitat (11 percent of the total pheasant habitat in the Planning Unit) is critical habitat. More than 11 percent of the pheasant population in the Planning Unit depend on this habitat. Therefore, failure to manage these critical areas will result in reduced overall populations on all lands regardless of land status.

From 1975 to 1995 hunter days are expected to make an 86 percent increase on public land. The PAA reflects the importance of the pheasant as a game bird in the Planning Unit. It is reflected in the expenditure of \$65,057.52 spent on hunting pheasants on public land in 1980. This will increase to an estimated \$618,595.70 by 1995. Populations and harvest of ring-necked pheasants were at a high level from 1960 through 1970. There was a significant decline in population, harvest and success rates by 1975 and under current management levels and habitat trends this decline is projected to continue through 1990. Because of the very high non-hunting related, natural, annual mortality rate, it is not possible

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(direction in reverse)

Form BLM-1 (Rev. 10-79)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BPP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Sage Grouse
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-2.4 Step 3

RATIONALE (cont.):

to maintain or increase pheasant populations by reduced hunter harvest when habitat is declining. If the decline in pheasant populations is to be halted, habitat will have to be provided to compensate for that being lost. With improved habitat, pheasant populations, harvest and success rates could be restored to 1970 levels by 1990.²

Multiple Use Analysis

Recommendation 2.4 shows the need to retain brushy cover for wildlife in areas where brushy vegetation is not plentiful. It is supported by watershed, recreation and visual resources but conflicts with lands, minerals, fire and range. All of these conflicts arise from proposed land treatments that vary from material extraction to vegetative manipulation. The friction comes from the possibility that land treatments may eradicate the brush and thus wildlife cover.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

Modify WL-2.4 -

All land treatment proposals affecting brushy islands or buffer strips, should receive multiple resource input to assure consideration of the wildlife habitat needs and keep the needed patches and islands of brush habitat. The existing islands and leave areas from the initial projects will remain leave areas in future maintenance unless wildlife input indicates that the areas are not critical habitat, in which case treatment can be done in a manner that benefits the wildlife values.

To allow for flexible planning and adequate consideration of brush cover for wildlife species.

² Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDHAO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION--ANALYSIS--DECISION

Name: <i>WFP</i> Twin Falls
Activity Wildlife - Upland Game
Overlay Reference Step WL-2.5 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Implement the following cooperative farm agreements to enhance upland game bird habitat:

T. 11 S., R. 14 E.
Sec. 11: NE1/4 SW1/4 - McCoy
North of Canal

T. 12 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 24: SE1/4 NW1/4 - Courtney
SW1/4 NW1/4
South of Canal

RATIONALE:

Currently, these parcels are isolated from their respective grazing allotments and are burdened with one form of trespass or another. The trespasses should be cleared and cooperative farm agreements should be implemented. The quality is such that when properly developed these parcels could provide very high quality nesting and brood rearing areas for upland game, especially the ring-necked pheasant. The pheasant is an important and highly sought after game bird in this area. Good pheasant habitat on public land is in short supply.

SUPPORT:

Recreation - Assistance in implementation of agreements to enhance recreational values.

Wildlife - Location and design of wildlife vegetative plantings and identification of plant species to be used. Coordination with operations and adjacent landowners.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation is an attempt to eliminate unauthorized activities by working with allotment users to implement cooperative farm agreements. This action would allow the entire parcel to be farmed, but only half harvested leaving the other half for wildlife feed and cover. This compromise would tend to satisfy both interests (wildlife and the cooperative farmer).

The proposal is supported by recreation and lands, but conflicts with lands and range recommendations. The lands conflict comes from a proposed land exchange that would stop a cooperative farm agreement. The range conflict is from proposed vegetation treatments and forage allocation. The problem could be solved by planning with the permittees to determine the best alternative management.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

Form 10-11, Apr 1973

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Upland Game
Overlay Reference	Step WL-2.7 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Provide improved upland game bird habitat by planting vegetation which will out compete noxious weeds, are non-spreading in nature but will provide the same benefits as many of the noxious weeds. Until this can be accomplished, herbicide and pesticide use will have to be selective.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Coordination in the weed control program with wildlife along areas of important upland game habitat.
- Watershed - Assistance with this recommendation for watershed benefits.
- Wildlife - Identification of areas to incorporate this recommendation.

RATIONALE:

Weed-seeds are an important component in the diet of the Hungarian partridge year around. "Huns" select nest sites in weed patches and value them as important escape areas. Weed control programs adversely affect the "Hun" by reducing its habitat. It is important to improve and maintain the existing Hungarian partridge habitat so as to support a population of 13,265 birds on public land in the Planning Unit by 1995. A gradual decline in populations, harvests and success rates from the present plateau is predicted through 1990 under current management levels and habitat trends. By improving and maintaining Hungarian partridge habitat in optimum condition, the demand should result in greater harvests and a slight increase in success rates.¹ The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows that in the Planning Unit 30 percent of the Hungarian partridge habitat is found on public land and 44 percent of the hunting days take place on public land. From 1975 to 1995 hunter days are expected to make a 47 percent increase on public land. This demand can be met with improvement and maintenance of existing Hungarian partridge habitat in top condition. The PAA reflects the importance of the "Hun" as a game bird in the Planning Unit. It is reflected in the expenditure of \$44,629.77 spent on hunting "Huns" on public land in 1980. This will increase to an estimated \$556,541.45 by 1995.

The general widespread use of herbicides and pesticides adversely affects pheasants, either through reduced cover and/or food supply.

¹ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (WUP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Quail
Overlay Reference	
Step (WL-2.8)	Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Improve quail habitat by establishing artificial quail roosting sites (brush piles on platforms) every one-half mile in quail range. Protect the 160 acres of juniper trees near Mule Creek. Maintain dense brushy areas in wetland-riparian situations. Maintain the natural shrub-tree mixtures and native vegetation. Maintain 25-50 percent shade provided by woody cover which is needed for successful quail nesting.

RATIONALE:

If roosting sites are not present quail will be few and scattered. For night roosting, quail require stiff-twigged, densely foliated evergreen trees or tall shrubs. In good quail habitat, there is at least one roosting site every one-half mile.

The mountain quail is a "sensitive" species. In desert habitats mountain quail nests are often found associated with junipers and other such woody plants.¹ It is important to maintain the natural shrub-tree mixtures and native vegetation that is an integral part of mountain quail habitat.

SUPPORT:

- Forestry - Maintenance of existing juniper area.
- Range - Development and implementation of grazing systems to protect "dense" brushy areas.
- Operations - Construction and installation of artificial roosting sites.
- Recreation - Assistance in design to enhance aesthetic values and recreational benefits.
- Watershed - Assistance in implementation of recommendation to enhance watershed.
- Wildlife - Location and design of artificial roosting sites. Coordination with other resources in protection of quail habitat.

Since quail nesting occurs in dense vegetation near a water source it is important to keep livestock from removing the vegetation around watering areas in quail habitat.

The existing valley/mountain quail habitat should be improved and maintained so as to support a population of 2,100 birds on public land in the Planning Unit by 1995. The Sikes Act (PL 93-452) authorizes the BLM to jointly develop and carry out wildlife programs with state wildlife departments on federal lands. The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows that in the Planning Unit 55 percent of the quail habitat is found on public land but only 2 percent of the hunting days take place on public land. From 1975 to 1995 hunter days are expected to make a 64 percent increase on public land. Under current management levels and habitat trends, it appears that peak populations were reached in 1975 and a gradual decline in population, harvest and hunter success are projected through 1990.

¹ Johnsgard, P. A. 1973. GROUSE AND QUAIL OF NORTH AMERICA. University of Nebraska Press. Lincoln, Nebraska.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Sage Grouse
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-2.9 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Maintain at least 20 percent live sagebrush cover within nesting, brood rearing and winter sage grouse habitat areas. Limit control of vegetation to a site by site basis within two miles of leks. Apply all treatment measures in irregular patterns. Treated areas will not be wider than 100 feet and untreated areas will be at least as wide as treated areas in sage grouse range. No control of sagebrush will be considered in any suitable area known to have supported wintering concentrations of sage grouse within the past ten years.

RATIONALE:

Sage grouse are intimately, probably inseparably, associated with sagebrush. Almost all cover types used are composed of various combinations of growth forms and densities of sagebrush. Sage grouse dependence on sagebrush cannot be over-emphasized. They are solely dependent upon sagebrush from October through April of each year.¹ Sagebrush is essential for food and cover requirements of sage grouse.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Design land treatments in accordance with the above recommendation.
- Operations - Layout of land treatment areas. Coordination with wildlife.

¹ Bean, R. 1941. LIFE HISTORY STUDIES OF THE SAGE GROUSE (Centrocercus urophasianus) IN CLARK COUNTY, IDAHO. B. S. Thesis. Utah State Agricultural College. Logan, Utah.

Griner, L. A. 1939. A STUDY OF THE SAGE GROUSE, (Centrocercus urophasianus), WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LIFE HISTORY, HABITAT REQUIREMENTS, AND NUMBERS AND DISTRIBUTION. M. S. Thesis. Utah State Agricultural College.

Oakleaf, R. J. 1971. THE RELATIONSHIP OF SAGE GROUSE TO UPLAND MEADOWS IN NEVADA. Job Final Report W-48-2. Nevada Department of Fish and Game.

Patterson, R. L. 1952. THE SAGE GROUSE IN WYOMING. Wyoming Game and Fish Commission. Sage Books, Incorporated. Denver, Colorado.

Savage, D. E. 1969. RELATION OF SAGE GROUSE TO UPLAND MEADOWS IN NEVADA. Job Progress Report W-39-R-9. Nevada Department of Fish and Game.

Wallestad, R. O. and Pyrah, D. 1974. MOVEMENT AND NESTING OF SAGE GROUSE HENS IN CENTRAL MONTANA. Journal of Wildlife Management. 38:630-633.

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 HPP
Twin Falls
Activity
Wildlife - Sage Grouse
Overlay Reference
Step WL-2.9 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

- Recreation - Assistance in design to provide pleasing aesthetic values.
- Watershed - Assistance in design to protect watershed values.
- Archaeology - Assistance in design to protect cultural resources.
- Wildlife - Designation of important and critical sage grouse use areas. Coordination with range and operations before any on-the-ground work begins.

Multiple Use Analysis

This is a recommendation to protect stands of sagebrush that play intimate roles in the life cycle of sage grouse. These birds are dependent on sagebrush for food and shelter throughout much of their lives. By following this proposal their dependence can be accommodated without sacrifice by other activities.

WL-2.9 is supported by watershed, recreation and visual resource management. The conflicts are with lands, fire and range. The lands conflict is caused by a proposed exchange of critical sage grouse range. The conflict would be compromised by allowing no exchanges until an HMP is developed for this critical sage grouse range.

The problem with fire is solved by changing sage grouse winter range from the protection proposed restricted retardant use to normal fire suppression methods. This would insure that the winter range is not totally decimated by fire.

Range recommendations RM-2.1 through RM-2.8 address land treatments that do not consider sage grouse habitat. To resolve this problem wildlife should be consulted on all land treatments that affect sage grouse habitat. Wildlife should recommend patterns of treatments and leave areas that will benefit wildlife.

All in all the modifications to other activity plans are inconsequential compared to the benefits of preserving sage grouse and their habitat.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

Form BLM-21, April 1977

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 WL-2.9 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis (cont.)

Priority consideration will be assigned to maintaining the productivity of existing seedings. Seedings in sage grouse strutting/nesting habitat will be evaluated to determine sites critical to sage grouse nesting needs. These specific sites will be eliminated or strip treated in 100 foot wide strips. A general objective will be to maintain up to 75 percent of the existing seeding acreage. However, if interdisciplinary evaluation shows that more modification is needed for the best resource management it will be done accordingly. The wildlife objective of maintaining 20 percent live sagebrush cover in the nesting-brood rearing sites will be the wildlife objective for the leave sites.

(Decision)
Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

Modify WL-2.9 --
Give sage grouse nesting, brood-rearing, and winter habitat needs priority consideration in these habitat areas. The guidelines developed by IDFG will guide the habitat management of these areas. Maintain existing range improvement practices that exist within these habitat areas. The key in determining the nesting-brood rearing habitat sites will be the location of leks relative to the 2-mile radius rule. Multiple use management of these areas will aim at maintaining adequate nesting cover. Brood-rearing needs in these areas will strive to maximize succulent forbs and insects. Management of wintering areas will be to maintain adequate sagebrush cover in identified winter areas.

Sage grouse are an important resource and are dependent on sagebrush for many of their life functions.

Support Needs:

Alternatives Considered:

Lands --
Coordinate with wildlife on land exchanges. (same as MFP-1)

1. Reject WL-2.9.
2. Modify WL-2.9.

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: WFP:
Twin Falls

Agency:
Wildlife - Sage Grouse

Overlay Reference:
Step WL-2.10 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Limited work will be permitted along streams, meadows or secondary drainages (dry and intermittent). A 100-yard strip (minimum) of living sagebrush will be retained on each edge of meadows and drainages for protection of sage grouse habitat. Install protective fencing on selected springs, seeps, meadows and well overflow areas, as they become identified, to protect succulent forage and improve sage grouse habitat.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Designate leave areas for all range land treatment projects in sage grouse range.
- Recreation - Assistance in design to provide a pleasing aesthetic value.
- Archaeology - Assistance in design to protect cultural resources.
- Watershed - Assistance in design to enhance watershed values.
- Operations - Layout of no control work areas for land treatments. Construction of protective fencing.
- Wildlife - Location and design of leave areas for sage grouse and for protective fences. Coordination with range and operations on projects.

RATIONALE:

High quality water is an important habitat component for sage grouse. This is particularly true in the late summer and early fall. Wet meadows and riparian habitats are critical brood rearing habitats for most upland game birds. Sagebrush is essential for food and cover requirements of the sage grouse. Sagebrush areas are critical along the edge of meadows and drainages because sage grouse normally select areas along water for rearing broods and loafing. Protective fencing should be constructed on selected sites, especially meadow areas which are heavily grazed in the spring. Periodic livestock grazing will be necessary for wet meadow maintenance in some locals. Studies of the relationship of sage grouse to upland meadows in Nevada showed that meadows are critical in providing succulent forbs and insects as a food source for sage grouse chicks between one and eleven weeks of age.¹

The existing sage grouse habitat needs to be improved and maintained so as to support a population of 1,329 birds on public land in the Planning Unit by 1995. The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows that in the Planning Unit 40 percent of the sage grouse habitat is found on public land but only 26 percent of the hunting days take place on public land. From 1975 to 1995 hunter days are expected to make an 86 percent increase on public land. In 1980, \$18,598.98 was spent hunting sage grouse on public land in the Planning Unit. This will increase to an estimated \$187,866.20 by 1990. There have been annual fluctuations but sage grouse populations have generally shown an increasing trend since 1960 with a peak

¹ Oakleaf, R. J. 1971. THE RELATIONSHIP OF SAGE GROUSE TO UPLAND MEADOWS IN NEVADA. Job Final Report W-48-2. Nevada Department of Fish and Game.

Savage, D. E. 1969. RELATION OF SAGE GROUSE TO UPLAND MEADOWS IN NEVADA. Job Progress Report W-39-R-9. Nevada Department of Fish and Game.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

Form BLM-11, Apr. 1973

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (NEP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Wildlife - Sage Grouse

Overlay Reference
Step 1 WL-2.11 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Allow livestock use in meadow areas as necessary to enhance sage grouse habitat. Cattle grazing should be curtailed in the nesting-brood rearing complex until after June 10. Delay sheep bands from utilizing known sage grouse nesting areas until the first week in June. Livestock grazing should be administered in such a manner to maintain and/or improve important sage grouse wintering areas.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Development of livestock grazing systems to adhere to the above recommendation.
- Recreation - Coordination with other resources to attain good aesthetic value.
- Watershed - Coordination with other resources to reduce erosion and enhance the watershed.
- Wildlife - Coordination with range in location of important and critical sage grouse use areas.

RATIONALE:

Livestock tend to concentrate in meadow areas and essentially remove all of the vegetation which is detrimental to sage grouse populations. Loss of sagebrush, grass and forbs reduces the quality of sage grouse habitat. By delaying the grazing until after June 10, the sage grouse will have largely completed their nesting. Sheep bands should be delayed until young sage grouse have hatched in the particular locality. Domestic sheep are known to have caused considerable nest abandonment around bedgrounds, in trailing areas, and during normal feeding.¹ Heavy utilization of important wintering areas may leave inadequate forage for sage grouse. This will depend on the size of the wintering area and the amount of sagebrush, depth of snow, and severity of the winter.

¹ Patterson, R. L. 1952. THE SAGE GROUSE IN WYOMING. Wyoming Game and Fish Commission. Sage Books, Incorporated. Denver, Colorado.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.
Distribution on request

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WL-2.11 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

The visual resource recommendation to protect riparian areas supports this recommendation as do watershed recommendations WS-1.4, WS-1.5 and WS-2.2. The major conflict with range management centers around curtailing livestock use in the nesting-brood rearing complex until after June 10. A total of 16 allotments are included in this complex. As stated in the recommendation, turnout dates would have to be setback at least 1 month. Proposed and existing grazing systems ensure that most of the area is not grazed prior to 6/10.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows:
Through the use of intensive grazing management systems maintain and enhance nesting-brood rearing complexes and wintering areas for sage grouse.

Reason:

Intensive grazing management systems will ensure that meadow and riparian areas receive periodic rest from spring grazing and that the bulk of riparian areas will be free from livestock while sage grouse are nesting. Wintering areas should be managed for improvement and/or maintenance.

Support Needs:

Range -
Develop intensive grazing systems and maintain existing systems to insure maintenance and enhance riparian areas nesting-brood rearing complexes and wintering areas for sage grouse.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept WL-2.11.
2. Reject WL-2.11.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Rationale:

Grazing management systems can be designed to benefit specific life cycle needs of sage grouse without underly restricting grazing use in the area.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1000-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BPP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Sage Grouse
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-2.12 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Allow energy exploitation for oil and gas leasing, ORV races and other ORV use in critical sage grouse nesting-brood rearing complexes after June 15. Close critical sage grouse wintering areas to snowmobling.

SUPPORT:

- Minerals - Assistance in complying with above recommendation for energy exploitation for oil and gas leasing.
- Recreation - Designation of ORV use dates. Contact with ORV user groups. Development of ORV plan implementing the above recommendation.
- Wildlife - Designation of critical areas. Coordination with minerals and recreation.

RATIONALE:

Most effects of increased energy exploitation and oil and gas leasing to bird life of the sagebrush type can be detrimental. The impacts to sage grouse when they are concentrated in the winter and under additional stress can result in reduced numbers and productivity.

Occasional nest abandonment or destruction will be caused by vandals, unthinking persons, or by accident incidental to human recreational activities on the public lands. Of primary concern on public lands is the authorization of ORV races across habitats that are critical sage grouse areas. These events should be conducted after the reproductive period or in an area where no loss to habitats will occur. The potential of fire caused by hot mufflers and tail pipes or by sparks or hot exhaust in brushy or grassy areas must also be considered. Prevention of such fires is necessary to preserve important habitat. Restrictions on snowmobile use in critical wintering areas is important so as not to add additional stress to the species.

According to the Twin Falls County Survey, 28.6 percent of the people surveyed feel that since the public lands provide some of the best and most diverse wildlife habitat, the potential for improving this habitat--and thus increasing game and non-game populations---is present. They felt public land habitat should be improved solely for wildlife.¹

¹ Burley District Memo. 1607. RESULTS OF THE TWIN FALLS SURVEY. November 19, 1980.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step WL-2.12 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with minerals recommendations to explore for and develop minerals resources in sage grouse range. Recreations lack of recommendations to close sage grouse nesting areas during nesting periods conflicts with this recommendation. Lack of snowmobile closures on sage grouse winter range conflicts. No existing problems with ORV use in relation to sage grouse have been identified. Wildlife URA III states in regard to wintering areas "The sagebrush must be above the accumulated snow." Those areas are not conducive to snowmobiling and are thereby protected without additional regulations.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify WL-2.12 -
Allow vehicle use on existing roads and trails and allow ORV events after June 15 in critical sage grouse nesting-brood rearing complexes. Close critical sage grouse wintering areas to snowmobiling. Coordinate this recommendaiton with M-2.1.

Support Needs:

Wildlife --
Monitor recreation and minerals activities to identify problems that may arise.

Recreation --
Monitor ORV use to ensure that sage grouse are not being unduly affected by human activities.

Minerals --
Monitor mineral activities to ensure that sage grouse are not being unduly offended by human activities.

Reason:

No existing problems have been identified in the sage grouse areas. Wildlife URA III says "Presently, the specific magnitude conflicts between visitor and ORV management and sage grouse disturbance is not known." Wildlife URA IV says occasional nest abandonment or destruction will be caused by vandals, unthinking persons and accidents incidental to recreational activities. The amount of production lost through such activities will probably not be significant to most sage grouse populations." Depending on the size of the population, there could definitely be a problem.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL-2.12.
2. Accept WL-2.12.

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 (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step WL-2.12 Step 3

Decision:

Modify the multiple-use recommendation.

- a. Allow vehicular use and oil and gas exploration without restriction except during the period from March 15 through June 15 in critical sage grouse nesting-brood rearing complexes. During this period, vehicular use will be limited to existing roads and trails.
- b. Close critical sage grouse wintering areas to snowmobiling.

Rationale:

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: Twin Falls

Activity: Wildlife - Sharp-tailed Grouse

Overlay Reference:
Step 1 WL-2.13 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Maintain and enhance habitat for a sharp-tailed grouse introduction. Maintain a grass understory at least 12 inches in height. Maintain present cover on public land adjacent to dryland grain fields. Protect areas of Idaho fescue and Sandberg bluegrass inter-mixed with bitterbrush and sagebrush and draws and small canyons with dense stands of berry producing vegetation. Allow grazing in meadows and spring and seep complexes after August 1.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Development and implementation of livestock grazing systems to provide optimum sharp-tailed grouse habitat.
- Watershed - Assistance in implementation of recommendation to enhance watershed values.
- Wildlife - Coordination with range in location of sharp-tailed grouse areas.

RATIONALE:

Historically, there are sharp-tailed grouse reported for only the extreme southern portion of the Twin Falls Planning Unit and recent range maps and reports show no sharp-tailed grouse anywhere in the Planning Unit.¹ IDFG fully supports a sharp-tailed grouse introduction into the Twin Falls Planning Unit (Gary Will, Regional Wildlife Manager, Region IV-IDFG, 4-1-80, Personal Communication).

The sharp-tailed grouse is a "sensitive" species. These birds occur in semidesert shrub in grass cover types as well as near cultivated fields which provide important food and cover requirements during most of the year.² A healthy native grass understory is important to the grouse in the breeding and nesting seasons. Successful nests are usually in ungrazed or lightly grazed pastures where grass understory is at least 12 inches in height.³

Sharp-tailed grouse are found in brushy draws and densely covered hillsides in the winter time.⁴ These areas are important winter habitat. They provide essential protection from the weather and an important source of food. Native habitat is essential to sharp-tailed grouse populations.

¹ Parker, T.L. 1970. ON THE ECOLOGY OF THE SHARP-TAILED GROUSE IN SOUTHEASTERN IDAHO. Unpublished M.S. Thesis. Idaho State University. Pocatello, Idaho.

² Bent, A.C. 1963. LIFE HISTORIES OF NORTH AMERICAN GALLINACEOUS BIRDS. Dover Publications, Inc. New York, New York.

³ Hillman, C.N. and Jackson, W.W. 1973. THE SHARP-TAILED GROUSE IN SOUTH DAKOTA. Department of Game, Fish and Parks. Technical Bulletin Number 3.

⁴ McArdle, B.A. 1977. THE EFFECT OF SAGEBRUSH REDUCTION PRACTICES ON SHARP-TAILED GROUSE USE IN SOUTHEASTERN IDAHO. Unpublished M.S. Thesis. Utah State University. Logan, Utah.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-2. Step 3

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify 2-13 as follows -
Maintain and enhance habitat for sharp-tailed grouse through the use of intensive grazing management systems. Maintenance of a 12 inch high grass understory is important. Maintain present cover on public lands adjacent to dryland grain fields. Protect grass areas inter-mixed with bitterbrush and sagebrush in draws and small canyons with dense stands of berry producing vegetation.

The exchange proposal will have priority because of the multiple resource values as explained in the multiple use analysis.

Support Needs:

Range -
Develop and implement grazing systems to provide optimum sharp-tailed grouse habitat. Coordinate all land treatments with wildlife.

Wildlife -
Prepare a management plan which includes specific habitat components necessary for sharp-tailed grouse. Provide input in land treatment design and location.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Reasons:

Good quality grasslands and brushy cover are essential for sharp-tailed grouse populations. Implementation of grazing systems is the best method for attaining good quality grasslands. Limiting land treatments in draws and other selected locations will ensure brushy cover is available when needed.

The proposed exchange is for some scattered parcels within the habitat units. It appears that the total multiple use values would benefit from the exchange if it can be accomplished.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL-2.13.
2. Accept WL-2.13.

Rationale:

Grazing management systems can be designed to enhance sharptail habitat without underly restricting grazing use.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Twin Falls

Wildlife - Aquatics

Objective Number
WL-3

OBJECTIVES:

Improve and maintain terrestrial, aquatic and wetland-riparian habitats for furbearers, waterfowl, shorebirds, and game fish.

RATIONALE:

Basic Guidance (1602.13A) states that the Bureau, in deciding among alternative uses of available resources and among management alternatives, will utilize both physical and social data in evaluating the immediate and long-range impact of proposed actions on environmental quality and ecological balance and will strive to maintain and enhance environmental quality.

Wetland and/or riparian habitats are extremely important to this group of wildlife and fishery species. IDFG in their Goals, Objectives and Policies 1975-1990 book fully support the protection of wetland-riparian habitats. Executive Order 11900, Protection of Wetlands are intended to improve the protection and management of wetland and riparian areas of BLM-administered lands. These procedures are part of the BLM manual section 6740 and were effective as of October 1, 1979.

The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) indicates that by 1995 the demand for fisherman days on public land in the Planning Unit will be 4,720 days for streams and 32,800 days for reservoir fishing. In other words, overall fisherman days per mile on public land habitat will increase by 49 percent for stream fishing and 60 percent for reservoir fishing over the current level.

In 1995, it is estimated that the gross value of fisherman days attributable to public land habitats in the Planning Unit will be \$767,944.00 for stream fishing and \$5,336,560.00 for reservoir fishing.

The total economic value for furbearing species has increased from \$3,620.31 in 1970-1971 to \$86,256.97 in 1978-1979. This value will continue to increase.

BLM's Wildlife Program Activity Policy Statement (1603.12D) describes in the following narratives, rationale for managing wildlife and their habitats.

1. Description of Program Activity. The Wildlife Program is primarily concerned with the protection and use of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fishes, and invertebrates through the enhancement and maintenance of their habitat components. The program activity is closely coordinated with State wildlife agencies.

2. Assumptions.

a. Increasing recognition and use of ecosystem concepts in the planning, use, and development of the public lands will result in the production of greater varieties and populations of wildlife.

b. Air, water, and noise pollution abatement programs and improved technology will result in improved wildlife habitat.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *WFD*
Twin Falls

Activity
Wildlife - Wetland-Riparian

Overlay Reference Areas
Step *WL-3.1* Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Retain in public ownership all public land adjacent to and including all water bodies and wetland-riparian areas. Improve 28 acres of wetland-riparian habitat currently in poor condition and 309 acres currently in fair condition to good and excellent condition. Maintain current good and excellent condition wetland-riparian areas in these classes. Prohibit surface occupancy or road development within 100 feet of all wetland-riparian areas. Expand wetland-riparian areas by diverting runoff water from troughs and piping water from springs into protected areas.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Development and implementation of intensive livestock grazing systems or abatement of grazing in wetland-riparian areas to improve the condition class.
- Lands - Retention of all lands adjacent to and including water bodies and wetland-riparian areas.
- Operations - Construction of wetland-riparian expansion areas.

RATIONALE:

Executive Order, (EO) 11990, Protection of Wetlands, are intended to improve the protection and management of wetland and riparian areas on BLM-administered lands. BLM manual section 6740.06E states to retain under BLM administration and ownership all wetland and riparian habitats.

Wetland-riparian habitats are critical wildlife areas as well as conflict areas with livestock. Where these areas are currently in poor and fair condition, they need to be improved to good and excellent. In order to improve some of these areas, livestock grazing needs to be abated. "Vegetation in certain areas, such as meadows and drainage ways are invariably closely utilized under any stocking rate or system of grazing. Such use may be detrimental to wildlife, aesthetic, recreational or other values. Where this is the case about the only way to preserve values is to fence the area off from grazing. Reducing livestock or adjusting the grazing season usually will not solve such a problem."¹ Other than the fencing of streams to exclude livestock, there are few known practical practices which can be implemented to improve or maintain quality habitat for trout.² According to a Twin Falls County Survey, 32.1 percent of the people surveyed indicated that they thought riparian areas should be fenced off to protect wildlife habitat.³ BLM manual

- ¹ Telephone conversation between Bruce Smith, Fisheries Biologist--Rock Springs BLM District and August L. Hormay, Grazing Management Specialist--DSC, on August 11, 1976, concerning rest-rotation grazing management.
- ² Armour, C. L. 1977. EFFECTS OF DETERIORATED RANGE STREAMS ON TROUT. Bureau of Land Management. Idaho State Office. Boise, Idaho.
- ³ Burley District Memo. 1607. RESULTS OF THE TWIN FALLS SURVEY. November 19, 1980.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

the actions on reverse

Form BLM-11 (Rev. 11-80)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: BLP:

Twin Falls

Agency:

Wildlife - Wetland-Riparian

Overlay Reference Areas

Step WL-3.1 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

Archaeology - Assistance in protection of wetland-riparian areas for cultural resource protection.

Recreation - Assistance in protection of wetland-riparian areas for recreational use.

Watershed - Assistance in protection of wetland-riparian areas for watershed benefits.

Wildlife - Location of improvement and expansion areas. Coordination with other resources on issues concerning wetland-riparian areas.

RATIONALE (cont.):

section 6740.22 states to establish buffer strips to protect wetland-riparian areas from disturbance.

Wetland-riparian areas support many forms of wildlife, several of which are "sensitive" species. BLM manual section 6740--Wetland-Riparian Area Protection and Management should be consulted before any type of action is taken involving any wetland or riparian area.³

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation could conflict with lands recommendations relating to land disposal if these lands include riparian areas or bodies of water. Conflicts with minerals center around possible mineral activity within 100 feet of wetland-riparian areas. Proposed recreation roads and campgrounds within 100 feet of wetland-riparian areas also conflicts with this recommendation. Season-long grazing use of riparian areas in fair or poor condition would also conflict with this recommendation. The recommendation gives the option of intensive management or fencing to improve wetland-riparian areas.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

- Modify 3.1 as follows -
1. Retain in public ownership on all public lands adjacent to and including all water bodies and wetland-riparian areas.
 2. Improve 28 acres of wetland-riparian habitat in poor condition and 309 acres in fair condition by

Reasons:

Wetland-Riparian habitat areas are critical wildlife areas and should be managed and protected as such. BLM Manual section 6740.0GE states that all wetland and riparian habitats should be retained under BLM administration and ownership. Improvement of riparian areas along Shoshone and

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	WL-3.1
Step 3	

implementing grazing systems which provide periodic deferrment from grazing. Establish exclosures along riparian areas on Shoshone and McMullen Creek to monitor the effects of grazing systems on riparian vegetation. If riparian areas do not begin to respond to grazing treatments within 5 years, consider reducing livestock use in riparian areas by fencing or other means.

3. Maintain current good and excellent condition wetland-riparian areas in these classes.
4. Design new roads and facilities in a manner which will not damage riparian areas.
5. Expand wetland-riparian areas by diverting runoff water from troughs and piping water from springs into protected areas.

Salmon Falls Creek will improve values for wildlife, fisheries, recreation and visual resources. The option of using intensive management initially is related to costs involved in fencing and the aesthetics of fences along streams. A monitoring plan will determine the effectiveness of intensive grazing management toward improving riparian habitat. The original 100 foot buffer strip was modified because each riparian area is unique and requires individual attention.

Expansion of wetland-riparian areas will improve wildlife habitat in the Planning Unit and reduce livestock trampling of soils around watering areas.

Support Needs:

Range -
Help to set up monitoring plan to determine affects of intense live-stock management systems on riparian habitat.

Wildlife -
Help set up monitoring plan to determine affects of intensive live-stock management systems on riparian habitat.

Operations -
Construction of wetland-riparian expansion areas.

Archaeologist -
Cultural examinations of exclosure sites.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Fence all riparian areas.
2. Reject WL-3.1.

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: *WLP*
Twin Falls

Activity:
Wildlife - Furbearers

Overlay Reference
Step *WL-3.2* Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Predator control will be allowed only on those areas where there is documented evidence of extreme depredation on domestic livestock and/or wildlife. See the URA Step III wildlife habitat overlay entitled "A.8. Predator Damage Control."

SUPPORT:

- Range - Identification of problem areas between predators and livestock.
- Recreation - Coordinate sport hunting areas with range and wildlife.
- Wildlife - Coordination with range and USFWS on predator control problem areas.

RATIONALE:

Wanton killing of predators usually does very little to solve depredation problems. Predator control, if directed to problem areas, can reduce specific problems. Presently, we do not have any information that indicates that predators, primarily coyotes, pose any serious threat to other wildlife populations.

The sport hunting of predators has added substantial amounts of money into the local and/or regional economy. Any form of predator control reduces the opportunity for sport hunting success.

Multiple Use Analysis

Existing predator control programs are carried out by the Fish and Wildlife Service and sport hunters. The BLM is consulted prior to actual field operations and determines: (1) if predator control is justified; (2) the method of control (trapping, aerial gunning, etc.); and (3) the time of control. This information, together with actual predation kills of livestock documented by the operator, forms the basis for a decision to allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to proceed.

Note. Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Abstractions on reverse

Form 100-10 (Rev. 1-1-70)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BFLP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Furbearers
Overlap Reference	Step 1 WL-3.3 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Improve furbearer habitat by implementing the following recommendations:

- (1) modify existing and install future water developments so that water is readily available at ground level to all furbearers;
- (2) designate leave areas (i.e. islands of brush) in all areas where land treatments are conducted to provide and maximize the "edge" effect. Protect present native vegetative communities;
- (3) prevent a loss of habitat from excessive reduction of stream flow or draw downs of any water source from their present levels. Avert the future channelization of water courses. Maintain riparian habitat in optimum condition.

RATIONALE:

The Wildlife Program Activity Policy Statement 1603.12D4b states that one of the major principles and standards of the wildlife program activity is to consider the welfare and habitat requirements of all wildlife, including predacious animals, in programs affecting the public lands.

All furbearers are or can be associated with riparian habitats. Water is a necessity for all furbearers. For several, it is an absolute requirement. IDFG fully supports the protection of riparian habitat. They state that riparian habitat is extremely important to the maintenance of quite a few furbearing species.¹ The river otter, a "sensitive" species, are well adapted to an aquatic existence and are seldom found far from water.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Preparation of EA's for range land treatment projects.
- Watershed - Assistance in preservation of current stream flow levels and protection of existing water courses.
- Operations - Layout of leave areas in land treatment projects. Improvements on water developments.
- Recreation - Assistance in layout of projects to provide pleasing aesthetic values.
- Wildlife - Designation of leave areas. Coordination with range watershed and operations.

Table 8 in the wildlife portion of the Twin Falls URA Step III shows the number of animals taken, the average pelt worth and total economic value of furbearers/predators in Twin Falls County. The total economic value for all species listed increased from \$3,620.31 in 1970-1971 to \$86,256.97 in 1978-1979. This shows that the demand for furbearers is ever-increasing. In order to meet the continuing demand the furbearer habitat must be maintained in optimum condition in order to support the increase in furbearer populations. Habitat for several furbearer species, which have been designated as "sensitive," must be enhanced.

¹ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOAL'S, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WL-3.3 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with minerals recommendations for exploration and development of mineral resources, if riparian areas would be damaged. Lands conflicts are based on areas being developed for agricultural production. Fire F-1.3, F-1.4 and F-1.5 may conflict with this recommendation in that the "edge" would be destroyed. In most cases, fire can be expected to increase "edge" by burning in irregular patterns. Range treatment proposals that include treating blocks of land conflict with the recommendation to leave islands of brush and maximize edge effects. The minimum stream flow recommendation is unnecessary as water from streams crossing public land is diverted below public land. The water in Salmon Falls Creek Reservoir is controlled by the Salmon River Canal Company and therefore, we do not have control over draw down. Economics of pumping prevent drawing water from Salmon Falls Creek below the dam on public land.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

- Modify WL-3.3 as follows -
Improve furbearer habitat by implementing the following recommendations.
- (1) Modify selected existing and future water developments so that water is available at ground level to furbearers and other wildlife species. Areas with available water deficiencies will be identified prior to modification.
 - (2) Designate leave areas (i.e. islands of brush) in all areas where land treatments are conducted to provide "edge effect." Protect present native vegetative communities.
 - (3) Avert the future channelization of water courses on public land. Maintain riparian habitat in optimum condition.

Before major expenditures are made for modification of existing facilities, the need for such modifications needs to be shown. Some areas are more likely to have an abundance of available water without the need for modification. Designation of leave areas in land treatment projects will increase the "edge" and the protection of native vegetative communities will optimize wildlife habitat. Channelization of streams has been proven to increase erosion and reduce productivity of streambanks.

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

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-3, Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Acquire the following parcels of land for the benefit of waterfowl, shorebirds, fisheries and other water oriented and wildlife species.

T. 12 S., R. 17 E. Cottonwood Creek
Sec. 2: NE1/4, W1/2 SE1/4 Reservoir

T. 13 S., R. 16 E. Deep Creek
Sec. 29: W1/2 NE1/4 Reservoir

T. 16 S., R. 16 E. Shoshone Creek
Sec. 24: N1/2 NE1/4

T. 12 S., R. 18 E. South Hills-
Sec. 8: W1/2 E1/2 McMullen Creek
Sec 17: NE1/4 NW1/4,
NW1/4 NE1/4

T. 16 S., R. 17 E. Horse Creek
Sec. 24: SE1/4 NW1/4 Reservoir

T. 12 S., R. 18 E. Fifth Fork of
Sec. 25: SW1/4 SW1/4 Rock Creek
Sec. 36: W1/2 NW1/4

Protect these wetland-riparian areas after acquisition.

SUPPORT:

Lands - Preparation of land report and EA for land acquisition.

Archaeology - Assistance in acquisition for protection of cultural resources.

Recreation - Assistance in acquisition for the benefit for hunter and fisherman days.

Watershed - Assistance in acquisition for watershed benefits.

Wildlife - Assistance in acquisition.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

RATIONALE:

Acquisition of these parcels, (760 acres), will increase the amount of wetland-riparian areas in the Planning Unit. These areas are extremely important to many wildlife species.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-579, Title II, Section 205(a) states that "notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary with respect to the public lands, is authorized to acquire pursuant to this Act by purchase, exchange, donation, or eminent domain, lands or interests therein. . ."

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-3.4 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

These parcels of land totaling 760 acres have been identified for acquisition because of their wetland-riparian values for waterfowl, shorebirds, fisheries and other wildlife found in the area. Acquisition would also enlarge sportsman's use areas and enhance access availability. The recreation recommendation R-1.1 identifies access needs for several of the parcels listed in WL-3.4. The areas identified in WL-3.4 are critical to the survival and maintenance of water-oriented wildlife species. It is important that these areas be acquired to insure that they remain in prime condition to meet the needs of wildlife which use the area.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-3.4 -
Acquire all six parcels of land,
totaling 760 acres, to benefit
waterfowl, shorebirds and fisheries
values.

Reason:

BLM ownership and administration will
insure that the land use and wildlife
benefits provided will remain
available.

Support Needs:

Lands -
Preparation of land report and EA.

ISO Appraisal.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL-3.4.
2. Reject R-1.1.

Decision:

Modify the multiple-use
recommendation.

- A. Acquire the recommended lands on
Shoshone Creek, South Hill,
McMullen Creek, Horse Creek
Reservoir, and Fifth Fork of Rock
Creek.

Rationale:

Federal ownership of the parcels of
land included in A would provide
opportunity to enhance wildlife values
and protect the riparian vegetation.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Activity

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WL-3.4 Step 3

Decision (cont.):

- B. Do not acquire the lands containing Cottonwood Reservoir or Deep Creek Reservoir

Rationale (cont.):

Federal ownership of the Deep Creek and Cottonwood Reservoir tracts would not insure the objective desired for these tracts. The reservoirs were constructed to provide storage for irrigation water. If we were to acquire these lands we would still not control the water rights and thus water level fluctuations in the reservoir would be controlled by the irrigation interests. Under this situation we could not guarantee protection of riparian and wildlife values. These are man-made reservoirs for irrigation purposes and they continue to serve that need. Federal ownership in this situation would be inconsistent with the purpose and use of the reservoir.

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	WFLP
	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference	
Step	IWL-3.5 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Improve shorebird and waterfowl nesting habitat in the following manner:

- (1) restrict livestock use along all shorelines during the spring and early summer;
- (2) fence off half of each side of existing and future stockpond development;
- (3) insure adequate water in stockpond developments in the spring;
- (4) plant vegetation to enhance cover.

SUPPORT:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Range | - Development of grazing systems to restrict livestock use along shorelines in the spring and early summer. Coordination with wildlife in the development of future stockponds. Assurance of water availability. |
| Operations | - Construction of fences around stockponds and planting of vegetation. |
| Archaeology | - Assistance in design to protect archaeological values. |
| Watershed | - Assistance in design of projects to provide watershed benefits. |
| Recreation | - Assistance in project design to benefit hunter days and to provide pleasing aesthetics. |
| Wildlife | - Coordination with range and operations in location and desing of fences around stockpond and the plant species to be planted. |

RATIONALE:

Population numbers can be increased by improving existing habitat. The livestock interaction of primary concern is the impact of grazing on waterfowl nesting cover. Waterfowl nest density and nesting success are both a function of the quantity and quality of nesting cover, and heavy livestock grazing on wetlands impacts the composition and density of native marsh vegetation. Hence, waterfowl production values are severely reduced.¹ Limited grazing removes some of the dense plant cover which ducks avoid, and generally makes the area more attractive. A fence should be constructed to cover half of the dam and half of the upper area of all stockponds. This is a necessity since livestock tend to concentrate in these areas. In these areas, livestock grazing would have an adverse effect on nesting habitat. Fencing, in this case, is the only feasible method to enhance the shoreline for waterfowl and shorebird production. Stockponds need to have an assured water source in the spring to supply the water requirements for waterfowl and shorebirds. Plantings can be made around the edges to enhance the cover. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-579, Title I, Section 102(a)(7) calls for a "broad management and authority under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield." Refer the Technical Note Number T/N 327 on "Construction and Management of Stockponds for Waterfowl" for specific details. The primary shorebird of concern is the long-billed curlew, a "sensitive" species.

¹ Molini, W. A. 1977. LIVESTOCK INTERACTIONS WITH UPLAND GAME, NONGAME AND WATERFOWL IN THE GREAT BASIN. A WORKSHOP SYNOPSIS. Department of Fish and Game. Reno, Nevada.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (W/F/P)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-3.5 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

Restricting livestock use along all shorelines conflicts with range managements facilities which were installed to provide stock water. Fencing half of the ponds does not conflict with any activity. Lack of livestock use on the earthen dam has resulted in some rodent related dam failures in the Planning Unit. Ponds in the Planning Unit depend on runoff for water. For this reason, it is impossible to insure that adequate water will be available in the spring. No conflicts exist with planting vegetation so long as shrubs and trees are not planted on retention structures.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

- Modify WL-3.5 as follows -
- (1) Fence off upstream portion of existing and future stockpond developments. The whole reservoir can be fenced in some cases if a draw-down pipe and trough are installed to provide stock water.
 - (2) Plant vegetation to enhance cover as needed.

Reasons:

Fencing half of ponds will provide an area for nesting cover for waterfowl and shorebirds without restricting livestock use in spring and early summer. We have no way of insuring water will be present in ponds during spring or at any other time. Planting vegetation along edges of ponds will enhance cover.

Support Needs:

- Wildlife -
Design necessary fences and plantings.
- Operation -
Install fences and plantings.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL 3.5.
2. Accept WL 3.5.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Rationale:

This recommendation will provide for multiple-use management of rangeland resources.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: *WFP*

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife - Waterfowl

General Reference

Step *WL-3.6* Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Construct brush piles along all wetland-riparian areas used by waterfowl. Construct and install floating islands on the following bodies of water:

Berger Reservoir
Horse Creek Reservoir
Deep Creek Reservoir
Cottonwood Creek Reservoir
Bluegill Lake

and at additional sites as they become identified.

Construct and install artificial goose nesting platforms along the following water bodies:

Snake River
Salmon Falls Creek
Salmon Falls Creek Reservoir
Deep Creek Reservoir
Murtaugh Lake
Cottonwood Creek Reservoir
Shoshone Creek
Bluegill Lake

RATIONALE:

Nesting materials in the form of brush piles, when correctly constructed and located, provide nesting cover and protection as would a good stand of natural vegetation.

The value of islands to waterfowl is well documented in the literature.¹ Islands possess certain characteristics which make them beneficial to nesting waterfowl. Small islands are frequently free of resident mammals and usually, most mammalian nest predators are discouraged from investigating, consequently, a high nesting security and nesting success results.² Islands increase the shoreline surface-acre ratio which in turn increases the capacity for territorial occupancy by breeding pairs of waterfowl. Following the breeding season, this same additional shoreline provides secure loafing areas for broods plus added shallow areas for brood rearing. Islands properly placed in stockponds are usually

¹ Hammond, M. C. and Mann, G. E. 1956. WATERFOWL NESTING ISLANDS. Journal of Wildlife Management. 20(4):345-352.

Atwater, M. G. 1959. A STUDY OF RENESTING IN CANADA GEESE IN MONTANA. Journal of Wildlife Management. 23(1):91-97.

Keith, L. B. 1961. A STUDY OF WATERFOWL ECOLOGY ON SMALL IMPOUNDMENTS IN SOUTHEASTERN ALBERTA. Wildlife Monograph 6.

Deubbert, H. F. 1966. ISLAND NESTING OF GADWALL IN NORTH DAKOTA. Wilson Bulletin. 78:12-25

Drewien, R. C. and Fredrickson, L. F. 1970. HIGH DENSITY MALLARD NESTING ON A SOUTH DAKOTA ISLAND. Wilson Bulletin. 82:95-96.

Hook, D. L. 1973. PRODUCTION AND HABITAT USE BY CANADA GEESE AT FREEZEOUT LAKE, MONTANA. M. S. Thesis. Montana State University. Bozeman, Montana.

McCarthy, J. J. 1973. RESPONSE OF NESTING CANADA GEESE (*Branta canadensis*) TO ISLANDS IN STOCKDAMS IN NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA. M. S. Thesis. Montana State University. Bozeman, Montana.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

~~Keith, L. B. 1961. A STUDY OF WATERFOWL ECOLOGY ON SMALL IMPOUNDMENTS IN SOUTHEASTERN ALBERTA. Wildlife Monograph 6.~~

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Agency	Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference	
Step IWL-3.6	Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

and at additional sites as they become identified.

Construct several islands in Deep Creek Reservoir.

SUPPORT:

Operations - Construction and installation of brush piles, floating islands and goose nesting platforms.

Wildlife - Coordination with operations on design and location of waterfowl developments.

RATIONALE (cont.):

isolated from cattle grazing at least during the growing season. As a result, they often provide good to excellent nesting cover regardless of the grazing treatment being imposed on the surrounding shoreline. Lack of suitable nesting and rearing habitat is the major limiting factor for local production of Canada geese. These birds respond very favorably to improvements in existing habitat or creation of new habitat of this type and there is still an excellent potential for further increases in goose numbers. Expansion programs and more refined management can result in much greater production than current conditions. Harvests have fluctuated but have shown an increasing trend. Significantly increased demand after 1970 has resulted in a reduction in success rates. Substantial increases in population and harvests over the current level will continue through 1990 under current management levels and habitat trends. A relatively modest increase in demand is expected and success rates will improve slightly.³ Artificial goose nesting platforms will enhance the production opportunity for this species.

³ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOAL'S, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

1975-1990 Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/F):	Twin Falls
Activity:	Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference:	
Step	WL-3.7 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

RATIONALE:

Provide enhanced habitat for waterfowl and shorebirds by fencing and planting riparian vegetation in the following areas:

- (1) Cottonwood Creek Reservoir, one-half mile of fence along the east side
T. 12 S., R. 17 E.
Sec. 2: NE1/4 SE1/4;
- (2) Horse Creek Reservoir, the western edge which lies on public land
T. 16 S., R. 17E.
Sec. 24: SW1/4 NW1/4;
- (3) two Mule Creek Reservoirs
T. 16 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 32: NW1/4NW1/4;
- (4) two ponds along the draw in #4040 Noh Sections allotment
T. 15 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 2 ;
- (5) L & N and Schnitker gravel pits
T. 11 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 35: S1/2 SW1/4;
- (6) isolated pond near Auger Falls
T. 9 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 24: SE1/4 SE1/4;

The livestock interaction of primary concern is the impact of grazing on waterfowl nesting cover. Waterfowl nest density and nesting success are both a function of the quantity and quality of nesting cover, and heavy livestock grazing on wetlands impacts the composition and density of native marsh vegetation. Hence, waterfowl production values are severely reduced.¹ Vegetation in certain areas, such as meadows and drainage ways are invariably closely utilized under any stocking rate or system of grazing. Such use may be detrimental to wildlife, aesthetic, recreational or other values. Where this is the case, about the only way to preserve values is to fence the area off from grazing. Reducing livestock or adjusting the grazing season usually will not solve such a problem.² Other than the fencing of streams to exclude livestock, there are few known practical practices which can be implemented to improve or maintain quality habitat for trout.³ Duck harvests have varied depending upon population levels and the number of hunters. Success rates have generally decreased as demand increased. It is projected that under current management levels and habitat trends, essentially this same situation will persist through 1990. Populations and success rates will decrease slightly while

- ¹ Molini, W. A. 1977. LIVESTOCK INTERACTIONS WITH UPLAND GAME, NONGAME, AND WATERFOWL IN THE GREAT BASIN. A WORKSHOP SYNOPSIS. Department of Fish and Game. Reno, Nevada.
- ² Telephone conversation between Bruce Smith, Fisheries Biologist--Rock Springs BLM District and August L. Hormay, Grazing Management Specialist--DSC, on August 11, 1976, concerning rest-rotation grazing management.
- ³ Armour, C. L. 1977. EFFECTS ON DETERIORATED RANGE STREAMS ON TROUT. Bureau of Land Management. Idaho State Office. Boise, Idaho.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-100 (Rev. 1-77)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BMP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-3.7 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

- (7) Loughmiller gravel pits
T. 12 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 1: SW1/4
Sec. 2: E1/2 SE1/4;
- (8) Deep Creek Reservoir
T. 13 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 19: E1/2 SE1/4
Sec. 20: SW1/4
Sec. 29: NE1/4 NW1/4;
- (9) Two Springs Reservoir
T. 16 S., R. 18 E.
Sec. 21: NE1/4 SW 1/4;
- (10) Baker Pit Reservoir
T. 13 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 31: SW1/4 SE1/4;
- (11) #4042 PVGA - Horse Creek--
five ponds on public land in Idaho
and two ponds in Elko District on
public land managed by Burley
District BLM.

RATIONALE (cont.)

demand and harvest will show a slight increase. If existing wetland production habitat can be preserved and nesting and rearing condition enhanced, it should be possible to improve on the current situation and provide increased populations, harvest and success rates through 1990.⁴

SUPPORT:

- Range - Coordination with wildlife in determining where livestock will water.
- Operations - Construction of fences and planting of riparian vegetation.
- Archaeology - Assistance in design of projects to protect archaeological values.

⁴ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOAL'S, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: Twin Falls
Area: Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference:
Step WL-3.7 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

- Recreation - Assistance in design of projects to enhance the aesthetic value and to benefit recreationalists.
- Watershed - Assistance in design of project to further enhance the watershed.
- Wildlife - Location and design of fences and species list of riparian vegetation to plant. Coordination with range and operations.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with range needs to provide water for livestock. The proposed WPRS acquisition may or may not prevent a conflict with improving waterfowl habitat. The plan calls for developing 40 small wetland ponds and providing 1,050 acres of irrigated cooperative farming areas, 510 acres of permanent irrigated cover and 1,100 acres of dryland areas seeded to wildlife benefiting vegetation.

Proposed mineral developments conflict with the proposed fencing of Loughmiller gravel pits. Waterfowl recurrently nest on reservoirs #(1), (2), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (11). No increases in the waterfowl are discussed in relation to these or the other proposals in this recommendation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-3.7 -
Provide enhanced habitat for waterfowl and shorebirds by fencing and planting riparian vegetation. Inventory areas and develop a management plan to identify waterfowl needs.

Reasons:

A more complete picture of the existing situation and potential increase in waterfowl and shorebirds production should be identified before developments occur.

Support Needs:

Wildlife -
Inventory areas to determine present nesting use and determine possible future nesting with protection from grazing.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL-3.7.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BFD)	Twin Falls
Agency	Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-3.8 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Enhance waterfowl habitat by making the following improvements:

- (1) enlarge the Rock Cabin Spring enclosure
T. 16 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 21: SE1/4 NE1/4
to at least two acres, down the draw.
Construct small potholes within the enlarged enclosure;
- (2) construct small potholes in the Sagehen Meadow wildlife enclosure
T. 16 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 28: NE1/4 NE1/4, NW1/4 NE1/4;
- (3) retain the isolated parcels of public land around Murtaugh Lake in public ownership; identify boundaries, settle trespasses, construct fences and manage for waterfowl.

SUPPORT:

- Operations - Construction of fences and of pothole blasting.
- Lands - Trespass settlement on public land around Murtaugh Lake.
- Recreation - Assistance in design of projects to enhance the aesthetic value and to benefit recreationalists.
- Watershed - Assistance in design of projects to further enhance the watershed.
- Archaeology - Assistance in design of projects to protect archaeological values.
- Wildlife - Coordination with lands and with range on location and design of projects.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

(Instructions on reverse)

RATIONALE:

Water is an essential element to all kinds of waterfowl. Dabbling ducks prefer shallow ponds for feeding. Courting, pairing and mating activities are generally performed on small open-water areas. Mating habitat is usually one or several small, shallow, open water ponds in fields, pastures, or marshy lands. Water depths of such ponds are generally less than six inches deep and may disappear within several weeks. A shallow pond with extensive vegetation is preferred habitat for rearing broods.

Murtaugh Lake is an important area for waterfowl, especially geese. Existing public land adjacent to the lake needs to be retained in public ownership and enhanced for geese since a lack of suitable nesting and rearing habitat is the major limiting factor for local production of Canada geese.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1WL-3.8 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation draws support from cultural resource which also proposed enlarging the Rock Cabin enclosure to include more of the existing cultural site and set up studies to monitor the effects of cattle use on cultural resources. The proposed potholes could conflict with known archaeological sites.

The recommendation to retain Murtaugh Lake parcels conflicts with an existing R & PP Lease issued to Twin Falls County for construction of a park. The park has been completed and the county now has the option of purchasing this parcel. The level of development and use of this parcel severely limits its importance for waterfowl.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reasons:

Modify WL-3.8 as follows -
Enhance waterfowl habitat by making the following improvements.

Increasing the size of the Rock Cabin enclosure and adding several potholes will increase waterfowl production while helping other wildlife species. Constructing potholes in the Sagehen Meadow enclosure will provide habitat for more waterfowl nesting. The parcel of public land not carried forward from the MFP I Recommendation has already been developed for recreation use and is of limited value for waterfowl production. The isolated areas are more well suited to waterfowl.

- (1) enlarge the Rock Cabin Spring enclosure
T.16 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 21: SE1/4 NE1/4
to at least two acres, down the draw. Construct small potholes within the enclosure.
- (2) Construct small potholes in the Sagehen Meadow wildlife enclosure
T. 16 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 28: NE1/4 NE1/4,
NW1/4 NE1/4
- (3) Retain parcels of land located at the following location on Murtaugh Lake:
R. 11 S., R. 20 E.
Sec. 18: W 1/2 NW1/4 SW1/4
Sec. 17: S 1/2 S 1/2 SE1/4
Identify boundaries, settle trespasses, construct fences and manage for waterfowl.

Support Needs:

Alternatives Considered:

Same as MFP 1 Recommendation.

1. Reject WL-3.8.
2. Accept WL-3.8.

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 (BPP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Fisheries
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	WL-3.10
Step 3	

RECOMMENDATION:

Develop and implement intensive livestock grazing management systems along all streams, reservoirs and wetland-riparian areas to improve water quality and fisheries and habitat condition classes. Fence approximately 8 miles along portions of the following streams and reservoirs to improve fishery habitat through the abatement of livestock grazing:

McMullen Creek
Salmon Falls Creek
Shoshone Creek
Horse Creek Reservoir

Fence additional areas as the need becomes identified.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Implementation of grazing systems. Coordination with wildlife in fencing.
- Archaeology - Assistance in design of fences to protect cultural values.
- Watershed - Assistance in fence locations.
- Recreation - Assistance in fence layout to provide pleasing aesthetic values and for recreational access.

RATIONALE:

IDFG surveys have determined that approximately 44 percent of both resident and nonresident anglers in Idaho prefer fishing for trout species in streams. An estimated 1,800,000 fisherman days or 48 percent of the state total are expended in this pursuit.¹

The restriction of livestock use from a riparian zone will improve aquatic-riparian habitat. This improvement can be measured via reduced sedimentation, increase in streambank cover, etc. These systems must include periods of rest to improve vegetative cover. If grazing systems are not practical, fencing appears to be the only available alternative to protect the streams. Where grazing use is detrimental to wildlife, aesthetic, recreational or other values, about the only way to preserve values is to fence the area off from grazing.² These areas proposed for fencing have high fishery value and/or potential. Fencing will enable streamside cover to improve and the sediment load in the streams will be reduced to some extent. The stream will narrow up and deepen. The end result will be cooler, cleaner water with better cover for the fish. Other than the fencing of streams to exclude livestock, there are few known practical practices which can be implemented to improve or maintain quality habitat for trout.³ Areas recognized as high quality fishery and/or spawning sites should continue to be managed under existing practices.

¹ Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1978. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF IDAHO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES. Volume I: GOAL'S, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES 1975-1990. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.

² Telephone conversation between Bruce Smith, Fisheries Biologist--Rock Springs BLM District and August L. Hormay, Grazing Management Specialist--DSC, on August 11, 1976, concerning rest-rotation grazing management.

³ Armour, C. L. 1977. EFFECTS OF DETERIORATED RANGE STREAMS ON TROUT. Bureau of Land Management, Idaho State Office. Boise, Idaho.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-21, April 1974

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Agency	Wildlife - Waterfowl
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-3.9 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Designate several upland feeding fields through cooperative farm agreements, where cultivated grains will be available for waterfowl. Establish these areas adjacent to Salmon Falls Creek Reservoir, Deep Creek Reservoir and other areas as they become identified.

SUPPORT:

Recreation - Assistance in formulation of agreements to provide non-consumptive and consumptive recreational values.

Watershed - Assistance in formulation of agreements to prevent erosion.

Wildlife - Coordination and agreements with adjacent landowners in implementation of this recommendation.

RATIONALE:

The provision of upland feeding areas near waterfowl areas through cooperative farm agreements would not only improve, but expand waterfowl habitat. Upland feeding on domestic grains, seasonally, is very important. Ducks will fly several miles to upland fields where cultivated grains are available. Goose pastures (green forage containing clovers and/or alfalfa), located near nesting cover, are essential for successful production areas. Various cultivated grains such as wheat, corn, rice, barley, oats, etc. are becoming ever more important as food for waterfowl along migration paths and on wintering grounds.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with existing grazing use in the areas identified. The majority of this area is seeded to crested wheatgrass. None of the public land in the area is currently being farmed. Approximately 80 acres of public land located in the recommendation area would be Class III agricultural land if water were applied. Approximately 60 acres would be Class II agricultural land if water were applied. The remainder of the public land shown in the recommendation is not suitable for agricultural development.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Bureau of Land Management, April 1975

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WL-3.10 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

Operations - Construction of fences.
Wildlife - Location and design of fences. Coordination with range and operations.

RATIONALE (cont.):

The BLM policy on "Wetland-Riparian Area Protection and Management," Federal Register, Volume 45, Number 25, February 5, 1980, states that "riparian areas will get protection necessary to maintain and restore habitat cover and diversity, etc."

Multiple Use Analysis

The portion of this recommendation dealing with fencing McMullen and Shoshone Creek conflicts with existing livestock use which depends upon water from these streams. Watershed recommendations support fencing of these streams as do visual resource recommendations. Range management recommendations support development and implementation of grazing systems.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify WL-3.10 as follows -
Develop and implement intensive livestock grazing management systems to improve water quality and fisheries and habitat condition classes in allotments along McMullen Creek, Salmon Falls Creek, Shoshone Creek and Horse Creek Reservoir. Install enclosures on selected areas and compare the ungrazed to grazed areas. If there is no response to grazing systems, fence as necessary to improve condition class. Fence additional areas as the need becomes identified.

Reasons:

The choice of using intensive management initially is related to the costs involved in fencing and the aesthetics of fences along streams. A monitoring plan will determine the effectiveness of intensive grazing management toward improving riparian habitat. If the intensive management systems do not improve habitat condition, fencing should be initiated.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1977)