

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFD)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Fisheries
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-3.11 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Improve bank stabilization and fisheries habitat along the following streams by planting willows, cottonwoods, grasses, roses, etc. where vegetation is scarce or lacking or by installing rip-rap, brush, log barriers or drop logs, etc. along the banks and by installing instream structures such as k-dams, logdams, trash catchers, digger logs, etc. in:

McMullen Creek
Shoshone Creek
Salmon Falls Creek
Fifth Fork of Rock Creek
Horse Creek Reservoir
Salmon Falls Creek Reservoir

Improve bank stabilization and fisheries habitat along additional water bodies as they become identified.

SUPPORT:

- Operations - Construction, installation and planting of various bank stabilization projects.
- Watershed - Assistance with bank stabilization projects for watershed protection.
- Recreation - Assistance in projects to provide pleasing aesthetic values and for the benefit of fishermen.
- Wildlife - Design and location of bank stabilization projects. Coordination with operations in implementation.

RATIONALE:

Improvements would enhance water quality, pool quality (depth/size), spawning gravels (silt/sediments), streambank cover stability (soil/vegetation) and fisheries survival and productivity. The vegetation will provide very important shade to the stream. This shade will lower the water temperature and thus result in improved fishery habitat. The overhanging willows will also serve as important cover for the fish. The structures along the bank will help to control livestock use along the shoreline and reduce sediment load into the stream. The instream structures will improve instream cover for the fish by forming deeper pools on the downstream side of the structure.

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Fisheries
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-3.12 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Improve fisheries habitat in the following streams in the following ways:

- (1) dredge Horse Creek Reservoir to make it deeper;
- (2) maintain the fish barrier in Upper Salmon Falls Creek;
- (3) poison the squawfish in Shoshone Creek and Salmon Falls Creek with "Squawtoxin;"
- (4) reduce and abate the sediment from agricultural and rangeland runoffs entering lower Salmon Falls Creek from public land from Lilly Grade to the Snake River.

SUPPORT:

- Watershed - Assistance in recommended projects to benefit watershed.
- Recreation - Assistance in recommended projects to enhance aesthetic values and improve recreational values.
- Operations - Construction and installation of projects.
- IDFG - Poisoning of squawfish with "Squawtoxin."
- Wildlife - Design and location of projects. Coordination with operations and IDFG.

RATIONALE:

Horse Creek Reservoir should be made deeper by dredging via a drag line. This would help to prevent winter kills and kills due to a low draw down if a drought should ever occur again.

The fish barrier should be maintained so as to prohibit the movement of trash fish from Salmon Falls Creek Reservoir upstream into Shoshone Creek. Maintenance of the fish barrier would help to maintain the integrity of the fisheries in Shoshone Creek.

The squawfish is an aggressive predator of trout. They not only eat small trout, but prey heavily upon the eggs and fry (or young). Squawtoxin is 90 percent restricted to squawfish. It may kill some of the other trash fish, but will not bother the game fish. This project should be done in full cooperation with IDFG.

The sediment from agricultural and rangeland runoffs entering Salmon Falls Creek needs to be abated so as to reduce the sediment load entering Salmon Falls Creek. By reducing this additional sediment load, the water quality, and hence fisheries habitat, would improve.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Fisheries
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-3.13 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Provide habitat for the sculpin found in Dry Creek by controlling or abating the introduction of wastewater into Dry Creek.

SUPPORT:

- Watershed - Assistance in controlling or abating the wastewater outfall to improve water quality.
- Recreation - Assistance in improving Dry Creek to make it a trout fishery for sportsmen.
- IDFG - Identification of the sculpin found in Dry Creek.
- Wildlife - Determination of exact location (public or private land) of wastewater outfall and then abatement of wastewater into Dry Creek.

RATIONALE:

There are two endemic species of scuplins in Idaho, one of which is currently found in Riley and Billingsly creeks in the Hagerman Valley and at several springs along the Snake River (Box Canyon, Blue Heart Springs, etc.). This is the Shoshone sculpin, a "sensitive" species. The sculpin which was found in Dry Creek should be identified by IDFG to determine if it may-in-fact also be a "sensitive" species. If it is found to be "sensitive," the habitat must be improved to a good or excellent condition class. The wastewater outfall should be abated to improve the current fisheries habitat not only for the possibility of the Shoshone sculpin residing in the creek, but also for the trout fishery potential which exists for Dry Creek.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Shoshone sculpin is considered a "sensitive" species in Idaho. The IDFG conducted a stream survey for the BLM during the summer of 1979. No game fish were collected, but seven scuplins were found. At that time, the scuplins were not identified to species. Since the Shoshone sculpin has been found in creeks coming into the Snake River, it is important to determine the specific species of the sculpin in Dry Creek. It is important to control or abate the introduction of wastewater into Dry Creek not only for the Shoshone sculpin, if in fact it does exist, but also for the trout fishery potential which exists. It is important that the Soil Conservation Service become involved in the abatement of waste water into Dry Creek. The IDFG supports this habitat improvement. The minerals recommendation M-4.4 could be implemented only if it does not adversely affect the fisheries.

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: WFFD
Twin Falls

Agency:
Wildlife - Fisheries

Overlay Reference
Step 1 WL-3.14 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

RATIONALE:

Enhance and maintain the habitat in and along the following streams and reservoirs for the stocking of the following game fish species:

Fifth Fork of Rock Creek	- Brook Trout Cutthroat Trout
McMullen Creek	- Brook Trout Cutthroat Trout
Shoshone Creek	- Rainbow Trout Brook Trout Cutthroat Trout
Bluegill Lake	- Largemouth Bass
Horse Creek Reservoir	- Rainbow Trout Cutthroat Trout Brown Trout
Berger Reservoir	- Black and White Crappie

Fisherman days per year on public land for streams and reservoirs in the Planning Unit has and will continue to increase in the future. The Planning Area Analysis (PAA) shows an average increase of 42 percent in fisherman days from 1975 to 1995. The PAA reflects the importance of fisheries in the Planning Unit. It is reflected in the expenditure of \$104,392.24 and \$737,667.00 for stream fishing and reservoir fishing, respectively, on public land in 1980. This will increase to an estimated \$767,944.00 for stream fishing and \$5,336,560.00 for reservoir fishing by 1995.

Stock additional areas as they become identified.

SUPPORT:

Watershed	- Assistance in habitat enhancement to improve water quality.
Recreation	- Assistance in habitat enhancement to provide an improved fisheries for sportsmen.
IDFG	- Stocking of fish in designated areas.
Wildlife	- Work with IDFG in the stocking of fish in the Planning Unit.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Instructions on reverse.

Form BLM-21 April 1978

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (W/F/P)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Fisheries
Overlay Reference	WL-3.15
Step 1	Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Protect, maintain and encourage the beaver activity in the Fifth Fork of Rock Creek and Shoshone Creek. Provide habitat in McMullen Creek to support a beaver introduction.

RATIONALE:

Beaver activity should be encouraged so as to act as a buffer against reduced water flow in late season and seasons of drought. The beaver will create instream structure that in turn will provide excellent pools for use as fish holding and overwintering areas.

SUPPORT:

Wildlife - Coordination with IDFG in introducing and maintaining beaver populations.

Multiple Use Analysis

The encouragement of beaver activity is important in that it will act as a buffer against reduced water flow in late seasons and seasons of drought. Watershed supports this recommendation. The instream structures constructed by the beaver will provide excellent pools for use as fish holding and overwintering areas. Sport fishing would be enhanced.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-3.15 -
Protect, maintain and encourage beaver activity.

Reason:

Beaver activity in streams will be beneficial not only to wildlife, but watershed and recreation as well.

Support Needs:

Transplant by IDFG.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL-3.15.

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-4
Area	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - In General
Objective Number	WL-4

OBJECTIVE:

Improve and maintain terrestrial, aquatic and wetland-riparian habitats for threatened and endangered, sensitive and high interest mammalian and avian species, amphibians and reptiles, and all other non-game mammalian and avian species.

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.

Non-game wildlife species are scattered throughout the Planning Unit. They are found in all habitat types. BLM has the responsibility to maintain the habitat to support viable populations of all vertebrate species as a wildlife resource to accommodate consumptive and non-consumptive uses. Public interest in non-game species has increased in recent years. Nearly each and every wildlife species currently has a public advocate. Interest will continue to increase in response to growing environmental awareness.

Non-game wildlife also provide an economic benefit. Expenditures related to sport hunting are a factor. Value of non-game pelts taken is significant. Non-consumptive uses such as observational, educational, photography and scientific study also involve considerable expenditures at the present time. There is the potential for a very large increase in monetary values related to non-consumptive uses.

Many of these non-game mammalian and avian species are listed on the Idaho Sensitive Species list (Instruction Memo Number ID-77-96). The bald eagle is on the Federal Threatened and Endangered Species list. It merits special consideration. BLM manual 6840 provides direction with respect to both sensitive and threatened and endangered wildlife species. FLPMA, NEPA, and ESA, are among other laws, all provide a strong basis to support this objective.

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.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: *MFP*
Twin Falls

Activity:
Wildlife - Raptors

Overlay Reference
Step 1 *WL-4.1* Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Acquire the following parcel of land to improve the raptor habitat prey base:

T. 11 S., R. 14 E. - Berger Section
Sec. 36

SUPPORT:

- Lands - Preparation of land report and EA for land acquisition.
- Recreation - Assistance in acquisition to provide aesthetic value to the Berger.
- Watershed - Assistance in acquisition to protect watershed values.
- Wildlife - Assistance in acquisition.

RATIONALE:

Acquisition of Section 36 (Kerr private) will allow expansion of raptor habitat on public land by providing an expansion area for the raptor prey base.

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 recommendation does not conflict with any activity recommendation. Acquisition of this section of untreated rangeland would not only ensure cover for raptor prey species but could also serve as an area to illustrate the condition of the entire Berger Tract prior to treatment.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-4.1 -
Acquire section 36, T.11 S., R.14 E.

Reason:

Acquisition of this section will ensure cover for raptor prey species and thereby ensure a food supply for raptors in the area.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-111 April 1975

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (BFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Raptors
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-4.2 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Permit oil and gas exploration, surface mining and other activities except during the following periods:

- (1) within one-half mile from Salmon Falls Creek rim for the period March 1 through July 15;
- (2) within one-half mile of known, active golden eagle eyries for the period March 1 through June 30;
- (3) within one-half mile of active ferruginous hawk nests for the period March 1 through July 15.

SUPPORT:

Minerals - Assistance in implementing the above recommendation.

Wildlife - Coordination with all resources in restricting activities along Salmon Falls Canyon rim and around nest sites of golden eagles and ferruginous hawks.

RATIONALE:

The high density of nesting raptors in Salmon Falls Canyon should be protected by restricting all activity and surface occupancy within one-half mile of Salmon Falls Canyon rim for the period recommended. The influence of human activity is responsible for reduced nesting success of raptors.¹ Several sensitive and many high interest raptors inhabit Salmon Falls Canyon. In the Birds of Prey Natural Area adult eagles tolerate activity in the Snake River Canyon below their nests but are very intolerant of human activity on the canyon rim above, particularly during the early nesting season.² Golden eagles nest frequently and readily desert their nest during the period of incubation. Human activity should be restricted from the time the eagles start incubating their eggs until the eaglets are two weeks old. It is unlikely that the adults would desert the nests and young after that. Desertion by the adults and/or premature leaving from the nest by the young can result from human disturbance. Human activity in an area where golden eagles nest or hunt will be sufficient to cause them to desert even if harassment is not deliberate. Although eyries may not be disturbed, hunting territory may be disrupted and prey population reduced, which may have adverse effects on eagles. During the incubation period, ferruginous hawks are sensitive to human activity and even slight disturbances may cause nest abandonment.³ They will readily abandon their nests even after a single visit if the young are still unhatched.

¹ Craighead, J. J. and Craighead, Jr., F. C. 1956. HAWKS, OWLS AND WILDLIFE. The Stackpole Company. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Wildlife Management Institute. Washington D. C.

² Kochert, M. N. 1973. GOLDEN EAGLE CRITIQUE. Available at Conservation Library. Denver Public Library.

³ Olendorff, R. R. 1973. THE ECOLOGY OF THE NESTING BIRDS OF PREY OF NORTHEASTERN COLORADO. International Biological Program. Technical Report Number 211. Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory. Colorado State University. Fort Collins, Colorado.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed.

Instructions

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Wildlife - Raptors

Overlay Reference
Step 1 WL-4.3 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Provide habitat for the raptor prey base by maintaining native sagebrush communities and allowing irregular patches of native brush to grow back into vast grass areas to increase the "edge" effect, thus wildlife species diversity. Prohibit any type of land treatment, (except fire rehabilitation efforts), within one-half mile of Salmon Falls Canyon rim. Provide for a minimum of 15 percent for the total land treatment area, (spraying, discing, burning, crested wheatgrass planting, etc.), to be left in its present stage of succession in the form of islands scattered throughout the treated area to improve ferruginous hawk habitat.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Coordinatin with wildlife for all range land treatments
- Operations - Layout of land treatment areas.
- Recreation - Assistance in design of projects to provide pleasing aesthetic values.
- Watershed - Assistance in design of projects to enhance watershed value.
- Archaeology - Assistance in implementing recommendation to protect cultural values.
- Wildlife - Design and location of "leave" areas and areas to be protected. Coordination with range and operations before on-the-ground work commences.

RATIONALE:

The majority of raptors in the Planning Unit depend upon ground dwelling mammals for a substantial portion of their diet. Any land treatment that will break up large, monotypic stands of vegetation will enhance raptor habitat. This will result in diverse, thus improved prey base; the prey will be more available to the hunting raptor. It is important to protect the native vegetation within one-half mile of the Salmon Falls Canyon rim in order to maintain the integrity of the raptor prey base. Development of large monotypic areas reduces the number of prey available to the raptors living in the canyon, who do much of their hunting on the rim and adjacent areas. Treating small tracts of land, creating many interspersed areas, will be most beneficial to raptors. This allows for some habitat suitable for possible reproduction and re-establishment of the prey base in the treated areas.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1000-11 April 1963

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-4.3 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

The area described in this recommendation is used extensively by raptors. Raptors hunt extensively along the edge of sagebrush areas and over crested wheatgrass seedings. These crested wheatgrass seedings are also an important forage source for livestock using the area. Four allotments included in this recommendation are currently not producing adequate forage to meet the grazing preference demand.

This recommendation conflicts with several of the specific activity recommendations as shown in the Impact Analysis. Activities with conflicts are recreation, lands, fire and range.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation to allow for vegetative treatment within the half mile buffer strip. Evaluate each project proposed to determine leave areas and problems. Do not treat islands of brush originally omitted from treatments. All treatments within the buffer strip will be evaluated to include recommendations from the wildlife biologist to determine specific areas to leave and layout of the treatment to ensure irregular treatment patterns. A minimum of 15 percent of the treatment area will be omitted from treatment.

Support Needs:

- Range -
Coordinate with wildlife for all range treatments.
- Recreation -
Assistance in design of projects to provide pleasing aesthetic values.
- Wildlife -
Design and locate the leave areas to be protected. Coordination with range and operations before on-the-ground work commences.

Reason:

The recommendation allocates the resources as a compromise that will provide raptor habitat and livestock forage. The recommendation does not provide maximum benefits for raptors or livestock forage but does provide benefits for both. The recommendation as modified appears to be favorable to all resource values that have been identified.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept WL-4.3.
2. Reject WL-4.3.
3. Modify WL-4.3 to do no land treatment within one-half mile of Salmon Falls Canyon rim.

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 WL-4.3 Step 3

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Rationale:

Each specific treatment should be individually designed to insure protection and enhancement of raptor habitat while meeting other multiple use needs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Agency	Wildlife - Raptors
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	WL-4.4
Step 3	

RECOMMENDATION:

Initiate livestock grazing in known curlew nesting areas after June 15 to maintain habitat and to prevent nest losses from trampling and abandonment.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Develop grazing systems to adhere to the above recommendation.
- Watershed - Assistance in implementing recommendation to enhance watershed values.
- Wildlife - Identification of areas in which to implement grazing systems.

RATIONALE:

Generally, grazing is compatible and often beneficial to long-billed curlew and burrowing owl populations. Trampling of ground nests is a problem with livestock grazing in curlew nesting areas in the spring. The long-billed curlew and western burrowing owl are considered "sensitive" species in Idaho. It is important that their habitat be maintained in optimum condition.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation has the potential for conflict with the normal use on over 30 allotments in the Planning Unit. The proposed restrictions on restricting grazing until after 6/15 could affect any permittee upon who's allotment a nest is found. No quantification of nest trampling or abandonment is given. No such cases have been reported in the Planning Unit to date.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify WL-4.4 -
If a critical nesting area is identified, modify the grazing system to protect the long-billed curlew.

Reason:

The chances of a nest being trampled or abandoned as a result of livestock grazing is not sufficient to disrupt existing livestock use periods. The spring period is a critical time for the nesting long-billed curlew which is a "sensitive" species." Any measures which can be implemented to prevent this species from becoming endangered should be incorporated into management plans.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instruct us on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Raptors
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-4.5 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Maintain the habitat in Salmon Falls Creek Canyon for the nesting and brood rearing of endangered, sensitive and high interest raptors.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Assistance in reducing and/or abating livestock grazing in the canyon.
- Recreation - Assistance in implementing the recommendation to provide pleasing aesthetic values to sportsmen.
- Archaeology - Assistance in implementing recommendations to protect cultural resources.
- Watershed - Assistance in implementing recommendation to enhance watershed.
- Wildlife - Maintain optimum raptor habitat in Salmon Falls Canyon. Work with other resources in protecting this area.

RATIONALE:

Salmon Falls Creek canyon exhibits a unique concentration of nesting raptors, including golden eagles, prairie falcons, red-tailed hawks, Swainson's hawks, American kestrels, Great-horned owls, barn owls, etc. To date, ten different raptorial species have been observed nesting on public land in the canyon. In 1980, 19 pairs of golden eagles, 19 pairs of prairie falcons and 22 pairs of red-tailed hawks were observed nesting in the area.¹ For the 45 linear miles of public land along Salmon Falls Creek, the following data was derived.

Year	Number of		Density
	Nesting Pairs	Number of Species	
1979	29	5	.6/linear mile
1980	67	6	1.5/linear mile

This data is not all inclusive.

Several "sensitive" and numerous high interest raptorial species inhabit Salmon Falls canyon. The Bald Eagle, an endangered species, has been observed in the canyon during the winter (Linda Parsons, Personal Observation 1-9-81), and near the canyon at other times of the year.

According to the Twin Falls County survey, 26.8 percent of the individuals surveyed were against grazing and ORV use in Salmon Falls Canyon. They felt that the canyon from Salmon Dam downstream to Balanced Rock should be managed as a special management area with no livestock grazing or ORV recreation allowed.

¹ Western Environmental Research Associates (WERA). 1980. INVENTORY OF THE THREATENED, ENDANGERED AND SENSITIVE BIRD SPECIES IN THE BURLEY BLM DISTRICT. Pocatello, Idaho.

² 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 - Raptors
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-4.7 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Improve raptor habitat by modifying selected sections of power lines and/or poles to prevent electrocution hazard. Place future power lines underground if possible.

SUPPORT:

- Recreation - Assistance with lands and wildlife in location and/or design of power lines, power poles, etc. to enhance aesthetic values.
- Lands - Insure that all future power-line right-of-ways and right-of-way renewals conform to raptor proof specifications.
- Wildlife - Work with lands to insure that powerlines conform to raptor proof specifications.

RATIONALE:

Eagles and raptors tend to use power poles in areas where natural perches are lacking. In the Planning Unit, very few perch sites, other than power poles, are available to the high population of raptors in the area. The design of power lines should be altered to prevent electrocutions. Since an electrocuted eagle frequently causes an interruption in transmission, such alterations should also be beneficial to the power companies by reducing the time they need to repair such power outages. In many cases the entire line will not have to be modified but only sections of a line and/or related poles. Raptors tend to select preferred poles and these must be raptor proofed. New power lines should be placed underground, if possible, or constructed according to specifications which eliminate electrocutions. Raptor proof power line construction specifications are outlined in the following publication:

Miller, D., Boeker, E. L., Thorsell, R. S. and Olendorff, R. R. 1975. SUGGESTED PRACTICES FOR RAPTOR PROTECTION ON POWER-LINES. Raptor Research Foundation, Inc., for Edison Electric Institute.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. Modification of powerlines to prevent raptor electrocutions will help to protect existing raptor populations in the Planning Unit.

Installation of underground powerlines across public land in the Planning Unit would be expensive to the power companies involved. Power companies have indicated that underground lines are cost prohibitive for major transmission lines.

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 (WFD)	Twin Falls
Agency	Wildlife - Raptors
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-4.8 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Protect abandoned mine shafts, tunnels, caves, cliff areas and ponds and their associated riparian vegetation to enhance spotted bat habitat.

SUPPORT:

- Minerals - Assistance in protection of recommended areas to protect minerals.
- Recreation - Assistance in protection of recommended areas for non-consumptive recreational uses.
- Archaeology - Assistance in implementation of recommendation to protect cultural resources.
- Wildlife - Coordinate the protection of these areas with the other resources.

RATIONALE:

The spotted bat is a "sensitive" species. It has been collected most often in desert terrain that is rough and dry.¹ This species might be found in caves.² This is why it is important to protect abandoned mine shafts, tunnels and cave areas. The spotted bat normally roosts in rocky crevices of canyon and cliff walls.³ Any type of water impoundment would only be beneficial to spotted bats, especially if located in close association to roosting sites. Spotted bats prefer to feed on insects found on and adjacent to ponds in arid areas. Pond developments and the encouragement of aquatic vegetation would support numerous insect populations and hence enhance spotted bat habitat. Since the spotted bat is a "sensitive" species, we are obligated to give it some special management consideration.

¹ Watkins, L. C. 1977. Euderma maculatum. Mammalogy Special Note 77.

² Vorhies, C. J. 1935. THE ARIZONA SPECIMEN OF Euderma maculatum. Journal of Mammalogy. 16:224-226.

Hardy, R. 1941. SOME NOTES OF UTAH BATS. Journal of Mammalogy. 22:289-295.

³ Easterla, D. A. 1973. ECOLOGY OF THE 18 SPECIES OF CHIROPTERA AT BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK, TEXAS. Northwest Missouri State University Study. 34(2 & 3).

Easterla, D. A. 1976. NOTES ON THE SECOND AND THIRD NEWBORN OF THE SPOTTED BAT, Euderma maculatum, AND COMMENTS ON THE SPECIES IN TEXAS. American Midland Naturalist. 96:499-501.

Poche, R. M. and Ruffner, G. A. 1975. ROOSTING BEHAVIOR OF MALE Euderma maculatum FROM UTAH. Great Basin Naturalist. 35:121-122.

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 - Non-Game
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-4.9 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Plant windbreak, cluster plantings of various fruits and berry-producing plants and other vegetative species, as they become identified on a site-by-site basis, in the wildlife enclosures in the Planning Unit to increase the food base and to enhance wildlife habitat for all nongame wildlife species. Protect fence rows, shorelines, streambanks and odd areas for wildlife. Retain islands of brush and promptly initiate reseeding projects on burned, chained, drilled, plowed, sprayed, etc. areas to provide food and cover for all wildlife species. Include a minimum of the following species in reseedings:

- - fourwing saltbush
- - ladak alfalfa
- - small burnett
- - wheatgrasses

SUPPORT:

- Range - Protection of certain areas and retention of brush islands in all land treatment projects.
- Operations - Vegetative plantings and layout of brush retention areas for wildlife.
- Recreation - Assistance in implementation of recommendation to provide pleasing aesthetic value and for non-consumptive recreational uses.
- Watershed - Assistance in implementation of recommendation to reduce wind erosion.
- Wildlife - Coordination with range and operations in location and design of plantings and brush retention areas.

RATIONALE:

Food for non-game wildlife species consists of a variety of items. The type and amount of cover required by non-game mammalian species is variable. For non-game birds, cover is an important factor in their life. It provides nesting, brood-rearing, escape and protection from the elements. It is important to enhance non-game avian habitat because a loss of suitable habitat is in direct conflict with bird populations. Many non-game wildlife species fulfill an important function as major prey species for avian and mammalian predators. Many of these non-game species are endemic to certain vegetative types. Trees and shrubs are necessary for some song bird migrations. Any disruption of their narrow ecological niche results in the disappearance or reduction of this particular species. By planting various vegetative species and protecting existing vegetative areas, non-game wildlife species will be insured of having suitable habitat required for their survival. In the Twin Falls County survey, 17.9 percent of the people surveyed were in favor of emphasizing the wildlife program on public land.¹ This shows that there is a true interest in the Planning Unit for wildlife preservation and enhancement. It is in the non-game area that BLM can show a true multiple use philosophy of land use management.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Barley District Memo. - 1980. RESULTS OF THE TWIN FALLS SURVEY. 1607.

Instructions on reverse

November 19, 1980.

Form 1600-1, April 1975

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife - Non-Game

Overlap Reference

Step: WL-4.10 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (*Decision*)

Enhance wildlife habitat for non-game species by implementing the following for livestock management:

- for seeded areas, avoid more than the following utilization percentages:
 - 40 percent utilization for spring use,
 - 60 percent utilization for summer use,
 - 60 percent utilization for fall and winter use;
- for native ranges of key species, avoid more than the following utilization percentages:
 - 30 percent utilization of spring use,
 - 40 percent utilization of summer use,
 - 50 percent utilization of fall and winter use;
- increase plant vigor and seed and forage production of desirable plants via seed trampling and management systems.

RATIONALE:

By not allowing more than the recommended utilization, this will insure that sufficient vegetation will be available to provide adequate nesting, forage, cover, etc. for non-game animals. It is imperative that the habitat be maintained, especially, to provide for small mammal needs because many of these animals have very small home ranges and cannot move to the "rest" areas. Non-game habitat will be greatly improved by increasing plant vigor and seed and forage production of desirable plants.

SUPPORT:

- Range - Management of livestock to adhere to recommended utilization percentages.
- Recreation - Coordination with range in implementing this recommendation to provide pleasing aesthetic value of the landscape.
- Watershed - Coordination with range in implementing this recommendation to enhance watershed values.
- Wildlife - Work with range in following recommended utilization for enhancement of non-game wildlife habitat.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 100-11 April 64

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-4.11 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with lands L-3.1 which identifies areas including enclosures to be developed for agriculture. Fire F-1.4 includes these areas in the Berger limited suppression area. Range RM-2.1 includes these areas in seeding maintenance proposals. The water for these enclosures and the proposed playa pipeline come from the Berger pipeline system. Pumping and operation of this system is paid for by the livestock permittees using the system. Use of water for wildlife at periods when livestock are not in the area could be a problem from a monetary standpoint.

The cost of power for running water to the enclosures based on 1980 power costs would be \$50 per enclosure. A wet area in the playa could be maintained for about \$200 per year for pumping cost.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-4.11.

Reasons:

Supplying water to the enclosures and playa will ensure a water source for wildlife species in the area at times when water is in limited supply.

Support Needs:

Wildlife -
Develop agreement with Berger Water Association.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WL-4.11.

Decision:

Modify the multiple-use recommendation.

Do not provide water to the playa area.

Rationale:

Provide water to the seven listed wildlife enclosures.

The playa supports a sensitive plant species (*Lepidium davisii*). Running water onto the playa would increase livestock and wildlife use resulting in possible injury to the plants.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Wildlife - Non-Game

Overlay Reference

Step WL-4.11 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Enhance cover and provide water for wildlife by:

- (1) maintaining running water into the seven wildlife enclosures on the Berger;

L & W
Parrott
Lierman
Kaster
Koch
Point S
Martens

from 4/1 through 9/30 each year.;

- (2) installing three-fourths mile of pipeline to provide water to the playa area in

T. 11 S., R. 14 E.

Sec. 33: NE1/4 SW1/4

and then construction of a fence to protect the area from grazing.

RATIONALE:

By providing water to the wildlife enclosures on the Berger and to the playa area, there will be increased food, cover and water supply to all wildlife species. This habitat enhancement project will also expand the range of several non-game species which require water daily. Since livestock tend to concentrate in wet areas construction of a fence around the playa will protect it from livestock grazing and trampling. Since the playa is a unique area it should be protected.

SUPPORT:

- Operations - Installation of pipeline to the playa area and fence construction.
- Recreation - Assistance in implementing this recommendation to provide pleasing aesthetic values and recreational opportunities.
- Archaeology - Assistance in implementing this recommendation to protect cultural resources.
- Watershed - Assistance in implementing this recommendation to enhance watershed.
- Wildlife - Coordination with range in leaving water turned on for the wildlife enclosures and in the development of the playa area.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-4.11 April 1974

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Agency	Wildlife - Non-Game
Overlay Reference	Step WL-4.12 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Install bird guzzlers in the following locations and at future locations as they become identified.

T. 14 S., R. 15 E.
Sec. 26: E1/2 NE1/4 - Yraugi Sections

T. 11 S., R. 17 E.
Sec. 28: SE1/4 SE1/4 - Hub Butte
or
Sec. 33: NE1/4 NE1/4

T. 12 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 13: SE1/4 SW1/4 - Landing Strip

T. 12 S., R. 16 E.
Sec. 35: NW1/4 - Gravel Pits

T. 11 S., R. 14 E.
Sec. 36 - Berger (pending acquisition)

Install bird guzzlers on existing and future pipelines as they become identified. Modify existing and design future water developments to make water readily available at ground level to all wildlife species. Install wildlife escape ramps on all existing and future livestock watering developments. Fence wildlife waters to prevent use by livestock.

SUPPORT:

Range - Identification of the location of existing and future pipelines and livestock watering developments.

Operations - Construction and installation of bird guzzlers, wildlife escape ramps and fences.

RATIONALE:

Water collection and storage facilities, "bird guzzlers," should be constructed at strategic locations in order to provide year-long water for wildlife. The guzzler would provide water during the summer and fall periods when free water is not as readily available. The installation of bird guzzlers on pipelines would provide available water for sole use by wildlife. Modification of water developments and installation of wildlife escape ramps is important to all wildlife species. These developments would enhance water availability.

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 - Non-Game
Overlay Reference:	Step WL-4.12 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

- Recreation - Assistance in design of projects to provide pleasing aesthetic values.
- Watershed - Assistance in design of fences to protect watershed values.
- Wildlife - Coordination with range and operations in design and location of bird guzzlers, escape ramps and other related developments.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any activity recommendation. Installation of bird guzzlers will provide an available water source for any wildlife species in the areas identified. Modification of existing water development should not conflict as long as existing livestock water is not decreased. Fencing of wildlife water areas will not conflict as long as livestock water is accessible.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-4.12 -
Install guzzlers, modify water developments, install wildlife escape ramps, and fence wildlife watering areas.

Reason:

Installation of bird guzzlers and modification of existing facilities will improve availability of water for wildlife. Installation of wildlife ramps will reduce drowning losses. Fencing wildlife water areas will increase escape and nesting cover near water.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife - Non-Game
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-4.13 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Develop nesting structures having the proper size and shape of entrance holes for a particular species to provide nesting habitat.

SUPPORT:

Operations - Construction and installation of bird houses.

Recreation - Assistance in developing projects to provide increased non-consumptive recreational values.

Wildlife - Design and location of bird houses.

RATIONALE:

In the Planning Unit relatively few trees exist on public land. In order to expand non-game avian habitat on public land, bird houses need to be installed. Installation of these houses will provide nesting habitat where it currently does not exist. To date, a dozen kestrel nest boxes have been put up in the Planning Unit. Nest success in these artificial nest boxes the first year out proved to be 100 percent, less human disturbance to boxes, (Linda Parsons, 1979, 1980, Personal Observation). This goes to show that nest boxes will be readily accepted and used.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendations. If sufficient natural nesting sites are available, there is little need for artificial structures other than having birds nesting on public land rather than private land.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-4.13

Reason:

Where it can be shown that a deficiency in nesting sites exists for a particular species, artificial nesting structures can improve habitat and increase populations of these species.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Wildlife in General
Overlay Reference	
Step	WL-4.14 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Decision)

Acquire the following easement and/or access routes to allow public access to BLM land for fishing, hunting and wildlife management:

Priority No.	Name and Number of Easement or Access Road	Legal Description	Estimated Length
1	1,000 Springs North Tract	T.9S., R.14E. Sec. 9: NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$.1 mile
2	1,000 Springs South Tract	T.9S., R.14E. Sec. 9: SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$.25 mile
3	Cottonwood Tract	T.11S., R.17E. Sec. 24: S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 25: N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ T.11S., R.18E. Sec. 30: SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$.75 mile
4	Springtown Tract	T.10S., R.18E. Sec. 11: SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.3 mile
5	1,000 Spring West	T.9S., R.14E. Sec. 17: SW $\frac{1}{4}$.9 mile
6	Echo Lake Tract	T.10S., R.18E. Sec. 4: SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$.25 mile
7	River West Tract	T.11S., R.20E. Sec. 5	.3 mile
8	River East Tract	T.11S., R.20E. Sec. 4	.2 mile
9	Eden Tract	T.10S., R.19E. Sec. 26: E $\frac{1}{2}$.8 mile
10	Miracle Springs Tract	T.9S., R.14E. Sec. 6: E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$.75 mile
11	Deep Creek Reservoir	T.13S., R.16E. Sec. 19: SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 20: NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 29: NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$.85 mile
12	South Hills via Kunkel	T.12S., R.18E. Sec. 2: E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.5 mile
13	Fifth Fork	T.12S., R.18E. Sec. 25: S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 36: W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$.75 mile
14	McMullen Creek	T.12S., R.18E. Sec. 8: W $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$	1 mile
15	Shoshone Creek	T.16S., R.16E. Sec. 24: NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$.25 mile

RATIONALE:

An ATROW Specialist should begin an aggressive easement acquisition program on wildlife habitat related access needs. With each passing year these easements are becoming more difficult to acquire. The public is being "locked" out of more and more public land. This lack of legal access also creates problems for BLM with respect to its management of isolated parcels. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-579, Title V, Section 502(a) states that "The Secretary, with respect to the public lands, is authorized to provide for the acquisition, construction and maintenance of roads within and near the public lands . . . and at the same time meet the requirements for protection, development and management of such lands for utilization of the other resources there-of." According to the Twin Falls County survey, 58.9 percent of the people surveyed felt that BLM should do something in acquiring legal access to public land. Other comments included, "access should be provided" and "provide better access for young and old."¹ It appears to be obvious that access to the public lands is a strong concern of user groups. Easements and/or access should be acquired expeditiously.

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

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 in General

Overlay Reference

Step WL-4.14 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION (cont.):

16	Green Private	T.14S., R.17E. Sec. 4: NW $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 5: NE $\frac{1}{2}$, NE $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$	1.5 mile
17	North Cottonwood Creek	T.12S., R.17E. Sec. 35: SE $\frac{1}{2}$.8 mile
18	Squaw Joe	T.12S., R.17E. Sec. 31: SW $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$.3 mile
19	Goat Springs	T.13S., R.17E. Sec. 18: NE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$.25 mile
20	Ridge Isolated	T.15S., R.16E. Sec. 5: SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 8: W $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 13: S $\frac{1}{2}$ Ridge Sec. 14: SE $\frac{1}{2}$, NW $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 15: NE $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 19: E $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 22: W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$	6.8 mile
21	Sharp-Lost Creek	T.15S., R.16E. Sec. 25: N $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 26: NE $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$	3 miles
22	Point Ranch	T.14S., R.15E. Sec. 35: S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ T.15S., R.15E. Sec. 2: N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$.75 mile
23	Rich Sections	T.15S., R.16E. Sec. 11: SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 12: W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 14: NE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	1.4 mile
24	Schnell-Salmon Tract	T.14S., R.15E. Sec. 26: SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 35: NW $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$.15 mile
25	South Muie Creek	T.16S., R.16E. Sec. 29: SE $\frac{1}{2}$.35 mile
26	PVGA-Mule Creek	T.16S., R.16E. Sec. 5: W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 8: W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$	2.2 mile
27	Lost Creek-U2	T.14S., R.16E. Sec. 11: W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 14: W $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 23: E $\frac{1}{2}$ Lost Creek-U2 Sec. 24: SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 25: N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$	3 mile
Priority No.	Name and Number of Easement or Access Road	Legal Description	Estimated Length
28	PVGA-Frahm	T.14S., R.17E. Sec. 18: SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, SE $\frac{1}{2}$.8 mile
29	South Big Creek	T.16S., R.17E. Sec. 11: SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, NE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$.5 mile
30	Magic Common	T.16S., R.17E. Sec. 22: SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 23: W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 27: NE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$.8 mile

Note:

(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 in General
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WL-4.15 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Retain and maintain all isolated parcels in public ownership to provide wildlife habitat prior to an inventory and incorporation into a habitat management plan.

SUPPORT:

- Recreation - Assistance in implementing recommendation to provide an increase in recreational use areas.
- Wildlife - Identification and inventory of isolated parcels. Development and implementation of a habitat management plan.

RATIONALE:

Isolated parcels of public land which are identified as having high wildlife values need to be managed as such. All isolated parcels in public ownership need to be inventoried for their wildlife values. Next, it is essential that they become incorporated into a respective habitat management plan. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-579, Title I, Section 102(a)(1)(8) and Title II, Section 201(a) state that "...the public lands will be retained in Federal ownership..." "... the public lands be managed in a manner that will provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife..." and "...The Secretary shall prepare and maintain on a continuing basis an inventory of all public lands and their resource and other values..." According to the Twin Falls County survey, 51.8 percent of the people surveyed felt that the BLM should continue to hold isolated tracts of undeveloped public land and manage them for wildlife.¹

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation is in some conflict with lands L-2.5 which calls for allowing WPRS to acquire 7,900 of public land for agricultural development. Lands L-7.2 calls for evaluating all exchange proposals within one year after completion of the MFP. An EA and land report would be required prior to any exchange taking place. An EA has been completed on the WPRS proposal.

¹ Burley District Memo. 1980. RESULTS OF THE TWIN FALLS SURVEY. 1607. 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 1 WL-4.15 Step 3

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify WL-4.15 -
Retain and maintain ALL isolated parcels in public ownership. If an opportunity arises that would benefit the resource values, the best use of the tract should be implemented.

Support Needs:

Same as MFP Step 1 WL-4.15.

Lands -
Evaluate all exchange proposals.

Reasons:

This recommendation does not allow for the resource manager to balance all resource values.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept WL-4.15.
2. Reject WL-4.15.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Rationale:

Retention of isolated tracts is imperative for continued protection of natural resource values.

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 (MFP)

Twin Falls
Activity

Watershed

Objective Number

WS-1

Objective: WS-1

Designate 480.5 acres, identified as wetland and riparian areas, as protective management areas for watershed values. Maintain 143.2 acres in good and excellent condition. Enhance 337.3 acres in fair or poor condition so that they are raised at least one condition class in 5 years.

Rationale:

BLM Manual 6740 establishes policy and procedures for the identification, protection, maintenance, enhancement and management of fresh, brackish and saline water wetland areas. It applies to all Bureau of Land Management (BLM) programs and actions. These areas include, but are not limited to, areas adjacent to waterways (whether waters are surface, subsurface or ephemeral), potholes, wet meadows, sloughs, marshes, swamps, bogs and muskegs, flood plains, lakes, reservoirs, springs and estuarine areas administered by BLM. Riparian areas which presently or potentially support broad-leaf vegetation in arid and semi-arid ecosystems are of special management concern.

This manual section implements Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands). Wetland-riparian areas are fragile and comprise an extremely small percentage of the public lands administered by the BLM. Many have been destroyed or degraded. This degradation is influencing water quality and quantity; flood frequency and severity, pollution, commercial, recreational and subsistence fisheries, area aesthetics and a wide range of fish and wildlife, including many endangered, threatened and sensitive species.

There were two main types of wetlands identified during the inventory of Twin Falls planning unit; those associated with streams (riparian) and those associated with springs and seeps. The beneficial hydrological functions of these areas are different.

Riparian areas in good or excellent condition reduce flood velocities, stabilize banks, share sediment loads with base flows, serve as ground water recharge areas and reduce evaporation losses from surface waters. As discussed in URA 4 (.45B3), these functions improve water quality. Improving water quality follows Bureau of Land Management Watershed Objective 1603.12E3b.

Most riparian areas are also floodplains. BLM Manual 7221 describes the policies, responsibilities and procedures to be used to incorporate floodplain management into all Bureau activities. This manual section implements Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management). One of the major objectives of floodplain management is to restore, maintain and preserve the natural and beneficial functions of floodplains. This is best accomplished by maintaining floodplains in good ecological condition.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WS-1.1 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-1.1

Allow no development of undeveloped springs or further development of other springs pending final management designation for wetland preservation.

Rationale:

Development can cause irreversible damage to the existing wetland and to the wetland potential. Damage is caused by excavation of the soil and by the removal of the water from the area.

It is an accepted range management practice to develop springs and distribute the water through pipelines to water troughs in order to obtain more even utilization of range forage. However, as discussed above, in URA 4 (.45B3a) and in Objective WS-1, when these springs have associated wetlands they have important hydrological and biological functions which can be impaired by the removal of water. BLM is required to manage (protect, maintain and enhance) wetlands by Executive Order 11990 and BLM Manual 6740.

The majority of springs and associated wetlands in Twin Falls Planning Unit have been adversely impacted by cattle overuse and by the removal of water by development. (Twenty-nine of thirty-six springs and seeps examined during the water-rights inventory were developed.)

Support:

Range to make condition ratings based on successional stage, plant cover and composition. Wildlife, range, hydrologist to develop multidisciplinary wetlands management plan.

Priorities for protection and enhancement of wetlands and for development and mitigation can be established by formulating a comprehensive multidisciplinary water management plan which designates each wetlands management.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Watershed

Overlay Reference
Step 1 WS-1.1 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

The issue is one of proper wetland development and management. A plan is needed to show which springs can be developed and which ones cannot. The plan should show the water needs for the wetland habitat so a determination can be made showing how much water can be removed. Where possible the plan should show the method of development that is least damaging to existing resource values. Enhancing measures should be shown in the plan to show how the wetland habitat can be improved during development to benefit the various resource values and uses. The plan should show priority groups to establish an order of which wetlands should be developed first through last.

The plan should be a brief documentation prepared as a summary document using the information in the existing riparian/wetland inventory done in 1980. The plan should be a multidisciplinary effort to evaluate the wetland values of each resource present.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WS-1.1 -
Develop a multidisciplinary wetlands
management plan.

Reasons:

Proper management of wetlands is important to all resource values. Data is needed to show what the gains and losses are from development so judgment can be made as to whether a development should be done and to what degree it can be done. The information is needed to determine some modifications that may improve the habitat for some resource uses while the development is being done.

Support Needs:

Multidisciplinary team to prepare
documentation from currently existing
inventories.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WS-1.1.
2. Use the EA process by itself.

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
Watershed

Overlay Reference
Step WS-1.1 Step 3

Decision:

Reject the multiple-use
recommendation.

Rationale:

Protection of wetlands can best be provided on a site-by-site basis through an adequate EA process. A multi-disciplinary EA team will prepare a high intensity EA for those actions significantly effecting wetland areas. This is the best way to show the gains and losses on a site specific basis.

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
Watershed

Overlay Reference
Step 1 WS-1.2 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-1.2

Fence developed spring sites to protect wetlands and water supply.

Rationale:

The Wetland-Riparian section of the Manual 6740.33 recommends that spring sites be protected from overuse by grazing animals or other conflicting uses by fencing. Fencing will allow the establishment of better cover and recovery of brushy species, if present. This will help prevent erosion, provide more diverse wildlife habitat and provide visual contrast.

As discussed in the Objective rationale and in URA 4 (.45B3), erosion in wetlands can detrimentally impact water yields. Preventing erosion and preserving water yields are supported by Watershed Objective 1603.12E3a and b.

Support:

Division of Operations:

Engineers for layout and design, fencing crew to construct fence.

Watershed and Wildlife:

To identify extent of wetland requiring fencing.

Multiple Use Analysis

Studies show that fencing is the only accepted, reliable means of protecting wetlands from livestock abuse. It allows the sustained beneficial use of the spring waters without affecting the productivity of the site. Although aesthetics are adversely affected by fences, their protective qualities outweigh the inconvenience to the human eye, exemplified by support from Wildlife (WL-2.6, 2.10, 3.1, 3.8) and Cultural Resources (CRM-1.6, 1.7).

(Decision.)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WS-1.2 -
Fence wetland around developed springs.

Reasons:

Concentrations of animals in and near springs can deteriorate the quality of this resource.

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	Watershed
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	WS-1.3 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-1.3

Pipe overflow water from water troughs to fenced areas where wetland values can be enhanced. Appropriate areas for piping water to are existing channels or small reservoirs.

Rationale:

When a spring is developed, water is removed from the spring site with a concomitant reduction in the size of the wetland. The loss of this wetland can be partially mitigated by developing a wetland from the trough overflow. Existing channels are less likely to erode when water is applied than are other areas. Frequently, wetland vegetation may already be present in the channel. If channels are not used, the small reservoirs will retain the water and allow establishment of hydrophytes. Fencing of the area where the water is piped will protect wet soil from compaction and prevent overutilization of vegetation by cattle.

When trough overflow is not piped away from the trough compaction of the wet soil and the continued application of water can result in gully formation.

Support:

Division of Operations:

Engineers for layout and design,
fencing crew to construct fence.

Mitigation and restoring measures are expected for adversely impacting wetlands by executive Order 11990 (Protect of Wetlands) and BLM Manual 6740.13C.

Multiple Use Analysis

Spring developments normally supply livestock water to troughs. Some of these developments are without proper overflow equipment resulting in a trampled and deteriorated wetland. This undesirable situation can easily be changed for the better by piping this overflow water away from the trough and into its natural drainage or a nearby pond. This wetland should then be fenced, protecting it from destructive forces and preserving its vegetation for wildlife and natural beauty.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-1.3 Step 3

The fencing of overflow wetlands is supported by Wildlife and conflicts with none of the other activities.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WS-1.3 -
Fence and protect overflow wetland.

Reasons:

Livestock can trample a wetland, causing soil compaction, deteriorated vegetation and potential gully cutting.

Support Needs:

Division of Operations -
For layout and design and construction.

R. A. Staff -
Identify the sites and implement the projects.

Administration -
Contracting and procurement.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WS-1.3.
2. Fence some of the overflows.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Rationale:

Fencing of developed springs is necessary to protect the resources as well as the development. Excess use and trampling of the spring area by livestock can seriously degrade the water quality and impair water yield.

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	
Watershed	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	WS-1.4
Step 3	

Recommendation: WS-1.4

Give maximum protection to the riparian habitat bordering perennial streams with fisheries value. Fence as necessary along the rims of canyons on Fifth Fork of Rock Creek, McMullen Creek, Shoshone Creek and Salmon Falls Creek to prevent cattle access to the riparian area. Rest riparian areas from cattle use until in good ecological condition.

Support:

Engineers for layout and design.

Fencing crew to construct fence.

Range to make condition ratings based on successional stage, plant cover and composition and to develop and implement management plan.

Rationale:

Riparian areas in good ecological condition have beneficial water quality and flood values. These are discussed in URA 4 and Objective 1 rationale. Protecting riparian habitats on the above named streams will conform with Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetland) and Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management). It will implement manual sections 6740 and 7221 and accomplish Watershed objectives 1603.12E3b and c.

The State of the Art document on best management practices for livestock grazing and water quality protection arrived at the following principal conclusions:

- 1) Severe damage to riparian wildlife and fisheries habitat often results from riparian zone activities such as livestock grazing.
- 2) The riparian zone is a critical habitat during some life stage for a very high percentage of the species inhabiting a given geographic area.
- 3) In most cases good livestock management alone is not adequate to protect riparian, fisheries and wildlife habitat from severe damage.
- 4) Of the livestock grazing management techniques available for riparian habitat protection, only riparian zone fencing appears capable of certain protection.
- 5) It is not economically feasible to fence all riparian habitat on livestock grazing lands.

The above named creeks should be fenced because fencing is the only method that assures riparian zone protection and these creeks have important fisheries

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	Watershed
Overlay Reference	
Step	WS-1.4 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

Fencing streams is a controversial and expensive proposition throughout the West. The intended purpose is to protect or restore riparian habitat to a good to excellent ecological condition. Fences, along with time, accomplish this objective, allowing riparian vegetation to grow and multiply unchecked.

Several conflicts arise with this proposition. First, and most important, is that livestock are locked away from their traditional watering streams by the fence. Recreation and aesthetics are also affected by the dense vegetation and fence, which restricts access for fishing and hunting. Another problem is cost and the benefits derived from it. Besides the obvious cost of fence installation, there would also be yearly maintenance plus the cost of new water sources for the cattle. It would be expensive to fence the streams mentioned so the recommendation must be modified. The cost of implementing a deferred grazing system in Western Stockgrowers Allotment, including needed water sources and forage development to facilitate the rest, is estimated at about \$230,000.

By implementing grazing management in the Western Stockgrowers, Magic Common and Baker Lost Creek Allotments the targeted streams will get periodic rests. Shoshone and McMullen Creeks could then be monitored for trend by establishing ungrazed exclosures that could be compared with selected, long term trend study plots. Little can be done at Salmon Falls Creek immediately because we need the cooperation of the Boise District. It is reasonable to work with the cooperator and attempt to find an alternate place for this grazing through development of the land use plan in the Jarbridge R.A. The Fifth Fork of Rock Creek just passes through a small portion of public land offering the BLM little to no chance of improving that stream. With a monitoring system on the two highest potential streams we can watch the effects of the new management systems and act accordingly if future change occurs.

(Decision)
Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reasons:

Modify WS-1.4 -
Fence exclosures on Shoshone Creek in Magic Common Allotment and on McMullen Creek in Western Stockgrowers. Implement grazing management in the allotments bordering these streams and monitor for riparian trend.

The cost of fencing the streams plus the cost of developing alternate water sites and forage is reason to try livestock grazing management and monitor the changes if they occur. Examination of 1950 and 1978 aerial photos and site examination shows that Shoshone Creek probably has not changed significantly in 30 years, so it probably will not change soon.

This modification is consistent with WS-3.1.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Objective Number

WS-2

Objective: WS-2

Improve or maintain soil productivity by stabilizing non-geologic erosion through management and treatments.

Rationale:

The Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 requires that:

"the public lands be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource...values."

Section 102a(8); "and that management be on the basis of multiple use and sustained yield unless otherwise specified by law."

Section 102a(7); (underlining supplied).

Basic Manual Guidance (1602.42C2a) supplements this with the objective:

"To conduct land use and resource management programs to utilize, and at the same time maintain the productive capacity of natural ecosystems to meet resource production and other human needs, now and in the future."

Erosion reduces the productive capability of watersheds, creates the potential for greater downstream damages from floods and sedimentation and increases surface water pollution through contamination from transported sediments and dissolved solids. The loss of soil productivity results in a concurrent loss in the ability to sustain yield and maintain the productive capacity of ecosystems.

Further support for the prevention of erosion and maintenance of soil productivity are contained in:

Supplemental guidance (1603.12E3a) which conveys the long-term objective to "restore, maintain and improve soil productivity to enhance on-site resource uses";

Watershed Manual 7000 which imparts the policy to: "conserve, improve, and manage the soil and water resource base in a manner that will provide for a sustained yield of multiple use benefits and accomplish objectives which may enhance the present and future quality of the environment." (7000.06) and to specific objective to "control and prevent erosion to the extent practicable." (7000.02B1).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-2.1 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-2.1

Control surface disturbing activities on soils in the severe erosion susceptibility class by prohibiting mechanical range treatments and by restricting road building, ORV and grazing use.

Rationale:

Soil mapping units with severe erosion susceptibility are identified and discussed in URA 2 (.38B). Because of the nature of these soils removal of cover even for short periods of time can result in erosion losses high enough to reduce the productive capacity of these soils. These soils are only suitable for aerial treatment and this should be guided by the maintenance of adequate cover.

The disturbance from road building and ORV use is usually localized. However, without design to prevent gully formation, productivity is lost off-site as well as on-site.

The use of soils when they are saturated disturbs and destroys plant roots and compacts the soil resulting in reduced vegetative cover and higher erosion rates. All surface disturbing activities including grazing should be restricted until the soil will support the activity without disturbing the root zone.

For further discussion see URA 3 and URA 4 (.45A2, 45A3 and .45B3). Preventing loss of soil productivity is consistent with FLPMA, Basic BLM Manual Guidance (1602.42C2a), supplemental Manual Guidance (1603.12E3a) the Watershed Manual and the State Five Year Goals as discussed in the Objective rationale.

The Twin Falls Public Opinion Survey indicates that 43% of the respondents favored restrictions, including reductions in ORV and cattle use, to improve watershed conditions

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instruction

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WS-2.1 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

Soils of this Severe Erosion Susceptibility Class (SESC) are scattered throughout the Planning Unit and are arranged in variable relief. Some are relatively flat areas while others are on steep slopes.

This recommendation calls for restricted mechanical use of the SESC areas regardless of slope, or need for resource treatments. The recommendation conflicts with lands and minerals. These conflicts are resolved by managing future exploration and developments on these soils for minimal disturbance and prompt rehabilitation. Conflicts are stronger with range improvements, proposing no mechanical treatments on these soils. This recommendation must be modified to consider slope and need for treatment, allowing more flexibility to treatment planning while advising caution when dealing with these soils.

When a mechanical range treatment is the best feasible method to accomplish resource management objectives, these measures should be followed:

1. Leave untreated buffer strips along the contours and limit the width of treatments.
2. Do not treat drainage ways.
3. Use a seed mixture that is well adapted to the specific site.
4. Use equipment designed to reduce compaction and surface disturbance.

If these suggestions are followed, mechanical range improvement on susceptible soils can be done with minimal erosion impact.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reasons:

Modify WS-2.1 -
Allow mechanical treatments in special situations where benefits can be greater than losses, taking all precautions to minimize soil disturbance.

All treatment situations are different and some demand mechanical treatments for success. There are sites where watershed conditions can be improved by converting from sagebrush to perennial grass and forbs.

Refer to overlay MFP-1 WS-2.

This multiple use recommendation is consistent with WS-3.1.

Support Needs:

Alternatives Considered:

Soil Scientist -
To assist in preparing treatment plans.
R. A. Staff -
Project identification, planning, layout, and design.

1. Accept WS-2.1.
2. Reject WS-2.1.

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 (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WS-2.2 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-2.2

Adjust livestock grazing to maintain vegetative cover in areas with severe erosion susceptibility. In areas with moderate SSF's (41-60) or with significantly higher sheet erosion rates institute management practices that allow development of healthy vegetative cover and thus reduce surface soil loss.

The following management practices are recommended:

- for severe erosion susceptible areas adjust stocking rates so that utilization is 50 percent or less;
- for areas with identified erosion problems adjust stocking rates so that utilization is 40 percent or less, or manage within a 3 to 6 pasture rest-rotation system;
- for areas with identified erosion problems restrict ORV use to roads and trails that are properly designed and restrict use on saturated soil.

Restrict ORV Use.

Support:

Range to establish grazing practices to maintain the desired utilization and monitor it or to manage the rest-rotation grazing system.

Rationale:

Fifty percent utilization is considered good range management to maintain healthy plants (SCS Range Management Handbook, 1003.1(c)) with large, deep root systems which act to stabilize the soil, provide ample litter to encourage germination and seedling establishment and minimize surface runoff. Thus, reducing erosion and maintaining soil productivity as required by FLPMA, Basic BLM Manual Guidance (1602.42C2a), Supplemental Manual Guidance (1603.12E3a), the Watershed Manual and the State Five Year Goals (See Objective Rationale).

Because maintaining vegetative cover is very important on soils in the severe erosion susceptibility class (URA2.38B) to prevent erosion, utilization should be maintained below 50 percent.

When accelerated erosion has been identified either by a moderate SSF or by modeling high sheet erosion (URA3 .45A2 and .45A3) utilization has previously exceeded 50 percent. Reducing utilization to 40 percent in these areas would allow recovery of the existing vegetation, litter accumulation and seedling establishment. This opportunity was recognized in URA 4 (.45B3) and will reduce the erosion rates and maintain soil productivity. Rest-rotation grazing systems with 3 to 6 pastures allow at least one spring rest which restores plant vigor and allows seed formation.

The Twin Falls Public Opinion Survey indicates that 43 percent of the respondents favored restrictions, including reductions in ORV and cattle use, to improve watershed conditions.

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

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-2.2 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with RM-3.1 for those areas with identified erosion problems. Allocation of forage in RM-3.1 is based on biological limits, through the SVIM process. Thirteen allotments currently have some identified erosion problems. All of these allotments are managed or are proposed to be managed, under rest or deferred rotation systems.

Concentrated ORV use is presently occurring on sites in the Western Stockgrowers Allotment. None of those erosion problem areas in this or any other area can be attributed to ORV use. The areas are currently all open to ORV use. Stipulations will be developed to restrict ORV use on areas being damaged and during seasons when damage occurs. For example, an ORV recommendation to close the foothills area during wet seasons and coordinate with USFS closures in the South Hills. An ORV designation plan is proposed for development for the Twin Falls Planning Unit in FY 1981.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation to use the following management practice:

- Allow no more than 50 percent utilization on native ranges.
- Manage those allotments with identified erosion problems with grazing systems that allow periodic spring deferment.
- Restrict ORV use on areas which can be shown to be damaged by excessive use. Needed restrictions will be developed as needed in the Twin Falls Planning Unit ORV plan based on current soil-vegetation inventory data.

Reasons:

As stated in MFP I Recommendation, 50 percent is considered good range management to obtain healthy plants with large deep root systems which act to stabilize the soil, provide ample litter to encourage germination and seedling establishment and minimize surface runoff.

As stated in the recommendation, a deferred system or a rest rotation system will provide rest from spring grazing.

No areas have been identified in URA3.45A2 or .45A3 which show resource damage due to ORV use. The entire Planning Unit is currently open to ORV use. Site specific restrictions will be instituted as problem areas are identified.

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

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-2.3 Step 3

(Decision)

Recommendation: WS-2.3

Treat actively eroding gullies as they are identified by correcting contributing factors such as poor road placement and by using site appropriate methods such as gully head stabilization, water spreading, dams, dikes on gabions, and/or planting of deep rooted species.

Rationale:

Gully erosion, severe enough to destroy site potential and existing roads, has been identified at Winter Spring and on North Cottonwood Creek.

These gullies and any others should be treated to stop further reduction in soil productivity and loss of on-site resource uses (Supplemental Guidance 1603.12E3a). Treatments should be carefully studied by the hydrologist, engineer, and resources with on site uses to assure that the problems are not aggravated by the treatment.

Support:

Engineer and hydrologist to plan site specific treatments.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any resource. It is an attempt to stop gully type erosion wherever it is identified. Only two problem areas have been located and each should be treated to minimize damage. As new gullies are found they should be evaluated and proper action taken.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form BLM-100 (April 1977)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-2.6 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-2.6

Prevent gully formation and excessive erosion by blocking from use and by rehabilitating roads and trails with excessive slopes.

Rationale:

There are several ORV tracks and roads identified in URA 4 (.45B3b3) which require these attention, include both sides of the Lost Creek summit road, ORV tracks in the North Cottonwood Creek drainage, and Cherry Springs Road. These and any other roads and tracks which have excessive slopes and have the potential for gully formation should be blocked by fencing, construction of berms, placement of rocks or other acceptable means that will prevent further use. Rehabilitation of the scars should follow the recommendations discussed in the Rationale of WS Recommendation 2.6.

The prevention of erosion to preserve site values is consistent with FLPMA, Basic Manual Guidance (1602.42C2a), Supplemental guidance (1603.12E3a), and Watershed Manual section 7000.

Public opinion as indicated in the Twin Falls Survey supports restricting ORV use to improve watershed conditions. With 43% of the respondents favoring restrictions.

Support:

Division of Operations to install blocks and to seed appropriate mixtures.

Multiple Use Analysis

There are no conflicts from this recommendation, which proposes the blocking and rehabilitation of roads and trails on steep slopes in order to stop erosion. This type of action could interfere with other interests if the

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-2.6 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis (cont.)

purpose of the road is unknown. Short cuts and hill climbing trails should be blocked and rehabilitated, but other roads with regular traffic should either be rerouted or treated so the slope and erosion can be reduced. Proper location and construction will resolve most problems of erosion on roads.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify WS-2.6 -
Block and rehabilitate unnecessary roads and trails on steep slopes, but modify well traveled roads (Cherry Spring Road) to reduce the erosion problem.

Refer to URA 4 (.45B3b3) for specific sites already identified.

Support Needs:

R. A. Staff -
Identify the problem roads.

Division of Operations -
Block and rehabilitate trails, survey and design roads in need of construction or reconstruction.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Reasons:

To stop soil loss and loss of site productivity on unused trails that climb steep slopes. Another need is to stop the irresponsible ORV use that is causing the problem, otherwise, they will likely make trails around the blocks.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WS-2.6.
2. Accept WS-2.6.

Rationale:

Roads causing unusual or severe erosion problems should be blocked or modified to reduce erosion hazards.

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 (MPP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Objective Number	WS-3

Objective: WS-3

Meet applicable Federal and State of Idaho water quality standards on perennial streams with fishery value by 1985 and on other perennial streams in the Twin Falls Planning Unit by 1990.

Rationale:

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) in Section 202C(8) provides that in the development and revision of land use plans, the secretary shall..."provide for compliance with applicable pollution control laws, including State and Federal air, water, noise or other pollution standards or implementation plans".

Basic Manual Guidance (1602.42C3) states that:

"All land use and resource management program decisions must be consistent with Federal or State air and water quality standards, and with public health and safety standards affecting solid waste disposal and noise abatement."

A long-term objective for the Water Resource Program (Manual 1603.12E3b) is to restore, maintain and improve surface and ground water quality for both on-and-off site use.

BLM Manual Section 7240 provides guidance for managing water quality on BLM administered lands so that the quality can meet or exceed both Federal and State standards.

Water Quality objectives are to:

- A. Provide water in quality and quantity suitable for all intended uses.
- B. Control activities which might adversely affect the quality of water on or leaving the public lands.
- C. Establish and maintain land-use management practices which assure the protection of water supplies and aquatic habitat resources from chemical, physical or biological deterioration."

It is Bureau policy to protect, maintain, restore and/or enhance the quality of water on public lands so that it's utility for other dependent ecosystems, including present and/or desired human environments, will be maintained equal to or above legal water quality criteria. The water quality limits are those defined by the most stringent applicable laws and regulations. (Manual 7240.06)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Agency

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-3.1 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-3.1

Meet water quality standards on stream segments that have been designated for a salmonoid fishery by implementing Watershed recommendation 1.4, 2.4 and non-land use recommendation 2.1. In the drainage basins of these streams, implement Watershed recommendations 2.1 and 2.2.

Rationale:

Streams with salmonoid fishery designation (Fifth Fork of Rock Creek, McMullen, Shoshone and Salmon Falls Creeks) exceed the Idaho Water Quality Standard for temperature during the summer. Temperature reduction can best be achieved by shading the stream. As discussed in URA 4 (.45A7) riparian habitat in excellent condition should provide the needed shade. The Rationale for Recommendation 1.4, points out that fencing to exclude grazing is the only management technique that assure protection of riparian habitat from severe damage.

The other water quality standard not met is that for fecal coliforms. As discussed in URA 4 (.45A7) exclusion of cattle from the stream area year round would be necessary to eliminate fecal coliform contamination.

Support:

Division of Operations: Engineers for layout and design, fencing crew to construct fences.

Range: To make condition ratings based on successional stage, plant cover and composition and to develop and implement management plan.

Hydrology: To assist in developing management plan and to monitor water quality parameters.

Wildlife: To assist in developing management plan and to monitor fisheries.

Suspended or non-filterable solids are the sediment in the stream. There is not a numerical standard for this parameter. Suspended solids concentration of 80 mg/l has been shown to reduce macroinvertebrate populations by 60%. The aquatic habitat inventory and concurrent macroinvertebrate analysis showed sediment problems in each of the above named streams. Sediment can be lowered by healthy riparian vegetation which stabilizes the banks thus preventing mass wasting and bank cutting. The brushy riparian vegetation also lowers overbank velocities which reduces flood damage and allows the overbank area to share sediment loads. An additional function of the riparian zone is to trap sediments from the adjacent slopes and prevent them from entering the stream.

Implementing WS recommendation 1.4 and 2.4 will establish and maintain a

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-3.1 Step 3

Therefore, the objectives of this recommendation must be modified to a monitoring program for water quality and riparian trend at the targeted streams. This monitoring will provide seasonal data that can be interpreted to indicate the success of present management techniques on improving fisheries habitat.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reason:

Modify WS-3.1 -
Implement the monitoring studies and grazing management in WS-1.4.

To determine need, if any, for more protection of fisheries streams to improve quality, if management is not adequate to meet the resource objectives.

Modify WS-2.1 -
Allow treatment if it is needed and beneficial.

Accept WS-2.4 and non-land use recommendation 2.1.

Support Needs:

Alternatives Considered:

R. A. Staff -
Establish and monitor riparian vegetation trend studies.

1. Accept WS-3.1.
2. Modify WS-3.1.

Watershed -
Monitor seasonal water quality in fishery streams. Show whether the proposed grazing management is successful within a reasonable time such as 6 years in a two-treatment grazing system.

Decision:

Rationale:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

After a reasonable length of time (5 years) if monitoring studies do not show an improvement in water quality both for temperature, fecal coliform and suspended sediments, the streams should be fenced and livestock excluded.

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 (MFL)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WS-3.2 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-3.2

Meet water quality standards on stream segments with agriculture and cold water biota uses by implementing Watershed recommendations 1.5 and 2.4, and non-land use recommendation 2.1. In drainage basins of these streams implement Watershed recommendations 2.1 and 2.2.

Rationale:

The rationale for the above recommendation has been discussed in the individual recommendation rationale and in recommendation 3.1.

Support:

Range: To implement management techniques and to make condition ratings bases on successional stage, plant cover and composition.
Hydrology: To monitor water quality.

Multiple Use Analysis

This is similar to WS-3.1, without the fisheries value, and the recommendation should be modified. Perennial streams should be monitored on a seasonal basis to determine riparian condition, trend and water quality at high and low flow periods.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify WS-3.2 -
Implement monitoring studies in WS-1.5, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4.
Part of 1.5 is accepted.
Part of 2.1 is accepted.
Most of 2.2 is accepted.
Most of 2.4 is accepted.
The measures in non-land use recommendation 2.1 is accepted.

Reasons:

To determine if there is a need for more intensive management to improve water quality if management is not adequate to meet the resources objectives.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 WS-3.2 Step 3

Support Needs:

R. A. Staff -
Establish trend and condition
studies.

Watershed -
To monitor water quality in non-
fisheries, perennial streams.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept WS-3.2.
2. Modify WS-3.2.

Decision:

Modify the multiple-use
recommendation.

Meet water quality standards on stream
segments by initiating decisions made
for WS-1.5, WS-2.1, WS-2.2, and
WS-2.4. The use of engineers for
design of stream channel modification
will be a standard practice as
recommended in Non-Land Use
Recommendation 2.1.

Rationale:

The law requires management to meet
water quality standards on all streams
on public lands.

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 (WFD)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Objective Number	WS-4

Objective: WS-4

Reduce flood damage both on and off public land.

Rationale:

This objective is consistent with water resource objective (1603.12Ec):

Reduce and control flood and sediment damage, both on and off the public lands.

The floodplain Executive Order 11988 was issued to reduce flood damage by managing floodplains.

BLM Watershed program objectives (7000.02B) include:

Enhance on-site resource use values, including fish and wildlife development and utilization, livestock grazing, timber production, outdoor recreation, industrial development, mineral production, and wilderness preservation under the principles of multiple-use management and sustained resource yield; and

Enhance off-site values, including improvement of water quality, improved timing and yield of streamflow, renewal of ground water supplies, control of floods and sedimentation, maintenance of estuaries, protection of public health, and stabilization of local economies.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: <i>M.P.</i> Twin Falls
Activity Watershed
Overlay Reference Step 1 WS-4.1 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-4.1

Enhance water yield and reduce flood peaks by constructing snow fences in the heads of drainages at higher elevations.

Support:

Forest Service: cooperative agreement because many of the best sites are located on the Forest Service.
Hydrologist: To locate fences on public land.
Fencing crew: To install fences.

Rationale:

Snow fences accumulate larger drifts which melt more slowly. They contribute water to streamflows later into the dry season and they melt at a more uniform rate reducing the chances of high spring runoff causing flood damage.

By trapping snow that would normally blow away or sublimate snow fences can increase water yields from snow melt. In addition, properly placed snow fences can increase ground water yields if placed in recharge areas.

The building of snow fences accomplishes both the water resource objective 1603.12E3c discussed in W.S. Objective 4 Rationale and 3b to restore and maintain water yield for both on-and off-site use.

Multiple Use Analysis

This is a dual purpose recommendation to reduce flood hazards, but increase water yield. It has no conflicts with other activities, but will require a cooperative agreement with the Forest Service, since that is where most of the streams proposed for treatment originate. It is a plan that would help fisheries, wildlife and water users while reducing flood potential.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WS-4.1 -
Construct snow fences in the headwaters of area drainages at higher elevations.

Reasons:

This measure could reduce flood peaks by spreading those flood waters over the season, thus increasing useable water yield.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WS-4.1 Step 3

Support Needs:

Forest Service -
Cooperative agreement to put up
fences at headwaters.

Hydrologist -
Locate and mark potential sites.
Consult Idaho Department of Water
Resources

Operations -
Assemble fence.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject WS-4.1.
2. Add sites to the proposed.
3. Deduct sites from the proposal.

Decision:

Reject the multiple-use
recommendation.

Rationale:

This should not be undertaken on a
large scale until further studies
indicate the feasibility both
technical and economical.

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 - WFD:	Twin Falls
Activity:	Watershed
Objective Number:	WS-5

Objective: WS-5

Insure the protection and preservation of water supply requirements for all BLM resource uses.

Rationale:

This objective supports Supplemental Guidance Objective 1603.12E3d.

To fulfill FLPMA directives for multiple use and sustained yield it is necessary to protect present water uses and preserve water for future needs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step WS-5.1 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-5.1

Whenever springs which qualify as public water are identified, notify the State Director of their location so that the records can be noted of the land withdrawal (Public Water Reserve 107) where the spring is located.

Rationale:

All springs with a flow of .145 gal/minute or greater existing in 1926 or coming in existence before 1977 are interpreted as being reserved by Executive Order of April 17, 1926. There are many public water reserves that have not been noted.

Noting these springs withdraws the 40 acres where they are located to prevent disruption of the spring for public use. Idaho Instruction Memo ID-80-50 instructs the District to inform the State Director (943) of these springs locations.

Support:

Watershed: To systematically measure spring flow to see if the springs qualify as Public Waters.

Lands: To notify State Director (943) of spring locations.

Multiple Use Analysis

Reference to Idaho IM ID-80-50 and Executive Order of April, 1926, give the direction for completing the action recommended in WS-5.1. An inventory of all public waters has been completed showing the current use of each spring examined. A water rights - water use inventory has been done and water claims and water rights applications have been filed on all waters with developments.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Allocate all waters that qualify as Public Water Reserves for public use. Use water rights filings with the State for all developed sources and Public Water Reserves on all other qualified sources.

Reasons:

Most waters on public lands are valuable for public uses such as fish and wildlife, stockwater, people water, wetland, riparian, or a combination of use. These waters should be allocated to the public needs and uses.

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	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 WS-5.2 Step 3

Recommendation: WS-5.2 (*Decision*)

Reserve water for instream uses, especially fisheries, by using the State of Idaho filing system.

Support:

Wildlife and Watershed: To make In-stream flow need determinations and to file with Idaho Water Resources Board.

Rationale:

By filing for instream flows on streams with fisheries value the minimum flow needed for fisheries can be assured. New diversions on private land above BLM land and change in diversions that would impact the minimum flow will not be allowed by the State of Idaho Water Resources Board and the fisheries will be protected.

McMullen Creek, Shoshone Creek, and Salmon Falls Creek are listed on the State Office's contract with Idaho Department of Fish and Game for instream flow determinations. As the minimum flow needed is determined, we must file with the Water Resources Board.

Fifth Fork of Rock Creek will have to have instream flow needs determined by our staff. Idaho law allows filing for instream flows for wildlife and other beneficial uses beyond the needs of fisheries. Filings should be made for these uses as needed.

Multiple Use Analysis

The filing of a minimum instream flow water right is the only method of protecting a stream and its wild dependents from stream depletion. As water and power demands increase it is possible that stream diversions could move up the channels to gain the advantage of gravity to avert the need for power thus the existing stream flow would be eliminated. There are no present draw down problems at area streams but as the demand for water increases over the years, the need for stream protection will also grow. By establishing minimum flows with the State Department of Water Resources we can protect the important waterways from future diversions, thereby preserving these natural resources.

This recommendation is supported by Wildlife and Recreation.

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 (WFD)

Twin Falls

Activity

Watershed

Objective Number

WS-6

OBJECTIVE:

Conserve plants officially listed by Federal Government as being in potential danger of extinction and prevent sensitive species needing special consideration in land-use planning and decisionmaking processes from becoming threatened or endangered.

RATIONALE:

On December 28, 1973, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) (see Appendix 1) became law and superseded similar acts passed in 1966 and 1969.

It was declared in Section 2 of the ESA that all Federal departments and agencies shall utilize their authorities to conserve species (plants and animals) officially listed pursuant to Section 4 of the ESA. This national policy is repeated and expanded in Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 1536) of the ESA, which sets forth procedures to be used and requirement to be met by Federal departments and agencies in order to comply with the Act. Section 7 mandates have three objectives: conserving listed species; ensuring that the continued existence of listed species is not jeopardized; and ensuring that Critical Habitats of listed species are not destroyed or adversely modified. These mandates are non-discretionary and are supported by civil and criminal penalties. Citizen lawsuits are authorized and could result in penalties being assessed against responsible officials of Federal agencies. It is also implied by Section 7 of the ESA that adequate cooperation, consultation, and assistance will occur in the endangered species conservation effort. The current legal procedures for this cooperation and consultation can be found in 50 CFR 402 or in the Federal Register, Volume 43, pages 869-876, January 4, 1978 (see Appendix 2, Interagency Cooperation Regulations). However, amendments to the ESA in 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979 have substantially changed Section 7 requirements.

Draft Manual 6840 establishes BLM policy and guidance for complying with the Endangered Species Act. It is Bureau policy to conserve federally and State-listed endangered or threatened plants and animals and to utilize its authorities in furtherance of the purposes of the ESA and similar State laws. The objectives of all Bureau activities and programs will include the means to improve the habitat and prove justification for delisting such species. State laws protecting plants and animals faced with local extirpation or premature extinction apply to BLM activities and programs to the extent that they are consistent with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (P.L. 94-579) and other Federal laws. It is also Bureau policy to ensure that the crucial habitats of sensitive plants and animals will be managed and/or conserved to minimize the need for listing such plants and animals by either Federal or State Governments in the future.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFD)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	WS-6.1 Step 3

Recommendation: *(Decision)*

Protect playas that support Lepidium davisii by allowing no developments or improvements and no ORV use in the playas or surrounding area (Section 29, 30, 31, and 32, T.14 S., R. 15 E.).

Rationale:

As discussed in URA 3 (.45A9) Lepidium davisii can withstand a moderate amount of disturbance. Since the populations on both playas are currently stable, present uses do not appear to jeopardize the population.

ORV use and trampling by large grazing animals has adversely impacted Davis' playa mustard in other areas. Severe disturbance such as plowing or spraying with herbicide destroys playa mustard and may be the reason the mustard was not located on other playas in the planning unit.

As identified in URA 4 (.45B3) the present road and fence do not appear to have affected the population. However, improving the road would increase traffic and the risk of ORV use of the playas. Other improvements such as water troughs could result in increase grazing animal use.

Maintenance of status quo in the above named sections appear to be the best protection.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation is to protect the potentially threatened plant Lepidium davisii. It has no conflicts and is supported by Cultural Resources CRM-1.5 and 1.9, by recommending no road improvements in the area. There is an existing road which runs very close to the playas, but as long as it remains unimproved there should be no added pressure on the habitat of these plants.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WS-6.1 -
Allow no future improvements near the playas in T. 14 S., R. 15 E., sections 29, 30, 31, 32 that would endanger Davis' Playa Mustard.

Reasons:

Davis Playa Mustard is a threatened species and requires protection.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	WS-6.2 st (cont.)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reject WS-6.2 *(Decision)*
Do not designate an ACEC or withdraw the area from mining. The surface will be managed according to the 3809 regulations.

Reasons:

An ACEC designation is not needed to provide protection for this potentially endangered species. It has been found on most of the playas along Salmon Falls Creek under existing management.

The current political leaders have issued directions that guide land managing agencies to use management rather than withdrawals so a withdrawal from mining is out.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept WS-2.6.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	WS+6.3 Step 3

Recommendation: (Decision)

Protect Idaho Sensitive Species by prohibiting range improvements and other activities which could adversely affect the natural plant community in the area.

Restrictions should be observed in the following locations:

For Allium anceps - T. 12 S., R. 18 E., Sections 10, 11, 14, and 15 and T. 15 S., R. 15 E., Sections 8 and 5; and

For Astragalus tetrapterus - T. 16 S., R. 15 E., Sections 8 and 9.

Rationale:

Bureau policy is discussed in Objective 6 Rationale. Instruction Memo ID-81-144 March 3, 1981, reiterates Bureau policy, "That sensitive species will be conserve and managed to minimize the need for State or Federal listing."

The "Inventory of Threatened and Endange Plants Located in the Twin Falls Plannin Unit" recommends that "Protection of threatened and endangered plant sites from heavy use and impact should be encouraged until such time as data becomes available which indicates that the plants can sustain other kinds of treatment."

The 1979 inventory supplied the first report of Allium anceps and the only known location of Astragalus tetrapterus Both of which are listed as Sensitive on the current Idaho list.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation is mandated by existing law and policy IM-ID-81-144 and does not require a land use allocation decision for all identified areas. It is required in every development action implemented.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept the recommendation.

Decision:

Accept the multiple use recommendation.

Restrict activities that threaten sensitive species wherever they exist within the planning area. Consideration will be given through the EA process.

Reasons:

Bureau policy mandates protection of sensitive species.

Rationale:

Bureau policy is to conserve sensitive species to minimize the need to list them on the Federal and State T & E list.

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 (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Fire Management

Objective Number

I

Objective F-1

To protect and enhance the resources of public lands in order to preserve their capability to contribute toward meeting the resource needs of the nation.

Rationale:

This objective is supported by policy statements within Bureau manual 9210 and other authority sources as outlined below.

- A. Protection Act of September 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 857; 16 U.S.C. 594).
- B. Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269; 43 U.S.C. 315).
- C. O. and C. Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874; 43 U.S.C. 1181e).
- D. Reciprocal Fire Protection Act of May 27, 1955 (69 Stat. 66; 42 U.S.C. 1856, 1856a).
- E. Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U.S.C. 686).
- F. Public Land Administration Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 506; 43 U.S.C. 1361).
- G. Disaster Relief Act, Section 417 (Public Law 93-288).
- H. Annual Appropriations Acts for the Department of the Interior.
- I. United States Department of the Interior Manual (590 DM 1.3).
- J. Planning area analysis.
- K. Normal year fire plan.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Fire Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 1.1 Step 3

F-1.1

Recommendation:

Designate a permanent Fire Guard Station site in the vicinity of Salmon Dam in T. 14 S., R. 15 E., Sec. 8: SE $\frac{1}{4}$. Construction of the facility could be accomplished by the fire crew resulting in a considerable savings.

Rationale:

At the present time we are maintaining a temporary Guard Station facilities at the old Rogerson School house. This situation is less than desirable as our crew is constantly in the public view, the rental fees are exceedingly high, poor utility services and limited storage and parking areas. With the construction of a new site these problems would be eliminated and, in addition, the facility could also be utilized by the resource area for office space, storage of equipment, materials and supplies.

Support:

Engineering: Survey and design complex and compile materials lists.
Public information specialist: Media releases and orientation.
Administration: Procurement of required materials and/or services.
Realty: Prepare required withdrawals.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. Construction of a permanent guard station would reduce or eliminate problems of high rent, poor utility service and limited storage and parking areas. Additionally, the station could be used as a base for other district personnel working in the area.

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
Fire Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 F-1.1 Step 3

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept F-1.1.

Reasons:

Construction of a permanent Fire Guard Station in the Rogerson area will be beneficial to fire control operations and other personnel working in the Rogerson-Shoshone Basin area.

Support Needs:

As described in MFP 1 Recommendation.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject F-1.1.
2. Choose a different location.

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation to the extent that construction will be accomplished in the most feasible and economical manner.

Rationale:

Same as for multiple use recommendation.

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

Fire Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 F-1.2 Step 3

F-1.2

Recommendation:

Designate the area lying within the Salmon Creek Canyon below Salmon Dam as a limited suppression area. All fires occurring in this area will be left in their natural state and only suppression effort expended would be in a case of threatening life or escaping the confines of the canyon.

Rationale:

Presently this area is being considered for wilderness designation of which fire is considered a natural part of the overall wilderness scheme. Fires occurring within this area for the most part will remain relatively small due to the natural terrain and existing barriers such as canyon walls, rock slides, creeks, etc. Suppression costs, limited access and personnel safety is also a contributing factor in designating this area as a limited suppression area.

Support:

Public Information Officer: News media releases
Area Personnel: Development of EA

Multiple Use Analysis

The recommendation is supported by Wilderness 1.2 which recommends establishing the canyon as a natural area. Fire is considered a natural part of the overall wilderness scheme. No conflicts were identified between this and any other 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
Fire Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 F-1.2 Step 3

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept F-1.2.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1 Recommendation.

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation to the extent that the limited suppression area will be that area downstream from the dam to the area at Balanced Rock. Suppression in these areas will be by ground forces or mechanical means.

Reasons:

Designation of Salmon Falls Canyon below Salmon Falls Dam as a limited suppression area will compliment the natural area recommendation. Limited access and rugged terrain make fire suppression very difficult and hazardous.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject F-1.2 and continue to use normal suppression.

Rationale:

Minimum suppression is compatible with the management of the Salmon Falls Canyon.

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

Fire Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 F-1.3 Step 3

F-1.3

Recommendation:

Restrict the use of aerial retardant on resource value class II lands within the Twin Falls Planning Unit. Retardant should be used on Class II Lands only to protect and/or ensure the safety of private property, structures, livestock, general public and fire suppression personnel.

Rationale:

Suppression costs should be commensurate with established resource values. Since aerial retardant is an extremely expensive tool costing approximately a dollar per gallon or two thousand dollard per load delivered on the fire, it is felt use should be limited in areas of low values with the exception of the areas identified in the recommendation.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with Wildlife Recommendations to maintain and enhance sage grouse and mule deer winter range and critical mule deer summer range. The importance of these areas is based on the listed wildlife species needs for large amounts of browse in the diet during the winter. Retention of brushy areas on the isolated parcels identified in WL-2.2 and WL-2.4 is important for providing cover areas for pheasants.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation to remove the identified sage grouse, antelope and mule deer winter areas, mule deer critical summer range, and isolated tracts from the restricted retardant recommendation.

Reasons:

The values described for the areas identified should be protected from fire with all standard fire suppression methods.

Support Needs:

Fire Management Operations -
Determine fire supression techniques necessary to protect identified values on a fire by fire basis.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Accept F-1.3.
2. Reject F-1.3.

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

Fire Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 F-1.3 Step 3

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation.

Do not use aerial retardant on resource value Class II lands except when needed to protect or ensure the safety of private property, structures, livestock, general public and fire suppression personnel.

Do not use aerial retardant on any open waters such as reservoirs, ponds, streams, and springs.

Aerial retardant can be used to aid in protecting identified sage grouse, antelope, and mule deer winter areas, mule deer critical summer range, and isolated tracts.

Rationale:

The decision to use or not use retardant within these areas will be determined on a fire-by-fire basis by management after considering input by the Fire Management Team. Retardant use will be avoided unless high value resources need protection, or life and private property is at risk.

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	Fire Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	F-1.4
Step 3	

Recommendation:

Use fire as a management tool in those areas identified for vegetation manipulation or land treatment. Limit suppression efforts in the areas within the Berger that are scheduled for land treatment maintenance. Suppression efforts will be conducted in accordance with an approved plan.

Areas identified for land treatment maintenance:

1. Parrott Allotment

- Burn pasture 3
- Burn pasture 2
- Burn pasture 1

2. Wrigley Allotment

- Burn pasture 2
- Burn pasture 3
- Burn pasture 1

3. Ellis Allotment

- Burn pasture 4
- Burn pasture 2
- Burn pasture 9
- Burn pasture 3

4. Buhl Group

- Burn pasture 1
- Burn pasture 2
- Burn pasture 3
- Burn pasture 4

5. Kerr Allotment

- Burn 300-400 acres every year.

Rationale:

In support of this recommendation it would be advantageous if a fire occurred within one of the identified areas. If a fire occurs in a pasture within one year of the scheduled maintenance, no suppression action will be taken until the fire has accomplished the prescribed requirements or until the fire is determined to be a hazard to livestock, improvements, etc.

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

Fire Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 F-1.4 Step 3 (cont.)

Recommendation (cont.):

6. Kaster Allotment

- Burn pasture 3
- Burn pasture 2

7. Lanting Allotment

- Burn pasture 4
- Burn brush areas in other pastures as fits schedule.

8. PVGA Allotment

- Burn brush areas in pastures as fits schedule.

9. Schnitker Allotment

- Burn pasture

10. Noh Allotment

- Burn brushy islands as fits schedule.

11. L & W Allotment

- Burn brushy islands in pasture 3.

12. Chadwick Allotment

- Burn brush on west edge of west pasture.

13. Koch Allotment

- Burn brush in pasture 3

14. Kunkel Allotment

- Burn pasture 4
- Burn brush islands in pasture 3.

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
Fire Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 F-1.4 Step 3

Recommendation (cont.):

15. Whiskey Creek Buffer

- Burn brush area along west side.

Support:

Public Information Specialist:
Media news releases

Range and Wildlife Specialist:
Project and/or activity plans

Area personnel:
Development of EAR's and assistance
with burns

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. The recommendation as stated requires an approved maintenance burn plan for the area being burned. It further states that limited suppression activities will be in effect only until the fire has accomplished the prescription requirements.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept F-1.4 and add the following -
All reasonable efforts will be made to protect islands of brush which are present within any limited suppression areas.

Reasons:

The recommendation requires an approved maintenance burn plan in order for limited suppression action to be used. The addition of the brush island paragraph will further ensure that attempts are made to protect identified wildlife values on the Berger Resource Conservation Area.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Fire Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 F-1.4 (cont.)
Step 3

Support Needs:

- Range -
Completion of burn EA.
- Wildlife -
Identification of protection areas
in burn plans.
- Fire Management -
Completion of burn plan.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject F-1.4.
2. Accept F-1.4 as written.

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation to include all the identified area and to agree with the range multiple use recommendation RM-2.7. RM-2.7 says practice limited fire suppression on existing seedings and proposed seedings with the modifications shown in RM-2.3, RM-2.4, and RM-2.5. Aggressive fire suppression will be initiated to protect wildlife values on sage grouse strutting grounds, antelope and mule deer winter range, mule deer critical summer range and on the Twin Falls-Cassia Isolated Sikes Act Tracts. Fire management will consult closely with the area manager on actions in these areas.

Rationale:

A fire management plan is to be prepared for the entire resource area including the Twin Falls Planning Unit that will show the detail required to accomplish this action. Include F-1.4, F-1.5, and RM-2.7 in the 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 (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Fire Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1F-1.5 Step 3

Recommendation:

Designate the Whiskey Creek area as a limited suppression area. The boundaries of this area will be the Salmon Dam road on the south, the Salmon Falls Creek Canyon on the west, the Salmon Butte stock driveway road on the east and Whiskey Creek on the North.

Rationale:

This area is considered as having a relatively low resource value and suppression efforts and costs should be commensurate with established values. Suppression action will be taken to prevent the fire from escaping the designated boundaries or if it is considered a hazard to people, livestock, improvement, etc.

Support:

Public Information Specialist -

Media releases and orientation.

Resource Area Manager -

Shifting of livestock use to compensate for forage losses.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with Wildlife Recommendations regarding maintenance of habitat for antelope and raptor prey base. The major wildlife concern is for possible destruction of sagebrush areas. Antelope require large amounts of sagebrush throughout the year, but particularly in the winter. Raptor prey, particularly jackrabbits, use brush area for cover extensively.

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

Fire Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 F-1.5 Step 3

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify F-1.5 as follows -
Designate the treated areas of the Whiskey Creek area as limited suppression areas. Take normal suppression efforts on any fires burning or threatening native sagebrush areas. The boundaries of this area will be the Salmon Dam road on the south, the Salmon Falls Creek Canyon on the west, the Salmon Butte stock driveway road on the east and Whiskey Creek on the north.

Reasons:

Modification of this recommendation will protect high resource value areas identified by wildlife. The seedings will be enhanced by allowing fire to burn through them.

Support Needs:

Fire Management -
Provide for suppression fires within or threatening native sagebrush within the Whiskey Creek limited suppression area.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject F-1.5.
2. Accept F-1.5.

Decision:

Accept the multiple use recommendation.

Rationale:

This decision is also to be implemented through a modified suppression plan and/or a fire management plan for the resource area as identified in F-1.4 and RM-2.7.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)