Chapter 3—Current Management Direction and Management Opportunities

3.1. Existing Situation

The AMS was developed as a data/information baseline to describe the Upper Snake FO's existing condition, which is a result of years of following current management direction. Because resource conditions have changed over time, new issues have come to light, and a comprehensive framework is needed for the Upper Snake FO to effectively administer public lands under its purview into the future, it is necessary to undertake the Upper Snake RMP planning effort. The new RMP developed in response to this need will maintain, improve, and/or help restore resource conditions; identify desired future conditions; and provide for the economic needs of local communities over the long term.

3.2. Evaluation of Current Management and New Management Opportunities

This chapter presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs and plan amendments (e.g., FMDA) since development of the Upper Snake FO's four LUPs. As part of the planning effort, these plans were evaluated to determine what direction therein was still valid to incorporate into the new RMP, what direction could be valid with modifications, and what direction was not applicable to be considered further in the process. In evaluating the state of the current management direction, it was natural that topics would be identified that needed new management direction developed. Each resource/resource use in the area profile (Chapter 2) is presented with a discussion identifying new management opportunities. This narrative is followed by a table that describes the adequacy of the resource/resource uses' current management direction and its responsiveness to address current conditions and issues. For all resources/resource uses, the direction in the tables will become the basis for the No Action alternative in the RMP development process.

3.3. Air Resources

Air resources, not specifically addressed in existing LUPs; have been managed on a case-by-case basis in accordance with BLM policy and IMs.

Options for Additional Management Consideration

Development of management direction such as that identified below would achieve desired outcomes and area-wide criteria or restrictions that apply directly to emission generating activities and compliance with the CAA.

- Develop management direction consistent with the Idaho State Implementation Plan of the CAA and the M/IAG smoke management program.
- Coordinate emission generating activities through the M/IAG smoke management program.
- Incorporate BMPs management techniques, or practices, to control fugitive dust emissions.

3.4. Geology/Paleontological Resources

Geology/paleontological resources not specifically addressed in existing LUPs; have been managed on case-by-case basis in accordance with BLM policy and IMs.

Options for Management Consideration
Development of management direction such as that identified below would achieve desired resource protection by assuring use restrictions are in place prior to authorizing surface-disturbing activities; management recommendations are developed to promote the scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils resources; and threats are identified and mitigated as appropriate.

- Implement the Potential Fossil Yield Classification system.
- Complete and maintain an inventory of fossil localities and monitor known occurrences.
- Promote partnerships and inform and educate the public about the protection of fossil resources.

3.5. Soil Resources

Table 3-1 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for soil resources.

Options for Management Consideration
Soil resources management direction in existing LUPs is consistent in managing for soil stability by maintaining or improving vegetative cover and reducing erosion potential by managing for a distribution of ground cover, including litter. This direction provides for the proper infiltration, retention, and release of water appropriate to soil type, vegetation, and landform while providing for proper nutrient cycling, hydrologic cycling, and energy flow.

Consideration of the following management direction would assure resources and uses of public lands are managed to the same standard resulting in reducing soil loss while providing quality habitat for species diversity, and improving water quality/storage values.

- Develop management direction to incorporate applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a) for all resources and uses.

Table 3-1. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for soil resources.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
Big Desert MFP		
Stabilize erosion areas using native or exotic species which will be most successful in soil stabilization.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing. Soils are evaluated during the standards and guides process with issues addressed at that time. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: Yes	Consider management direction/criteria to identify when/where natives and non-native species would be used for soil stabilization.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	Adequacy: Adequate. This direction provides for ground cover and litter appropriate for soil stability.	
Big Lost MFP		
Manage livestock grazing and soil disturbing activities to maintain good range or ecological condition on soils with potential problems with clay sub-soils or shallow soils over bed rock.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing. Soils are evaluated during the standards and guides process with issues addressed at that time. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: Yes **Adequacy**: Adequate. This direction provides for ground cover and litter appropriate for soil stability.	Incorporate Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a) into management direction.
Increase soil vegetative cover by increasing range condition class to good condition soils with existing management problems on clay sub-soils.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Soils are evaluated during the standards and guides process with issues addressed at that time. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate, this direction provides for ground cover and litter appropriate for soil stability.	Incorporate Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health into management direction.
Increase soil vegetative cover by increasing range condition class to good condition soils on soils subject to deep gully erosion.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Soils are evaluated during the standards and guides process with issues addressed at that time. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: Yes **Adequacy**: Adequate. This direction provides for ground cover and litter appropriate for soil stability and reducing gully potential.	Incorporate Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health into management direction.
Maintain existing cover on soils susceptible to wind erosion.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Soils are evaluated during the standards and guides process with issues addressed at that time. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. This direction provides for ground cover and litter appropriate for soils susceptible to wind erosion.	Incorporate Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health into management direction.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
W1.1. Reverse current trend of increasing erosion, promote soil development, and stabilize the second flood plain of Birch Creek by rotobeating and reseeding approximately 2000 acres.	**Decision Status**: Completed. Rotomowing done in 1982. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Land treatments designed to remove sage brush canopy cover need to be evaluated with respect to improving overall sage-grouse habitat.	To continue rotobeating and reseeding in areas appropriate to, and benefitting from, these types of land treatment.
W1.2. Reduce erosion, increase vegetative cover, and improve watershed conditions through land treatments* or improved management on a maximum of 216,783 acres of public land where one or more of the following criteria are met: < 15% density of perennial grasses. 30% or more small rock density of desert pavement. 40% crown density or more of Wyoming Sagebrush, Basin Big Sagebrush, Three-tip, or Mountain Sagebrush. 50% or more bare gravel. *Land treatments include interseeding, chemical spraying, and rotobeating. Controlled burning may be feasible, but specific sites and prescriptions have not been identified.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented. Because of the lack of funding and areas that had higher potential the project has not gone forward as planned. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Land treatments need to consider critical antelope habitat and sage-grouse strutting and nesting needs, in this area. Much of the area is desert pavement and recovery of the area to the described conditions may not be consistent with other resource needs.	None
W3.2. Rotobeat or use other methods to remove sagebrush cover on 50 acres of sagebrush in Squaw Springs Valley.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. There is an exclosure around a spring in the Squaw Creek pasture at this time and a prescribed burn was done in a mosaic pattern in the valley. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Land treatments designed to remove sagebrush canopy cover need to be evaluated with respect to improving overall sage-grouse habitat.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Manage soils to minimize erosion loss.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Soils are evaluated during the standards and guides process with issues addressed at that time. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. This direction provides for ground cover and litter appropriate for soil stability and reducing soil erosion losses.	Incorporate Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health into management direction.

3.6. Microbiotic Soil Crusts

MSCs, not specifically addressed in existing LUPs, have been managed on case-by-case basis in accordance with BLM policy and IMs.

Options for Additional Management Consideration

The importance of MSCs to overall ecological system health is in its infancy of study. As such, there has not been any BLM policy or IMs since establishment of the Upper Snake FO's LUPs to manage this resource. Development of management direction, such as that identified below, would provide for resource location, prioritization, and protection by assuring use restrictions are in place prior to authorizing surface disturbing activities and threats are identified and mitigated as appropriate.

- Identify, inventory, prioritize and protect, as needed, MSC habitat.
- Evaluate prioritized areas to determine the potential and condition of MSCs.
- Consider protections that make progress towards achieving Standard 4 (Native Plant Communities) of the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).

3.7. Water Resources

Table 3-2 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for water resources.

Options for Additional Management Consideration

Water resources management direction is not consistent across existing LUPs making it difficult to achieve desired future conditions (e.g., proper functioning channel and floodplain) and associated physical characteristics such as desired width/depth ratios, high streambank stability, and low fine sediment. Similarly, water quality is treated the same way, usually by site-specific fencing projects only. Consideration of management direction, such as that identified below, would achieve desired conditions resulting in improved water quality and availability and functioning, healthy streams and watersheds.

- Minimize, mitigate, restrict, or exclude surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV, minerals development, and livestock grazing) in areas with potential for streambank erosion.
- Minimize, mitigate, restrict, or exclude activities that impair water quality for all streams, and especially for listed 303(d) streams.
- Relocate campgrounds, roads, and trails out of floodplains and onto adjacent upland sites where they would pose less threat to water quality.
- Apply Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a) to applicable resources and uses to improve streams, riparian areas, and water quality.
- Incorporate applicable management direction regarding water resources from the decision record for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (BLM 2008g) for the entire Upper Snake FOA.

In addition, comments received following public scoping provided the following ideas for consideration in developing water quality management direction.

- Limit grazing, eliminate OHVs, and eliminate noxious weeds to maintain the health of these areas.
- Livestock/OHVs should be excluded in areas affected by heavy bank erosion.
- The land use plan revision should lead to measurable, substantial improvements in riparian areas and water quality over the existing situation.
- Enhance the quality of streams, riparian zones, and accelerate restoration of these areas.
- Look to the 303(d) list to consider how high quality waters can be protected and how degraded waters can be improved.
- Ensure that anti-degradation provisions are being met, and are applied to other activities as well.
- Protect aquatic ecosystems through water quality protective measures.
- Ensure that designated beneficial uses of the streams be fully met.
- Reduce the impaired status of water quality-limited streams.

Table 3-2. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for water resources.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Vol. 2 Watershed W-2. Restore and maintain vegetative cover in stock trail driveway west of Springfield to protect soils and prevent flooding in Aberdeen.	**Decision Status**: Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. This was a one-time flood event and is not foreseen to be a recurrent threat or issue.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Watershed, W-3. Alleviate flooding and sediment damage of other lands in Twin Buttes and Flat Top watersheds.	**Decision Status**: Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. This was a one-time flood event and is not foreseen to be a recurrent threat or issue.	None
Watershed, W-1. Control pollution sources on public land (P.L. 92-500).	**Decision Status**: Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues**: Yes **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Some sources may be controlled; other sources may only be reduced by vegetative filtering.	Reduce or remove pollutant sources on public lands, where appropriate and feasible.
Watershed, W-1.2. Limit livestock access to waterways on all lands adjacent to Main Snake River.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Permanent fencing is not realistic.	Incorporate Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a) as direction. Add in T&E management considerations.
Vol. 3 WLA-1. Improve water quality of Main Snake River. Protect streambanks, including islands, from livestock use on all areas bordering Snake River, except specific areas which should be continued at 1979 actual livestock use rate.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Permanent fencing is not realistic.	None
WLA-4. Restore the beneficial uses of riparian areas.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues**: Yes **Adequacy**: Adequate. Current BLM standards are to meet or make progress towards proper functioning condition (PFC).	Manage riparian–wetland areas to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC.
WLA-4.2. Protect banks in high erosion rate areas.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Not effective to counter large river bank natural erosion.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Lost MFP		
Watershed 2.2. Control mine-related point sources of pollution in Champagne Creek Watershed from the Ella Mine, St Louis, and Reliance groups. Initiate by 1986.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Decision is site-specific and needs to be expanded for the entire FOA.	Reduce or remove mine-related point and non-point sources of pollution at abandoned mine sites throughout the FOA.
Watershed 2.3. Control channel erosion on Trail Creek. Initiate by 1986.	**Decision Status:** Completed: Fence constructed in 1990s. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The fence will improve riparian vegetation and help to alleviate continued channel down cutting, and possibly help to aggrade the channel. But once a channel has downcut as much as this channel has, it's difficult to "control" channel erosion.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire field office to identify active areas of erosion and prioritize monitoring and funding to reduce erosion, if needed.
Watershed 2.4. Control channel erosion in Chicken Creek Allotment. Initiate by 1986.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This site-specific erosion control project is no longer an issue. Erosion reduction actions can be accomplished later on, if they present themselves, under general watershed or water quality decisions.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to identify active areas of erosion and prioritize monitoring and funding to reduce erosion, if needed.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Watershed #4. Control erosion in Hurst Cr. with rock dams in gully.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This site-specific erosion control project is no longer an issue. Erosion reduction actions can be accomplished later on, if they present themselves, under general watershed or water quality decisions.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to identify active areas of erosion and prioritize monitoring and funding to reduce erosion, if needed.
Aquatic Wildlife #1. a. Divert Warm Creek back to its original channel to eliminate vertical drops.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	Adequacy: Not adequate. This site-specific stream project is no longer an issue.	process across the entire FOA to identify active areas of erosion and prioritize monitoring and funding to reduce erosion, if needed.
Aquatic Wildlife #1.c. Encourage development of a drop structure at junction of Williams Cr. and Cedar Run Ditch.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This site-specific stream project is no longer an issue.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to identify active areas of erosion and prioritize monitoring and funding to reduce erosion, if needed.
Aquatic Wildlife #2. Replace bridge over Little Lost River at Clyde to reduce erosion and siltation.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Work has been completed.	None
Aquatic Wildlife #3. Reduce siltation and degradation of stream and riparian areas through protective fencing to exclude livestock from concentrated use areas.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Protective fences are effective in reducing livestock concentrations and reducing siltation and stream and riparian degradation.	Ensure future adequate maintenance and integrity of riparian pasture and exclosure fences, or any other livestock grazing BMPs that accomplish this same objective.
Aquatic #3. a. Fence 7 mi of Wet Cr. to prevent further degradation of stream quality. Water gaps will be used to provide livestock water.	**Decision Status:** Completed: 7 mi in 1981 and 3 mi in 1989. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Implementation-level decision which has been completed, with improvement occurring.	None
Aquatic #3. b. Fence upper 0.5 mi Summit Cr. to prevent damage to riparian vegetation and streambanks by livestock, if this practice is shown effectively in adjacent areas.	**Decision Status:** Completed, 1986. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Implementation-level decision which has been completed, with improvement occurring.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Aquatic #3. c. Fence Squaw Springs to prevent continued erosion and siltation.	**Decision Status:** Completed, 1980. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Implementation-level decision which has been completed, improvement occurring.	None
Aquatic #3. d. Fence 3 mi Birch Creek.	**Decision Status:** Completed, 1976, 1991. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Implementation-level decision which has been completed, improvement occurring.	None
Aquatic #4. Restore Little Lost River to its original channel to reduce erosion and improve stream quality.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. More damage would occur if work performed.	None
Aquatic #5. Acquire water right on Birch Cr.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This water right was never pursued because Birch Creek waters were already allocated and water right holders were opposed to it. This site-specific water right claim is no longer an issue; at the time, better use of water was determined to be to fill ponds below the hydrodiversion pond.	Consider direction to acquire minimum stream flows where needed and appropriate.
Aquatic #6. Construct 3.5 mi fence along Little Lost road to exclude livestock grazing from 4.5 mi of Big Springs Creek and 0.5 mi of Little Lost River.	**Decision Status:** Completed, 1983 and 1989. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. More damage would occur if work performed.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Medicine Lodge RMP		
A Water Quality Management Plan would be developed for Indian Creek and one for Edie and Irving Creeks. Actions would likely include fencing of some riparian areas, drift or trail fencing, and some improved livestock distribution measures. Improve water quality from poor to fair on approximately 11 mi of streams in the area.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current BLM standards are to meet or make progress towards PFC, and/or to improve water quality standard indicators.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to implement BMPs to protect or improve water quality standard indicators.
The 1.5 mi on Threemile Creek would be monitored to ensure improvements in water quality and riparian habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Allotments are monitored to ensure improvements in water quality and habitat.	Incorporate Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health as direction.
Manage 1.2 mi of Game Creek to improve riparian habitat and improve water quality. Monitor 6.2 mi of stream to ensure maintenance of existing satisfactory riparian habitat and water quality. Improve or maintain water quality, fisheries and riparian habitat on 7.4 mi of stream.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Stream already shows improvement. Current BLM standards are to meet or make progress towards PFC, and/or to improve water quality standard indicators.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to implement BMPs to protect or improve water quality standard indicators.
Improve 1 mi of Sand Creek through fencing and 1 mi through livestock management. Maintain existing satisfactory riparian habitat and water quality on 12.8 mi. Periodic monitoring would be needed to ensure improvement and maintenance. Improve 2 mi of Sand Creek from very poor to good condition.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Some fencing as well as riparian and water quality improvements completed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Stream already shows improvement. Current BLM standards are to meet or make progress towards PFC, and/or to improve water quality standard indicators.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to implement BMPs to protect or improve water quality standard indicators.
Two mi of fence are needed to improve 1 mi of stream for riparian and water quality values. An additional 15 mi of stream would be managed to improve riparian habitat and water quality while 3.4 mi of stream will be managed to	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Streams already show some improvement. Current BLM standards are to meet	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to implement BMPs to protect or improve

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
maintain existing riparian, fisheries and water quality in satisfactory condition. Management decisions will be designed to complement the Willow Creek 208 watershed project. Maintain good to excellent riparian vegetation on 8 mi and improve 1 mi of Willow Creek. Maintain good to excellent condition on 7 mi Gray's Lake Outlet, 1.6 mi on Tex Creek and 1.8 mi on Hell Creek in support of the 208 project.	or make progress towards PFC, and/or to improve water quality standard indicators.	water quality standard indicators.
One mile on the lower end of Kelly Canyon would be managed to improve water quality and 1 mi managed to maintain existing satisfactory riparian habitat and water quality. The improvement would be through grazing management and reseeding of eroded areas. ORV use would be controlled to further improve water quality. Manage 1 mi of Kelly Canyon to improve water quality from poor to good. Reduce man-caused erosion to not more than 2.5 tons/acre.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current BLM standards are to meet or make progress towards PFC, and/or to improve water quality standard indicators.	Use the Healthy Rangelands Standards and Guides assessment process across the entire FOA to implement BMPs to protect or improve water quality standard indicators.

3.8. Vegetation—Upland Vegetation

Vegetation management direction in existing LUPs consists of providing forage for wildlife species and livestock grazing under their respective management programs. As a result of changing policy and guidance and lack of management direction for vegetation and wildland fire management in the four existing LUPs, the FMDA was developed (BLM 2008b). Management for vegetation with regard to wildfire now exists and is discussed in Section 3.14, Wildland Fire Ecology and Management.

Options for Management Consideration

Consideration of possible management direction, as described below, could result in describing desired vegetation conditions that maintain and improve plant species diversity, fish and wildlife habitat, soil stabilization, and water quality and storage.

- Develop direction that incorporates the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a) for restoration, rehabilitation, or reclamation activities associated with authorized/permitted activities.
- Develop direction that incorporates applicable conservation measures from the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (ISAC 2006) and or local working group plans.

In addition, comments received during public scoping provided various suggestions for consideration in developing vegetation management direction. These suggestions included

- Identifying criteria and measures to control/prevent the continued spread of invasive species/noxious weeds consistent with the principles of integrated weed management,
- Developing direction with emphasis to protect, enhance, restore, and maintain native plant species and communities, and
- Developing direction that actively restores fire to a more natural role in vegetation communities.

3.9. Vegetation—Riparian Habitats and Wetlands

Table 3-3 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for vegetation—riparian habitats and wetlands.

Options for Additional Management Consideration

Riparian–wetland management direction in existing LUPs varies by plan and is inconsistent, which makes it difficult to achieve desired vegetative conditions (e.g., PFC) or physical characteristics such as desired width/depth ratios, streambank conditions, and large woody material characteristics for healthy and diverse riparian–wetland systems. Consideration of management direction, such as that identified below, would achieve desired conditions and result in plant and animal species diversity, improved fish and wildlife habitat, stabilized soils, filtered surface runoff, improved water quality/storage, and enhanced recreation and aesthetic values.

- Develop direction for riparian–wetland areas to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC.
- Develop direction/criteria for using MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change.
- Develop direction that incorporates applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a) into the management of riparian areas.
- Consider incorporation of applicable management direction from the decision record from the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan EA (BLM 2008g) for the Snake River FOA.

In addition, comments received during public scoping provided the following suggestions for consideration in developing riparian–wetland management direction.

- Limit grazing, eliminate OHVs, and eliminate noxious weeds to maintain the health of these areas.
- Exclude livestock/OHVs in areas affected by heavy bank erosion.
- Enhance the quality of streams, riparian zones, and accelerate restoration of these areas.
- Ensure the LUP revision leads to measurable, substantial improvements in riparian areas and water quality over the existing situation.

Table 3-3. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for vegetation—riparian habitats and wetlands.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Protect and enhance riparian and aquatic habitat areas of the Snake River Omitted Lands.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. An HMP for Snake River "Omitted Lands" was developed in 1982. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Improving only select riparian areas is inadequate. The Upper Snake FOA has over 470 mi of streams (lotic sites) and over 350 acres of wetlands (lentic sites). Priorities need to include improvement and/or maintenance of riparian–wetland areas throughout the FOA. Monitoring and management changes have been made to improve or maintain riparian–wetland areas largely in response to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a). Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Omitted Lands: Recognize that even though the omitted lands are under multiple-use management, the highest resource value is for waterfowl habitat. Livestock grazing will be managed to improve and maintain a wide diversity of vegetative species, heights, and age structures.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Omitted lands continue to undergo multiple-use management, with an emphasis on waterfowl and other wildlife species habitat. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language should reflect the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process, PFC, and other current direction.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Do not allow vegetative control within 100 yards of water sources. Vegetative control will be allowed along intermittent stream courses.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. This decision refers to streams and riparian zones. The only vegetative control which may fall in this area is noxious weed control which will continue. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction does not consider biological controls. Adequate buffer zones need to be identified.	Need to consider biological controls. Also need to look at the buffer zones for adequacy. Need to tie to the Vegetation Treatments using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States, Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (BLM 2007c). Need to be clear about intent and purpose of direction.
Retain all riparian areas in public ownership.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. All lands are retained in public ownership. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language may be too strong, should allow for flexibility for "no loss of quality/quantity" of riparian–wetland areas.	Need to allow for flexibility in retention or disposal of riparian–wetland areas, particularly in instances where BLM may exchange a riparian–wetland parcel for another riparian–wetland parcel that would have greater benefit to the public and BLM's management goals and objectives.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Lost MFP		
Provide proper riparian system management through grazing systems or fencing.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Riparian management is a priority program. Allotment management plans (AMPs) with riparian management goals have been developed for Sheep Mountain and Trail Creek grazing allotments, but not developed for every allotment. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language should reflect the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process, PFC, and other current direction.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Manage allotments to protect quality of water and vegetation in riparian areas. Accomplish through grazing systems or fencing if needed.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Allotments are managed according to Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language should reflect the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process PFC, and other current direction.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement,

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Retain in public ownership critical wildlife habitat and riparian areas.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No net loss of riparian–wetland habitat has occurred. The Upper Snake FO has acquired conservation easements or fee title on hundreds of acres of riparian–wetland habitat along the South Fork of the Snake River and the Henry's Lake area. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** The FO will continue to acquire conservation easements or fee title on additional riparian–wetland habitat and continue to retain critical riparian–wetland habitat in public ownership.	None
Retain in federal ownership all riparian areas and permanent water sources unless disposal would not violate EOs 11988 (Flood Plan Management) and 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) as interpreted in IM 83-602 (Wetland Flood Plain, and Endangered Species Consideration in Planning for Land Disposal Actions).	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No net loss of riparian–wetland habitat has occurred. The FO has acquired conservation easements or fee title on nearly 18,000 acres of riparian–wetland habitat along the South Fork of the Snake River and the Henry's Lake area. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** The FO will continue to acquire conservation easements or fee title on additional riparian–wetland habitat and continue to retain critical riparian–wetland habitat in public ownership.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Establish new riparian vegetation along Summit, Wet, and Sawmill Creeks.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Wet Creek fenced to manage cattle. Summit and Sawmill Creeks fenced and/or improved in FY86 and 88. These areas continue to establish new riparian vegetation. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language should reflect the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process, PFC, and other current direction.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Reclaim and/or enhance visually undesirable cultural modifications along major travel routes and recreation areas in the planning unit by: Establishing new areas of riparian vegetation (willows, birch and cottonwood) along Summit Creek, Wet Creek, and portions of Sawmill Creek.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Wet Creek fenced to manage cattle. Summit and Sawmill Creeks fenced and/or improved in FY86 and 88. These areas continue to establish new riparian vegetation. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language should reflect the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process, PFC, and other current direction.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement,

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
A low-level aerial photo flight will be made every 3–4 years and analyzed to determine riparian trend. (Trend data for the riparian area could be correlated to any [electro] shocking data obtained to determine the grazing impacts to the fishery.)	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Although color infrared aerial flights were periodically completed (1992 and 2001), they were not flown every 3–4 years. Trend data were not correlated to fish shocking data. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language should reflect the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process, PFC, and other current direction.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Photo points will be established on both the upper and lower riparian areas. The upper riparian area will be surveyed by ocular survey methods at least every 2 years. Area range conservationists will help take photos.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Photo points established, but ocular survey methods not completed every 2 years. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language should reflect the Idaho Standards for	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	Rangeland Health assessment process, PFC, and other current direction.	actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Maintain 366,000 acres of antelope habitat by: Retaining in federal ownership: 120,000 acres of fawning habitat; 170,000 acres winter habitat. All permanent water sources and riparian habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. One sale involved riparian area: Robison, 40 acres. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Language may be too strong, should allow for flexibility for "no loss of quality/quantity" of riparian–wetland areas.	Need to allow for flexibility in retention or disposal of riparian–wetland areas, particularly in instances where BLM may exchange a riparian–wetland parcel for another riparian–wetland parcel that would have greater benefit to the public and BLM's management goals and objectives.
Reduce siltation and degradation of stream and riparian areas through protective fencing to exclude livestock from concentrated use areas: a. Fence 7 mi of Wet Creek (in conjunction with recreation site development) to prevent further degradation of stream quality. Water gaps will be used to provide livestock water. (AQ 3.1)	**Decision Status:** Ongoing a. 7 mi fenced in FY81. Cattle excluded on 4 mi; 3 mi under management system. b. and c. Completed in FY86 and 80, respectively. Prescribed burn improved vegetative species diversity, with substantial improvement evident.	Consider developing criteria for prioritizing maintenance and integrity of riparian pasture and exclosure fences.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
b. Fence the upper 0.5 mi of Summit Creek to prevent damage to riparian vegetation and streambanks by livestock, if this practice is shown effectively in adjacent areas. (AQ 3.2) c. Fence Squaw Springs to prevent continued erosion and siltation (in conjunction with Watershed) (AQ 3.3 and 2.1) d. Fence about 3 mi along Birch Creek; Sec. 5, 9, 16; T. 9 N., R. 30 E.	d. 2 mi fenced FY76 and FY80. Section 16 still not fenced (state land). State exchange pursued but not successful. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Future fencing maintenance and needs are implementation-level actions that are conducted on a site-specific basis.	
Medicine Lodge RMP		
A total of 30.5 mi of stream will be managed to improve riparian systems, fisheries and/or water quality. This will require 13.6 mi of fence to be built to protect 6.8 mi of stream. Another 53 mi of stream will be managed to maintain existing fisheries, water quality, and riparian habitat in current satisfactory condition. Public lands within the SCS Willow Creek 208 watershed project area will be managed in cooperation with other land owners and agencies to implement the watershed protection plan.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Management to improve or maintain riparian areas in satisfactory condition; numerous riparian fences built since 1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Improving only select riparian areas is inadequate. The FOA has over 470 mi of streams (lotic sites) and over 350 acres of wetlands (lentic sites). Priorities need to include improvement and/or maintenance of riparian–wetland areas throughout the FOA. Monitoring and management changes have been made to improve or maintain riparian–wetland areas largely in response to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
The 1.5 mi on Threemile Creek will be monitored to ensure improvements in water quality and riparian habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. PFC monitoring in 2007 shows a strong upward trend. Currently PFC in upper reach and FAR in lower reach.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	Condition was nonfunctional (NF) in 1995. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Improving only select riparian areas is inadequate. The FOA has over 470 mi of streams (lotic sites) and over 350 acres of wetlands (lentic sites). Priorities need to include improvement and/or maintenance of riparian–wetland areas throughout the FOA. Monitoring and management changes have been made to improve or maintain riparian–wetland areas largely in response to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process.	towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Manage 1.2 mi of Game Creek to improve riparian habitat and improve water quality. Monitor 6.2 mi of stream to ensure maintenance of existing satisfactory riparian habitat and water quality.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. PFC monitoring in 1997 indicates that Game Creek is PFC. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Improving only select riparian areas is inadequate. The FOA has over 470 mi of streams (lotic sites) and over 350 acres of wetlands (lentic sites). Priorities need to include improvement and/or maintenance of riparian–wetland areas throughout the FOA. Monitoring and management changes have been made to improve or maintain riparian–wetland areas largely in response to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Improve 1 mi of Sand Creek through fencing and 1 mi through livestock management. Maintain existing satisfactory riparian habitat and water quality on 12.8 mi. Periodic monitoring will be needed to ensure improvement and maintenance.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. 68% of Sand Creek is currently PFC and 32% is FAR in an upward trend. No fencing has been completed on Sand Creek, but livestock management has changed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Improving only select riparian areas is inadequate. The FOA has over 470 mi of streams (lotic sites) and over 350 acres of wetlands (lentic sites). Priorities need to include improvement and/or maintenance of riparian–wetland areas throughout the FOA. Monitoring and management changes have been made to improve or maintain riparian–wetland areas largely in response to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
Two miles of fence are needed to improve 1 mi of stream for riparian and water quality values. An additional 15 mi of stream will be managed to improve riparian habitat and water quality while 3.4 mi of stream will be managed to maintain existing riparian, fisheries and water quality in satisfactory condition. Management decisions will complement the Willow Creek 208 watershed project.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. **Willow Creek**: 40% PFC, 49% FAR (with 43% in upward trend and 57% static), 11% NF. **Grays Lake Outlet**: 44% PFC; 33% FAR (with 33% in upward trend and 67% static); 22% NF. **Tex Creek**: 100% FAR (with 70% in upward trend and 30% static).	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	Hell Creek: 36% PFC; 60% FAR (with 66% in upward trend and 34% static); 4% NF. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Improving only select riparian areas is inadequate. The FOA has over 470 mi of streams (lotic sites) and over 350 acres of wetlands (lentic sites). Priorities need to include improvement and/or maintenance of riparian–wetland areas throughout the FOA. Monitoring and management changes have been made to improve or maintain riparian–wetland areas largely in response to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process.	have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.
One mile on the lower end of Kelly Canyon will be managed to improve water quality and 1 mi managed to maintain existing satisfactory riparian habitat and water quality. The improvement will be through grazing management and reseeding of eroded areas. OHV use will be controlled to further improve water quality.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. **Kelly Creek:** 20% FAR in upward trend; 80% NF. **Little Kelly Creek:** 100% FAR in upward trend. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Improving only select riparian areas is inadequate. The FOA has over 470 mi of streams (lotic sites) and over 350 acres of wetlands (lentic sites). Priorities need to include improvement and/or maintenance of riparian/wetland areas throughout the FOA. Monitoring and management changes have been made to improve or maintain riparian/wetland areas largely in response to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health assessment process.	Manage riparian–wetland areas (lotic/lentic) with a goal to attain or move towards PFC, recognizing that natural limitations and/or actions outside BLM's control may prevent some areas from achieving PFC. Conduct MIM studies on priority streams that have been identified through PFC monitoring as needing improvement, particularly those that have undergone a management change. Manage toward attainment of Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Make management changes as necessary based on progress of riparian areas.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Silvicultural Guidelines and Harvesting Techniques: • Roads will not be constructed along riparian areas. Roads will be closed and rehabilitated at end of sale.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. It is common practice to avoid building roads along riparian areas and to close and rehabilitate roads as sales are concluded. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This decision does not address general timber harvest practices in and adjacent to riparian–wetland areas.	Consider establishing appropriate buffer zones around riparian–wetland areas (both lotic and lentic sites). Establish general timber harvest practices with a goal to protect and maintain riparian–wetland areas.
Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat: • Management actions within floodplains and wetlands will include measures to preserve, protect and, if necessary, restore, their natural functions (as required by EOs 11988 and 11990 and BLM Manual 6740). Management techniques will be used to minimize the degradation of stream banks and the loss of riparian vegetation. Bridges and culverts will be designed and installed to maintain adequate fish passage. Riparian habitat needs will be taken into consideration in developing livestock grazing systems and pasture designs. Some of the techniques that can be used to maintain riparian areas: • changing class of stock from cow/calf pairs to herded sheep or yearlings; • either eliminating summer grazing or scheduling summer grazing for only one year out of every three; • locating salt away from riparian zones; • laying out pasture fences so that each pasture has as much riparian habitat as possible; • locating fences so that they do not confine or concentrate livestock near	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The management techniques referenced in this decision are routinely implemented in riparian–wetland areas. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This decision does not adequately address lentic wetland areas.	Consider management direction to protect lentic wetland areas.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
the riparian zone; • developing alternative sources of water to lessen the grazing pressure on the riparian habitat; and • excluding livestock completely from riparian habitat by protective fencing if other measures do not work. Where applicable, the elk management guidelines contained in the Elk Habitat Relations for Central Idaho and Eastern Idaho will be followed. This includes: • maintaining adequate untreated peripheral zones around important moist sites (i.e. wet sedge meadows, springs. riparian zones).		
Management activities in riparian zones will be designed to maintain, or, where possible, improve riparian conditions. Roads and utility corridors will avoid riparian zones to the extent practicable.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Management activities in riparian–wetland areas have been consistent with protecting, maintaining, and improving riparian conditions. Avoidance of riparian zones when constructing roads and utility corridors is a priority. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This decision does not adequately address lentic wetland areas.	Consider management direction to protect lentic wetland areas.

3.10. Special Status Species

The current LUPs have little direction for special status species management. The management guidelines that follow come from the BLM 6840 Manual for special status species management (BLM 2008c), which focuses on listed species (i.e., ESA T&E). **Table 3-4** presents the current management direction for special status species from the existing LUPs. **Table 3-5** through **Table 3-11** describe management direction by individual listed species resulting from USFWS consultations on existing LUPs, biological assessments and opinions, and recovery plans issued since approval of the Upper Snake FO's four LUPs.

Options for Management Considerations

The current RMP and MFPs have little direction for special status species management. What direction there is varies by plan and is inconsistent among plans, making it difficult to achieve desired outcomes based upon recovery plans, conservation agreements, and conservation strategies. Consideration of management direction, such as that identified below, would result in preventing the loss of habitat and enhancing habitat favorable for special status species.

- Set priorities for inventory and monitoring of special status species.
- Assure habitats are suitable to maintain viable populations of special status species.
- Focus rehabilitation in special status species habitat to native plant species when possible.
- Set guidelines to protect pollinators of special status plant species.
- Use special designations (e.g., ACEC, RNA) where necessary to protect special status species.
- Continue with cooperative maintenance of the IDFG spatial database for special status species.
- Assure BLM actions are in compliance with the ESA.
- Cooperate with the USFWS in planning and providing for the recovery of listed species.
- Retain in federal ownership habitat essential for the survival and recovery of sensitive or listed species.

Table 3-4. Current management from the Upper Snake FO's LUPs for special status species.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Wildlife 10.5 – Do not develop a comprehensive habit management plan for antelope or sage-grouse in this area beyond planning for providing of wildlife water. Develop a priority listing of water developments for planning and construction.	**Decision Status**: Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Decision does not address all habitat requirements of sage-grouse or pronghorn except for water requirements.	Determine specific habitat guidelines for priority species (similar to those established for sage-grouse) for use throughout the FOA rather than for specific management areas. Manage for desired

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		future condition (DFC, e.g., seral stages) of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 4.1 – No vegetative manipulation projects will be undertaken within 0.25 mi of strutting grounds.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing. Prescribed burning is done in coordination with IDFG. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Direction does not describe or achieve a DFC.	Manage for DFC (e.g., seral stages) of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.
Protect and enhance riparian and aquatic habitat areas of the Snake River Omitted Lands	**Decision Status**: Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Enhancement of riparian and aquatic habitats is needed for fisheries and aquatic species.	Provide for protection of Utah valvata snail species habitats and populations.
Whenever possible, management activities in habitat for threatened, endangered or sensitive species will be designed to benefit those species through habitat improvement.	**Decision Status**: Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. The direction should not state "whenever possible."	Consider direction that improves fisheries and aquatic habitats to reduce the likelihood of species becoming listed as T&E species.
Big Lost MFP		
Special status species are not addressed in the Big Lost MFP.		
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Wildlife 7.a – Maintain 375,000 acres of upland game and non-game habitat by using "The Guidelines for Maintenance of Sage-grouse Habitats" from the western States Sage-grouse Committee vegetation manipulation projects.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Brush control projects have adhered to sage-grouse guidelines. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Managing sensitive species and their habitats is requirement of BLM manual 6840 and land use planning.	Develop management direction for potential threats consistent with State and LWG plans for management of sage-grouse and other wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 7.b – Retain 250,000 acres of sage-grouse nesting, brood rearing, and winter habitat in federal	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes	Develop management direction for potential threats consistent with

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
ownership.	**Adequacy:** Adequate. The importance of retaining habitat is beneficial to the public.	State and LWG plans for management of sage-grouse and other wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 8.b – Design AMPs to consider sage-grouse nesting and brood rearing habitat on 250,500 acres	**Decision Status:** Completed. AMPs have been designed to accommodate this habitat need. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Developed AMPs along with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health are viable options to achieve desired future habitat conditions.	Develop direction such as seasonal/timing restrictions or buffer zones related to potential threats consistent with the most current science.
Wildlife MA 2: Objective 5 – Provide forage and cover for existing and projected wildlife numbers. Improve 10 percent or 4,000 acres of unsatisfactory antelope and sage-grouse habitat. Maintain a suitable prey base for 35 bald eagles and 75 golden eagles. Provide foraging habitat adjoining a peregrine falcon reintroduction site in the Buck Springs area.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Habitat in much of the area is in a downward trend. This area provides foraging opportunities for wintering bald and golden eagles. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current management should focus on moving towards and sustaining natural ecosystem potential.	Develop direction such as seasonal/ timing restrictions or buffer zones related to potential threats consistent with the most current science.
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Wildlife MA 7: Objective 4 – Maintain satisfactory habitat for antelope and sage-grouse, including strutting and nesting areas and winter range.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Forage is reserved for antelope; sage-grouse numbers are stable to slightly increasing. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Wildlife habitat is managed using the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC (e.g., seral stages) of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types. Develop direction such as seasonal/timing restrictions or buffer zones related to potential threats consistent with the most current science.
Wildlife MA 2: Decision 4 – Develop a monitoring plan that will ensure maintenance of a suitable prey base for bald eagles, golden eagles and peregrine falcons. Monitoring is	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Upland habitats are managed to maintain and improve sagebrush/grass habitats for native wildlife, which contribute to the prey base for raptors. Monitoring of	Manage for DFC (e.g., seral stages) of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
also needed to ensure maintenance of antelope fawning and winter range and sage-grouse habitat.	habitat condition and trend is ongoing. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Current management focuses on moving toward and sustaining natural systems and ecosystem potential.	appropriate vegetation types to sustain a natural ecosystem. Develop direction such as seasonal/timing restrictions or buffer zones to protect avian species.

Table 3-5. Management direction as a result of USFWS consultation on Upper Snake FO LUPs and a 2006 biological opinion for the endangered Utah valvata Snail (*Valvata utahensis*).

Utah Valvata Snail Management Direction
USFWS 2006 Consultation for the Big Desert, Big Lost, Little Lost/Birch Creek MFPs and Medicine Lodge RMP
Special Status Animal and Plant Management – Common to all Programs In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, BOR, hydroelectric power companies, and others: • Cooperate in gathering existing information to understand the distribution of known populations, and contribute new information as opportunities arise. • Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. • Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. • Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives. • Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal lands to support recovery of the Snake River snails.
Soil and Water Resources Management: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management) • As a part of promoting recovery, the goals are to promote conservation of healthy riparian areas to avoid erosion, sediment delivery, and other negative water quality impacts, or to minimize impacts if avoidance is not possible. • Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species will be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications will support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. • Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent landowners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs. • Where needed, improve watershed conditions adjacent to suitable habitat to prevent soil erosion and negative water quality impacts. Conserve riparian vegetation near suitable habitat to minimize potential for erosion and sediment delivery to springs.

Utah Valvata Snail
Management Direction

Upland Vegetation Management: Rangelands (includes weed management)

- Projects involving the application of pesticides in uplands adjacent to riparian areas located near suitable Snake River snails habitat will be designed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.
- Manage upland areas to minimize sediment delivery into suitable habitat.

Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)

- Activities within the Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management) program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management

- Activities within the Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management

- Activities within the Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Livestock Grazing Management: Permits and Leases

- Manage livestock grazing and trailing adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat to promote healthy watershed conditions while implementing the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).
- Promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable habitat following fire, fire rehabilitation, restoration treatments, or other major disturbances.
- Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments adjacent to suitable habitat to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Livestock Grazing Management: Livestock Management Facilities

- Manage livestock facilities to promote healthy riparian communities or to prevent erosion, or a combination of these objectives, while implementing the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
- Protect springs in or adjacent to suitable habitat to conserve and recover snail habitat.

Recreation Management

- Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Utah Valvata Snail
Management Direction

- Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas, spring access, and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Protect springs with known populations to conserve snail habitat.
- Educate the public on the Snake River snails' unique ecological requirements, sensitivity to habitat alteration, and need for habitat protection

Recreation Management: Travel Management

- Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, and non-motorized trails, so as to not preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect known populations and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Special Designation Area Management

- Explore the potential for new designations that would enhance species recovery.

Fire Management: Fire Suppression

- Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection.
- Fire suppression efforts will be conducted, as possible, to protect snail habitat. Place a high priority on protecting highly erosive areas adjacent to suitable habitat from wildfire.
- Coordinate with USFS, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near suitable habitat.

Fire Management: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation

- Implement ES&R activities to promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat.
- Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides will be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.

Fire Management: WFU

- WFU projects (where allowed) will be designed to conserve suitable Snake River snails' habitat.

Fire Management: Prescribed Fire

- Prescribed fire projects will be designed to conserve suitable snail habitat.

Utah Valvata Snail
Management Direction

Fire Management: Non-fire Fuels Management

- Implement projects involving the application of pesticides in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.
- Promote establishment of plant species needed to control erosion adjacent to suitable habitat.

Fire Management: Community Assistance

- Follow all measures included throughout the "Fire Management" program sections.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Tenure Adjustment (land sale, exchanges, withdrawals, etc.)

- Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands that support known populations or could enhance habitat for Snake River snails.
- Retain Snake River riparian habitat in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Use Permits and Leases

- Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Protect the watershed contributing to snail habitat.

Lands and Realty Management: ROWs

- Issue new ROWs and review existing ROWs at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Locatable Minerals

- Approve plans of operations or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Saleable and Leasable Minerals

- Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Protect the watershed contributing to the snail habitat.

Cultural Management

- Activities within the Cultural Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Utah Valvata Snail
Management Direction

Paleontology

- Activities within the Paleontology program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

2006 Biological Opinion, F-06-0261

- For the upcoming allotment permit re-issuances, cooperate with the USFWS, the Bureau, the livestock permittee, and other parties to identify strategies for avoiding or minimizing adverse impacts to Utah valvata should the action change.
  - Where possible, the Bureau will consider substrate hardening for new or expansions of existing livestock access sites to the Snake River to reduce the amount of sediment reentry into the water column associated with livestock watering activities within Utah valvata habitat.
  - Continue Bureau participation in the Snail Technical Team or other forums to share information, develop partnerships, and encourage research to facilitate the survival and recovery of the Utah valvata snail.
- In order for the USFWS to be kept informed of actions minimizing or avoiding adverse effects or benefiting listed species or their or their habitats, the USFWS requests notification of the implementation of any conservation recommendations.

Table 3-6. Current management direction from a biological opinion and a USFWS recovery plan since approval of the Upper Snake FO's four LUPs for the threatened Bull Trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*).

Bull Trout Management Direction
1998 Biological Opinion: Effects to Bull Trout from Continued Implementation of Land and Resource Management Plans and Resource Management Plans as Amended by the Interim Strategy for Managing Fish-Producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, Western Montana, and Portions of Nevada (INFISH), and The Interim Strategy for Managing Anadromous Fish-Producing Watersheds In Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and Portions of California (PACFISH).

Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas

- Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs) are portions of watersheds where riparian-dependent resources receive primary emphasis, and management activities are subject to specific standards and guidelines. RHCAs include traditional riparian corridors, wetlands, intermittent streams, and other areas that help maintain the integrity of aquatic ecosystems by (1) influencing the delivery of coarse sediment, organic matter, and woody debris to streams, (2) providing root strength for channel stability, (3) shading the stream, and (4) protecting water quality.
  - Category 1. Fish-bearing streams: Interim RHCAs consist of the stream and the area on either side of the stream extending from the edges of the active stream channel to the top of the inner gorge, or to the outer edges of the 100-year floodplain, or to the outer edges of riparian vegetation, or to a distance equal to the height of two site-potential trees, or 300 ft slope distance (600 ft, including both sides of the stream channel), whichever is greatest.
  - Category 2. Permanently flowing non-fish-bearing streams: Interim RHCAs consist of the stream and the area on either side of the stream extending from the edges of the active stream channel to the top of the inner gorge, or to the outer edges of the 100-year flood plain, or to the outer edges of riparian vegetation, or to a distance equal to the height of one site-potential tree, or 150 ft slope distance (300 ft, including both sides of the stream channel, whichever is greatest.
  - Category 3. Ponds, lakes, reservoirs, and wetlands greater than 1 acre: Interim RHCAs consist of the body of water or wetland and the area to the outer edges of the riparian vegetation, or to the extent of the seasonally saturated soil, or to the extent of moderately and highly unstable areas, or to a distance equal to the height of one site-potential tree, or 150 ft slope distance from the edge of the maximum pool elevation of constructed ponds and reservoirs or from the edge of the wetland, pond or lake, whichever is greatest.
  - Category 4. Seasonally flowing or intermittent streams, wetlands less than 1 acre, landslides, and landslide-prone areas: This category includes features with high variability in size and site-specific characteristics. At a minimum the interim RHCA must include:
    - the extent of landslides and landslide-prone areas
    - the intermittent stream channel and the area to the top of the inner gorge
    - the intermittent stream channel or wetland and the area to the outer edges of the riparian vegetation
    - for Priority Watersheds, the area from the edges of the stream channel, wetland, landslide, or landslide-prone area to a distance equal to the height of one site-potential tree, or 100 ft slope distance, whichever is greatest

Bull Trout
Management Direction

  - for watersheds not identified as Priority Watersheds, the area from the edges of the stream channel, wetland, landslide, or landslide-prone area to a distance equal to the height of one-half site potential tree, or 50 ft slope distance, whichever is greatest
- In non-forested rangeland ecosystems, the interim RHCA width for permanently flowing streams in categories 1 and 2 is the extent of the 100-year flood plain.
- Project and site-specific standards and guidelines listed below would apply to all RHCAs and to projects and activities in areas outside RHCAs that are identified through NEPA analysis as potentially degrading RHCAs.

Timber Management

- TM-1. Prohibit timber harvest, including fuelwood cutting, in RHCAs, except as described below.
  - Where catastrophic events such as fire, flooding, volcanic, wind, or insect damage result in degraded riparian conditions, allow salvage and fuelwood cutting in RHCAs only where present and future woody debris needs are met, where cutting would not retard or prevent attainment of other riparian management objectives (RMOs), and where adverse effects can be avoided to inland native fish. For priority watersheds, complete watershed analysis prior to salvage cutting in RHCAs.
  - Apply silvicultural practices for RHCAs to acquire desired vegetation characteristics where needed to attain RMOs. Apply silvicultural practices in a manner that does not retard attainment of RMOs and that avoids adverse effects on inland native fish.

Roads Management

- RF-1. Cooperate with federal, tribal, state, and county agencies, and cost-share partners to achieve consistency in road design, operation, and maintenance necessary to attain RMOs.
- RF-2. For each existing or planned road, meet the RMOs and avoid adverse effects to inland native fish by:
  - completing watershed analyses prior to construction of new roads or landings in RHCAs within priority watersheds.
  - minimizing road and landing locations in RHCAs.
  - initiating development and implementation of a Road Management Plan or a Transportation Management Plan. At a minimum, address the following items in the plan:
    - Road design criteria, elements, and standards that govern construction and reconstruction.
    - Road management objectives for each road.
    - Criteria that govern road operation, maintenance, and management.
    - Requirements for pre-, during-, and post-storm inspections and maintenance.
    - Regulation of traffic during wet periods to minimize erosion and sediment delivery and accomplish other objectives.
    - Implementation and effectiveness monitoring plans for road stability, drainage, and erosion control.
    - Mitigation plans for road failures.
  - avoiding sediment delivery to streams from the road surface:

Bull Trout
Management Direction

  - Outsloping of the roadway surface is preferred, except in cases where outsloping would increase sediment delivery to streams or where outsloping is infeasible or unsafe.
  - Route road drainage away from potentially unstable stream channels, fills, and hillslopes.
- avoiding disruption of natural hydrologic flow paths.
- avoiding sidecasting of soils or snow. Sidecasting of road material is prohibited on road segments within or abutting RHCAs in priority watersheds.

- RF-3. Determine the influence of each road on the RMOs. Meet RMOs and avoid adverse effects on inland native fish by:
  - reconstructing road and drainage features that do not meet design criteria or operation and maintenance standards, or that have been shown to be less effective than designed for controlling sediment delivery, or that retard attainment of RMOs, or do not protect priority watersheds from increased sedimentation.
  - prioritizing reconstruction based on the current and potential damage to inland native fish and their priority watersheds, the ecological value of the riparian resources affected, and the feasibility of options such as helicopter logging and roads relocation out of RHCAs.
  - closing and stabilizing or obliterating, and stabilizing roads not needed for future management activities. Prioritize these actions based on the current and potential damage to inland native fish in priority watersheds, and the ecological value of the riparian resources affected.
- RF-4. Construct new, and improve existing, culverts, bridges, and other stream crossings to accommodate a 100-year flood, including associated bedload and debris, where those improvements would/do pose a substantial risk to riparian conditions. Substantial risk improvements include those that do not meet design and operation maintenance criteria, or that have been shown to be less effective than designed for controlling erosion, or that retard attainment of RMOs, or that do not protect priority watersheds from increased sedimentation. Base priority for upgrading on risks in priority watersheds and the ecological value of the riparian resources affected. Construct and maintain crossings to prevent diversion of streamflow out of the channel and down the road in the event of crossing failure.
- RF-5. Provide and maintain fish passage at all road crossings of existing and potential fish-bearing streams.

Livestock Grazing Management

- GM-1. Modify grazing practices (e.g., accessibility of riparian areas to livestock, length of grazing season, stocking levels, timing of grazing, etc.) that retard or prevent attainment of RMOs or are likely to adversely affect inland native fish. Suspend grazing if adjusting practices is not effective in meeting RMOs.
- GM-2. Locate new livestock handling and/or management facilities outside of RHCAs. For existing livestock handling facilities inside the RHCAs, assure that facilities do not prevent attainment of RMOs. Relocate or close facilities where these objectives cannot be met.
- GM-3. Limit livestock trailing, bedding, watering, salting, loading, and other handling efforts to those areas and times that would not retard or prevent attainment of RMOs or adversely affect inland native fish.

Bull Trout
Management Direction

Recreation Management

- RM-1. Design, construct, and operate recreation facilities, including trails and dispersed sites, in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs and avoids adverse effects on inland native fish. Complete watershed analysis prior to construction of new recreation facilities in RHCAs within priority watersheds. For existing recreation facilities inside RHCAs, assure that the facilities or use of the facilities would not prevent attainment of RMOs or adversely affect inland native fish. Relocate or close recreation facilities where RMOs cannot be met or adverse effects on inland native fish cannot be avoided.
- RM-2. Adjust dispersed and developed recreation practices that retard or prevent attainment of RMOs or adversely affect inland native fish. Where adjustment measures such as education, use limitations, traffic control devices, increased maintenance, relocation of facilities, and/or specific site closures are not effective in meeting RMOs and avoiding adverse effects on inland native fish, eliminate the practice or occupancy.
- RM-3 Address attainment of RMOs and potential effect on inland native fish in Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness, and other Recreation Management plans.

Minerals Management

- MM-1. Minimize adverse effects to inland native fish species from mineral operations. If a Notice of Intent indicates that a mineral operation would be located in a RHCA, consider the effects of the activity on inland native fish in the determination of significant surface disturbance pursuant to 36 CFR 228.4. For operations in a RHCA, ensure operators take all practicable measures to maintain, protect, and rehabilitate fish and wildlife habitat which may be affected by the operations. When bonding is required, consider (in the estimation of bond amount) the cost of stabilizing, rehabilitating, and reclaiming the area of operations.
- MM-2. Locate structures, support facilities, and roads outside RHCAs. Where no alternative to siting facilities in RHCAs exists, locate and construct the facilities in ways that avoid impacts to RHCAs and streams and adverse effects on inland native fish. Where no alternative to road construction exists, keep roads to the minimum necessary for the approved mineral activity. Close, obliterate, and revegetate roads no longer required for mineral or land management activities.
- MM-3. Prohibit solid and sanitary waste facilities in RHCAs. If no alternative to locating mine waste (waste rock, spent ore, tailings) facilities in RHCAs exists, and releases can be prevented and stability can be ensured, then:
    - analyze the waste material using the best conventional sampling methods and analytic techniques to determine its chemical and physical stability characteristics.
    - locate and design the waste facilities using the best conventional techniques to ensure mass stability and prevent the release of acid or toxic materials. If the best conventional technology is not sufficient to prevent such releases and ensure stability over the long term, prohibit such facilities in RHCAs.
    - monitor waste and waste facilities to confirm predictions of chemical and physical stability, and make adjustments to operations as needed to avoid adverse effects to inland native fish and to attain RMOs.

Bull Trout
Management Direction

  - reclaim and monitor waste facilities to assure chemical and physical stability and revegetation to avoid adverse effects to inland native fish, and to attain the RMOs.
  - require reclamation bonds adequate to ensure long-term chemical and physical stability and successful revegetation of mine waste facilities.

- MM-4. For leasable minerals, prohibit surface occupancy within RHCAs for oil, gas, and geothermal exploration and development activities where contracts and leases do not already exist, unless there are no other options for location and RMOs can be attained and adverse effects to inland native fish can be avoided. Adjust the operating plans of existing contracts to (1) eliminate impacts that prevent attainment of RMOs and (2) avoid adverse effects to inland native fish.
- MM-5. Permit sand and gravel mining and extraction within RHCAs only if no alternatives exist, if the action(s) would not retard or prevent attainment of RMOs, and adverse effects to inland native fish can be avoided.
- MM-6. Develop inspection, monitoring, and reporting requirements for mineral activities. Evaluate and apply the results of inspection and monitoring to modify mineral plans, leases, or permits as needed to eliminate impacts that prevent attainment of RMOs and avoid adverse effects on inland native fish.

Fire and Fuels Management

- FM-1. Design fuel treatment and fire suppression strategies, practices, and actions so as not to prevent attainment of RMOs, and to minimize disturbance of riparian ground cover and vegetation. Strategies should recognize the role of fire in ecosystem function and identify those instances where fire suppression or fuel management actions could perpetuate or be damaging to long-term ecosystem function or inland native fish.
- FM-2. Locate incident bases, camps, helibases, staging areas, helispots, and other centers for incident activities outside of RHCAs. If the only suitable location for such activities is within the RHCA, an exemption may be granted following a review and recommendation by a resource advisor. The advisor would prescribe the location, use conditions, and rehabilitation requirements, with avoidance of adverse effects to inland native fish a primary goal. Use an IDT, including a fishery biologist, to predetermine incident base and helibase locations during presuppression planning.
- FM-3. Avoid delivery of chemical retardant, foam, or additives to surface waters. An exception may be warranted in situations where overriding immediate safety imperatives exist, or, following a review and recommendation by a resource advisor and a fishery biologist, when the action agency determines an escape fire would cause more long-term damage to fish habitats than chemical delivery to surface waters.
- FM-4. Design prescribed burn projects and prescriptions to contribute to the attainment of the RMOs.
- FM-5. Immediately establish an emergency team to develop a rehabilitation treatment plan to attain RMOs and avoid adverse effects on inland native fish whenever RHCAs are significantly damaged by a wildfire or a prescribed fire burning out of prescription.

Bull Trout
Management Direction

Lands and Realty

- LH-1. Require instream flows and habitat conditions for hydroelectric and other surface water development proposals that maintain or restore riparian resources, favorable channel conditions, and fish passage, reproduction, and growth. Coordinate this process with the appropriate state agencies. During relicensing of hydroelectric projects, provide written and timely license conditions to the FERC that require fish passage and flows and habitat conditions that maintain/restore riparian resources and channel integrity. Coordinate relicensing projects with the appropriate state agencies.
- LH-2. Locate new hydroelectric ancillary facilities outside RHCAs. For existing ancillary facilities inside the RHCA that are essential to proper management, provide recommendations to FERC to assure that the facilities would not prevent attainment of the RMOs and that adverse effects on inland native fish are avoided. Where these objectives cannot be met, provide recommendations to FERC that such ancillary facilities should be relocated. Locate, operate, and maintain hydroelectric facilities that must be located in RHCAs to avoid effects that would retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs and avoid adverse effects on inland native fish.
- LH-3. Issue leases, permits, ROWs, and easements to avoid effects that would retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs and avoid adverse effects on inland native fish. Where the authority to do so was retained, adjust existing leases, permits, ROWs, and easements to eliminate effects that would retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs or adversely affect inland native fish. If adjustments are not effective, eliminate the activity. Where the authority to adjust was not retained, negotiate to make changes in existing leases, permits, ROWs, and easements to eliminate effects that would prevent attainment of the RMOs or adversely affect inland native fish. Priority for modifying existing leases, permits, ROWs, and easements would be based on the current and potential adverse effects on inland native fish and the ecological value of the riparian resources affected.
- LH-4. Use land acquisition, exchange, and conservation easements to meet RMOs and facilitate restoration of fish stocks and other species at risk of extinction.

General Riparian Area Management

- RA-1. Identify and cooperate with federal, tribal, state and local governments to secure instream flows needed to maintain riparian resources, channel conditions, and aquatic habitat.
- RA-2. Trees may be felled in RHCAs when they pose a safety risk. Keep felled trees on site when needed to meet woody debris objectives.
- RA-3. Apply herbicides, pesticides, and other toxicants, and other chemicals in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment of RMOs and avoids adverse effects on inland native fish.
- RA-4. Prohibit storage of fuels and other toxicants within RHCAs. Prohibit refueling within RHCAs unless there are no other alternatives. Refueling sites within an RHCA must be approved by the USFS or BLM and have an approved spill containment plan.
- RA-5. Locate water drafting sites to avoid adverse effects to inland native fish and instream flows, and in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment of RMOs.

Bull Trout
Management Direction

Watershed and Habitat Restoration

- WR-1. Design and implement watershed restoration projects in a manner that promotes the long-term ecological integrity of ecosystems, conserves the genetic integrity of native species, and contributes to attainment of RMOs.
- WR-2. Cooperate with federal, state, local, and tribal agencies, and private landowners to develop watershed-based Coordinated Resource Management Plans or other cooperative agreements to meet RMOs.

Fisheries and Wildlife Restoration

- FW-1. Design and implement fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement actions in a manner that contributes to attainment of the RMOs.
- FW-2. Design, construct, and operate fish and wildlife interpretive and other user-enhancement facilities in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs or adversely affect inland native fish. For existing fish and wildlife interpretive and other user-enhancement facilities inside RHCAs, assure that RMOs are met and adverse effects on inland native fish are avoided. Where RMOs cannot be met or adverse effects on inland native fish avoided, relocate or close such facilities.
- FW-3. Cooperate with federal, tribal, and state wildlife management agencies to identify and eliminate wild ungulate impacts that prevent attainment of the RMO or adversely affect inland native fish.
- FW-4. Cooperate with federal, tribal, and state fish management agencies to identify and eliminate adverse effects on native fish associated with habitat manipulation, fish stocking, fish harvest, and poaching.

2002 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Chapter 19, Little Lost River Recovery Unit, Idaho. 122 p. In: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bull Trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) Draft Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon

- Protect, restore, and maintain suitable habitat conditions for bull trout.
- Maintain or improve water quality in bull trout core areas or potential core habitat.
  - Develop and implement a management strategy to reduce sediment levels on NFSL and private lands in the Badger Creek watershed.
  - Develop and implement a management strategy to reduce sediment levels in bull trout spawning and rearing habitat in the Wet Creek watershed.
- Identify barriers or sites of entrainment for bull trout and implement tasks to provide passage and eliminate entrainment.
  - Evaluate feasibility of reconnecting Williams Creek to the Little Lost River by providing adequate stream flows
  - Conduct survey of culverts on BLM and private lands and develop a plan to address culverts found to inhibit fish passage.
  - Inventory diversions in the lower Little Lost River, evaluate entrainment and feasibility of eliminating or reducing entrainment, and implement appropriate actions.

Bull Trout
Management Direction

- Evaluate bull trout loss at the flood-control structure near Howe and implement tasks to reduce negative effects.

- Identify impaired stream channel and riparian areas and implement tasks to restore their functions.
  - Evaluate effects of livestock grazing on bull trout egg incubation and on spawning and rearing habitat and adjust grazing strategy as appropriate.
  - Evaluate the effects of channelization on the middle portion of the Little Lost River (i.e., the reach between the confluences of Iron and Summit Creeks) and develop and implement a strategy to restore a natural stream channel.
  - Evaluate habitat conditions in the lower portion of the Little Lost River (i.e., the reach from the confluence of Summit Creek to the Little Lost River Sinks) and develop and implement a strategy to restore habitat conditions.
  - Identify upland conditions that negatively affect bull trout habitats and implement tasks to restore appropriate functions.
- Prevent and reduce negative effects of nonnative fishes and other nonnative taxa on bull trout.
  - Conduct research and monitoring to implement and evaluate bull trout recovery activities, consistent with an adaptive management approach using feedback from implemented, site-specific recovery tasks.
  - Design and implement a standardized monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of recovery efforts affecting bull trout and their habitats.
  - Conduct research evaluating relationships among bull trout distribution and abundance, bull trout habitat, and recovery tasks.
  - Conduct evaluations of the adequacy and effectiveness of current and past best management practices in maintaining or achieving habitat conditions that are conducive to bull trout recovery.
  - Evaluate effects of diseases and parasites on bull trout and develop and implement strategies to minimize negative effects.
  - Develop and conduct research and monitoring studies to improve information concerning the distribution and status of bull trout.
  - Investigate habitat conditions in Wet Creek during winter.
- Use all available conservation programs and regulations to protect and conserve bull trout and bull trout habitats.
  - Use partnerships and collaborative processes to protect, maintain, and restore functioning core areas for bull trout.
  - Use existing federal authorities to conserve and restore bull trout.
  - Enforce existing federal, state, and tribal habitat protection standards and regulations and evaluate their effectiveness for bull trout conservation.

Table 3-7. Management direction as a result of the 2008 BA for the threatened Ute ladies'-tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*).

Ute Ladies'–tresses Current Management
2008 Biological Assessment for … Ute Ladies'-tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*) … for Snake River Activity/Operations Plan revision Bureau of Land Management—Upper Snake Field Office and Caribou-Targhee National Forest—Palisades Ranger District
• Make the emergency OHV closure (issued by the BLM, Upper Snake Field Office in 2004) permanent for the Annis Island's Cottonwood allotment. • Design projects within known or potential habitat to include, but not be limited to, fall, spring, and/or late winter grazing and temporary closures based on site-specific needs that would avoid or minimize impacts. • Monitoring of known or potential habitat would continue, as needed, based on threats. • Treat noxious weeds within known or potential habitat in accordance with the following preferred treatment order: o Biological Control o Mechanical Control o Chemical Control. Site-specific clearances would be performed in occupied or potential habitat for Ute ladies'-tresses orchid. • Insecticide applications would maintain a 0.5 mi treatment-free buffer zone around known Ute ladies'-tresses populations.

Table 3-8. Management direction as a result of USFWS consultation on Upper Snake FO LUPs for the candidate yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*).

Yellow-billed Cuckoo Management Direction
USFWS 2006 Consultation for the Big Desert, Big Lost, Little Lost/Birch Creek MFPs and Medicine Lodge RMP
Special Status Animal and Plant Management – Common to all Programs • In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, and others: o Continue to cooperate in determining the distribution of known populations and suitable habitats. o Following current monitoring protocols, continue to cooperate in monitoring for species presence on a regular basis. o Participate in research essential to conservation of the species. Cooperate in determining specific limiting factors in terms of habitat needs and characteristics. o Cooperate in the management and improvement of suitable habitat to promote species conservation.

Yellow-billed Cuckoo
Management Direction

- Working with other agencies, compile a general list of BMPs that would apply to all programs, to the extent that such a list would assist with species and habitat conservation. The intent of implementing BMPs is to avoid or minimize negative impacts.
- Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation.
- Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation.
- Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives.
- Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal public lands to support conservation of the yellow-billed cuckoo.

Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)

- As a part of conservation, the goals are to promote multi-tiered forested riparian habitat development and maintenance in suitable habitat and restoration areas, to avoid negative impacts, or to minimize impacts if avoidance is not possible.
- Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species will be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications will support conservation and minimize risks of exposure.
- Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent landowners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs.
- Conserve riparian vegetation in suitable habitat (for example, healthy willow stands and cottonwood trees) to maintain their integrity for use by yellow-billed cuckoos, and initiate management in restoration areas.

Upland Vegetation Management: Rangelands (includes weed management)

- Projects involving the application of pesticides in uplands adjacent to suitable yellow-billed cuckoo habitat or in restoration areas will be designed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.

Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)

- Projects involving the application of pesticides in forested areas and woodlands adjacent to suitable yellow-billed cuckoo habitat or in restoration areas will be designed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management

- In restoration areas, cooperate in creating opportunities for yellow-billed cuckoo occupancy by enhancing habitat.

Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management

- Activities within the Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote conservation.

Yellow-billed Cuckoo
Management Direction

Livestock Grazing Management: Permits and Leases

- Manage livestock grazing and trailing to promote growth and recruitment of healthy riparian vegetation communities (for example, willows, and cottonwood trees). Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the yellow-billed cuckoo while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).
- Promote restoration of suitable habitat following fire, fire rehabilitation, restoration treatments, or other major disturbances.
- Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments with known populations to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Livestock Grazing Management: Livestock Management Facilities

- Manage livestock facilities to promote healthy riparian vegetation communities (for example, willows and cottonwood trees). Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the yellow-billed cuckoo while implementing the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).

Recreation Management

- Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits in accordance with goals for promoting species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Coordinate with the IDFG to educate recreation users at boat ramps and at designated camp areas about the need to conserve yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.

Recreation Management: Travel Management

- Manage roads, OHV, routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect known populations and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Special Designation Area Management

- Explore the potential for new designations that would enhance species conservation, such as good-condition cottonwood/willow riparian forest.

Yellow-billed Cuckoo
Management Direction

Fire Management: Fire Suppression

- Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection.
- Fire suppression efforts will be conducted, as possible, to protect yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.
- Coordinate with USFS, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near suitable habitat.

Fire Management: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation

- Implement ES&R activities to promote yellow-billed cuckoo habitat rehabilitation.
- Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides in or adjacent to suitable habitat areas will be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.

Fire Management: WFU

- Wildland fire use projects (where allowed) will be designed to conserve suitable yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.

Fire Management: Prescribed Fire

- Prescribed fire projects will be designed to conserve suitable yellow-billed cuckoo habitat and restoration areas.

Fire Management: Non-fire Fuels Management

- Implement projects involving the application of pesticides in or adjacent to suitable habitat or restoration areas in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.
- Promote establishment of vegetation needed to achieve suitable yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.

Fire Management: Community Assistance

- Follow all measures included throughout the "Fire Management" program sections.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Tenure Adjustment (land sale, exchanges, withdrawals, etc.)

- Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands that support known populations or could enhance habitat for yellow-billed cuckoo.
- Retain yellow-billed cuckoo habitat in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Use Permits and Leases

- Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Yellow-billed Cuckoo Management Direction
Lands and Realty Management: ROWs • Issue new rights-of-way and review existing rights-of-way at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. **Mineral Management: Locatable Minerals** • Approve plans of operations or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. **Mineral Management: Saleable and Leasable Minerals** • Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. **Cultural Management** • Activities within the Cultural Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote conservation. **Paleontology** • Activities within the Paleontology program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote conservation.

Table 3-9. Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) management direction as a result of USFWS consultation on Upper Snake FO LUPs.

Bald Eagle Management Direction
While delisted on August 8, 2007, these conservation measures are being followed to prevent contributing to the species being re-listed.
USFWS 2006 Consultation for the Big Desert, Big Lost, Little Lost/Birch Creek MFPs and Medicine Lodge RMP
Special Status Animal and Plant Management – Common to all Programs • In cooperation with the IDFG, USFWS, and others: o Continue to cooperate in determining the distribution of populations and suitable habitats. o Following current monitoring protocols continue to cooperate in conducting systematic nest surveys and monitoring. o Cooperate in the management of nest sites and communal roost sites to promote species recovery. o Cooperate in the maintenance and improvement of habitat in key foraging areas, for example,

Bald Eagle
Management Direction

mule deer winter range, and aquatic and riparian habitat for fish and waterfowl, where a need exists.

- Cooperate to maintain and develop nesting and roosting habitat for future use by bald eagles.
- Working with other agencies, compile a general list of BMPs that would apply to all programs, to the extent that such a list would assist with consultation and species recovery. The intent of implementing BMPs is to avoid or minimize negative impacts.

- Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation.
- Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation.
- Protect bald eagles from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods.
- Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives.
- Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal lands to support recovery of the bald eagle.

Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)

- Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species will be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications will support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent landowners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs.
- Conserve mature riparian forests (i.e., cottonwood galleries) in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate.

Upland Vegetation Management: Rangelands (includes weed management)

- Projects involving the application of pesticides in uplands adjacent to suitable bald eagle habitat or in restoration areas will be designed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.

Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)

- As a part of promoting recovery, the goals are to promote mature forest conservation in suitable habitat, to avoid negative impacts, or to minimize impacts if avoidance is not possible.
- Conserve mature upland forests in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate.
- Projects involving the application of pesticides in forested areas and woodlands adjacent to riparian and wetland areas that provide suitable bald eagle habitat will be designed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.

Bald Eagle
Management Direction

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management

- Activities within the Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management

- Activities within the Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery. As a part of promoting recovery, the goals are to promote productive fish habitat as a prey species for bald eagles, to avoid negative impacts, or to minimize impacts if avoidance is not possible.

Livestock Grazing Management: Permits and Leases

- Manage livestock grazing and trailing to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).
- Promote restoration of suitable habitat following fire, fire rehabilitation, restoration treatments, or other major disturbances.
- Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments with nest sites and communal roost sites to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Livestock Grazing Management: Livestock Management Facilities

- Manage livestock facilities to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).

Recreation Management

- Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Coordinate with the IDFG to educate recreation users at boat ramps and at designated camp areas about the need to conserve bald eagle habitat.

Bald Eagle
Management Direction

Recreation Management: Travel Management

- Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect suitable habitat and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Special Designation Area Management

- Explore the potential for new designations that would enhance species recovery, such as relict, good-condition cottonwood galleries.

Fire Management: Fire Suppression

- Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection.
- Fire suppression efforts will be conducted, as possible, to protect bald eagle habitat. Place a high priority on protecting suitable habitat.
- Coordinate with USFS, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near nest sites and communal roost areas.

Fire Management: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation

- Implement ES&R activities to promote bald eagle habitat rehabilitation.
- Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides will be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.

Fire Management: WFU

- Wildland fire use projects (where allowed) will be designed to conserve suitable bald eagle habitat.

Fire Management: Prescribed Fire

- Prescribed fire projects will be designed to conserve suitable bald eagle habitat.

Fire Management: Non-fire Fuels Management

- Implement projects involving the application of pesticides in accordance with the approach described in the "Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)" program section.
- Promote establishment of plant species needed to achieve suitable bald eagle habitat.

Fire Management: Community Assistance

- Follow all measures included throughout the Fire Management program sections.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Tenure Adjustment (land sale, exchanges, withdrawals)

- Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private in suitable habitat areas that could enhance habitat for bald eagles.
- Retain bald eagle habitat in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.

Bald Eagle
Management Direction

Lands and Realty Management: Land Use Permits and Leases

- Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Lands and Realty Management: ROWs

- Issue new rights-of-way and review existing rights-of-way at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Locatable Minerals

- Approve plans of operations or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Saleable and Leasable Minerals

- Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Cultural Management

- Activities within the Cultural Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Paleontology

- Activities within the Paleontology program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Table 3-10. Gray wolf (*Canis lupis*) management direction as a result of USFWS consultation on Upper Snake FO LUPs.

Gray Wolf Management Direction
While delisted on March 28, 2008, these conservation measures are being followed to prevent contributing to the species being re-listed.
USFWS 2006 Consultation for the Big Desert, Big Lost, Little Lost/Birch Creek MFPs and Medicine Lodge RMP

Special Status Animal and Plant Management – Common to all Programs

- In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, and others:
  - Determine the distribution of wolves and key gray wolf habitat areas (dens, rendezvous sites, and crucial big game winter ranges).
  - Cooperate in maintaining and improving gray wolf habitat by focusing on reducing human/wolf interactions and improving big game winter range.
- Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation.
- Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation.
- Protect gray wolves from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods.
- Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal lands to support recovery of the gray wolf.

Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)

- Activities within the Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management) program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)

- Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) in forested areas and woodlands that may affect the species will be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications will support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- Implement forest management actions that maintain the integrity of gray wolf habitat.

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management

- Coordinate with IDFG to improve big game winter range conditions.

Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management

- Activities within the Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Livestock Grazing Management: Permits and Leases

- Activities within the Livestock Grazing Management: Permits and Leases program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Gray Wolf
Management Direction

Livestock Grazing Management: Livestock Management Facilities

- Activities within the Livestock Grazing Management: Livestock Management Facilities program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Recreation Management

- Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Recreation Management: Travel Management

- Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Manage recreational travel towards reducing human/gray wolf interactions within and adjacent to key habitat areas to promote gray wolf recovery.
- Maintain regular compliance checks on road and OHV closures to protect key gray wolf habitat areas and identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Special Designation Area Management

- Activities within the Special Designation Area Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Fire Management: Fire Suppression

- Fire suppression efforts will be conducted, as possible, to protect gray wolf habitat. Place a high priority on enhancing key gray wolf habitat areas.
- Coordinate with USFS, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near key gray wolf habitat areas.

Fire Management: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation

- Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides will be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)" program section.

Gray Wolf
Management Direction

Fire Management: Wildland Fire Use

- Where opportunities exist, wildland fire use projects will be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat.

Fire Management: Prescribed Fire

- Where opportunities exist, prescribed fire projects will be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat.

Fire Management: Non-fire Fuels Management

- Implement projects involving the application of pesticides in or adjacent to suitable habitat or restoration areas in accordance with the approach described in the "Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)" program section.
- Where opportunities exist, non-fire fuels management projects will be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat.

Fire Management: Community Assistance

- Follow all measures included throughout the Fire Management program sections.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Tenure Adjustment (land sale, exchanges, withdrawals)

- Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands in or adjacent to key gray wolf habitat areas that could enhance habitat value for gray wolves.
- Retain key gray wolf habitat areas in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Use Permits and Leases

- Issue new land use permits and leases so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Lands and Realty Management: ROWs

- Issue new ROWs so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Locatable Minerals

- Approve plans of operations or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Saleable and Leasable Minerals

- Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Gray Wolf Management Direction
Cultural Management • Activities within the Cultural Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery. **Paleontology** • Activities within the Paleontology program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Table 3-11. Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) management direction as a result of USFWS consultation on Upper Snake FO LUPs.

Grizzly Bear Current Management
Grizzly bears were listed as a threatened species under the ESA in September 2009 (USFWS 2009).
USFWS 2006 Consultation for the Big Desert, Big Lost, Little Lost/Birch Creek MFPs and Medicine Lodge RMP
Special Status Animal and Plant Management – Common to all Programs • In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, and others: o Cooperate to identify and map grizzly bear habitats o Cooperate in grizzly bear habitat management within grizzly bear recovery zones o Manage habitat outside of recovery zones identified as occupied by grizzly bears o Cooperate with other agencies to protect and restore habitat connectivity between recovery zones • Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation. • Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation. • Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives. • Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal lands to support recovery of the grizzly bear. **Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management)** • Activities within the Soil and Water Resources: Riparian–Wetland Areas (includes weed management) program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Grizzly Bear
Current Management

Upland Vegetation Management: Rangelands (includes weed management)

- Activities within the Upland Vegetation Management: Rangelands (includes weed management) program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)

- As part of promoting recovery, the goal is to maintain or enhance grizzly bear habitat in BMUs by managing road densities and avoiding adverse impacts.
- Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species will be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications will support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- Conduct forest management in a manner that is compatible with grizzly bear recovery goals.

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management

- Activities within the Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management

- Activities within the Fish and Aquatic Habitat Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Livestock Grazing Management: Livestock Management Facilities

- Manage livestock facilities to avoid or minimize conflicts with grizzly bears.

Recreation Management

- Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude grizzly bear habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Recreation Management: Travel Management

- Manage existing roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Grizzly Bear
Current Management

- Manage new OHV and non-motorized trails to maintain or improve grizzly bear habitat.

Special Designation Area Management

- Activities within the Special Designation Area Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Fire Management: Fire Suppression

- Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection.
- Fire suppression efforts will be conducted, as possible, to protect or enhance grizzly bear habitat.
- As needed, coordinate with USFS and IDL personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near grizzly bear habitat.

Fire Management: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation

- Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides in suitable habitat will be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described in the "Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)" program section.
- Implement ES&R activities only if needed to avoid resource damage.
- If needed, design ES&R treatments in grizzly bear habitat to minimize conflicts with grizzly bears and habitat objectives.

Fire Management: WFU

- Wildland fire use projects (where allowed) will be designed to conserve suitable grizzly bear habitat.

Fire Management: Prescribed Fire

- Prescribed fire projects will be designed and implemented to conserve and recover grizzly bear habitat.

Fire Management: Non-fire Fuels Management

- Implement projects involving the application of pesticides in suitable habitat in accordance with the approach described in the "Forest and Woodland Management (includes weed management)" program.
- Non-fire fuels management plans will be designed to conserve grizzly bear habitat.

Fire Management: Community Assistance

- Follow all measures included throughout the Fire Management program sections.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Tenure Adjustment (land sale, exchanges, withdrawals)

- Encourage land tenure adjustments within recovery zones, grizzly bear occupancy areas, and linkage areas that would result in long-term positive effects for grizzly bear conservation and recovery.

Grizzly Bear
Current Management

- Greater Yellowstone population only: Retain grizzly bear habitat in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.

Lands and Realty Management: Land Use Permits and Leases

- Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to grizzly bears resulting from human uses.

Lands and Realty Management: ROWs

- Issue new rights-of-way and review existing rights-of-way at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Locatable Minerals

- Approve plans of operations or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Mineral Management: Saleable and Leasable Minerals

- Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Cultural Management

- Activities within the Cultural Management program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

Paleontology

- Activities within the Paleontology program will implement relevant conservation measures as described in the "Special Status Animal and Plant Management" program section to promote recovery.

3.11. Wildlife

Table 3-12 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for wildlife.

Options for Management Consideration

Management direction for wildlife species in existing LUPs is not consistent making it difficult to achieve desired habitat conditions. Maintaining and improving wildlife habitat requires managing for diverse, healthy plant communities, reliable water sources, and connectivity of habitats. Consideration of management direction such as identified below would reduce conflicts with other resource uses and result in desired future conditions beneficial to wildlife while providing healthy habitats.

- Develop use restrictions (e.g., seasonal or timing) to achieve desired habitat conditions.
- Develop guidelines for management of domestic animals and wildlife (e.g., domestic sheep and bighorn sheep).
- Identify crucial seasonal habitats (e.g., winter, summer, and fawning ranges) and migration routes that connect them.
- Identify desired future vegetative conditions for major habitat types that support priority wildlife species, migratory birds, and T&E species.
- Consider management guidelines and BMPs to maintain or improve priority wildlife species and migratory birds habitat.

Table 3-12. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for wildlife.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Wildlife 1.1 – Allocate forage to support present antelope population numbers as estimated below: • Winter - 415 • Spring - 490 • Summer - 540 • Fall - 465 Provide sufficient forage to support a 100% increase in antelope numbers by 1995 through improved rangeland condition expected through intensive livestock management.	**Decision Status:** Completed. Forage has been allocated. AMPs included considerations for prescribed burns and water catchments to improve antelope habitat. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current policy is no longer to allocate forage. Wildlife habitat is managed following the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).	Manage for DFC (e.g., seral stages) of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 2.1 – Allocate forage to support present mule deer population numbers as estimated below: • Winter - 325 • Spring - 175 • Summer - 145 • Fall - 175	**Decision Status:** Completed. Forage allocated in grazing EIS to support present populations. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current policy is to no longer to allocate forage. Wildlife habitat is managed following the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife 1.2 – Maintain existing vegetative composition on 167,620 acres of antelope range.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Maintaining existing plant composition is consistent with managing to the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 1.3 – Convert 67,740 acres of shrubland to grass-forb composition by chaining and burning. Reseed with mixture of grass, forbs, and shrubs. Limit acreage to amount required to achieve resource goals.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No chaining done; 16,400 acres burned in the 1980s. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Currently managing to meet Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health rather than converting shrubland to grass-forb composition.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat, consistent with sage-grouse LWG plans, IDFG plans, etc.
Wildlife 1.5 – Do not restrict livestock use of available forage to allow for 50% utilization by livestock.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Grazing systems are currently based on moderate use (41–60%). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Currently managing to meet the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 2.2 – Improve 30,720 acres of mule deer range through controlled burning. Consolidate mule deer burning needs with those proposed by the range program. Burn additional areas shown to have mule deer values where species diversity or quality can be improved. Limit acreage to reasonable amount recognizing that water and cover are limiting habitat factors not forage.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No controlled burning has been done. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. As wildland fire has burned 70% of affected area.	Identify and prioritize mule deer habitat improvement areas Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 3.1 – Maintain the current predator control program in the unit.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The program is administered by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	(APHIS). BLM coordinates with APHIS with where and by what control methods take place on public lands.	
Wildlife 5.3 – Develop wildlife water to enhance existing habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Seventeen catchments built; 5 well systems improved; 35 guzzlers developed for wildlife. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Guzzlers continue to provide season long water, improving wildlife distribution.	Identify criteria for the development of wildlife water on a landscape level. Pursue partnerships to develop and maintain wildlife waters with local wildlife groups.
Wildlife 10.2 – Make water available to wildlife on all livestock watering facilities. Work with ranchers and IDFG to provide needed water.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Water development for wildlife in Big Desert is ongoing. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Water developments have increased available habitat for wildlife during summer months.	Pursue partnerships to maintain water availability for wildlife after the grazing season has ended.
Wildlife 10.1 – Reseeding projects will use a mixture of native and introduced species adapted to the site. Specific species and rates to be planted should be developed on a site-specific basis.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Seeding occurs on an as-needed basis on disturbed areas. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Seeding is using more native species than non-native for improved results.	Consider direction that prioritizes rehabilitation/ restoration projects to include areas not meeting or making progress toward the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
Wildlife 10.4 – Retain in public ownership isolated tracts that have wildlife or other resource values. If these values are not evident or anticipated, dispose of the tracts. Consider private exchange as a first priority disposal method.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Isolated tracts of wildlife importance have been retained. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Isolated tracts adjacent to agricultural lands have importance to upland game birds and sensitive species associated with shrub-steppe.	Consider direction land tenure adjustments consider wildlife values such as presence/absence of priority species, habitat health, and potential linkage corridors.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife 7.1 – Maintain 17,600 acres of juniper woodlands for raptor nesting and hunting habitat. Do not allow vegetative manipulation. Minimize human disturbance within 1 mi of potential nest sites from Feb. 1–July 1.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The concept is responsive as is the vegetation management and human disturbance aspects.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrub/trees for the appropriate vegetation types. Develop direction (seasonal/timing restrictions to reduce disturbance.
Wildlife 4.2 – Do not allow vegetative control within 100 yards of water sources. Vegetative control will be allowed along intermittent stream courses.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Vegetative control should follow riparian and aquatic guidelines.	Develop direction (seasonal/ timing) for buffer zones related to potential threats consistent with the most current science.
Wildlife 4.3 – Wildlife input to AMPs should include consideration of forage species diversity desirable to wildlife. Ideal mixture of grasses/ forbs/sagebrush would be 25/25/50 percent. Deferred grazing systems would be better than rest rotation systems in sage-grouse habitats. One of the 30 Big Desert allotments will have a rest rotation grazing system.	**Decision Status:** Completed. Deferred grazing has been implemented and one rest rotation grazing system. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction needs to consider a desired future condition (DFC) for vegetation that provides essential habitat components for wildlife.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat. Develop management direction for potential threats consistent with State and LWG plans for management of sage-grouse and other wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 5.1 – Make trial plantings on two selected areas to determine feasibility of wind breaks adjacent to agricultural lands to protect chukars.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction needs to consider a DFC for vegetation that provides essential habitat components for wildlife.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 5.2 – Allow no vegetative control within 0.5 mi of agricultural lands to protect pheasant cover. Vegetative control where annuals or poisonous plants dominate will be allowed.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No vegetative control has occurred. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction needs to consider a DFC for	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	vegetation that provides essential habitat components for wildlife.	
Wildlife 6.1 – Authorize livestock grazing during seasons and at stocking rates listed under R.M. 3.1 for Omitted Lands.	**Decision Status:** Completed 1982, Omitted Lands HMP. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Grazing systems, stocking rates, and clarification of seasons of use has improved habitat conditions on Omitted Lands.	Consider making vacant allotments and Omitted Lands as unavailable to livestock grazing.
Wildlife 6.2 – Manipulate the vegetative resource on Omitted Lands through regulation of grazing use to improve waterfowl nesting habitat.	**Decision Status:** Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction needs to consider a DFC for vegetation that provides essential habitat components for wildlife.	Prioritize management of resources and uses along the Snake River corridor.
Wildlife 6.3 – Install goose nesting platforms on Omitted Lands to increase nesting success as many ground nests are flooded each year.	**Decision Status**: Completed, 29 platforms installed (1983). **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Direction is of implementation level and needs to consider a DFC for vegetation that provides essential habitat components for wildlife.	Manage Omitted Lands for a DFC to sustain a natural ecosystem.
Wildlife 10.3 – Protect and enhance riparian and aquatic habitat areas of the Snake River Omitted Lands.	**Decision Status**: Completed, Omitted Lands HMP (1982) with objectives being monitored. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: Yes **Adequacy**: Adequate. Riparian habitats are being managed for desired conditions.	Manage Omitted Lands for a DFC to sustain a natural ecosystem.
Big Lost MFP		
Wildlife 1 – Allocate forage to support big game population numbers as follows: • Mule Deer - 1977 • Elk - 908	**Decision Status:** Completed. Forage allocations were reserved in Big Lost EIS and grazing decisions. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current policy is to no longer allocate forage.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in the sagebrush community to provide wildlife habitat.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
• Antelope - 654 • Bighorn Sheep - 8	Wildlife habitat is managed following the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	
Wildlife 2 – Manage Beaverland Pass allotment for bighorn sheep habitat values.	**Decision Status:** Completed. Sheep AUMs have been relinquished or converted to cattle. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Domestic sheep AUMs were relinquished or converted to cattle to protect bighorn sheep.	Develop guidance to avoid conflicts between domestic sheep and goats and native species (e.g., sheep and bighorn sheep).
Wildlife 3 – Improve mule deer and elk winter range in Appendicitis Hills by mechanical thinning of mountain mahogany stands and scarifying soils to allow seedling establishment.	**Decision Status:** Not completed. Method not proven to be successful in other areas. Winter elk habitat is sufficient in Appendicitis Hills (1989 update). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Options to improve mountain shrub communities have improved. Decadent shrub stands and increased competition for deer habitat by elk would indicate that this is a valid conclusion.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types to provide wildlife habitat.
Wildlife 4 – Provide wildlife watering facilities on existing and proposed pipelines.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Burnett pipeline in Elbow allotment has fenced enclosures. Wildlife watering facilities on existing pipelines may need maintenance. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Water development for wildlife has not been a priority in the Big Lost. Water distribution is adequate for big game in most cases. The majority of use in Elbow allotment is winter and transitional range and water development would not be advised.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife 5 – Construct five water catchments in Deadman Canyon area.	**Decision Status:** Incomplete. Three catchments have been built. One in Deadman drainage and two in Cedar Canyon. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Most of the wildlife use is for winter range and developing additional water may not be advisable.	None
Wildlife 6 – Provide proper riparian system management through grazing systems or fencing.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. AMPs with RMOs have been developed for the Sheep Mountain and Trail Creek allotments. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Most Big Lost riparian areas are under some type of grazing change resulting in long-term improvement.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, shrubs/trees in riparian communities to provide wildlife habitat.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Wildlife 1d – Allocate 6,882 AUMs to antelope.	**Decision Status:** Completed 1982. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current policy is to no longer allocate forage. BLM currently manages wildlife habitat condition based upon the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 3.b – Allocate 2,490 AUMs to deer.	**Decision Status:** Completed 1982. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current policy is to no longer allocate forage. BLM currently manages wildlife habitat condition based upon the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 5.d – Allocate 1,777 AUMs to elk.	**Decision Status:** Completed 1982. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current policy is to no to longer allocate	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	forage. BLM currently manages wildlife habitat condition based upon Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	types.
Wildlife 1.a – Maintain 366,000 acres of antelope habitat by retaining in federal ownership 120,000 acres fawning habitat, 170,000 acres winter habitat, and all permanent water sources and riparian habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. One sale involved riparian zone: Robison Unintentional Trespass Act, 40 acres. BLM acquired antelope spring and summer range through an exchange in the 1990s. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Decision is consistent with FLPMA policy to provide habitat for wildlife.	Consider direction that land tenure adjustments consider wildlife values such as presence/absence of priority species, habitat health, and potential linkage corridors.
Wildlife 1.b – Maintain existing shrub production on 9,868 acres of winter range in the Jumpoff allotment and treat 800 acres.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. 800 acres seeded with crested wheatgrass during the 1980s. Remaining habitat continues to be shrub production. New grazing system implemented in 2006 should improve range condition within the allotment. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. BLM currently manages wildlife habitat condition based upon the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 1.c – Devise AMPs to consider antelope habitat requirements.	**Decision Status:** Completed. AMP grazing systems and range improvements developed considering antelope habitat requirements. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Developed AMPs along with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health are viable options to achieve DFC.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 1.e – Include seeds for forbs, grass, and shrubs on reseeding projects.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Following areas have been seeded: Warm Springs, Jumpoff, and Williams Creeks. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Using a	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	diversified seed mix (native) is done on rehabilitation projects.	Consider direction that prioritizes rehabilitation/ restoration projects to include areas not meeting or making progress toward the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
Wildlife 1.f – Maintain 35–40% native shrub composition on 191,000 acres spring and summer range.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Objective is being met with the exception of where crested wheatgrass seedings exist. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Consistent with management toward natural systems and ecosystem potential.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types. Use the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health to meet habitat requirements for native wildlife and sensitive species.
Wildlife 2.a – Enhance antelope habitat by maintaining livestock pipelines to provide water through October 1.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Areas where water is provided include: Red Hills, Lower Flume, Pass Creek Ext., Cedar, Burnt Canyon, Kaufman, Deer Pass, Fowler pipelines and Dry Creek hydro. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Water development increases productivity and distribution of pronghorn.	Identify criteria for the development of wildlife water on a landscape level. Pursue partnerships to develop and maintain wildlife waters with local wildlife groups.
Wildlife 2.b – Construct 7 catchments in Bird Canyon, Sands Canyon, Fallert, Eightmile Canyon, O'Brien Canyon, Rattlesnake Gulch, and Cedar Canyon.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Catchments in place at: Reno Gulch-3, O'Brien Canyon-1, and Deer Canyon pipeline. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Water development to improve habitat requirement for wildlife is valid and increases productivity and distribution of wildlife.	Identify criteria for the development of wildlife water on a landscape level. Pursue partnerships to develop and maintain wildlife waters with local wildlife groups.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife 2.c – Restrict livestock trailing during fawning (May 25–June 21).	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Addressed in applicable AMPs and Antelope HMP (1982). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Restricted trailing limits disturbance, increasing reproductive success during critical fawning season.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 2.d – Maintain antelope migration routes free of livestock concentrations during spring (March 30 to May 30) and fall (October 1 to November 30) migrations.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Addressed in Antelope HMP (1982) and Howe Peak AMP (1980). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Maintaining crucial areas such as movement corridors free from disturbance are important to needs of pronghorn.	Identify important wildlife migration routes and develop management direction such as buffers or seasonal/timing restrictions associated with migration routes.
Wildlife 3.a – Maintain 91,661 acres of mule deer habitat by designing AMPs to minimize dietary overlap between livestock and deer.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. 1982 - Bell Mountain, Hawley Mountain and Williams Creek AMPs address this. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Existing grazing plans take into consideration mule deer seasonal use requirements.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 3.c – Retain mule deer winter range in BLM ownership.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No winter range disposals have occurred. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The importance of retaining winter range in public ownership is well documented.	Consider direction in which land tenure adjustments consider wildlife values such as presence/absence of priority species, habitat health, and potential linkage corridors.
Wildlife 3.d – Exclude deer winter range from brush control projects.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. None treated. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Current management focuses on moving toward and sustaining natural systems and ecosystem potential.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types. Utilize the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health to meet habitat requirements for native

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		wildlife and sensitive species.
Wildlife 4.a – Improve 5,000 acres of deer winter range by designing AMPs to increase vegetative composition of important deer forage.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The Bell Mountain AMP addresses this. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Developed AMPs along with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health are viable options to achieve DFC.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types. Utilize the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health to meet habitat requirements for native wildlife and sensitive species.
Wildlife 4.b – Thin or prune about 500 acres of mountain mahogany to stimulate growth within reach of deer.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. 160 acres thinned FY 1981; 40 acres pruned in fiscal year 79/80. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Many mahogany stands are mature, even-aged stands with little regeneration or diversity in age/structure.	Consider direction that prioritizes rehabilitation/ restoration projects to include areas not meeting or making progress toward the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
Wildlife 5.a – Maintain 8,254 acres of elk habitat by removing all livestock on elk winter range by Oct 1.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Hawley Mountain AMP addresses this, and livestock season of use ends prior to Oct. 1. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Elk range has expanded since 1980. BLM currently manages wildlife habitat condition following the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types. Utilize the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health to meet habitat requirements for native wildlife and sensitive species.
Wildlife 5.b – Allow brush control only if it is beneficial to elk.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Brush control completed in the Squaw Springs burn. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Proposed objectives for shrub treatment would be to achieve a DFC to improve ecological potential, which benefits elk.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife 5.c – Prune 595 acres of mountain mahogany.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. 160 acres thinned FY1981; 40 acres pruned in fiscal year 79/80. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Many mahogany stands are mature even aged stands with little regeneration or diversity in age/structure.	Consider direction that prioritizes rehabilitation/ restoration projects to include areas not meeting or making progress toward the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
Wildlife 5.e – Retain all elk range in federal ownership.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No disposal of important elk range has occurred. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The importance of retaining elk range in public ownership beneficial to the public.	Consider direction in which land tenure adjustments consider wildlife values such as presence/absence of priority species, habitat health, and potential linkage corridors.
Wildlife 6.a – Maintain 375,243 acres of raptor nesting and hunting habitat by maintaining current diversity and aspect of vegetation.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Raptors are considered special status species which require maintaining and improving habitats.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 6.b – Minimize human disturbance within 1 mi of nest sites for prairie falcons, ferruginous hawks, and golden eagles.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Raptors are considered special status species which require maintaining and improving habitats.	Consider development of management direction such as timing and distance stipulations to protect avian species.
Wildlife 7.c – Maintain vegetative diversity except on existing crested wheatgrass seedings.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing, except current policy is not to maintain seedings as monocultures. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Policy is to manage seedings for vegetative diversity along with native plant communities.	Consider management direction to improve diversity within monoculture grass seedings.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife 7.d – Reserve about one-half production of livestock forage for food and cover.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. DFC is managed following the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife 8.a – Improve upland game and nongame habitat by providing water for sage-grouse, small mammals, etc.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Water development to improve habitat requirement for wildlife is valid and increases productivity and distribution of wildlife.	Identify criteria for the development of wildlife water on a landscape level. Pursue partnerships to develop and maintain wildlife waters with local wildlife groups.
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Wildlife Management Area (MA) 1: Objective 6 – Provide forage and cover for existing and projected wildlife numbers. Maintain or improve at least 75% of all terrestrial wildlife habitats in satisfactory condition.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Habitat conditions support IDFG population targets.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife MA 4: Objective 6 – Provide forage and cover for existing numbers of wildlife and maintain or enhance upland game habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Habitat conditions support IDFG population targets.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife MA 1: Decision 5 – An HMP will be developed for the Edie Creek Bench for about 168,700 acres. Objectives of the HMP will be to improve deer, antelope, sage-grouse, and moose habitat. Vegetation manipulation will be accomplished through controlled burning and as a result of livestock grazing adjustments.	**Decision Status:** Not completed. HMP not developed. A prescribed burn was conducted in the area (1986). Wildlife water developments and pond were built off Spring Hollow pipeline. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Wildlife habitat is managed using the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in appropriate vegetation types. Develop direction such as seasonal/timing restrictions or buffer zones related to potential threats consistent with the most current science.
Wildlife MA 5: Objective 6 – Manage wildlife habitat for elk, deer, and moose in accordance with the	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes	Review Sands HMP and develop new RMP guidance. Align

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Sands HMP.	**Adequacy:** Adequate. The Sand Creek HMP provides management for winter habitat for migratory big game and yearlong habitat for other resident and migratory wildlife.	management action with IDFG's plan for the Sand Creek Wildlife Management Area.
Wildlife MA 5/6: Decisions 3/5 – Continue to manage this area and monitor wildlife habitat under terms of the Sands HMP. If the Sands HMP is revised, the area will continue to be managed to maintain wildlife habitat as specified in the revised HMP. (Area 6 falls within the Sands HMP.)	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Management still follows the Sand Creek HMP. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The Sand Creek HMP provides management for winter habitat for migratory big game and yearlong habitat for other resident and migratory wildlife.	None
Wildlife MA 5/Objective 6; MA 6: Objective 5 – Manage critical elk winter range consistent with the objectives of the Sands HMP, including deer and moose winter range. Provide winter vehicle closures to protect wintering elk under an ACEC management plan.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Sand Creek HMP still in effect. Nine Mile Knoll ACEC was modified in 1999 and is now "no human entry" from January 1 to March 31. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The Sand Creek HMP provides management for winter habitat for migratory big game and yearlong habitat for other resident and migratory wildlife. Human entry closure has been modified. In general, Opening Day is May 1 North of Egin–Hamer road and April 1 South of Egin–Hamer road.	Consider expanding existing ACEC to protect big game migration routes. Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types to sustain a natural ecosystem. Develop direction such as seasonal/timing restrictions or buffer zones to protect species.
Wildlife MA 8: Decision 5 – Management of the wildlife habitat will be in accordance with the MOU for the Tex Creek wildlife program. About 700 acres of land disturbed by farming operations will be rehabilitated, 20 acres seeded to bitterbrush, and 10 acres of aspen treatment.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Management occurs under the Tex Creek Cooperative Agreement. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The Tex Creek Wildlife Management Area is comprised of land owned by several agencies and is managed to mitigate big game habitat losses due to the construction of the Ririe Dam. BLM's participation in managing this area is essential.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types. As appropriate, consider management direction consistent with IDFG plans.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife MA 9: Objective 5 – Manage 10,333 acres for livestock grazing in support of wildlife and recreation, improve livestock distribution along the river, and improve range condition in the Kelly Canyon/Stinking Springs area from fair to good condition on 400 acres.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Spring grazing on the Kelly Canyon/ Stinking Springs winter range remains. Utilization objectives addressed in the decision record for the Snake River Operations Plan (BLM 2008f). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Extremely important winter ranges for deer take on increased significance with deterioration of upstream big game ranges. Mule deer habitat is not improving.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife MA 9: Objective 6 – Maintain high quality riparian habitat, provide critical nesting and wintering areas for bald eagles, maintain high quality big game winter range and improve about 70 acres of unsatisfactory big game habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Bald eagle nests along the Snake River have increased from 8 to 25 active bald eagle nesting territories. Management for protection of habitat is provided in the decision record for the Snake River Operations Plan (BLM 2008f). Big game winter range benefits have resulted from acquisitions, easements, changes in livestock grazing, and human entry closures. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Area has maintained highest biological diversity within the FOA and contains the majority of special status species.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types.
Wildlife MA 9: Decision 3 – Timber sales can be designed on 364 acres in the Conant Valley and Kelley Canyon areas using select cut methods. About 352 acres are withdrawn from the commercial forest base for bald eagle nesting and wintering and other multiple uses. The 2,925 acres of cottonwood along the river are withdrawn from timber management because of high values for bald eagle nesting and wintering, wildlife and	**Decision Status:** Not completed. No timber sales conducted within the Snake River area. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Recreational and wildlife concerns in this area of high biological diversity need to be addressed.	Identify areas that are available and have the capacity for planned, sustained-yield timber harvest or special forest product harvest.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
recreation. Periodic monitoring will be needed to prevent unauthorized cutting of firewood. Develop guidelines to improve winter range through management of other bureau programs (i.e. travel management, recreation, livestock, etc.) and assess restoration potential.		
Wildlife MA 9: Decision 5 – Wildlife habitat will be managed in accordance with the South Fork of the Snake River MOU and the Pacific States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan. A management plan for the Snake River ACEC will be in accordance with these and will be implemented on completion. About 20 goose nesting platforms, 200 acres of bitterbrush seeding, and 10 acres of aspen treatment are proposed.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The Snake River Operations Plan EA (BLM 2008i) emphasizes bald eagle protection and recovery. Some projects to improve waterfowl nesting habitat and improve winter range for big game have been implemented. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. BLM does not control in-stream flows important to goose reproduction. Goose nesting platforms installed but unused.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types to sustain a natural ecosystem.
Wildlife MA 2: Decision 4 – Develop a monitoring plan that will ensure maintenance of a suitable prey base for bald eagles, golden eagles, and peregrine falcons. Monitoring is also needed to ensure maintenance of antelope fawning and winter range and sage-grouse habitat.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Upland habitats are managed to maintain and improve sagebrush/grass habitats for native wildlife which contribute to prey base for raptors. Monitoring of habitat condition and trend is ongoing. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Current management focuses on moving toward and sustaining natural systems and ecosystem potential.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types to sustain a natural ecosystem. Develop direction such as seasonal/timing restrictions or buffer zones to protect avian species.
Wildlife MA 3: Decision 5 – Maintain satisfactory habitat in key elk calving areas (especially in the Antelope Ridge area), antelope fawning areas, and big game winter range. Provide suitable habitat for upland game on the scattered tracts.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Assessments initiated to evaluate elk habitat. Several habitat improvement projects have been developed for upland game within the scattered tracts. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Current	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types to sustain a natural ecosystem. Develop direction such as seasonal/timing restrictions or buffer zones

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	management focuses on moving toward and sustaining natural systems and ecosystem potential.	to protect species.
Wildlife MA 3: Decision 5 – Develop a monitoring plan to ensure that habitat is satisfactory in key elk calving areas (predominately in Antelope Ridge), antelope fawning areas, and big game winter range.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Assessments have been initiated to evaluate big game condition and trend. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Current management focuses on moving toward and sustaining natural systems and ecosystem potential.	Manage for DFC of an appropriate mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs/trees in appropriate vegetation types to sustain a natural ecosystem. Develop direction such as seasonal/ timing restrictions or buffer zones to protect avian species.

3.12. Fisheries and Aquatic Species

Table 3-13 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for fisheries and aquatic species.

Options for Management Consideration
Management direction in existing LUPs varies by plan and is inconsistent making it difficult to achieve desired habitat conditions to support general fisheries and aquatic species. Consideration of management direction such as that identified below would result in preventing the loss of habitat or enhancing habitat favorable for fisheries and aquatic species.

- Assure habitats are suitable to maintain viable populations of fisheries and aquatic species.
- Inventory and monitor current fisheries and aquatic species distributions.
- Address barriers to migration.

Table 3-13. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for fisheries and aquatic species.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Protect and enhance riparian and aquatic habitat areas of the Snake River	**Decision Status:** Ongoing	None.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Omitted Lands.	**Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. The need to protect these Main Snake River riparian and aquatic habitats still exists.	
Big Lost MFP		
Manage riparian areas to protect quality of water and vegetation.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The need to manage these areas still exists to protect aquatic species.	Manage for PFC.
Retain in public ownership critical wildlife habitat and riparian areas.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The need to retain these areas still exists to protect aquatic species.	Consider a zone concept for the entire Upper Snake PA with specific criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Reduce siltation and degradation of stream and riparian areas through protective fencing to exclude livestock from concentrated areas.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Adjustment of livestock grazing (e.g., season of use, herding) and maintenance of fences has improved riparian areas.	Manage for PFC.
Obtain water right on Birch Creek	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Water right not obtained but several gpm flow to fill 4 to 5 ponds below dam acquired. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This water right was never pursued because of the number of existing water rights on Birch Creek. The filling of the ponds below the hydro project was determined to be a better use for the water.	None
Continue to use water gaps on both Big Springs and Birch Creeks to exclude livestock grazing. Provide adequate water gaps for livestock grazing.	**Decision Status:** Completed in 1983 and 1989. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Construct 3.5 mi of fence along Little Lost River road to exclude livestock from 4.5 mi of Big Spring Creek and 0.5 mi of Little Lost River.	**Adequacy:** Adequate, fences built and water gaps in use.	
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Three-quarter (3.4) miles of stream will be managed to maintain existing riparian, fisheries and water quality in satisfactory condition (Tex and Hell Creeks	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Need to change the action to include present riparian direction.	Manage for Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a) and PFC to enhance aquatic and related species habitat.
Improve water quality, fisheries habitat and riparian habitat on 30.5 mi of streams in unsatisfactory condition and maintain on additional 53 mi that is satisfactory.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Need to change the action to include present riparian direction.	Manage for Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and PFC to enhance aquatic and related species habitat.
Fish and wildlife habitat will continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as a part of project-level planning.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The need to evaluate habitat still exists to protect aquatic species.	Develop criteria or prioritize important aquatic habitats so habitat evaluation continues.
Whenever possible, management activities in habitat for threatened, endangered or sensitive species will be designed to benefit those species through habitat improvement.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The direction should not state "whenever possible."	Consider direction that improves fisheries and aquatic habitats to reduce the likelihood of species becoming listed as T&E species.
Management actions within floodplains and wetlands will include measures to preserve, protect and if necessary restore their natural functions.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The need to manage riparian areas still exists to protect aquatic species.	Manage for Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and PFC to enhance aquatic and related species habitat.
Riparian habitat needs will be taken into consideration in developing livestock grazing systems and pasture designs.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The need to manage riparian areas still exists to protect aquatic species.	Manage for Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and PFC to enhance aquatic and related species habitat.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Wildlife reintroductions and fish stocking proposals will be evaluated and recommendations will be made to the IDFG.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. There is a need to differentiate between stocking native and non-native species and historic and non-historic habitats.	Consider direction that allows for cooperatively working with IDFG to reintroduce native species to vacant suitable historic habitat and discourages introductions of non-native species.

3.13. Cultural Resources

Table 3-14 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for cultural resources.

Options for Management Consideration

Current cultural resource management direction in existing LUPs varies by plan, unnecessarily duplicates plan objectives and recommended management actions, or omits needed management actions. Current direction does not provide FO cultural staff specialists with effective tools for complying with laws and regulations governing cultural resources. Current direction also does not achieve cultural resource management goals of reducing imminent threats to cultural resources, including TCPs, and ensuring that these resources remain available and accessible for use by present and future generations of public land visitors and users. The consideration of the following management direction would reduce threats, stabilize site conditions, and ensure availability:

- Consult with federally recognized tribes (i.e., Shoshone–Bannock, Nez Perce) to evaluate the effects of proposed federal undertakings and management actions on TCPs and other cultural resources and work with the Shoshone–Bannock Tribes to identify TCPs under the Section 110 authority of the NHPA.
- Comply with Section 106 of the NHPA. The FO would determine and assess effects of all actions or undertakings (as defined in the NHPA) on cultural resources, including TCPs. The compliance process would follow appropriate consultation protocols with the Idaho SHPO and federally recognized tribes.
- Implement existing protocol agreement with the SHPO.
- Manage archaeological collections in conformance with Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections (36 CFR I § 79 et seq.) and BLM policy. Collections would be available for study by qualified researchers.
- Assign known cultural resources and areas with expected cultural resources for the following uses according to their nature, type, condition, NRHP status, and their relative preservation value. Currently, these categories include scientific use, conservation for future use, traditional use, public use, experimental use, and discharge from use.

- Prepare cultural resource management plans as needed for areas with significant or rare types of cultural resources and stabilize and monitor at-risk cultural resource sites and TCPs.
- Conduct pro-active cultural resource inventories in projected high-use and/or high-impact areas and in areas where available data predicts a high probability of identifying and recording significant heritage resources.
- Manage archaeological sites to reduce vandalism and unauthorized and unregulated surface artifacts collecting. Work closely with law enforcement staff to develop and prosecute Archeological Resource Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA) cases. Collecting or excavating cultural materials on public lands is prohibited, except by a BLM permit in accordance with ARPA and other laws and regulations.
- Conduct fuels management and fire rehabilitation to ensure that these activities have no effect or no adverse effect on known and unidentified cultural resource sites.
- Consider appropriate exclusion and avoidance areas for historic trails and trail corridors. Consider buffers for no ground disturbance for trails with a physical tread, trail marking and mapping partnerships, interpret trails and related sites when feasible and appropriate.

In addition, written comments received during public scoping provided the following ideas for consideration in developing cultural resources management direction:

- Consider and implement specific (Shoshone–Bannock) tribal goals and objectives to ensure future generations of Tribal members will have the same unique opportunities to enjoy the natural landscape, gather resources, and continue traditional cultural practices.
- Preserve (Shoshone–Bannock) tribes prehistoric and historic sites and endeavor to avoid adverse impacts whenever possible.
- Develop a cultural resource management plan in consultation and concurrence with affected tribes for the Upper Snake FO.
- Proactively manage the numerous cave and karst resources in the FO to preserve or enhance associated biological and cultural resource values.
- Maintain site integrity of cave and karst resources. Cave and karst features were commonly utilized by the Shoshone and Bannock peoples for shelter, cache, cultural landmarks, and ceremonial sites. Caves can provide unique preservation for archeological materials including fibers, plant, and faunal material, and human remains. The site integrity of these locations must be maintained, to protect the resources from looting, vandalism, unauthorized uses, and excessive damage from users.
- Provide specific management direction for project level implementation to protect, preserve, and enhance treaty and cultural resources.
- Ensure that future generations of tribal members will have the same unique opportunities to enjoy the natural landscape, gather resources, and continue traditional cultural practices. The lands and resources under BLM management in the Upper Snake FOA are an important part of the Tribes' history, contemporary subsistence, and cultural practices.
- Establish the Bannock Trail as a National Historical Trail. The Tribes requested that the BLM assist and cooperate in any future efforts to list this trail in the National Trails System.

Table 3-14. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for cultural resources.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
CRM 1.1. Mark and interpret segments of the Oregon Trail (Jeffrey–Goodale Cutoff).	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Trail interpretation has not been completed. Jeffrey–Goodale Cutoff was marked in 1993. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The opportunities to interpret historic emigrant trails remain a valid management goal. However, it does not anticipate the shift in management emphasis from interpretation to marking.	Consider direction for historic trails in general to preserve trails for present and future use and visitation. Management actions for trail segments would include identification, inventory, marking, mapping, and interpretation.
CRM 1.2. Record the Big Butte Stage Station site.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Stage station site was recorded. Associated historic cultural materials and features need to be documented in detail.	Management direction should emphasize documentation of associated cultural materials and historic trail segments.
CRM 1.3. Reconstruct a replica of the Big Butte Stage Station at or near its original location at the base of Big Southern Butte.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This decision is an implementation-level action. A stage station replica located near Big Southern Butte would be difficult to manage and could be vandalized or destroyed.	None
CRM 1.4. Erect interpretive signs near Big Southern Butte that explain Snake River Plain prehistory and history.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Such direction needs to be applied across the entire FOA.	Consider direction regarding developing brochures and other media to interpret the cultural and natural history of the entire FOA.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
CRM 2.1. Allocate 11 sites for surface erosion studies.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The need to study effects of soil erosion on surface lithic scatters remains, but studies should select a few critically threatened sites.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and or monitored and identify selected prehistoric sites for scientific and conservation use. Enable issuing of permits for appropriate research, including data recovery and nominating appropriate sites to the NRHP based upon study results.
CRM 2.2. Allocate sites for data collection related to unauthorized and unregulated surface collecting of artifacts.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not include specific recommendations for evaluating sites and does not address Shoshone–Bannock concerns regarding removing artifacts from sites. Site evaluation usually requires disturbing and removing cultural materials.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected prehistoric sites for scientific and conservation use. Enable issuing of permits for appropriate research, including data recovery and nominating appropriate sites to the NRHP based upon study results.
CRM 3.1. Allocate sites for future scientific and conservation use. It would be necessary to monitor site condition periodically. Changes in condition would be recorded and used to make recommendations affecting the use allocation status.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. There is a need to preserve sites for future scientific research. Decision does not recognize need to protect Shoshone–Bannock Tribal interest in prehistoric and historic Snake River Plain sites.	Consider direction to include recognition of Shoshone–Bannock Tribal interest in prehistoric and historic sites and provides protection as needed.
CRM 4.1. Allocate two sites, Bobcat Cave and Webb Springs, for controlled surface collecting and test excavations. Bobcat Cave is a lava tube rockshelter. Webb Springs is an open site damaged by unauthorized excavation.	**Decision Status:** Completed. Bobcat Cave was excavated in 1989. Damage from an unauthorized dig at Webb Springs was evaluated in 1991. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not recognize the need	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation use. Develop feasible physical protective

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	to protect these sites for future scientific research and socio-cultural reasons. Sites are also Shoshone–Bannock heritage resources.	measures (e.g., fencing, gating) and enable nomination to the NRHP as appropriate.
CRM 4.2. Allocate sites threatened by unauthorized, uncontrolled surface collecting for controlled surface collecting, but no testing.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision is not sensitive to Shoshone–Bannock concerns regarding removal of artifacts from prehistoric sites.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation use.
CRM 5.1. Protect 36 Snake River Plain sites.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Sites can be allocated to appropriate management categories without acquiring additional information. Decision does not recognize the need to protect Shoshone–Bannock prehistoric and historic sites.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation use.
CRM 5.2. Protect 17 prehistoric surface and cave/rockshelter sites on the Snake River Plain, including Houghland, Springfield, and No.2 Well Caves.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Decision is not sensitive to Shoshone–Bannock concerns regarding management of cave and karst features.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
CRM 5.3. Protect and preserve the Cerro Grande town site.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not recommend interpreting the Cerro Grande town site. Cerro Grande was a unique historic site associated with the Salmon River Railroad.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g.,

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
CRM 5.4. Intensively inventory Bear Paw Kipuka, New Butte, Purple Butte, Snowdrift Crater, Bowl Crater, North Laidlaw Butte, and Bear Park within the Great Rift Wilderness Area.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. IFD personnel have completed a Class III cultural resource inventory of 1,500 acres within which is now a portion of the Craters of the Moon National Monument managed by the NPS and the Shoshone FO. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision should have included additional areas.	Develop management decisions for proactive inventory of other Great Rift/Snake River Plain features and areas adjacent to the Monument in cooperation with the NPS, Shoshone FO and Shoshone–Bannock Tribes.
Big Lost MFP		
CRM 1.3. Allocate public land for a buffer zone around the Moore Pioneer Cemetery.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The original decision did not include provisions for implementing recommended protective actions.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted. Develop a site stewardship partnership to protect and maintain site integrity and condition.
CRM 2.1. Manage 15 prehistoric sites for surface erosion data collection.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not include specific recommendations for evaluating sites and does not address Shoshone–Bannock concerns regarding removing artifacts from sites. Evaluation usually requires disturbing	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing,

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	and removing cultural materials.	gating, rock barriers, and bank stabilization) as warranted.
CRM 2.2. Manage historic sites located in the Lava Creek and Champagne Creek areas for weathering and natural deterioration studies.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. There is still a need to preserve these sites for future scientific, traditional, conservation or uses.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
CRM 2.3. Manage 11 sites on public land to determine effects of livestock trampling on prehistoric cultural resource sites.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not include specific recommendations for protecting sites and does not address Shoshone–Bannock concerns regarding protection of prehistoric sites.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
CRM 3.1. Manage public land for potential scientific studies of Native American pictograph and petroglyph sites.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Decision has been implemented on a limited basis. The Upper Snake FO developed a long-term partnership with Archeographics. Archeographics crews and individuals have visited and completed detailed recording of pictographs and petroglyphs at various locations throughout the FOA. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This decision should have included proactive inventory recommendations and stressed using collected information to support site	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use categories and nominate sites to National Register. Recognizes importance of rock art sites to Shoshone–Bannock Tribes. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	nominations to the National Register. There is still a need to preserve these sites for future scientific, conservation, traditional, and public uses.	warranted.
CRM 3.2. Manage public land for scientific studies of prehistoric settlement patterns and migration routes.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use categories
CRM 3.3. Manage public land for lithic material source identification studies.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs. Does not consider advances in technology available for lithic source identification.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use categories
CRM 3.4. Manage public land with historic mining structures to provide scientific studies concerning historic wooden buildings and/or early mining in Idaho.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This decision should have included specific recommendations for documenting and stabilizing historic mining sites and protecting them from vandalism and wildfires.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use categories and nominate sites and mining districts to NRHP as warranted.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Decision 1. Allocate surface lithic scatters to studies of livestock trampling impacts on cultural resource sites.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision should have considered eliminating livestock trampling effects on surface lithic scatters.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
Decision 2. Allocate rockshelters for long-term, in-site preservation and protection.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs. Does not consider advances in technology available for lithic source identification.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
Decision 3. Allocate prehistoric cultural resource sites (rockshelters, surface lithic scatters, tipi rings, hunting blinds, rock structures and pictograph panels) for potential scientific uses.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Rock art sites in the Little Lost and Birch Creek Valleys have been recorded. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs. Does not consider advances in technology available for lithic source identification and analysis.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
Decision 4. Protect, preserve, and stabilize the Clyde Cabin and Warm Springs Creek Tipi Rings.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision should include other historic sites in the Little Lost and Birch Creek Valleys. FO staff has restored Warm Springs Creek in the Little Lost River Valley to its original channel. This action protected some tipi rings.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Decision 5. Conduct test excavations on selected prehistoric Native American sites located in the planning unit.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. ARPA-related test pits have been excavated in the Birch Creek Valley. Decision does not specify conditions and circumstances for test excavations. Does not consider Shoshone–Bannock concerns about excavating prehistoric sites.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Management Area (MA) 1 – Medicine Lodge: Manage cultural resources for socio-cultural, management, and potential scientific uses in the Medicine Lodge Management Area.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Rock art sites in the Medicine Lodge Watershed have been recorded. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The Decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
MA 2 - Table Butte/Twin Buttes: Reduce archaeological site vandalism and manage cultural resources for socio-cultural, management, and scientific uses in the Table Butte–Twin Buttes areas.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories.
MA 3 – Camas Creek: Develop and implement a cultural resource management plan for the Camas Management Area to protect and manage the area's prehistoric and historic sites.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	TCPs.	Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
MA 5 – Sands: Develop a Cultural Resources Management Plan for the Sands Management Area. The plan would provide detailed management recommendations and monitoring schedule. Plan would be implemented upon completion.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
MA 7 – Idaho National Laboratory (INL): Manage cultural resources for potential scientific uses.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. INL security requirements make it difficult to manage sites along the INL boundary. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider a full spectrum of management options. It does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs within and adjacent to the INL.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.
MA 8 – Tex Creek and Willow Creek: Manage cultural resources located in the Tex Creek and Willow Creek areas for conservation and potential scientific uses.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
MA 9 – Snake River: Cultural resources would be managed under the Snake River Activity Plan.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not consider Shoshone–Bannock and other federally recognized tribes' roles, and interest in protecting prehistoric sites and TCPs.	Consider developing criteria as to which sites should be inventoried and/or monitored and identify selected sites for scientific and conservation and traditional use or public use categories. Develop feasible physical protective measures (e.g., fencing, gating, rock barriers, and site hardening) as warranted.

3.14. Wildland Fire Ecology and Management

In general, fire management direction in the four existing LUPs has been to suppress all wildland fires, which over time has resulted in an unnatural accumulation of fuels, expansion of Douglas-fir into aspen, and increased insects and disease in forested areas. These changes have altered fire regimes by increasing the potential for large, severe fires and decreasing or increasing fire frequency. Native plant communities, especially those containing sagebrush, and the wildlife species dependent upon these communities have been affected. **Table 3-15** presents current wildland fire ecology and management direction for the four existing LUPs.

In July 2008, the existing LUPs of the Upper Snake FO were amended by the FMDA (BLM 2008c). The purpose of this amendment was to incorporate fire, fuels, and related vegetation management direction, consistent with the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy, to BLM federal public land management programs. The FMDA provides management direction for wildland fire (addressed in chapter 2) to achieve desired fire and vegetation conditions, with consideration for special status species and fish and wildlife habitat, while returning fire to its natural role in the ecosystem. FMDA management direction which amended the four Upper Snake FO LUPs is presented in the Table 3-16. The information presented is specific to the Upper Snake FO PA.

Options for Management Consideration

Since approval of FMDA, BLM policy and planning direction has been revised for wildland fire ecology and management and may require consideration of additional management direction during the Upper Snake FO planning process. Areas of possible consideration may include:

- Identify geographic areas where suppression actions would be taken.
- Identify the types of fuels management or vegetation management treatments (e.g., wildland fire use and prescribed fire; and mechanical, biological, and chemical treatments) that would be implemented.

- Establish landscape-scale fire management priorities or provide criteria that will guide more site-specific priorities at the fire management plan level.

Table 3-15. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for wildland fire ecology and management.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Decision #1.1. Continue to maintain the fire lookout on Big Southern Butte.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Maintaining fire lookouts is not a planning decision. Such action is considered in fire management plans.	None
Decision #2.1. Limit fire suppression actions on Hell's Half Acre and Cedar Butte Lava flows. Provide full fire protection on Big Southern Butte and East Butte on any fires that may threaten fire lookout or communication facilities. Heavy equipment will not be used.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for Fire Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (BLM 2008c).	None
Decision #2.2. Establish areas in the Big Desert where wildfires will be allowed to burn under controlled conditions.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
Big Lost MFP		
Decision #1. Designate the 21,900-acre Appendicitis Hills WSA as a limited suppression area where bulldozers will not be used in wildfire suppression.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues: No** **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
Decision #2. Suppress wildfires and limit prescribed fires to protect sensitive soils including; 1. Sheet erosion sensitive soils (URA-3 Sec. 2, C-2, overlay 45A.3). 2. Gully erosion sensitive soils (URA-3,	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Sec. 2, C-3, overlay 45A.3) 3. Wind erosion sensitive soils (URA-3 Sec. 2, C-4, overlay 45A.4).		
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Decision #1. Keep fire lookout at Big Southern Butte.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Maintaining fire lookouts is not a planning decision. Such action is considered in fire management plans.	None
Decision #2. Prepare limited suppression plans for Hawley Mountain WSA and Donkey Hill ACEC.	**Decision Status:** Not completed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression plans are a component of fire management plans.	None
Decision #3. Begin prescribed burning by 1981.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Prescribed burning-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Management Area (MA) 1. Medicine Lodge: Manage 22,700 acres as limited fire suppression and the remaining 145,978 acres as full suppression.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
MA 1 – Medicine Lodge: A fire management plan for about 22,700 acres will be developed for limited fire suppression.	**Decision Status:** Not completed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression plans are a component of fire management plans.	None
MA 2 – Table Butte/Twin Buttes: Manage fire on a limited suppression basis on 101,076 acres and full suppression on 55,489 acres.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	
MA 3 – Camas Creek: Manage 58,680 acres as full fire suppression.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
MA 4 – Scattered Tracts: Manage 28,627 acres of public lands under full fire suppression.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
MA 5 – Sands: Manage 90,000 acres as limited fire suppression and 97,000 acres as full suppression.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
MA 6 – Sand Mountain: Manage 21,100 acres as full fire suppression.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
MA 8 – Willow Creek/Tex Creek: Manage 11,490 acres as full fire suppression.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
MA 9 – Snake River: All of the management area would be handled as a restricted fire suppression area. No heavy equipment and no fire retardant will be used. Fire control will be done in a manner to protect natural systems, erodible soils and scenic quality.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	None
MA 9 – Snake River: Fire suppression activities will be conducted using no fire retardant or heavy equipment unless management decides natural systems	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
and values could be adequately protected.	Suppression-related actions amended by the ROD for FMDA.	

Table 3-16. FMDA goals and objectives and vegetation desired future condition for wildland fire.

Management Goals	Desired Future Condition (DFC)	
	Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes	Percent in DFC
Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Invasive Annual Grass		
Increase the number of acres with a native/placeholder shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass: < 15 years old Grass/shrub mix: 15–30 years old Shrub/grass mix: > 30 years old	14 14 52
Decrease the number of acres with more than 10% cheatgrass cover and/or weeds.	Cheatgrass/weeds	< 20
Mid-Elevation Shrub (Including Juniper Encroachment Acres)		
Increase the number of acres with a native/placeholder shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass: < 5 years old Grass/shrub mix: 5–15 years old Shrub/grass mix: > 15 years old	23 45 23
Decrease the acres of Mid-elevation Shrub encroached upon by juniper, and/or any other undesirable species present.	Juniper encroachment Cheatgrass/weeds	7 2
Increase acres burned to more closely approximate the historical fire regime. Improve composition and structure of Mid-elevation Shrub types to better represent historical sagebrush steppe cover types.	–	–
Mountain Shrub		
Increase the acres of early-seral and mid-seral stages. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial grass/shrub: < 10 years old Shrub/Perennial Grass: 10–20 years old Shrub dominated: > 20 years old	33 33 33
Increase acres burned to more closely approximate the historical fire regime. Improve composition and structure of Mountain Shrub types to better represent historical Mountain Shrub cover types.	–	–

Management Goals	Desired Future Condition (DFC)	
	Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes	Percent in DFC
Aspen/Conifer and Dry Conifer		
Increase acres of early-seral and mid-seral Aspen/Conifer and Dry Conifer cover types (pure aspen and Aspen/Conifer mix). Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Aspen: < 30 years old Aspen/Conifer mix: 30–50 years Dry Conifer: > 50 years old	40 40 20
Increase acres burned to more closely approximate the historical fire regime. Improve composition and structure of Aspen/Conifer and Dry Conifer types to better represent historical Aspen/Conifer and Dry Conifer cover types.	–	–
Salt Desert Shrub		
Maintain or increase acres with a native/placeholder shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass: < 30 years old Shrub/Grass/Bare Ground Mix: > 30 years old	20 76
Decrease acres with cheatgrass, weeds, and/or other undesirable species present.	Cheatgrass/weeds	4
Maintain fire frequency and size to approximate the historical fire regime. Maintain or improve Salt Desert Shrub types to better represent those historical cover types.	–	–
Vegetated Rock/Lava		
Maintain or increase acres with a native/placeholder shrub-grass mix. Spatial arrangement of varying age-classes should occur in a mosaic across the landscape.	Perennial Grass Rock/Shrub/Grass/Tree mix	6 80
Decrease acres with cheatgrass, weeds, and/or other undesirable species present.	Cheatgrass/weeds	< 14
Maintain fire frequency and size to approximate the historical fire regime. Maintain Vegetated Rock/Lava types to better represent those historical cover types.	–	–
Wet/Cold Conifer		
Maintain the mix of early, mid, and late seral stands of lodgepole pine forest.	Shrub/grass: < 30 years old Shrub/tree: 30–75 years old Tree-dominated: >75 years old	30 44 26

Management Goals	Desired Future Condition (DFC)	
	Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes	Percent in DFC
Maintain fire frequency and size to approximate the historical fire regime. Maintain or improve Wet/Cold Conifer types to better represent those historical cover types.	–	–
Wildland Urban Interface		
Decrease fire frequency and size in the vicinity of the WUI to protect public and fire-fighter safety, public resources, and private lands.	Decrease fire hazard from high to moderate or low by implementing vegetation treatments and actions outlined in County/Community Mitigation Plans.	

Prioritization Criteria

Identified prioritization criteria for wildland fire suppression and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments is as follows:

Wildland Fire Suppression Priorities

All wildland fires will receive an AMR. The top three wildland fire suppression priorities when multiple wildland fire ignitions occur are:

- Fire-fighter and public safety are the first priority in response to fire suppression. At no time would the activities described in this plan amendment compromise fire-fighter and public safety.
- The protection of property and WUI is the second priority.
- Minimize risks to sage-grouse source, key and restoration habitats.

WUI areas and sage-grouse habitat are both considered "critical suppression" areas of highest priority. AMR will consist of perimeter control and minimizing the number of acres burned, unless the safety of the public or firefighters is at risk. Other BLM-administered public lands are considered "conditional suppression" areas where AMR will consist of the full range of management responses (perimeter control to monitoring) depending on values at risk, suppression resources available, season severity and burn condition and suppression costs. "Conditional suppression" areas include those areas identified as suitable for WFU. Fire management plans will be used to further define priorities between "critical" and "conditional" suppression areas.

WUI areas are identified in the National Fire Plan as requiring protection. CARs in the WUI identified in the Federal Register (66 FR 160, 2001*)* are accessed via county/community mitigation plans and initiated by interagency planning efforts. The National Fire Plan mandates that priority be given to protecting these communities from wildland fire and to preventing fires that start on private lands from spreading to BLM-administered public lands.

Vegetation treatments in and around WUI acres would be conducted with the goal of reducing fire hazard. This goal would not necessarily contribute to progress towards FRCC 1.

When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities follow the two prioritization criteria described above, followed by the following prioritization:

- Minimize risks to sage-grouse source, key, and restoration habitats.
- Minimize risks to habitats occupied by T&E and candidate species.

Management Goals	Desired Future Condition (DFC)	
	Vegetation/Fuels Age Classes	Percent in DFC

- Minimize risks to resources where changes in fuel accumulation and fire occurrence have occurred (i.e., FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 areas).

Fire and Non-fire Vegetation Treatment Priorities

Criteria for establishing vegetation treatments are:

- Design landscape-scale projects to reduce the combined risk to human life/property and resources (e.g., where WUI and ecosystems at risk coincide).
- In designing vegetation treatments in low- and mid-elevation shrub and mountain shrub that could potentially affect greater sage-grouse, conservation measures would be implemented as appropriate.
- The planning, designing, and monitoring of WUI and landscape level projects will be accomplished through interagency planning (BLM and USFS) with active local community participation, and through the development of partnerships.

Vegetation treatments in and around WUI areas would be conducted with the goal of reducing fire hazard. This goal would not necessarily contribute to progress towards FRCC 1.

Vegetation treatment priorities in non-WUI areas would vary by vegetation type across the PA. In general, vegetation treatment priorities include the following:

- Diversify perennial grass to speed reestablishment of sagebrush cover.
- Enhance structural and species diversity in degraded low-elevation sagebrush steppe.
- Reduce shrub and juniper density in mid-elevation shrub.

Reduce invasive species or noxious weeds in all vegetation types.

- Rejuvenate aspen stands, reduce insect infestation and disease, and create a diversity of forest successional stages across the landscape.
- In mountain shrub, rejuvenate old, decadent shrubs and increase cover and density of desirable herbaceous species.

Objectives/Management Actions

Objective 1. Make progress toward desired future condition (DFC) in the low-elevation shrub, perennial grass, invasive annual grass, mid-elevation shrub, mountain shrub, and juniper vegetation types.

Management Actions

- Use chemical, mechanical, seeding, and prescribed fire treatments as appropriate to achieve DFC.
- In perennial grass, invasive annual grass, and juniper-invaded vegetation cover types, restore the sagebrush steppe with an aggressive sagebrush seeding effort, using the appropriate sagebrush subspecies for the treatment area.
- Strategically place treatments on a landscape scale to prevent fire from spreading into important sagebrush steppe habitat or the wildland–urban interface (WUI).

Objectives/Management Actions

Objective 2. Maintain, protect, and expand sage-grouse source habitats.

Management Actions

- Suppress wildland fires in source habitats except where wildland fire use (WFU) would benefit habitat.
- Allow WFU in sage-grouse source habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site-specific, project-level coordination with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG).
- Conduct vegetation treatments in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to source habitats.
- Treat areas within source habitats that have low resiliency (i.e., areas characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush).
- Following wildland fire, WFU and prescribed fire treatments, use chemical, mechanical, and seeding treatments with appropriate plant materials to attempt to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive, annual vegetation and noxious weeds.
- Use native plant materials when determined to be appropriate and practical at project-level implementation.

Objective 3. Treat sage-grouse key and restoration habitats to expand source habitats. Improve and maintain sage-grouse restoration (R1-3) and key habitats.

Management Actions

- Use appropriate management response to wildland fire in all sage-grouse restoration and key habitats and healthy wildlife habitats.
- WFU may be allowed in historically frequent fire regimes to restore fire's natural role and in sage-grouse restoration and key habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site-specific, project-level consultation/ collaboration with IDFG.
- Conduct vegetation treatments in restoration and key habitats to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect restoration and key habitats.
- Treat areas of restoration and key habitats that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity.

Objective 4. Make progress toward DFC in historically frequent fire regimes (aspen/ conifer, dry conifer, mid-elevation shrub encroached by juniper, mountain shrub) by increasing WFU and prescribed fire to create a fire regime within the historical range of variability.

Management Actions

- Use mechanical and chemical treatments to prepare areas in Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 2 and FRCC 3 for prescribed fire and WFU.
- Where prescriptive parameters, resource conditions, and vegetation conditions allow, use WFU or prescribed fire to increase the annual average number of wildland fire acres to an average similar to historical conditions. Site-specific NEPA analysis would be completed prior to implementation.
- Following wildland fire, WFU and prescribed fire treatments, use chemical, mechanical, and seeding treatments with appropriate plant materials to attempt to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of

Objectives/Management Actions

invasive, annual vegetation, and noxious weeds. Use native plant materials where determined to be appropriate and practical at project- level implementation.

Objective 5. In the wet/cold conifer vegetation type and/or areas in FRCC 1, maintain vegetation conditions using mechanical, chemical, prescribed fire, or WFU treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are within the historical range of variability (i.e., maintain the current fire regime in these vegetation types).

Management Action

- Use treatments, as appropriate, to maintain landscapes in FRCC 1.

Wildland Fire Use (WFU) Areas

For the Upper Snake FOA, 501,700 acres are suitable for WFU and 1,289,300 acres are not suitable do to social and economic considerations. Suitable areas are limited to the following vegetation types, aspen/conifer, dry conifer, mid-elevation shrub, juniper, mountain shrub, and wet/cold conifer, which have been degraded because of too little fire, shifts in species dominance, and accumulation of fuels. WFU may be allowed in sage-grouse habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site-specific project level consultation/collaboration with IDFG.

Treatment Acres

The treatment type and footprint treatment acres for the Upper Snake FO over a 10-year period are summarized as follows:

Footprint Acre	Treatment Type				
	Wildland Fire Use	Mechanical	Chemical	Prescribed Fire	Seeding
565,015	1,145	365,775	567,920	193,220	523,240

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

Wildland Fire Suppression Restrictions

The following suppression restrictions are applied to the following resources/uses, fire management, cultural resources and historic trails, noxious weeds, recreation, riparian areas, special designations (WSA's and ACECs), vegetation, wildlife, and threatened, endangered and candidate species, and are applied to all suppression actions.

Fire Management

- A wildland fire situation analysis will be initiated as per the Redbook (Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations).
- Interagency cooperation will be maintained to facilitate coordinated fire management activities across administrative boundaries.
- Wildland fire suppression activities will continue to exercise tribal trust responsibilities.
- In the event a wildland fire escapes initial attack, a BLM resource advisor will be assigned to ensure that resource management concerns are adequately addressed and that necessary mitigation occurs. If one of the following is being threatened or has the potential to be threatened, the appropriate

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

manager will be notified with the following information and a resource advisor will be dispatched: (1) public health and safety, (2) WUI, (3) sage-grouse habitat and, (4) Any ACEC, resource natural area (RNA), congressionally designated watershed or any other area of significant concern.

- Prior to wildland fire season potential areas of conflict between archeological resources and wildland fire suppression activities should be identified.

Cultural Resources and Historic Trails

- Dozer blading should not occur within 300 ft of playas or dry lakebeds to protect cultural resources. Buffer zones greater than 300 ft from playas and dry lake beds are preferable.
- Dozer blading should not occur within 300 ft of known historic trails, cultural sites, NRHP districts, landmarks, and ACECs designated for cultural resources.
- Through the FO manager or resource advisor, an archaeologist will be notified to: (1) provide technical expertise, (2) identify cultural resources that may be encountered, and (3) identify best cultural protection practices to be used during suppression activities. Examples of cultural protection practices may include but are not limited to:
- Manual reduction of fuels from vulnerable sites/features; disposal of debris away from cultural features.
- Creation of fire breaks near or around sites.
- Wrapping of structures in fire proof materials or use of retardant/foam to protect structures.
- Flush-cutting and covering of stumps with dirt, foam, or retardant where subsurface cultural resources could be affected.
- Identification of and reduction of hazard trees next to structures.
- Use of low intensity, backing fire in areas near historic features.
- Saturation of ground/grass adjacent to vulnerable structures with water, foam, or gel before burning.
- Covering of rock art or wrapping of carved trees, dendroglyphs, and other such features in fire retardant fabric.
- Limbing of carved trees to reduce ladder fuels.
- Reduction of fuels and smoke near rock art.
- Covering of fuels near rock art with foam, water, or retardant, avoiding the rock art.

Noxious Weeds

- To minimize spread of noxious weeds, equipment used for extended attack or Type I/II incidents should be cleaned before arriving on-site and prior to leaving the incident. Staging areas and fire camps should avoid sites with noxious weed infestations.

Recreation

- Developed recreation sites and structures on public lands will be protected.
- Minimum Impact Suppression Techniques (MIST) guidelines will be followed where appropriate as

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

identified in the Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations (USDA and USDI 2006).

Riparian Areas

- Dozer blading should not occur within 300 ft of perennial streams unless approved by the authorized officer. Buffer zones greater than 300 ft from riparian areas are preferable.
- Application of retardant or foam, adjuvant/surfactant should be avoided within riparian areas and 300 ft adjacent to riparian areas and waterways.

Special Designations (WSA, ACEC)

- Within wilderness study areas (WSAs), wildland fire management activities would follow BLM Manual H-8550-1, Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas requires approval of the authorized officer.
- Fire camps and staging areas should be placed outside of special management areas.
- Use of natural firebreaks and existing roads and trails to contain a wildland fire would be encouraged.
- The resource values, hazards present, and management prescriptions within specific areas would be evaluated when applying guidelines to ACECs.

Vegetation

- Blading should occur on existing roads where possible. Blading through undisturbed areas, especially those supporting native cover types, should be avoided unless necessary to protect life, property, or resource values.

Wildlife

- When conducting fire suppression actions, species with recovery plans, conservation agreements, Partners in Flight species, and Birds of Conservation Concern will be protected as specified in their respective plans and or agreements.
- Establishment of control lines, base camps, and support facilities in known special status species habitat will be avoided unless life and property are threatened.

Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species

The following restrictions apply to threatened, endangered and candidate species and to "designated" critical habitat.

- Fire fighter safety and public safety are top priorities in response to fire suppression. At no time will activities compromise fire fighter safety and public safety.
- The BLM will coordinate annually with the USFWS to update species status in the planning area.
- FO managers will ensure resource staff initiates emergency consultation with the USFWS whenever suppression activities may impact listed species habitat and, more specifically, during emergency suppression actions to protect life and property.
- Control lines, base camps, support facilities, and other suppression-related facilities should not be established within:

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

- 0.5 mi of known bald eagle or yellow-billed cuckoo nests (February 1–August 15)
- 1 mi of occupied gray wolf den sites (April 15–June 30)
- 300 ft of occupied Ute ladies'-tresses habitat
- 300 ft of all water bodies and springs occupied by T&E and candidate species
- Secure habitat within designated grizzly bear primary conservation areas.

- MIST guidelines will be followed in occupied T&E and Candidate species habitat where appropriate (Appendix T in Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations, 2005). MIST guidelines direct suppression techniques, procedures, tools, and equipment that least impact the environment. Wet-lining (using water to soak/saturate fuels) is the preferred fireline construction tactic.
- FO managers will assign a resource advisor or other designated representative as per the current Red Book guidance.
  - BLM will notify USFWS when appropriate to discuss T&E species mitigation within the suppression area to assure conservation practices are being followed to avoid adverse effects.
  - When incident management teams (IMTs) are required, the resource advisor will brief the incident commander about conservation measures needed to avoid adverse effects.
- Where grizzly bears may reasonably occur:
  - The BLM resource advisor will brief all fire crews on general operating procedures including proper bear safety, sanitation, and food storage.
  - Incident commanders, fire management officers, and scouts should be equipped with and trained to use bear deterrent spray.
  - Garbage should be disposed of in bear-proof containers when possible and removed from camps daily, preferably in the evening.
- No water-dipping by helicopters will occur within 0.5 mi of any occupied bald eagle nest.
- Fuel storage, fuel trucks, and refueling activities will not occur within 300 ft of live waters containing T&E and candidate species. The current hazardous material plan will be followed to ensure T&E and candidate species and habitat will not be adversely affected in the event of a spill.
- Dozer blading should not occur within 300 ft of perennial streams or their tributaries occupied by T&E and candidate species.
- Drafting equipment for pumps will be properly screened to prevent entrapment of T&E fish species. Maximum screen mesh size shall be 3/32 in. diameter.
- Any sump created by blocking flow in any occupied T&E habitat will be performed in coordination with a natural resource specialist to prevent dewatering.
- If chemical products will be injected into the system, water will not be pumped directly from the streams. If chemicals are needed, water will be pumped from a portable tank, or a backflow check valve will be used.
- Application of retardant or foam (aerial or ground) will be avoided within 300 ft of perennial streams or their tributaries occupied by T&E and candidate species pursuant to the current Red Book guidance.
- To minimize spread of noxious weeds, equipment used for extended attack or Type I/II incidents

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

should be cleaned before arriving on-site and prior to leaving the incident. Staging areas and fire camps will avoid sites with noxious weed infestations.

TES Reporting Requirements

In order to monitor the impacts of wildland fire-suppression activities, the Level I team will meet immediately after the fire season to review a summary of activities (fire suppression) that may have occurred in or adjacent to T&E and candidate species habitat. If the Level I team identifies fire-suppression activities for which more information is needed to ascertain potential effects to the environmental baseline for a particular listed or candidate species, BLM will provide a report providing the necessary information identified by the Level I team to the USFWS Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office or the Eastern Idaho Field Office no later than December 31 for the preceding 12-month period. The types of information that may be needed include:

- The location, timing, size, intensity, and suppression activities used for each fire.
- Any mitigations used during fire-suppression activities to avoid effects to T&E and candidate species and habitat, any T&E and candidate species or habitat affected, and the estimated extent of effects.
- Results of post-fire reviews and monitoring.

Fire and Non-Fire Vegetation Treatment Restrictions

The following restrictions are to be applied to site-specific restoration and hazardous fuels reduction treatment actions for the following resources/uses, vegetation, air quality, cultural resources and historic trails, hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites, livestock grazing, placeholder species, recreation, riparian areas, special designations (e.g., WSAs, ACECs), visual resources, wildlife, and T&E and candidate species.

Vegetation

- No chemical treatment would conflict with existing or future national vegetative treatment guidance. To reduce potential resource impacts from chemical treatments, herbicide use would conform to application criteria described in the 1991 document, Environmental Impact Statement for Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States or in subsequent revisions and/or replacements of this document. Use would conform to instructions from BLM Manual 9011 Chemical Pest Control, as well as label restrictions and current policies and state statutes. In addition, the prescription for herbicide application (desired, optimum environmental conditions) would evaluate off-site migration and non-target species by assessing wind speed and direction, temperature, precipitation forecast, soil infiltration potential, constraints on overland water transport due to precipitation or flooding, establishment of riparian buffer strips, and risk to special status species. Fishery and/or wildlife biologists would assist project planners in selecting appropriate herbicides for use among or near terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna sensitive to herbicides.
- The economic effects of alternative fuels management practices would be considered. Local involvement and economic benefits from fuels reduction projects would be promoted.
- Collaboration with local partners to assess WUI areas would be continued, and existing mitigation plans would be updated to implement fuels treatments.

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

- There would be no Healthy Forest Restoration Act treatments in old-growth forests.
- Vegetation treatment activities would continue to exercise Native American tribal trust responsibilities.
- Fuels treatments would be utilized to reduce the overall threat of the establishment and spread of noxious/invasive plant species.
- The economic effects of alternative fuels management practices would be considered. Local involvement and economic benefits from fuels reduction projects would be promoted.
- Collaboration with local partners to assess WUI areas and to update existing community wildfire protection plans (CWPPs) would continue.

Air Quality

- All fire activities on BLM-administered public lands would be coordinated with the M/IAG smoke management program. Under this program, prescribed fire and WFU could be restricted when regional or local air quality is compromised, or if the project would negatively affect visual quality in Class 1 Airsheds (e.g., Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, Bridger Wilderness, Sawtooth Wilderness, and Craters of the Moon Wilderness), non-attainment areas, and sensitive receptors.

Cultural Resources and Historic Trails

- The FO will ensure that required and appropriate cultural resource inventories/surveys are completed prior to implementing site-specific fuels projects to meet BLM policy.
- A Class II or Class III inventory will be conducted for all proposed prescribed fire areas unless previous inventory has been deemed adequate in consultation with the SHPO and Native American tribes.
- All prescribed fires and fuels projects will be subject to further site-specific analyses and Section 106 of the NHPA compliance and consultation.
- All proposed fire and non-fire (mechanical, chemical, and seeding) vegetation treatment actions will be assessed in consultation with the SHPO and Native American tribes for their potential to affect cultural resources. Where previous inventory has been sufficient to identify vulnerable cultural resources, no inventory should be needed. However, where adequate inventory is lacking, appropriate and required inventory of the area as determined in consultation with the SHPO will be conducted.
- Fire project planners should coordinate with the archeologist to incorporate, as necessary, best cultural protection practices in burn plans. Examples of cultural protection practices to be considered may include but are not limited to:
    - Manual reduction of fuels on vulnerable sites/features; disposal of debris away from cultural features.
    - Use of low-intensity backing fire in areas near historic features.
    - Saturation of ground/grass adjacent to vulnerable structures with water, foam, or gel before burning.
    - Pre-burning of site(s) at lower intensity than planned for surrounding areas.

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

- Limiting fire intensity and duration over vulnerable sites.
- Use of a fast-moving, higher intensity fire over lithic scatters, where rock materials are vulnerable to longer-duration heating.
- Creation of fire breaks near or around sites.
- Wrapping of structures in fire-proof materials or use of retardant/foam to protect structures.
- Flush-cutting and covering of stumps with dirt, foam, or retardant where subsurface cultural resources could be affected.
- Identification of and reduction of hazard trees next to structures.
- Covering of rock art or wrapping of carved trees, dendroglyphs, and other such features in fire retardant fabric.
- Limbing of carved trees to reduce ladder fuels.
- Reduction of fuels and smoke near rock art.
- Covering of fuels near rock art with foam, water, or retardant, avoiding the rock art.
- Dozer blading should not occur within 300 ft of known historic trails and cultural sites.

- Cultural resources will be given full consideration during subsequent site-specific NEPA processes. This consideration provides for review of existing literature on previous inventories, field inventory of areas not surveyed, documentation and evaluation of identified sites, analysis of site-specific effects, application of appropriate management actions to reduce anticipated adverse effects, and consultation with the SHPO.
- The FO will ensure that existing cultural and paleontological data and information will be reviewed and that required appropriate cultural resource inventories/surveys will be complete prior to implementing site-specific fuels projects to meet BLM policy.
- Dozer blading should not occur within 300 ft of known historic trails, cultural sites, NRHP districts, landmarks and ACECs designated for cultural resources.
- All proposed fire and non-fire (mechanical, chemical and seeding) vegetation treatment actions will be assessed in consultation with the SHPO for their potential to affect cultural resources. Where previous inventory has been sufficient to identify vulnerable cultural resources, no inventory should be needed. However, where adequate inventory is lacking, appropriate and required inventory of the area, as determined in consultation with the SHPO, will be conducted.
- All prescribed fire and fuels projects will be subject to further site-specific analyses and Section 106 of the NHPA compliance and consultation.
- A Class II or Class III inventory will be conducted of all proposed prescribed fire areas unless previous inventory has been deemed adequate in consultation with the SHPO.

Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites

- Hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites identified within any specific fuels management or vegetation treatment area would be avoided.
- The use of hazardous substances (e.g., retardant, foam, gasoline in riparian zones, and explosives) for fire control would be avoided whenever practical.

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

Livestock Grazing

- All treatment areas would be rested from livestock grazing until project-specific monitoring identified in site-specific project plans and/or NEPA documents show resource objectives have been met. Resumption of grazing would be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Placeholder Species

- Plant materials used in re-vegetation actions would be native when appropriate and practical. However, desirable non-native species may be used in re-vegetation actions on harsh or degraded sites, when native seed is not available, or where they would structurally mimic the natural plant community and prevent soil loss and invasion by exotic annual grasses and noxious weeds. The species used would be those that have the highest probability of establishment on these sites. These "placeholders" would maintain the area for potential future native restoration. Native seed would be used more frequently and at larger scales as species adapted to local areas become more available.

Recreation

- Treatments in developed or high-use recreation areas would be designed to minimize impacts to the recreational resource or users.
- Treatments would be designed to minimize impacts to character of the managed recreation setting and to the recreation experiences and benefits desired by the recreation participant. In areas where the character of the setting and/or the desired benefit outcomes is not defined, treatments would be designed to minimize impacts to the recreational resource or users.

Riparian Areas

- No dozer blading should occur within 300 ft of perennial streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 ft are preferable.

Special Designations (WSAs, ACECs)

- Within WSAs, fuels and vegetation treatments and WFU should follow BLM Manual H-8550-1, Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas requires approval of the authorized officer; however, minimizing use of tools is the preferred practice.

Visual Resources

- Treatments occurring in areas classified or inventoried as VRM Class I and II would consider visual qualities to preserve the landscape character. Wherever possible, landscape modifications would replicate the natural line, form, color, and texture found in the surrounding area. Treatments that result in long-term disruption of natural visual qualities (e.g., drill seeding that establishes vegetation rows) should be avoided or hidden by design.

Wildlife

- Seasonal guidelines may be applied if needed to mitigate the impacts to big game species from planned fuels management and vegetation treatments.
- Restrictions may be imposed on fuels management and vegetation treatment projects in areas supporting nesting raptors. Treatment proposals would be coordinated with IDFG.

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

- Species with recovery plans, conservation agreements, Partners in Flight species, and Birds of Conservation Concern will be protected as specified in their respective plans/agreements.
- Habitat conservation assessment and conservation strategies have been prepared and are currently being implemented for the following BLM sensitive species: Townsend's big-eared bat, wolverine, spotted bat, trumpeter swan, northern goshawk, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, greater sage-grouse, Idaho dunes tiger beetle, Bonneville cutthroat trout, bull trout, Yellowstone cutthroat trout, red band trout and leather sided chub.
- Vegetation treatments proposed in areas supporting sage and sharp-tailed grouse would be coordinated with IDFG and would be implemented under LUP guidance or restrictions.
- Seasonal guidelines may be applied to mitigate the impacts to big game species from planned vegetation treatments as specified in LUPs.
- Collaboration with appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to promote public education on species at risk, including their importance to the human and biological community and the rationale behind the protective measures that would be applied to their habitats will occur during implementation.

Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species

The following restrictions apply to habitats occupied by T&E and candidate species and designated critical habitat.

- Treatment activities may occur near or adjacent to T&E and candidate species habitat and will be designed to minimize or mitigate impacts to habitat occupied by T&E and candidate species and designated critical habitat so that the species or their habitats will not be adversely affected. All related fire and non-fire vegetation treatment activities in areas that may affect T&E and candidate species will be conducted in consultation with USFWS. Further, all such activities will be designed and implemented in such a manner that potential impacts to T&E and candidate species from disturbance or habitat modification would be extremely unlikely to occur or would be so small as to not be meaningfully measured, detected, or analyzed.
- T&E and candidate species with recovery plans, conservation agreements, and conservation strategies will be protected as specified in their respective plans/agreements/strategies. These protections include such measures as adequate habitat and range for a given species, including mitigation measures for multiple land use activities authorized by the BLM.
- Herbicide applicators will obtain a weather forecast for the area prior to initiating a spraying project to ensure no extreme precipitation or wind events could occur during or immediately after spraying. Aerial application of herbicides will not occur during periods of inversion. Spraying will follow label instructions.
- Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities would be conducted according to standards and guidelines in National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines (USFWS 2007). The PA located within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem would conduct fuels management and vegetative treatments according to standards and guidelines in the Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan (Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Working Group 1996). Nests within the Snake River ACEC would follow guidelines within the decision record for the Snake River Activity Plan

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

EA. Those outside of the ACEC would follow national guidelines (660 ft) of active nest sites from February 1–July 31.

- Riparian cottonwood forests with a willow a understory that may be impacted by fuels management and vegetation treatments would be surveyed for yellow-billed cuckoos prior to initiating project activities. When developing vegetation treatment projects, no ground-based application of herbicides would occur from May 1–August 31 within 200 ft of occupied yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.
- Aerial application of chemicals would not occur from May 1–August 31 within 0.5 mi of occupied yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.
- Fuels management and vegetation treatment areas within the PCA would be coordinated with USFWS as per ESA guidelines and USFS activities to comply with road density restrictions and number and juxtaposition of management activities within the PCA.
- When developing vegetation treatment projects, open and total motorized access routes or trail density within BMUs would not increase. When developing vegetation treatment projects within the PCA the Bureau will coordinate activities with the USFWS as per ESA guidelines.
- Fuels management and vegetation treatments that may occur within the Little Lost River drainage would be conducted according to standards and guidelines developed for bull trout *(Salvelinus confluentus)* Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas on BLM lands within the geographic range of bull trout (USFWS 1999a, 2002).
- No aerial application of herbicides would occur within 0.5 mi of all water bodies and springs containing listed snails and bull trout.
- No ground-based applications of herbicides, surfactants, or adjuvants would occur within 100 ft of perennial streams or their live water tributaries occupied by listed snails, Columbia spotted frog, and bull trout.
- Dozer blading would not occur within 300 ft of streams that have habitat occupied by T&E or Candidate Species.
- Ground-disturbing activities other than tree and shrub planting will not occur within 300 ft of all water bodies and springs containing listed snails, Columbia spotted frog and bull trout.
- No aerial application of herbicides would occur within 0.5 mi of all water bodies and springs containing listed snail, Columbia spotted frog and bull trout species.
- Treatments will follow INFISH guidelines in bull trout habitat.
- For those portions of the Snake River drainages where fuels management and vegetation treatments have the potential to effect populations of T&E Snake River mollusks, the BLM will consult with the USFWS to ensure mitigation measures are adequate to avoid adverse effects to Snake River mollusks.

Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R) Restrictions

- The Field Office Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan contains ES&R restrictions that would be applied to all site-specific ES&R actions.

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

Selected Conservation Measures Considered In Vegetation Treatments Affecting Greater Sage-Grouse

Prescribed Fire

- Prior to planning prescribed burns or other vegetation management treatments in sagebrush communities, ensure that sage-grouse seasonal habitats have been mapped (see 5.3.2 for additional discussion of mapping).
- Once seasonal habitats have been mapped, ensure that proposed project areas have been evaluated on the ground in the context of the appropriate seasonal habitat characteristics (see 5.3.2).
- Avoid the use of prescribed fire and other sagebrush-reduction projects in areas where sagebrush is limiting on the landscape or in habitats that currently meet, or are trending toward meeting, breeding or winter habitat characteristics.
- If the analysis shows that a vegetation treatment may still be advisable, design habitat-manipulation projects to achieve the desired objectives, considering the following:
    - Where prescribed burning, or other treatments, in sage-grouse habitats may be warranted (e.g., sagebrush cover exceeds desired breeding or winter habitat characteristics; understory does not meet seasonal habitat characteristics and restoration is desired; there is a need to restore ecological processes; or a proposed treatment site is in an exotic seeding being managed for overall sage-grouse benefits on the surrounding landscape).
    - Project design should be done with interdisciplinary input and in cooperation with IDFG.
    - Ensure that any proposed sagebrush treatment acreage is conservative in the context of surrounding seasonal habitats and landscape.
    - Where appropriate, ensure that treatments are configured in a manner that promotes use by sage-grouse (see Connelly et al. 2000 for additional discussion).
    - Leave adequate untreated sagebrush areas for loafing/hiding cover near leks for sage-grouse.
- Evaluate and monitor prescribed burns, and other treatments, as soon as possible after treatment and periodically thereafter to determine whether the project was successful and is meeting or trending toward desired objectives.
- Avoid the use of prescribed fire or other sagebrush treatments in habitats prone to the expansion or invasion of cheatgrass or other invasive species unless adequate measures are taken to control the invasive species and ensure subsequent dominance by desirable perennial species. In many, if not most cases, this will likely require chemical treatments and reseeding.
- Plan, execute, and monitor prescribed fires in a manner that provides for adequate control and provision for contingency resources.
- Ensure that burn plans address the importance of preventing escaped fires when prescription fires are planned in the vicinity of stronghold and key habitat.

Annual Grasslands

- Local working groups (LWG), land management agencies, IDFG, and other partners should work closely together to identify and prioritize annual grassland areas for restoration. Work cooperatively to identify options, schedules, and funding opportunities for specific projects.

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

- In general, the priority for implementation of specific sage-grouse habitat restoration projects in annual grasslands should be given first to:
  - Sites adjacent to or surrounded by sage-grouse stronghold habitats, then
  - Sites outside stronghold habitats but adjacent to or within approximately 2 mi of key habitat, and
  - Sites beyond 2 mi of key habitat. The intent here is to focus restoration outward from existing, intact habitat.
- All seeding project designs should include measures for noxious weed control and monitoring for at least 3 years following implementation.
- Seed used in sage-grouse habitat restoration seedings, burned area rehabilitation projects, and hazardous fuels/wildland urban interface projects will be tested and certified as weed-free, based on prevailing agency policy and protocol. Private landowners are encouraged to use only certified seed, as well.
- In designing rehabilitation and restoration projects, use the best available science relative to seeding technology and plant materials. Use of NRCS's "VegSpec" website may be helpful. VegSpec is a web-based decision support system that assists land managers in the planning and design of vegetation establishment practices. VegSpec uses soil, plant, and climate data to select plant species that are site-specifically adapted, suitable for the selected practice, and appropriate for the purposes and objectives for which the planting is intended. (See http://plants.usda.gov).
- Design vegetation treatments in areas of high fire frequency to facilitate firefighter safety; reduce the risk of extreme fire behavior; reduce the risk and rate of fire spread to stronghold, key, and restoration habitats; reduce fire frequencies; and shorten the fire season.
- Where rangelands are dominated by annuals (such as cheatgrass) or where they border farmlands or railroad right-of-ways, convert cheatgrass areas to perennials, or establish buffers of perennial species to reduce the risk of fire spread from railroad or agriculture-related activities (e.g., sparks from trains, field burns, burn barrels), where appropriate and feasible.
- To discourage the spread of invasive annuals and noxious weed seed, require the washing of fire vehicles (including undercarriage) prior to deployments and prior to demobilization from wildfire incidents.
- Human activities such as fence and pipeline maintenance or construction, facility maintenance, utility maintenance, or any project or related work at or within 1 km (0.6 mi) of occupied leks that results in or will likely result in disturbance to lekking birds should be avoided from approximately 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. In general, this guideline should be applied from March 15–May 1 in lower elevation habitats and March 25–May 15 in higher elevation habitats.

Perennial Grasslands

- LWGs, land management agencies, IDFG, and other partners should work closely together to identify and prioritize perennial grasslands (exotic versus native) where plant species diversity or sagebrush is limiting on the landscape. Further, they should work cooperatively to identify options, schedules, and funding opportunities for reestablishing sagebrush in higher priority areas.
- When seeding sagebrush, source-identified, tested seed adapted to local conditions should be used.

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

- One or more of the following approaches for restoring sagebrush should be considered to improve likelihood of success:
  - Use of the "Oyer" compact row seeder, which compacts soil and presses seed into the surface.
  - Use of the Brillion cultipacker seeder, where seed is broadcast over the surface followed by cultipacking.
  - Transplant bare-root or containerized stock in small critical areas to establish a seed source.
  - Use the "mother plant" technique, and transplant bare-root or containerized stock in select locations throughout the area to establish a seed source.
  - For large areas (e.g., large wildland fires), aerial seed onto a rough seedbed (see Monsen et al. 2004) coupled with one or more of the above options.
  - In established stands of introduced perennial grasses, transplant sagebrush into strategic patches or strips in critical sites or throughout the area. Scalp spots or strips to reduce grass competition prior to planting. Or, as an alternative to scalps, consider the use of herbicides (see Monsen et al. 2004, Volume 3).
- Where the diversification of crested wheatgrass or similar seedings with native species of grasses, forbs, and/or shrubs is desired, Pellant and Lysne (2005) recommend a three-step process:
  - Reduce competition of crested wheatgrass to facilitate the establishment and persistence of the desired species. Possibilities include use of livestock, capitalizing on drought episodes that reduce grass vigor, herbicides such as glyphosate, and mechanical treatments.
  - Introduce desired, site-adapted species through drill seeding; aerial seeding followed by harrow, cultipacker or chaining; livestock trampling; or transplanting container stock, bareroot stock, or individual plants from native sources ("wildings"). Lambert (2005) provides descriptions, recommended seeding rates, and other useful information for nearly 250 species of native and non-native grasses, forbs, and shrubs.
  - As part of post-treatment management, ensure that livestock grazing and rest intervals are matched with the phenology and life history characteristics of the desired/seeded/transplanted species. Implement monitoring to clearly document how, what, when, and where treatments were implemented. Follow up with suitable effectiveness monitoring to document success of the treatments relative to project objectives.

Conifer Encroachment

- LWGs, land management agencies, IDFG, and other partners should work closely together to identify and prioritize conifer encroachment areas for further management action. Work cooperatively to identify options, schedules, and funding opportunities for specific projects. For western juniper, Miller and others (2005) provide Guidelines for Selecting the Most Appropriate Management Actions, pages 54–57.
- IDFG, land management agencies, LWGs, and other partners should work closely together to identify leks where conifer encroachment may be affecting lek attendance or nearby habitat quality.
- Remove Douglas fir or other conifers where they are encroaching on wet meadows, riparian areas, or sagebrush stands that provide potential sage-grouse habitat.
- Remove juniper, Douglas-fir, or other trees within at least 330 ft or an 8-acre area of occupied sage-grouse leks. The purpose of this procedure is to reduce perching opportunity for raptors or other avian predators within view of leks. Techniques could include chainsaw, chipper, or other suitable

Management Restrictions, Conservation Measures and Guidelines

mechanical means. Ensure cutting and slash disposal is completed between approximately July 15–January 30 to minimize disturbance to grouse that may be in the vicinity (e.g., males at leks, nesting females, and young broods). This practice serves to reduce raptor predation on sage-grouse by eliminating potential perches, thereby improving survival, recruitment, and productivity. It may be particularly valuable where avian predation may be of greater concern such as in areas with fragmented habitat, nearby infrastructure features, and/or in the case of small, isolated sage-grouse populations.

- Where juniper or other conifer species have encroached upon sagebrush communities at larger scales, employ prescribed fire, chemical, mechanical (e.g., chaining, chipper, chainsaw, or commercial sale), or other suitable methods to reduce or eliminate juniper. Priority should be given to areas where there is a strong likelihood for recovery of perennial herbaceous vegetation or where preparatory and follow-up actions (e.g., control of invasive species and seeding) are likely to be successful. Whenever possible, but especially if sagebrush habitat is limited locally, use juniper-control techniques that are least disruptive to the affected stand of sagebrush. For example, if junipers are only scattered, and the associated sagebrush community is otherwise relatively healthy, cutting junipers with chainsaws will remove the encroachment threat while allowing for immediate use of the sagebrush by sage-grouse. In all cases, control efforts should be planned using interdisciplinary expertise.
- Where juniper control around leks is planned, monitor leks for at least three consecutive years post-treatment to document effects on lek attendance. Ideally, 2–3years of pre-treatment monitoring is also recommended, but this may not always be feasible.

Community Assistance/Protection Guidelines

The following community assistance actions will be employed consistent with the National Fire Plan (NFP) (USDI 2000) policy:

- Continue to collaborate with local partners to assess and define WUI areas, update existing mitigation plans, and implement a prevention and education program.
- Work with other federal agencies, state, county, and private entities to update county mitigation plans.
- Provide rural fire assistance, as identified in mitigation plans, to rural fire districts. Assess and increase suppression capabilities and effectiveness by providing assistance to local fire suppression organizations.
- Provide planning and implementation assistance to private landowners so hazardous fuels can be reduced as identified in mitigation plans.
- Provide funding to implement fire education projects identified in mitigation plans.
- To reduce fuel hazards and the threat of wildland fire, including consideration of any local CARs.
- Continue to collaborate with local partners to assess WUI areas and update existing mitigation plans to implement fuels treatments.

3.15. Visual Resources

The current management direction based upon existing LUPs for visual resources is presented in **Table 3-22**.

Options for Management Consideration
Visual Resource management direction in existing LUPs is not consistent and sometimes lacking making it difficult to manage for landscape scenic values. Consideration of management direction as identified below would assure scenic values are considered with various land uses and ensure that the scenic quality of the landscape is retained.

- Identify all areas of public lands that should be designated as VRM Class I.
- Assure all public lands within the planning area are assigned to a VRM management class.

Table 3-17. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for visual resources.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
Big Desert MFP		
All scenery units classified as visual resource management (VRM) Class II shall be managed so that changes in the basic elements (line, form, color, and texture) should not be evident in the characteristic landscape. The Class II areas include: Wapi Flows lavas 19,440 acres Craters of the Moon lavas 152,230 acres Big Southern Butte 9,960 acres	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM Class II areas are managed to retain the existing character of the landscape so the level of change to the characteristic landscape remains low. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The two areas of Wapi Flows and Craters of the Moon lava flows are now outside the Upper Snake FO planning area. Doesn't account for current policy of wilderness study areas (WSAs) being in VRM Class 1 and the other classes re-evaluated in 1994.	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.
All scenery units classified as VRM Class III shall be managed so that changes in the basic elements may be evident, but subordinate to the characteristic landscape. The Class III areas include: (1) Lava Plain 1,233,000 acres; (2) Cedar Butte 46,560 acres; (3) Agriculture Zone 1 - 60,000 acres	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM Class III areas are managed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape so the level of change to the characteristic landscape remains moderate. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The acreage is wrong; some of the lava plain and agriculture land were assigned to another field office; VRM	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Zone 2 - 290,000 acres Total VRM Class III = 1,629,560 acres	Classes were re-evaluated in 1994.	
Big Lost MFP		
Designate 64,439 acres as VRM Management Class II. This class requires that management activities be designed and located to blend into the natural landscape and not to be visually apparent to the casual visitor. Contrast ratings for Class II must not exceed 12 points.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM Class II areas are managed to retain the existing character of the landscape so the level of change to the characteristic landscape remains low. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. VRM Class II for the planning unit was re-evaluated in1994.	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.
Designate 156,223 acres as VRM Class III. Management activities here may be evident to the casual visitor. However, the activity should remain subordinate to the existing landscape. Class III contrast ratings must not exceed 16 points	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM Class III areas are managed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape so the level of change to the characteristic landscape remains moderate. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. VRM Class III for the planning unit was re-evaluated in 1994.	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.
Designate 148,114 acres as VRM Class IV. Management activities may dominate this landscape but they should repeat the form, line, color, and texture of the natural landscape. Class IV contrast ratings must not exceed 20 points.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM Class IV areas are managed to provide for activities which require major modification of the existing character of the landscape so the level of change to the characteristic landscape may be high. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. VRM Class IV for the planning unit was re-evaluated in 1994.	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Manage the visual resources in the planning unit in accordance with VRM Class Designations II, III and IV. **9.2** Class II. Changes caused by management activity should not be	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM Class II areas are managed to retain the existing character of the landscape so the level of change remains low. VRM Class III areas are managed to partially retain the existing character	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
evident in the characteristic landscape (295,040 acres). **9.3** Class III. Changes may be evident but must remain subordinate to the characteristic landscape (226,080 acres). **9.4** Class IV. Changes may attract attention and be a dominant feature but must mimic the basic elements of the characteristic landscape (271,360 acres).	of the landscape so the level of change remains moderate. VRM Class IV areas are managed to provide for activities which require major modification of the existing character of the landscape so the level of change may be high **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Only three VRM classes were addressed in the Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP. When Hawley Mountain, Black Canyon and Burnt Creek WSAs were designated, they fell under a temporary VRM Class I designation.	
Reclaim and/or enhance visually undesirable cultural modifications along major travel routes and recreation areas in the planning unit by: • Reclaiming two material sites along Birch Creek (one near Kaufman Guard Station and the other near Blue Dome) if unauthorized or require permittee to reclaim if authorized. • Work with appropriate interests to facilitate repainting of the existing communication site located in T. 8 N., R. 31 E., Sec. 17 north, of Highway 28 using colors which reduce visual impact. • Consider removal or relocation of the temporary climatological station from its present location in T. 9 N., R. 30 E., Sec. 35, to an area less visible from the highway.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM is considered in project planning with the 1994 inventory being used. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. A need exists to enhance visual resource characteristics throughout the field office.	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
• To utilize plantings of cottonwood, willows, and/or other indigenous trees and shrubs to reduce the visual contrast between vehicles and the adjacent area and to provide spaces for campers if additional camping facilities are installed along Birch Creek. • Work with mineral interests to control the mineral exploration parallel to and northeast of Highway 28 so that operations are more compatible with VRM classification using the contract rating system. • Work with mining interests to reclaim or otherwise mitigate the disturbance mining activity has created on Scott Butte, located at T. 8 N., R. 31 E., Sec. 5. • Upon completion of a validity check, work with mining interest to reclaim or otherwise mitigate the disturbances caused by mining activity northeast of Highway 22, located in T. 7 N., R. 28 E., Sec. 21. • Clean up, recontour, scarify and revegetate existing scars created or unauthorized material excavations and dumping activities located along Uncle Ike Road, Wet Creek Road, Pass Creek Road, Badger Creek Road, Birch Creek Sportsman		

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
access' and Eightmile Canyon Road along Highway 22. • Close and reclaim the four known small unauthorized material sites located in the lower Lost River Valley. • Establish new areas of riparian vegetation (willows, birch and cottonwood) along Summit Creek, Wet Creek, and portions of Sawmill Creek. • Work with appropriate interest to restore or remove existing buildings and unused facilities at the Howe ski area. • Work with the telephone company to eliminate their distribution line located along Wet Creek, west of Hawley Mountain and along the Little Lost Valley highway north of Howe. Consult with wildlife specialist to select those poles most desirable for raptor perches.		
Protect the visual integrity of public lands considered as backcountry or environmentally sensitive areas in the planning unit by: • Do not allow utility lines, material sites, and other major cultural modifications that do not conform to VRM contrast rating criteria on the Lemhi Foothills Scenery Quality Unit, southwest of	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM is considered in project planning with the 1994 inventory being utilized. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. A need exists to enhance visual resource characteristics throughout the field office.	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM review and updated information.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Birch Creek. • Work with fire management to develop an effective and visually acceptable approach to fire suppression in backcountry, environmentally sensitive areas, and along major travel routes and use areas. • Retain in public ownership all existing public lands within backcountry or environmentally sensitive areas.		
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Visual Resources will continue to be evaluated as a part of activity and project planning. Such evaluation will consider the significance of the proposed project and the visual sensitivity of the affected area. Stipulations will be attached as appropriate to maintain existing VRM classes.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. VRM is considered in project planning with the 1994 inventory being utilized. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. In 1994, the VRM inventory was updated reflecting changes in the field office.	Consider developing management direction consistent with the 1994 VRM reviewed and updated information.

3.16. Cave and Karst Resources

Table 3-18 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for cave and karst resources.

Options for Management Consideration
Cave and karst resource management direction is limited in current LUPs and is specific to a few specific identified caves. Over the years, additional caves and karst resources have been identified which need to be managed consistent with BLM policy.

Consideration of management direction as identified below would achieve protecting cave and karst resources as well as providing habitat for species while also providing educational and recreational opportunities.

- Develop direction consistent with the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988 (16 U.S.C. 63 § 4301 et seq.).
- Identify, designate and develop management direction for significant caves meeting one or more of the following features, characteristics, or values: biota, cultural, geologic/mineralogic/paleontologic, hydrologic, recreational, educational or scientific.

Table 3-18. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for cave and karst resources.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Decision R 1.4. Acquire the private Seventeen Mile cave through exchange if a public need arises.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. No need to acquire the cave for public values. Private land owner has not asked BLM to manage the cave.	None
Decision R 1.5. Protect and manage Volcanna Mountain (South Grotto) Cave and Government Caves.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Government Cave is managed by the Upper Snake FO. Volcanna Cave (South Grotto) is managed by the Crater's of the Moon National Monument and Preserve **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Additional caves have been located in the planning area since 1981 and are managed/protected by BLM.	Develop management objectives for designated significant caves and consider if an administrative designation is appropriate.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Decision R 1.1. Manage and protect the recreation values of the lava tube caves.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Monitoring of known caves is ongoing. Some caves with bat hibernacula have been posted with appropriate closure dates for hibernation periods (Oct 15–May 1). This has been published in the Federal Register. Heavily used caves have visitor register tubes installed to monitor the amount of activity in each cave. Pamphlets on leave no trace cave ethics are provided to user groups that use the caves in the desert. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Current management protects the bat populations and wintering habitat of other animals that use the caves.	Develop management objectives for designated significant caves and consider if an administrative designation is appropriate.
Big Lost MFP		
Cave and Karst resources are not addressed in the Big Lost MFP.		
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Cave and Karst resources are not addressed in the Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP.		
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Production and use of commodity resources and commercial use authorization will occur, while protecting fragile resources and wildlife habitat, preserving natural systems and cultural values, and allowing for non-consumptive resource uses.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision is not consistent with the Idaho Falls District Cave Management Plan (1999), Federal Cave Resources Protection Act (1988), and the Species Conservation Assessment and Strategy for Townsend's Big-eared Bat (1999).	Develop management objectives for designated significant caves and consider if an administrative designation is appropriate.

3.17. Forestry

Table 3-19 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for forestry.

Options for Management Consideration

Opportunities for identification of both commercial and non-commercial forestry management direction are available for the Upper Snake FOA. However, existing LUPs provide inconsistent management direction making it difficult to achieve healthy forest initiatives while using BMPs to meet desired fire, vegetation, and silvicultural outcomes. Consideration of management such as that identified below would achieve desired conditions for plant and animal diversity, providing fish and wildlife habitat, infiltration of surface runoff, and improved water quality/storage, while providing for a sustained-yield timber harvest.

- Timber harvest activities within the PCA would be coordinated with USFWS in accordance with ESA guidelines and USFS activities to comply with road density restrictions and number and placement of management activities within the PCA.
- Silvicultural prescriptions should consider being consistent with accepted methods related to site, species, habitat types, the individual requirements of the forest stand and how that individual stands relates to the surrounding habitats on a landscape scale.

Logging

- Logging methods should utilize the lowest impact method of harvesting possible:
  - Horses, if reasonable, tractor (tracked or wheeled machinery), cable or aerial systems.
  - Tractor logging will be limited to slopes with gradients of less than 40%.
  - Season of logging will be limited to avoid soil compaction and rutting.
- Erosion control consideration will be taken into account on skid trails and landings and may include:
  - Spreading slash over skid trails and the construction of water bars.
  - After harvest is complete closing and seeding skid trails if necessary. The grass seed mixture will be selected for the forest community and elevation to be applied.
- Salvage operations will have priority when trees are destroyed by fire, disease, insects, or other forest pests. Salvage operations will be coordinated with wildlife and archaeologist personnel.
- Winter logging should be considered whenever the terrain permits.
- No winter logging operation will occur in critical deer, elk wintering range.
- Buffer strip should be left on either side of a live stream as dictated by terrain and stream type.
- Leave a uniform scattering of snags for cavity nesting birds and perch trees based upon site specific needs.

Slash

- Slash disposal should consider big game passage, desired revegetation and noxious weeds.
- Slash hazard reduction should be considered by lop and scatter in partial cut stands or piled and burned at the decks.

Roads

- Road locations shall consider topography, drainage, soils, and other natural features to minimize erosion.
- Permanent roads shall be considered when they meet long term resource objectives.
- Temporary roads shall be considered when to facilitate removal woody material.
- All roads and skid trails to be closed will be seeded to grass, legumes, and shrubs. Species will be selected for the forest community and the elevation.

Table 3-19. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for forestry.

Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Decision F 1.1. Introduce a variety of hardwood tree species, such as burr oak, sycamore, green ash, along with the existing cottonwoods on public land along the Snake River. Approximately 1,400 acres are to be converted to a mixed forest by 1987.	**Decision Status**: Not implemented. Not implemented due to wildlife conflicts, and wildlife is deemed the highest value for the land along the river. **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Introduction of non-native species would not be beneficial to the existing wildlife in the area. Intensive forest management could potentially affect critical habitat for threatened and endangered (T&E) species.	None
Decision F 1.2. Harvest over-mature, diseased or bug infested timber where possible, on the non-productive forest lands, and the productive forest land along the Snake River. Utilize local request from private land owners as much possible. Where a market does not exist, this harvest will be done with YACC, YCC force account crews or summer temporary help, and stockpiled for no more than 2 years. Use of this material could be for firewood, if no other product can be obtained from it.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented. Not implemented due to wildlife conflicts and wildlife is deemed the highest value for the land along the river. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Over-mature, diseased, or bug infested timber along the Snake River provides important habitat for threatened raptors and other species along the river corridor.	None
Decision F 2.1. Reforest (or bring up to full stocking levels) all productive forest lands within the planning area that have become non-stocked or partially stocked through past man-made or natural disturbances. Attain	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The highest values of the land along the Snake River are for wildlife and	None

Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
satisfactory regeneration within 5 years following future disturbances and attain full stocking levels 15 years following disturbance. Approximately 810 acres in 20-acre parcels would be planted with burr oak, sycamore, ash, Russian olive, black cottonwoods, and various conifers.	recreation, not intensive forest management. Introduction of non-native species would not be beneficial to the existing wildlife in the area. Intensive forest management could potentially affect critical habitat for T&E species.	
Decision F 2.2. Establish a seed tree orchard by FY-1983 on approximately 200 acres of the 810 acres on the non-stocked forest and along the Snake River. Theses 200 acres are to be located in patches averaging 20 acres in size scattered along the river above the Indian reservation. Seed trees to be established are primarily lodgepole pine and Douglas-fir, although other species such as Engelmann spruce or ponderosa pine should be considered as the need arises.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The highest values of the land along the Snake River are for wildlife and recreation, not intensive forest management. Introduction of non-native species would not be beneficial to the existing wildlife in the area. Intensive forest management could potentially affect critical habitat for T&E species.	None
Big Lost MFP		
Decision F-1. Sell Douglas-fir timber as follows: Lava Creek: 200 MBF Cave Rock: 250 MBF	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Sale of Lava Creek not viable due to economics, steep slopes, and no access. 70 MBF sold out of the Cave Rock area in 1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Mistletoe problem noted in these two areas; however, individual sales are not responsive to larger landscape needs, and overall forest heath remains an issue.	Consider management direction that promotes forest health on a landscape basis through various forestry and silvicultural methods.
Decision F-2. Conduct commercial thinning on 400–600 acres as follows: Timbered Dome: T. 3 N., R. 24 E., Sec. 1 Appendicitis Hill: T. 5 N., R. 25 E., Secs. 32, 33	**Decision Status:** Not completed. Thinning is not justified because of low timber quality and steep slopes. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Forest health is still an issue in Timber Dome and intensive timber management cannot be conducted in a wilderness study area (WSA).	Consider management direction that promotes forest health on a landscape basis through various forestry and silvicultural methods. Develop criteria to identify areas in need of management.

Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Decision F-3. Manage 5,585 acres of woodland and 1,751 acres of productive forest land to provide a variety of forest products to meet market demand and to compliment wildlife needs.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Decision is not consistent with current policy and needs to accommodate BLM IM No. ID-84-65.	Consider management direction that promotes forest health on a landscape basis through various forestry and silvicultural methods. Develop criteria to identify areas in need of management.
Decision F-4. Manage 2,100 acres of forested land on Appendicitis Hills WSA as set aside pending final decision on WSA status.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. WSA status is pending congressional action.	Consider management direction that promotes forest health on a landscape basis through various forestry and silvicultural methods. Develop criteria to identify areas in need of management, inclusive of WSAs that are released from Congressional consideration as wilderness areas.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Decision #1. Offer for sale an average of 60MBF/year from approximately 1,232 acres of productive forest land within the planning unit, all occupied by inland Douglas-fir. Timber sale efforts will be concentrated in: Donkey Hills: T. 10 N., R. 25 E., Secs. 7, 8, 9, 10 Sands Canyon: T. 7 N., R. 27 E., Sec. 16 Skull Canyon: T. 10 N., R. 30 E., Sec. 29 Goddard Canyon: T. 10 N., R. 30 E., Sec. 33; T. 9 N., R. 30 E., Sec. 3 Long Canyon T. 9 N., R. 30 E., Sec. 2	**Decision Status:** Not completed. Donkey Hills and Hawley Mountain are deferred from timber management because of steep terrain and are not feasible to helicopter log. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Conditions have changed (e.g., insects and diseases).	Consider management direction that promotes forest health on a landscape basis through various forestry and silvicultural methods. Develop criteria to identify areas in need of management.
Decision #2. Do a pre-commercial thinning on approximately 40 acres in Sands Canyon: T. 8 N., R. 27 E.,	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is a	Consider direction/criteria that promotes forest health on a landscape basis and can be

Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Sec. 16	project- level implementation action.	conducted concurrently on adjacent non-BLM administered public lands, e.g., state or private lands as appropriate.
Decision #3. Establish pre-commercial thinning projects on approximately 40 acres on Hawley Mountain: T. 9 N., R. 26 E. Secs. 19, 24	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Forest health is an issue but timber cannot be intensively managed in a WSA until Congress acts upon the Idaho WSA recommendations.	None
Decision #4. Initiate a controlled burning program on approximately 2,500 to 3,000 acres of productive forest land on Bassinger Canyon and Taylor Mountain.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. In this instance prescribed fire is not feasible because of terrain and economic constraints.	Consider direction that would re-introduce fire's role (wildland or prescribed) into the ecosystem.
Decision #5. Protect the 3,300 acres of productive forest land designated for deferred management. Conventional harvest methods are restricted, with minimal use of the area to be authorized.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented. The identified acres are located in the Hawley Mountain WSA. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. This does not eliminate intensive management needs, but reduces options for management while preserving the natural state under interim management policy guidance for WSAs.	Consider direction/criteria that identify what public lands would be available for a commercial or non-commercial forest operations which promotes forest health on a landscape scale.
Public lands within Intensive Forest Management Areas will be available for a full range of forest management activities. Areas classified as woodland will also be available for limited forest management activities. Forest activity plans generally will be required prior to initiating forest management activities in all areas. Exceptions will be allowed for small saw log, post and pole, and commercial thinning sales. Exceptions will also be made for emergency salvage sales of less than 250 MBF. These sales will be covered by an	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is generally the standard procedure within the IFD; however, management direction needs to be consistent with the goals of the Healthy Lands Initiative (HLI) and Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA).	Consider management direction consistent with the intent and goals of the HLI and HFRA and current wildlife issues.

Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
environmental assessment and a checklist of contract stipulations that conforms to the guidelines developed in the Eastern Idaho Sustained Yield Unit Environmental Assessment. Public land within set aside or withdrawn areas will not be available for the harvest of forest products. Firewood gathering by individuals for home use will be permitted in designated areas and, in some cases, undesignated areas by special request. Occasional firewood use may be authorized to accommodate government agencies, nonprofit groups, and private individuals, but only when such disposal serves a management goal.		
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Management Area (MA) 1 – Medicine Lodge: Timber sales can be held on 1,184 acres with 189 acres withdrawn from sales to protect elk winter range and calving areas, predominately in the West Fork of Irvine Creek and Patelzick Creek areas. An additional 1,347 acres of woodland will be managed for production of forest products with measures to maintain or improve mountain mahogany for wildlife uses.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is generally the standard procedure within the IFD; however, management direction needs to be consistent with the goals of the HLI and HFRA.	Consider management direction consistent with the intent and goals of the HLI and HFRA and current wildlife issues.
MA 3 – Camas Creek: Timber sales can be held on 1,788 acres of public land near the Targhee National Forest (NF) boundary, predominately in the Antelope Valley and Kilgore areas. Most of the sales will use select cut methods with only 124 acres clear cut in small blocks	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is generally the standard procedure within the IFD; however, management direction needs to be consistent with the goals of the HLI and HFRA.	Consider management direction consistent with the intent and goals of the HLI and HFRA and current wildlife issues. Need to consider forest health on a landscape level.
MA 4 – Scattered Tracts: About 466 acres is withdrawn from the commercial forest land base for T&E species and other multiple uses. About 1,750 acres can be clear cut in small blocks and an additional 1,873 acres	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is generally the standard procedure within the IFD; however,	Consider management direction consistent with the intent and goals of the HLI and HFRA and current wildlife issues.

Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
select cut. The timber is principally in the "Donut Hole" and areas adjacent to the Targhee NF. An additional 3,203 acres of woodland can be made available for sales of forest products to meet local and regional demand.	management direction needs to be consistent with the goals of the HLI and HFRA.	
MA 5 – Sands: Timber sales can be conducted on 3,623 acres, predominately in areas adjacent to the Yale–Kilgore road and in the Pine Creek–July Creek areas. Only 78 acres are withdrawn from commercial forest base for bald eagle nesting and other multiple uses. The majority can be clear cut in small blocks with about 1,524 acres by selective-cut methods. About 3,203 acres of woodland will be managed for the production of forest products on demand with stipulations to maintain wildlife habitat and watershed conditions.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is generally the standard procedure within the IFD; however, management direction needs to be consistent with the goals of the HLI and HFRA.	Consider management direction consistent with the intent and goals of the HLI and HFRA and current wildlife issues.
MA 8 – Willow Creek/Tex Creek: Timber sales can be conducted on 118 acres adjacent to the Caribou NF, by the select cut method, and 91 acres of woodland are available for timber management. Sales will be scheduled to meet local and regional demand.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is generally the standard procedure within the IFD; however, management direction needs to be consistent with the goals of the HLI and HFRA.	Consider management direction consistent with the intent and goals of the HLI and HFRA and current wildlife issues.
MA 9 – Snake River: Timber sales can be designed on 364 acres in the Conant Valley and Kelly Canyon areas using select-cut methods. About 352 acres are withdrawn from the commercial forest base for bald eagle nesting and wintering and other multiple uses. The 2,925 acres of cottonwood along the river are withdrawn from timber management because of high values for bald eagle nesting and wintering, wildlife, and recreation. Periodic monitoring will be needed to prevent unauthorized cutting of firewood.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is generally the standard procedure within the IFD; however, management direction needs to be consistent with the goals of the HLI and HFRA.	Consider management direction consistent with the intent and goals of the HLI and HFRA and current wildlife issues.

3.18. Livestock Grazing

Table 3-20 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs. **Table 3-21**, Table 3-22, and Table 3-23 summarize, by individual allotments, decisions from the Big Desert, Big Lost, and Little Lost/Birch Creek MFPs with regard to grazing preference, grazing systems, and range improvements. Table 3-25 summarizes, by management area, decisions for allotments from the Medicine Lodge RMP with regard to grazing preference, number of allotments with preference changes, and range improvements. In general, these decisions are allotment specific and are not responsive to current issues because they are not consistent with current policy and guidance in which livestock grazing needs to be assessed consistent with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997a).

With implementation of the four existing LUPs, adjustments in livestock grazing (e.g., season of use, preference [AUMs], and livestock numbers) have occurred along with the development of range improvements. AUMs authorized are consistent with the levels allocated in the existing LUPs. Allotments with specific management plans, as well as allotments without, are managed and evaluated for livestock effects to natural resources through the assessment process for the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.

Options for Management Consideration

Livestock grazing management direction in existing LUPs established a forage base for both wildlife and livestock. This direction is inconsistent with current policy and guidance of applying the Idaho Standards of Rangeland Health. Consideration of management direction as identified below would achieve desired conditions resulting in plant and animal species diversity, providing fish and wildlife habitat, soil stabilization, and improving water quality/storage values.

- Manage public lands available for livestock grazing consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health, making changes as warranted based upon allotment monitoring and evaluations.

In addition, written comments received during public scoping provided the following ideas for consideration in developing livestock grazing management direction.

- BLM should consider increasing AUMs since livestock production on rangelands use a small amount of energy input and the world will need a lot more food in the future.
- Livestock should be properly managed to protect and improve riparian areas; this should include not grazing some areas.
- Primary goal for livestock grazing should be to allow livestock grazing only when it does not conflict with the maintenance of plant and litter cover and forage for wildlife species.
- There should be no grazing on streams that are at risk or nonfunctional.
- Move or close domestic sheep/goat grazing allotments outside of historic bighorn habitat.
- Make forage reserve areas, where possible, in vacant allotments, unallocated areas, or in allotments that become available.
- Consider that not all areas should be grazed by livestock and may have a higher value by leaving them ungrazed.
- Determine the amount of forage produced and allocate 25% to wildlife and 25% to livestock.

Table 3-20. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for livestock grazing.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Maintain and/or improve quantity and quality of the vegetative resource through more intensive range management programs. This will be done by implementing grazing systems designed to provide for the physiological growth requirements of the vegetation, by installing management facilities and vegetative manipulation projects.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Changes are now done at the site-specific (allotment) level by an environmental assessment (EA) and grazing decision. Allotments are managed using the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
Implement AMPs with deferred grazing systems on the following 18 allotments.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. At the time of the MFP there were 61,586 AUMs in the Big Desert, now there are 58,718 AUMs; a reduction of 2,868 AUMs. Grazing systems are designed at the implementation level.	Manage in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health
Manage grazing on the Omitted lands to reflect: 1. Proper carrying capacity (stocking rates) 2. Season of use based on physiological needs of vegetation. Recognize Multiple Use values. 3. Percent public land factor Manage grazing to improve and maintain a wide diversity of vegetative species, heights, and age structures. Intensive forestry practices, recreation development, acquiring of access, mineral sales, and oil and gas surface occupancy will not be allowed.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Changes in AUMs have been done through grazing decisions. Grazing plans, exchange of use, and projects have been completed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Decision is too specific and the actions described are accomplished at the implementation level.	Manage in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health
Create 3 new allotments on unalloted public land: • Bauers	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No	Identify public lands (allocated or unallocated) as being available or not available

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
• Gneiting • O'Brien Resolve any resource conflicts prior to allotting -grazing use.	**Adequacy:** Not adequate. Public lands need to be identified available or not available for livestock grazing. Public lands available are managed consistent with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	for livestock grazing.
Big Lost MFP		
Implement intensive monitoring of rangelands and of management practices. 1. Utilization. A. Will not exceed 50% of key grass species on non AMP allotments. B. May exceed 50% under a management system. 2. Range condition A. Maintain good condition ranges. B. Improve poor and fair condition ranges. 3. Trend A. Stabilize and improve downward trend ranges. B. Maintain or improve stabilized trend ranges. C. Maintain upward trend ranges. 4. Actual Use A. Collect actual use area. 5. Summarize above data at end of third year after decisions are issued (1987) to determine if additional adjustments are necessary. 6. Continue monitoring two more years (1989) to determine if additional adjustments are necessary. Issue final decisions in the fifth year following initial decisions.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Actions identified are conducted at the implementation level and are not appropriate at the LUP level. Current direction is to manage according to the Idaho Standards of Rangeland Health. Monitor of grazing continues to determine if vegetation objectives are being attained.	Manage in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Issue percent federal range use licenses and exchange of use grazing agreements as appropriate on non-federal lands in the allotments. Develop rangeland management agreements with Challis National Forest for combined management of the following allotments. • Alder Creek • Sheep Mountain (Marsh Canyon) • Chicken Creek • Stoddard Creek • Ramshorn Canyon.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. This is an implementation-level action, and not an appropriate LUP decision.	None
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Decision #1 – After existing wildlife forage needs are met, allocate available forage to livestock. Proposed grazing use for the area is 27,800 AUMs for livestock (an overall 7 percent reduction in authorized use) and 10,453 AUMs for wildlife. After 15 years, about 14,000 additional AUMs should be available; 1,800 from vegetation manipulation and 12,200 from improved management.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Current AUMs for the area are 27,485 down 315 from the MFP. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. An increase of 14,000 AUMs is not reasonable and is an implementation-level action. Changes in AUMs need be determined through the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. The assessment process for the Idaho Standards of Rangeland health addresses implementation level needs/decisions.
Decision #2 – Management systems will be implemented on each allotment to provide the needed forage and maintain or improve forage production. The grazing systems to be implemented are: rest-rotation, 163,283 acres; deferred rotation, 183,883 acres; and seasonal, 51,017acres. Basic livestock management components for each allotment are shown [above] in Decision #1. AMPs will be developed for all allotments over the next 3 years. Supportive activities are outlined [below] in the range improvements table in Decision #3.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Many allotments do not have completed AMPs. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Under current management, AMPs are not feasible. Development of grazing system is an implementation level action.	Manage in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Decision #3 – Rangeland Improvements: Construct the projects needed to implement the grazing program and to achieve objectives of the grazing management plans.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Range improvement projects have been completed as needed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Range improvements are a tool for reaching objectives and are an implementation-level action.	None
Decision #4 – Monitoring: Grazing management systems will be monitored to ensure that objectives of the systems are being met. 1) Implement AMPs on all allotments in the planning unit. Where possible, grazing systems will be designed to favor the physiological needs of the vegetation, improve range condition, and increase forage production. 2) Allotments will be stocked so as not to exceed their carrying capacity as determined by 1978 SVIM method of determining forage production. AMPs will be implemented by 1983.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Monitoring needs to measure if the specific objectives are being met or not.	Monitor broad-scale vegetation objectives to help determine if LUP objectives are being met or making progress toward being met.
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Provide 100,449 AUMs of livestock forage. Approximately 620,539 acres of public land and 180,419 acres within the INEL boundary would be included in grazing allotments. Maintain or improve existing perennial forage plants, maintain soil stability, stabilize areas currently in downward trend, and increase availability of perennial forage plants.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Current AUMs are 101,300. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Current direction is to manage allotments to meet the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.	Manage in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. Identify public lands (allocated or unallocated) as being available or not available for livestock grazing.

Table 3-21. Summary of Big Desert MFP AMP direction regarding grazing preference (i.e., AUMs), grazing systems, and range improvements.

Allotment Name	Preference (AUMs)		Turnout Delayed	Exchange of Use (AUMs)	Grazing Systems	Range Improvements[a]				
	Decrease	Increase				F (mi)	W/P/T	R/T	C	VM (acre)
Big Desert MFP										
Big Butte	475	—	Yes	76	deferred grazing	8	5 mi/3	—	—	1,200
Big Desert Common Sheep	—	—	Yes	1,139	AMP/seasonal grazing	—	1	1 tank	—	226,000
Bowers	20	—	Yes	—	deferred grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Cedar Butte	—	16	—	56	AMP/seasonal grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Cinder Cone	—	192	Yes	150	deferred grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Cox's Well	353	—	Yes	183	deferred grazing	—	2 mi	3/1	—	—
East Butte	7	—	No	33	deferred grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Houghland	—	245	Yes	159	deferred grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Huddles Hole	—	10	No	—	seasonal grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Judge	10	—	—	—	AMP/seasonal grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Klempel	44	—	Yes	—	deferred grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Moonshine	—	173	No	—	deferred grazing	—	—	—	—	—
Muirbrook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No.2 Well	163	—	No	41	deferred grazing	—	6 mi/4	—	—	12,000
Quaking Aspen	1,084	—	Yes	174	rest rotation	—	—	—	—	—

Allotment Name	Preference (AUMs)		Turnout Delayed	Exchange of Use (AUMs)	Grazing Systems	Range Improvements[a]				
	Decrease	Increase				F (mi)	W/P/T	R/T	C	VM (acre)
Big Desert MFP										
Rock Corral	—	2,489	Yes	—	AMP/seasonal grazing	—	1/ 9 mi /4	1 tank	—	—
Rudeen	740	—	Yes	60	deferred grazing	3	—	—	1	2,000
Smith	385	—	Yes	79	deferred grazing	—	—	—	—	5,000
Springfield	1,111	—	Yes	78	deferred grazing	3	2 mi/4	—	—	15,000
Sunset	250	—	Yes	89	deferred grazing	4	—	—	3	2,500
Webb	—	—	—	—	AMP/seasonal grazing	—	—	—	—	Manage for annuals, do not reseed
Total	**4,632**	**3,125**	**—**	**2,317**	**—**	**18 mi**	**1/24 mi/15**	**3 / 3**	**4**	**263,700**

a. F = fence, W/P/T = well/pipeline /troughs, R/T = reservoirs/tanks, C = cattleguards, VM = vegetation manipulation

Table 3-22. Summary of Big Lost MFP AMP direction regarding grazing preference (i.e., AUMs), grazing systems, and range improvements.

Allotment Name	Preference AUMs		Season	Exchange of Use (AUMs)	Grazing System	Range Improvements[a]				
	Proposed Preference	Increase (Decrease)				F (mi)	W/P/T	R/T	C	VM (acre)
Big Lost MFP										
Aikele	120	—	5/15-8/5	46	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Alder Creek	501	—	5/16-6/16	74	deferred	1	3	4	0	1,200
Appendicitis Hill	300	(60)	6/1-9/30	consider	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Arco Peak	303	—	4/16-10/15	consider	deferred	0	0	0	0	0
Beck Canyon	128	(47)	5/1-10/15	128	deferred	0	3	2	0	600
Beverland Pass	538	(486)	5/1-9/30 11/1-11/30	—	deferred	0	0	1	0	300
Bliss	118	—	5/1-12/15	—	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Blizzard Mountain	270	(270)	6/16-10/15	consider	deferred	0	3	0	0	0
Champagne Creek	182	23	5/7-8/8	consider	deferred	1	1	0	0	600
Chicken Creek	585	—	5/1-9/30	consider	deferred	0	0	0	0	0
Craters	342	—	5/10-11/30	consider	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Crawford Canyon	12	(23)	5/10-5/17	consider	deferred	0	0	0	0	0
Deadman	2,669	—	4/1-10/31	34	rest rotation	13	0	0	1	2,500
Dry Canyon	0	—	—	—	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
Dry Fork	640	—	7/1-11/15	—	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Earl Smith	196	(230)	5/1-6/30	consider	deferred	0	0	0	0	400
Elbow	330	165	5/1-5/15	consider	rest rotation	0	6	0	0	800
Era Flat	55	—	5/1-11/30	312	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
George	94	—	6/16-8/31	84	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Goodman Canyon	129	—	5/1-9/30	171	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Hammond Canyon	205	—	5/1-10/30	consider	deferred	1	1	0	0	0
Harger Point	280	(40)	5/1-5/31 11/1-11/30	consider	rest rotation	1	0	0	0	200
Huggins	58	—	5/1-8/25	consider	deferred	1	1	0	0	200
Judd Brown Canyon	540	—	5/1-6/30 10/1-11/30	44	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
King Spring	460	—	6/16-10/31	—	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Latham Hollow	545	(120)	5/1-6/30	consider	deferred	1	2	3	1	400
Lava Creek	475	(342)	5/20-11/1	consider	seasonal	3	1	0	0	0

Allotment Name	Preference AUMs		Season	Exchange of Use (AUMs)	Grazing System	Range Improvements[a]				
	Proposed Preference	Increase (Decrease)				F (mi)	W/P/T	R/T	C	VM (acre)
Big Lost MFP										
Leslie Butte	116	(26)	5/10-7/9	consider	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Mahogany	300	—	5/1-6/30	—	seasonal	0	1	0	0	0
Marsh Can	139	—	5/18-6/15	consider	deferred	1	0	1	0	160
Martin Pasture	97	—	10/16-11/30	105	seasonal	0	0	0	1	0
Mcgee-Berry Canyon	442	—	5/12-10/11	consider	rest rotation	0	1	0	0	300
Newman Canyon	251	(177)	5/10-11/20	consider	deferred	1	4	0	0	200
Nichols	39	—	7/1-8/31	consider	seasonal	0	0	0	0	300
Ramshorn Canyon	974	—	5/1-6/30 10/15-11/10	27	rest rotation	0	1	0	2	600
Rocky Canyon	120	(180)	5/1-7/15	consider	seasonal	0	1	0	0	500
Serviceberry	382	—	6/16-10/31	consider	deferred	0	1	1	0	600
Sheep Mountain	720	—	5/1-11/15	112	deferred	1	1	0	1	500
Sorensen	152	—	5/20-10/19	consider	seasonal	0	1	0	0	0
Stoddard Creek	86	—	5/1-6/30	660	seasonal	1	0	0	0	80
Techick Canyon	150	20	7/16-9/15	85	seasonal	0	1	3	0	0
Trail Creek	320	(80)	5/1-11/31	50	deferred	1	1	2	1	0
Waddoups Canyon	1384	—	5/10-6/10	consider	seasonal	1	3	2	0	1700
Total	**15,747**	**(1,873)**	**—**	**1,932**	**—**	**28**	**37**	**19**	**7**	**12,140**

a. F = fence, W/P/T = well/pipeline /troughs, R/T = reservoirs/tanks, C = cattleguards, VM = vegetation manipulation

Table 3-23. Summary of Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP AMP direction regarding grazing preference (i.e., AUMs), grazing systems, and range improvements.

Allotment Name	Preference AUMs		Season	Exchange of Use (AUMs)	Grazing Systems	Range Improvements[a]				
	Proposed Preference	Increase (Decrease)				F (mi)	W/P/T	R/T	C	VM (acres)
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP										
Bear Canyon	327	(25)	5/16-10/15	—	deferred	1	1	0	0	0
Bell Mountain	486	(58)	5/16-8/30 11/1-12/2	—	deferred	0	2	0	0	0
Bernice	919	—	5/1-6/15 12/16-1/15	—	deferred	13	8	0	0	0
Briggs Canyon	697	(23)	5/10-5/31 9/7-9/27	—	seasonal	5	6	0	0	1,500
Burnt Canyon	505	215	7/16-10/31	—	seasonal	0	0	1	0	0
Cedar Point	92	(40)	12/22-1/22	—	seasonal	2	0	0	0	0
Cedarville	3,767	173	5/1-7/15 10/1-12/19	—	deferred	0	4	0	0	0
Eightmile Canyon	51	—	11/1-11/30	—	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Hawley Mountain	5,612	23	5/1-1/15	—	rest rotation	34	8	0	0	0
Horse Creek	643	—	5/16-7/15 10/16-11/21	—	deferred	0	2	0	0	0
Howe Peak	2,400	—	5/1-6/11 11/1-1/15	—	deferred	0	0	0	0	7,000
Jumpoff	562	(198)	5/1-8/20 12/1-1/11	—	rest rotation	0	2	0	0	0
Kyle Canyon	43	(27)	6/16-9/15	—	seasonal	0	0	0	0	0
Mahogany Butte	1,810	—	5/1-6/30 12/11-2/14	—	deferred	0	7	4	0	0
Pass Creek	1,691	(274)	5/18-6/30	—	seasonal	1	3	0	0	4,500
Sawmill Canyon	579	195	7/16-8/13	—	seasonal	0	4	1	0	0
Sinks	1,434	(77)	5/1-12/5	—	deferred	11	0	0	0	0
Spring Canyon	2,090	(889)	5/16-1/22	—	rest rotation	6	15	0	0	4,500

Allotment Name	Preference AUMs		Season	Exchange of Use (AUMs)	Grazing Systems	Range Improvements[a]				
	Proposed Preference	Increase (Decrease)				F (mi)	W/P/T	R/T	C	VM (acres)
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP										
Summit	270	—	7/1-10/29	—	seasonal	0	2	0	0	0
Uncle Ike Creek	903	—	5/1-6/30 10/1-1/30	—	rest rotation	11	10	0	0	0
Warm Springs	1,285	(356)	5/16-10/15	—	rest rotation	0	2	0	0	1,000
Wet Creek	602	—	5/16-7/15 10/16-12/30	—	deferred	0	2	0	0	0
Wigwam Butte	861	375	5/1-6/15 11/23-1/20	—	deferred	6	0	0	0	0
Williams Creek	171	164	5/16-6/30 11/6-12/31	—	rest rotation	3	3	0	0	500
Total	**27,800**	**(822)**	**—**	**—**	**—**	**93**	**81**	**6**	**0**	**19,000**

a. F = fence, W/P/T = well/pipeline /troughs, R/T = reservoirs/tanks, C = cattleguards, VM = vegetation manipulation

Table 3-24. Summary of Medicine Lodge RMP AMP direction regarding grazing preference (i.e., AUMs), number of allotments with preference changes, and range improvements.

Management Area	Number of Allotments	Preference (AUMs)		Allotments Reduced /Increased		Range Improvements[a]			
		Proposed Preference	Increase (Decrease)	Reduced	Increased	F (mi)	W/P/T	R/T	VM (acre)
Medicine Lodge RMP									
Medicine Lodge	25	28,763	5,318	4	1	52	14	18	19,700
Table Butte	21	18,613	3,167	4	3	5	10	1	15,680
Camas Creek	34	9,066	0	5	1	12	6	5	2,875
Scattered Tracts	53	3,813	0	6	0	5	4	3	1,385
Sands	64	27,841	1,042	4	7	27	17	5	24,750
Sand Mountain	3	997	(209)	0	1	3	3	0	1,800
INEL	1	7,313	4,177	0	0	0	2	2	13,000
Willow Creek	14	1,790	(145)	6	0	2	0	0	0
Snake River	48	2,478	(379)	4	0	10	3	0	400
Totals	**263**	**100,674**	**12,971**	**33**	**13**	**116**	**59**	**34**	**79,590**

a. F = fence, W/P/T = well/pipeline /troughs, R/T = reservoirs/tanks, C = cattleguards, VM = vegetation manipulation

3.19. Recreation and Visitor Services

Table 3-25 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for recreation and visitor services.

Options for Management Consideration
Recreation and visitor services management direction in existing LUPs varies and is not consistent making it difficult to provide a mix of recreational experiences and opportunities while striving to maintain desired vegetative conditions, maintain fish and wildlife habitat, and reduce impacts to water quality.

Consideration of management direction as identified below would result in plant and animal species diversity, providing quality fish and wildlife habitat, improving water quality, and providing public land users with a diversity of recreational experiences and opportunities.

- Identify and develop management direction for ERMAs for dispersed recreation opportunities.
- Determine if additional SRMAs should be designated and if existing SRMAs need any changes in management direction.
- Consider management direction for approximately 3,496 acres of BLM-administered public lands along the Teton River consistent with the Teton River Canyon RMP Finding of No Significant Impact and EA (BOR 2006) as appropriate.

Table 3-25. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for recreation and visitor services.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
R 1.1 - Manage and protect the recreational values of the following areas and in the priority as listed. 1. Big Southern Butte 1982 2. Great Rift WSA 1984 3. Kings Bowl 1983 4. Hells Half Acre 1983 5. Lava Tube Caves 1984 6. Cerro Grande 1984 (Cedar Butte WSA) 7. China Cup Butte 1982	**Decision Status:** Completed. Area 1 designated National Natural Landmark (NNL). Areas 2 and 3 are not within the boundaries of the Upper Snake FO. About 67,894 acres of the Great Rift NNL is within the Upper Snake FO. Area 4 is a wilderness study area (WSA) and NNL with visual resource management (VRM) class 1 inside the WSA. Area 5 is being protected as a significant cave. Area 6 is a WSA with VRM class 1. Area 7 is research natural area and	Consider criteria to assess and prioritize the planning area for cave resources, and roads and trails development, use designations with closures.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	WSA. Areas 2 and 4 recommended for wilderness status. Areas 6 and 7 recommended as non-wilderness. Area 3 no action taken. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Decisison Adequacy:** Adequate. Completed actions continue to protect the recreational values of these areas.	
R 1.4 - Provide resource protection and management of Hell's Half Acre lava flow by: a. Acquire State inholdings, b. Install self guiding trails at 1-15 rest stop by FY83. Publish brochure, make available to trail head, c. Improve the parking area and interpretive signs at Twenty mile rock. d. Develop a self guiding tour, e. Acquire Seventeen mile cave through exchange with land owner, f. Manage Hell's Half Acre for multiple use, some areas open to lava sales, primitive recreation will have management emphasis.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. All actions except "e" have been completed. Seventeen mile cave will not be acquired. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Travel management in process for "f." Completed actions continue to protect the recreational values of these areas.	Establish priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations, and for areas of concentrated OHV use. Consider direction allowing transportation within and on the periphery of WSA, as appropriate.
R 2.1 - Accomplish the following action on public lands along the Snake River and Big Lost River. Retain in public ownership for multiple use management except forestry and minerals with emphasis on wildlife management. Restrict livestock grazing on Omitted lands in accordance with 1979 SVIM inventory.	**Decision Status:** Completed. No public lands disposed of except through Omitted Lands Act. Done by EIS decision in 1982. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate, the FO has been approached by Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) about making a new state park in the area.	Consider management direction through land tenure adjustments that future needs of State agencies are considered as appropriate (e.g., work with IDPR to identify suitable areas for the possible designation as a state park as appropriate).
R 3.1 - By 1982 establish a public campground and picnic area in T. 1 S., R. 36 E., Sec. 26, Firth River	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The public campground and picnic area has not	Consider direction as appropriate to cooperatively manage

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
bottoms. Develop, operate and maintain the sites with public funds. Site development and operation plan should include: potable water source improve all-weather access roads stabilize and improve shoreline area elimination of livestock grazing, and ORV use (except on designated ~roads and trails) site supervision and reliable maintenance program withdrawal from appropriation under mining laws	been established. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Currently no legal public access to the Firth River bottoms.	campgrounds, picnic areas, and obtain public access to such areas with IDPR as appropriate.
Big Lost MFP		
R 1 - Manage three parcels as sportsmans access sites. Place sportsman access signs on Antelope road and Spring Creek road.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Minimal public land at these sites to accommodate recreational activities. Signing area would invite public into area where conflicts between public and private lands could not be avoided.	None
R 2 - Obtain public access across private lands in the following areas. Timbered Dome Appendicitis Hill Hammond Canyon	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. No legal public access to Appendicitis Hill and Hammond Canyon.	Develop criteria to prioritize acquiring legal public access to BLM-administered public lands.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
R 1.1 - Improve Visitor Safety by: Place signs for visitors. Develop IFD recreation brochure. Eliminate open mine shaft hazards. Develop potable water at campgrounds. Sign safe water at recreation sites.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Limited signage has occurred, recreational brochures being developed for visitor use and safety in high use recreation areas. At existing recreation sites with potable water, signs have been posted. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. This action continues to maintain and improve	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	visitor safety and recreational experiences.	
R-2 - Develop day use and overnight facilities at: 1. John Day (Birch Creek) Recreation Site. 2. Clyde School 3. Big Springs Creek, 4. Wet Creek/Dry Creek Canal	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Minimal facilities developed at sites 1 and 2. Sites 3 and 4 not developed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Need to improve dispersed sites throughout the FO to protect resources and improve visitor safety and recreation enhancement.	Develop management direction to manage recreation opportunities.
Planning Decision: 3.1 - Identify key access routes and sites important for their recreational values so the public will be aware these areas are available for recreation use. Develop access through: Easement acquisition, Road maintenance, Signing. Specific areas requiring signing include: Birch Creek, Lower Little Lost, Big Spring Creek, Clyde School Camp Site, Wet Creek Drainage, Sawmill Creek and Summit Creek (at the Junction of Sawmill Creek Road).	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Highest priority easements have been requested; no easements currently in place. Heaviest used roads maintained and signing is minimal. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Still have need for easements, signing, and road maintenance, identifying specific roads for easements is too limiting.	Develop criteria to prioritize potential easements for all high priority recreation areas.
3.3 - Acquire access easements across private land to BLM land having recreational values: Bell Mountain Road- obtain approximately 0.5 mi easement, Deer Creek Road - obtain approximately 0.5 mi easement, Skull Canyon - obtain approximately 0.5 mi easement, Upper Birch Creek - obtain approximately 50 ft easement, Black Creek Road. - obtain approximately 0.5 mi easement,	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. These easements were never pursued. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Still have need for easements. Identifying specific roads for easements is too limiting.	Develop criteria to prioritize potential easements for all high priority recreation areas.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Bell Mountain Creek - obtain approximately 0.75 mi easement.		
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Management Area (MA) 1– Medicine Lodge: Management Objective 8 **–** Continue to manage for dispersed recreation opportunities in the area.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The Upper Snake FO continues to manage for dispersed recreation opportunities. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Dispersed recreation management direction needs to be consistent with current guidance and the land use planning handbook.	Develop management direction to manage recreation opportunities.
MA 3 – Camas Creek: Management Decision 7 **–** The 1,540 acres designated for semi-primitive motorized use will be monitored periodically to ensure maintenance of outdoor recreation values.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented. Monitoring has not been initiated. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Need monitoring throughout FO in areas with conflicts.	Consider developing travel management areas (TMA) and criteria to prioritize travel management planning for these areas.
MA 3 – Camas Creek: Objective 8 **–** Continue to manage for dispersed recreation opportunities and manage 1,540 acres as semi-primitive motorized.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Monitoring in this area has not been done. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No. **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Need monitoring throughout FO in areas with conflicts.	Consider developing TMAs and criteria to prioritize travel management planning for these areas.
MA 4 – Scattered Tracts: Objective 7 **–** Continue to manage the area for dispersed recreation with 945 acres closed to winter and early spring ORV use and 375 acres in the Game Creek area completely closed to OHVs.	**Decision Status:** Completed. Area is closed to OHV use except for a single road that accesses the area. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Dispersed recreation management direction needs to be consistent with current guidance and the land use planning handbook.	Consider developing TMAs and criteria to prioritize travel management planning for these areas.
MA 5 – Sands: Objective 8 **–** Intensively manage the sand dunes for OHV use as a special recreation management area (SRMA) in conjunction with MA 6. Manage remainder of area for dispersed recreation opportunities.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Access is only available for intensive ORV use and other recreational opportunities not addressed.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
MA 5 – **Sands:** Decision 7 **–** A management plan will be developed for the St. Anthony Sand Dunes SRMA, a portion of which is in MA 6.	**Decision Status:** Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The Sand Dunes area is managed for OHVs but other aspects of recreation management for opportunities and experiences is lacking with regard to the SRMA.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.
MA 5 – Sands: Decision 8 **–** St. Anthony Sand Dunes SRMA will be managed under a specific management plan consistent with the objectives for this management area and the Nine Mile Knoll ACEC management plan. (Refer to MA 6).	**Decision Status:** Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The Sand Dunes area is managed for OHVs but other aspects of recreation management for opportunities and experiences is lacking with regard to the ACEC and SRMA.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.
MA 6 – Sand Mountain: Decision 6 **–** Manage the Sand Mountain area to promote the most appropriate designation, management and use of the area for recreation consistent with the objectives of the Sands Habitat Management Plan (HMP).	**Decision Status:** Completed. Area is managed as SRMA, ACEC, WSA and within objectives of Sands HMP. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. HMP needs to be updated and SRMA plan objectives need to be developed.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.
MA 6 – Sand Mountain: Decision 4 **–** A management plan will be developed for the St. Anthony Sand Dunes SRMA, a portion of which is located in MA 5. The dunes will be managed for ORV use, consistent with the Sands HMP. If part of the dunes are designated a National Natural Landmark, this factor will be considered in the management plan. Two campgrounds will be developed to accommodate OHV use. About 21,100 acres are closed to OHV use during the winter in connection with the Nine Mile Knoll ACEC. There are about 31,600 acres in the Nine Mile Knoll ACEC, of which 21,100 acres are located in MA 6.	**Decision Status:** Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. As all uses and potential designations need to be considered to provide recreational opportunities and experiences with minimal impact to resources.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
MA 6 – Sand Mountain: Decision 5– The St. Anthony Sand Dunes SRMA will be designated and managed consistent with the ACEC management plan.	**Decision Status:** Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. No specific management direction for either of the areas developed.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.
MA 8 – Willow Creek/Tex Creek: Decision 7 – One campground can be developed at Kepps Crossing.	**Decision Status:** Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. There continues to be increased recreational use of the Willow Creek area due to its close proximity to Idaho Falls.	Develop management direction to manage recreation opportunities.
MA 9 – Snake River: Objective 5 – Manage 10,333 acres for livestock grazing in support of wildlife and recreation, improve livestock distribution along the river and improve range condition in the Kelly Canyon and Stinking Springs area from fair to good on 400 acres.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. See Record of Decision (ROD) for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (BLM 2008f). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No. **Adequacy:** Not adequate. ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations does not address vacant allotments.	Consider appropriate areas as available or unavailable for livestock grazing to reduce impacts with recreational opportunities and experiences.
MA 9 – Snake River: Objective 7– Manage the recreation values and uses of the area as an SRMA with a comprehensive management plan that recognizes other resource values and uses.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. See ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (BLM 2008f) addresses management of recreational opportunities and experiences.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.
MA 9 – Snake River: Decision 8 – A management plan for the Snake River SRMA will be developed to manage the recreation values and uses. If feasible, a single management plan including both the Snake River SRMA and Snake River ACEC will be completed rather than separate plans for the same area. This plan will provide for more detailed management of all public land resources including cultural and historical values.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Completed. See ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Snake River Activity/Operations Plan was updated in 2008 and addressed how recreational opportunities and experiences to be managed.	Develop management direction for SRMAs consistent with other resource values.

3.20. Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management

Many OHV-related decisions were considered under the recreation program of the Upper Snake FO's existing LUPs. However, current BLM direction emphasizes a more comprehensive, interdisciplinary approach; thus, the relevant decisions are identified under CTTM. **Table 3-26** presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for CTTM.

Options for Management Consideration

Trails and travel management direction in existing LUPs varies and is not consistent, making it difficult to manage a comprehensive transportation network (i.e., roads and trails) for a mix of users while striving to maintain desired vegetative conditions and reducing impacts to fish, wildlife, and soils and water quality.

Consideration of management direction as identified below would achieve desired vegetation conditions, plant and animal species diversity, provide for quality fish and wildlife habitat, soil stabilization, improved water quality, access to public lands and motorized, non-motorized and mechanized recreational opportunities.

- Develop direction for designating TMAs.
- Develop direction for creating a system of roads and trails to allow for widespread public access to recreational opportunities, to protect resources, to reduce user conflicts, and to allow varied transportation activities.
- Develop direction for closing and rehabilitating roads in riparian areas.
- Consider direction for maintaining existing trails and/or possibly developing new trails that connect with existing county and/or other federal agency trail systems.

In addition, written comments received during public scoping provided the following ideas for consideration in developing CTTM direction.

- Consider ways to maintain or reduce roads so that sensitive and at-risk natural resources are managed for ecological benefits.
- Consider methods for decommissioning or closing redundant routes when other routes are available to reach public-desired destinations.
- Develop direction for travel within and near special designation areas (e.g., WSAs, ACECs).

Table 3-26. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for CTTM.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Decision R 1: Manage and protect the recreation values of the following areas and in the following priority:	**Decision Status:** Completed. Seasonal restrictions in place, HHA trails developed, and China Cup	Consider direction identifying travel management areas

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Southern Butte 1982 Hell's Half Acre (HHA) China Cup Butte	Butte being monitored. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Big Southern: Decision limited off-highway vehicle (OHV) travel to existing roads. Primary road to the summit is gated for public safety in the winter season. Mineral claims in existence when the MFP was signed are no longer active. HHA: Most of HHA is in Wilderness Study Areas (WSA) status. Site is also a National Natural Landmark, and has two proposed Research Natural Areas in the boundary. I-15 trails installed at Idaho Transportation Department rest stops. The 20-mile Trail was established in FY 1992. China Cup: The area was recommended for fencing if ORV use in the area degraded the butte. The site is a WSA/RNA and is monitored yearly, but no additional use has been detected that would require a fence.	(TMAs) and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations, and for areas of concentrated OHV use. Consider designations across the field office for "limited to existing roads/trails," or "limited to designated roads/trails." Consider direction allowing transportation within and on the periphery of WSA, as appropriate.
Decision R 1.3: Manage and protect the recreation values of the following areas and in the following priority: Crystal Ice Cave	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Crystal Ice Cave is now within the jurisdiction of the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve. However, the access road leading to Crystal Ice Cave is under the Upper Snake FO jurisdiction. Public is interested in BLM maintaining the access road.	Consider direction identifying TMAs and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations.
Decision R 3.1: By 1982 establish a public campground and picnic area in T. 1 S., R. 36 E., Sec. 26, Firth River bottoms. Develop, operate and maintain the sites with public funds. Site development and operation plan should include:	**Decision Status:** Not implemented. Currently there is no legal public access to Firth River bottoms. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Demand for recreation site and several actions not demonstrated. OHV	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
1. potable water source 2. improve all-weather access roads 3. stabilize and improve shoreline area 4. elimination of livestock grazing, and ORV use (except on designated roads and trails) 5. site supervision and reliable maintenance program 6. withdrawal from appropriation under mining laws	closures completed 2001, in Federal Register notice.	
Decision R 4.1: Provide for ORV use by accomplishing the following: A. Establish a competitive ORV race area in the vicinity of Coffee Point. Start this action in 1981. B. Establish the Snake River Plain National Recreation Trail primarily for ORV use.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Decision abandoned January 1988 due to adverse impacts on other resources.	None
Decision R 4.2: Close the following areas to ORV use: A. China Cup Butte RNA (160 acres) B. Cedar Butte C. Saddle Butte D. Big Southern Butte Limit ORV use to existing roads and trails in the following areas: E. Quaking Aspen Butte F. Areas where the slope is greater than 15% and where soil association 8 occurs. G. Allow ORV use on all public lands which are not closed or restricted.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Areas recommended as closed are actually limited to existing roads. Areas with slope over 15% are not identified. Big Southern Butte has a road to the summit that is closed during the winter season.	Consider direction identifying TMAs and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations, and for areas of concentrated OHV use. Consider designations across the field office for "limited to existing roads/trails," or "limited to designated roads/trails."

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Lost MFP		
Decision R-1: Manage two parcels of public land on Antelope Creek and one on Cherry Creek as sportsman access sites. These are located at Marsh Canyon (T. 5 N., R. 25 E., Sec. 29, NE¼ NW ¼) and Spring Creek Junction (T. 4 N., R. 24 E., Sec. 11, NW¼ NW¼) on Antelope Creek and at Ras Canyon (T. 4 N., R. 24 E., Sec. 2, NW¼ SW¼ and Sec. 3, NE¼ SE¼) on Cherry Creek. Management should include the following action: a. Place Sportsman Access signs on Antelope Road, Spring Creek Road and on U.S. Highway 93A at the Antelope Road intersection.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction is not consistent with current recreation management direction. Action would have resulted in adjacent private lands being used and not avoided.	None
Decision R-2: Obtain legal access to public lands across private lands in the following areas: Timbered Dome: T. 3 N., R. 24 E., Sec. 13; T. 3 N., R. 25 E., Secs. 13, 19, 20; and T. 4 N., R. 24 E., Secs. 10, 14. Appendicitis Hill: T. 5 N., R. 26 E., Secs. 7, 8, 17, and 18. Hammond Canyon: T. 4 N., R. 25 E., Secs. 15, 16, 22, 23, and 25.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Access available to Timbered Dome via an alternate route. Private landowner (Mule Deer Foundation) has granted public access (walk-in) in Hammond Canyon. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Parcels were considered by the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation in 2002 as part of a large, proposed Lost River Trail system in Butte and Custer County. Some interest in this trail system may yet exist among users and local governments.	Consider direction identifying TMAs and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations, and for areas of concentrated OHV use.
Decision R-3: Designate all public lands as closed, restricted, or open to off-road vehicles. Where information is insufficient, monitor the sites for two years and then make the designation. Complete an ORV plan by FY85. Lands closed to ORVs – none. Lands where ORVs are restricted to existing roads and trails. Arco Hills (T. 4 N., R 27 E., Secs. 19 and 30)	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. February 1988 review noted that the status was unchanged. Actions as to limited or closed to be determined during implementation-level travel management planning.	Consider direction identifying TMAs and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations, and for areas of concentrated OHV use. Consider designations across the field office for

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Areas on Clay Subsoils (URA 3, Sec. 2, C-2) Soils prone to deep gullying (URA 3, Sec. 2, C-3) c. Lands open to ORVs – all other public lands.		"limited to existing roads/trails," or "limited to designated roads/trails."
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Recreation Decision #1: Improve visitor safety by: 1. Placing direction and distance signs at appropriate backcountry locations to help orient visitors.	**Decision Status:** Not completed. Latest review of 1997 noted, "There has been limited action on sign placement." **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Signage is needed to clearly articulate what uses are and are not allowed with regards to motorized, non-motorized, and mechanized use.	Consider direction which identifies criteria for consistent signage across the field office area.
Recreation Decision #3.1: Identify key access routes and sites important for their recreational values so the public will be aware these areas are available for recreation use. Specific areas requiring signing include: Birch Creek, Lower Little Lost, Big Spring Creek, Clyde School Camp Site, Wet Creek Drainage, Sawmill Creek and Summit Creek (at the Junction of Sawmill Creek Road).	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction is not consistent with current recreation management direction.	Consider direction identifying TMAs and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations, and for OHV use.
Recreation Decision #3.3: Acquire access easements across private land to BLM land having recreational values.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. As opportunities arise with willing participants, easements are negotiated for public access.	Consider direction for identifying priorities for public land access.
Recreation Decision #4: Support a diversity of outdoor recreation on public lands within the planning unit by developing an ORV plan for the unit and by being receptive to any non-BLM recreation development proposal.	**Decision Status:** Not completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Implementation-level travel management planning will specifically address OHV usage and consider public proposals.	Consider direction identifying TMAs and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning for resource protection in areas with special designations, and

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		for areas of concentrated OHV use. Consider designations across the field office for "limited to existing roads/trails," or "limited to designated roads/trails." Consider direction or criteria to identify other needs for road networks rather than only recreational uses.
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Management Area (MA) 1 – Medicine Lodge: 5,920 acres closed to ORV use, and an additional 6,720 acres under seasonal closure. (Map shows a closed area at Edie Creek. Seasonally restricted area not shown.) **MA 2 – Twin Buttes**: No restrictions noted. **MA 3 – Camas Creek**: No restrictions noted. **MA 4 – Scattered Tracts**: 350-acre closure in place near Henry's Lake; seasonal closures near Monida Pass. Also, Game Creek RNA excludes ORV traffic. **MA 5 – Sands/MA 6 – Sand Mountain**: SRMA established for intensive management of dunes. Riders are generally restricted to open sands. A no-human entry closure is in place for surrounding lands around the Egin-Hamer Road during the winter (dates of release of the closure vary between April 1 and May 1). In MA 5, 2,560 acres were closed to ORVs, with an additional seasonal closure of 15,800 acres. In MA 6, 21,000 acres were closed to ORV use in conjunction with the Nine Mile Knoll ACEC. A winter vehicle closure and an embargo on new	**Decision Status:** Completed, 2001. Closure is for OHVs and snow machines. Administrative use is only exception for BLM, permittees, state and federal agencies. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. 2001 Federal Register notices implemented several recommended closures or seasonal restrictions noted in the Big Desert MFP, Medicine Lodge RMP, and associated activity level plans. Except where revised in the Snake River Plan, these closures and restrictions should carry forward into the new RMP.	Consider direction identifying TMAs and priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning. Consider designations across the field office for "limited to existing roads/trails," or "limited to designated roads/trails."

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
road construction were also placed on Nine Mile Knoll ACEC. **MA 7 – INEL (now INL)**: No restrictions noted. **MA 8 – Willow Creek, Tex Creek**: 8,290 acres were left open to OHV use, seasonal closures on 3,355 acres, and closures on 3,200 acres. 6,485 acres were designated as "semi-primitive non-motorized." **MA 9 – Snake River**: Provisions for ORV use were supplanted by the Snake River Activity Plan (2008). The OHV guidance from that plan should carry forward in the RMP. One mile on the lower end of Kelly Canyon will be managed to improve water quality and 1 mi managed to maintain existing satisfactory riparian habitat and water quality. The improvement will be through grazing management and reseeding of eroded areas. ORV use will be controlled to further improve water quality. Man-caused soil erosion will be reduced to not more than 2 ½ tons/acre/year through seeding, ORV management, and grazing management. About 1,191 acres will be managed for general ORV use while the balance of the area will be either closed to ORVs (6,020 acres) or restricted to existing roads and trails. About 8,320 acres of the area will be managed as semi-primitive non-motorized.		
Travel planning, including the designation of areas open, restricted, and closed to motorized vehicle access will remain a high priority for public land. Public land within areas identified as open to motorized vehicle use generally will remain available for such use without restrictions. Exceptions to this general rule may be authorized	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Travel management planning not completed to date, only the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (BLM 2008f) closed certain areas. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Implementation-level travel	Consider bringing forward travel management guidance from the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan. Consider direction identifying TMAs and

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
after consideration of the following criteria: • the need to promote user enjoyment and minimize use conflicts; • the need to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resource values; • the need to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant degradation of wildlife habitats; and • the need to promote user safety. Public land within areas identified as restricted to motorized vehicle use generally will receive priority attention during trave1 planning. Specific roads, trails or portions of such areas may be closed seasonally or yearlong to all or specified types of motorized vehicle use. Public land within areas identified as closed to motorized vehicle use will be closed yearlong to all forms of motorized vehicle use except emergency or authorized vehicles. Exceptions may be allowed in WSAs based on application of the Interim Management Policy. Restrictions and closures will be established for specific roads, trails, or areas only where problems have been identified. Areas not designated as restricted or closed will remain open for motorized vehicle use.	management planning will specifically address OHV usage and consider public proposals.	priorities for completing implementation-level travel management planning. Consider designations across the field office for "limited to existing roads/trails," or "limited to designated roads/trails."

3.21. Lands and Realty

Table 3-27 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs and applicable plan amendments for lands and realty.

Options for Management Consideration
Lands and realty management direction in existing LUPs is inconsistent making it difficult to achieve desired outcomes to accommodate resource uses reducing conflicts/impacts with resources as demands are placed on public lands for utility corridors, ROWs, and access to private lands intermingled with public lands.

Comments received during public scoping provided various ideas for consideration in developing management direction with regard to lands and realty actions such as ROWs and corridor development, wind energy development, access to public lands, and land tenure adjustments. Consideration of management direction as identified below would achieve desired conditions resulting in reducing conflicts with uses and resources.

- Develop criteria/management direction for energy development through issuance of ROW grants.
- Develop management direction for lands that come under BLM administration in the future, including lands where withdrawals are relinquished or revoked, and consider retention of public access in all land tenure adjustments.
- Identify zones and criteria for land tenure adjustments throughout the planning area.
- Develop criteria/management direction to identify utility corridor(s) locations as applicable, as well as avoidance and exclusion areas for various land use authorizations.

Table 3-27. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for lands and realty.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
Big Desert MFP		
Lease landfill sites to Bingham County.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Several leases were issued; however, due to current policy, IM WO-2006-238 and IM ID-2007-004, these leases were closed.	Consider direction that would enable making public lands available through a direct sale or recreation and public purposes (R&PP) conveyance to county and local government for landfills.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Dispose of public lands in area 1 and 2.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Establish a communications site on Big Southern Butte.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Decision conflicts with other direction in plan (Recreation) that stated "Commercial facilities will not be allowed. BLM and Fish and Game facilities will remain."	Consider identifying similar sites/areas (e.g. Big Southern Butte) in exclusion areas for right-of-way (ROW) development.
Reject USFWS withdrawal applications 1-010203 and 1-021996 on Snake River Omitted lands.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. It was determined that a withdrawal was not the appropriate method to conserve species in this area.	None
Revoke all Classification and Multiple Use (C&MU) classifications (activity plan will be developed on disposal areas 2 and 3 prior to revocation).	**Decision Status:** Completed. Classifications revoked, no activity developed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. National Wildlife Federation lawsuit resulted in a court injunction in changing classifications.	None
Revoke all administrative withdrawals that no longer serve intended purpose.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The review was completed in accordance with FLMPA. Withdrawals on China Cup Butte, the stock driveway, and the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) recommended for retention.	Review and provide administrative withdrawal direction for each alternative as needed.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Pursue a withdrawal on 160 acres associated with the designated China Cup Butte Research Natural Area.	**Decision Status:** Completed by Public land Order 3530. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Action to withdraw public lands completed 1/29/1965.	None
Approve Lebrecht private exchange.	**Decision Status:** Completed, February 1983. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	None
Dispose of isolated tracts which do not have resource values. Consider exchange as first priority disposal method.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Dispose of 3300.94 acres of public land.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Watershed, W-3.2. Retain all public lands in floodplain in public ownership.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Floodplains usually contain wetlands and under Executive Orders 11988, Floodplain Management, and 11990, Protection of Wetlands, BLM is encouraged to	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	retain public lands containing wetlands and floodplains.	
Big Lost MFP		
Make land available for lease as a sanitary landfill by Butte County and assist in locating suitable landfill sites. Complete by FY 1987.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented. Butte County proposed a new site for the Moore landfill. Due to public opposition the landfill was closed and rehabilitated. Arco landfill remains open on private lands. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Policy no longer allows leasing of public land for landfill purposes (IM WO-2006-238 and IM ID-2007-004).	Consider direction that would enable making public lands available through a direct sale or R&PP conveyance to county and local government for landfills.
Revoke the C&MU Act of 1964 in its entirety on public lands within the planning unit.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The C&MU Act, 1964, expired in 1970. The BLM, through FLPMA, has the authority to determine whether or not public land can be disposed.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Approve desert land applications and dispose of lands under development where they are capable of long-term crop production based on the following criteria: • Class I, II, III soils • Availability of water • Economic feasibility Disposal would not impose unacceptable consequences on other resource uses and values.	**Decision Status**: Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Not adequate. Pending Desert Land Entry (DLE) applications have not been approved because they do not meet one or more of the suitability requirements of the Act.	Need to look at the criteria for DLE and determine if applications are still appropriate for the field office. Lands may not meet all of the suitability criteria outlined in Act.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Transfer out of ownership isolated tracts which are difficult to manage by: • Sale – Competitive bid to bring highest value for the land. • Providing to counties or cities for R&PP sites. • Processing pending disposal type actions • Exchange – when in best National interest.	**Decision Status**: Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues**: No **Adequacy**: Adequate. This direction should be considered as criteria or management direction associated with land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Legalize unauthorized ROW facilities where the impact does not impose unacceptable consequences to other resource uses and values.	**Decision Status:** Completed **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Does not provide adequate direction on where and when BLM would allow new ROWs or authorize current unauthorized use of public land.	Identify avoidance and exclusion areas for ROW development. Identify corridors where necessary. Develop criteria where special stipulations would be placed on ROWs.
Retain in federal ownership all critical antelope, elk, mule deer, and sage-grouse ranges as shown on wildlife overlays 1 and 2.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Legalize the use of Clyde Cemetery (T. 9 N., R. 27 E., NWNE Sec. 15).	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. No action taken as the Cemetery Act of March 1, 1907, was repealed with passage of FLMPA.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Locate and authorize a sanitary land fill site for the communities of Lone Pine and Blue Dome.	**Decision Status:** Completed, site authorized December 1981. Unauthorized site cleaned up and closed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Public lands are no longer leased for the purpose of landfills.	Consider direction that would enable making public lands available through a direct sale or R&PP conveyance to county and local government for landfills.
Eliminate agricultural trespass.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. District policy for such situations being followed: No new authorizations allowed, existing permits not renewed when expire, and permits are non-assignable. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. District policy has been effective in controlling agricultural trespass.	Consider incorporating District policy as resource management plan direction.
Initiate an exchange program with the State of Idaho to acquire isolated State tracts which lie adjacent to public lands within the planning unit	**Decision Status:** Not implemented. Action postponed and cancelled, 1982. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Mitigate human safety and wildlife mortality hazards of Dry Creek Flume (ROW I-015694 replaced by I-23042 in 1986).	**Decision Status:** Completed 1982 as mitigation for ROW I-23042. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Mitigation for ROW I-23042 reduced wildlife mortality and provide for human safety.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Provide land for a diversion structure for Little Lost Flood Control group to stop winter flooding	**Decision Status:** Completed, 7/19/1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Issuance of ROW to Howe Flood Improvement District has helped to control winter flooding situation.	None
Allow only DLEs which fall within areas where there-are no restriction or conflicts which would make them unsuitable.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Issuance of DLEs needs to be consistent with suitability criteria identified in the DLE Act, and no resource conflicts exist.	Consider direction that addresses suitability of public lands for DLE. Consider identifying lands that do not meet the suitability criteria as outlined in Act.
Plan Amendment for the Little Lost/Birch Creek LUP to Allow for Exchange of Approximately 122.73 acres of Public Land in the Idaho Falls District (10/16/1989)		
Exchange 122.73 acres of public land (T. 9 N., R. 30 E., Sec. 4, 5, 9) for private land.	**Decision Status:** Completed, 2/19/1991. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Plan Amendment for the Little Lost/Birch Creek Management Framework Plan to Allow for Exchange of Approximately 1,037 acres of Public Land in the Idaho Falls District (9/18/1991)		
Exchange of 1,037.16 acres of public land (T. 5 N., R.29 E., Sec. 5 & 14) for private land.	**Decision Status:** Completed, 10/9/1992. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Management Area (MA) 1 - Medicine Lodge: Examine 280 acres of public land, applying the standard operating procedures, for sale, state or private exchange (Map 3b).	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
MA 1 - Medicine Lodge: Utilities will be limited to existing corridors where possible.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Does not provide direction on where and when would allow new ROWs and if would require mitigations or seasonal restrictions.	Consider identifying and designated corridors where necessary. Identify areas that would be open, avoided, excluded or restricted.
MA 2 - Table Butte/Twin Buttes: Examine 680 acres of public land for sale, private or state exchange, act on 1,395 acres under DLE application, and examine 1,120 acres of public land where soil is suitable for farming. Land disposals will meet criteria outlined in the standard operating procedures.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
MA 4 - Scattered Tracts: Examine 3,288 acres for transfer from BLM jurisdiction through sale, private or state exchange. Examine 200 acres for public purposes or exchange and examine 80 acres for their suitability for agricultural entry. Transfer of public lands will meet the criteria listed in the standard operating procedures.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
MA 5 – Sands: Both state and private exchanges will be encouraged in order to improve the pattern of private, state and public land in the management area. Land examinations would be needed for all feasible exchange opportunities and transfers under agricultural entry.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
MA 5 – Sands: Nine Mile Knoll ACEC – no disposal of public land, no new roads or major ROWs.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Direction is specific for area as to authorizing of no new roads or ROWs.	Consider carrying this direction forward and placing similar types of public lands in appropriate a land tenure zone for retention. This area could also be considered in an avoidance or exclusion area for land use authorizations.
MA 8 - Willow Creek/Tex Creek: Objective 2: Retain 11,490 acres of public land for long term multiple use management.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Tex Creek in close proximity to Idaho Falls provides opportunities for many different recreational experiences.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
MA 8 - Willow Creek/Tex Creek: Land examinations will be made on private and state exchange proposals as they arise to support the Willow Creek 208 Project.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
MA 9 - Snake River: Land examinations will be completed for 486 acres for sale or exchange. Land examinations will be completed for feasible state or private exchanges as these opportunities arise.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
MA 9 - Snake River: Constraints that apply to the North Menan Butte ACEC include . . . the area will be closed to . . . and mining under the 1872 law.	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Need to determine if a withdrawal or other restrictions are appropriate for managing this area.	Review and provide mineral withdrawal direction for each alternative to protect resources
Plan Amendment to the Medicine Lodge Management Plan for Direct Sale of Public Lands to Madison County for Construction and Demolition of a Landfill Near Rexburg, Idaho (11/25/2008)		
Allow for a direct sale of 139.76 acres to Madison County for a landfill.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Amendment approved sale to be finalized in 2010. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The amendment allowed the authorized officer to offer the parcel to the county through a direct sale.	Consider direction that would enable making public lands available through a direct sale or R&PP conveyance to county and local government for landfills.
Plan Amendment to the Medicine Lodge Management Plan for the Direct Sale of Public Lands to Dale E. McDowell, Louise J. Prudhomme, and George McDowell (September 7, 2007)		
Allow for the disposal of 1.25 acres for an unintentional encroachment.	**Decision Status:** Completed. Patent issued March 3, 2009. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Identifying specific parcels for disposal does not allow the authorized officer flexibility in making decisions regarding land tenure adjustments.	Consider a zone concept for entire planning area with specified criteria for implementing land tenure adjustments.
Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Designation of Energy Corridors on Bureau of Land Management-Administered Lands in the 11 Western States		
Designation of Section 368 Corridors and Amendment of RMPs.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The ROD amended the Big Desert MFP and Medicine Lodge RMP, in which the Interstate -15 transportation/utility corridor (approximately 22.3 mi; 3,500 ft wide; 9,461 acres) was designated for Section 368 energy corridors. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes	Consider direction which may or may not designate additional corridors in the planning area.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	Adequacy: Adequate. The designation met Section 368 of the National Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the need for upgraded and new electricity transmission and distribution facilities to improve reliability, relieve congestion, and enhance the capability of the national grid to deliver electricity.	

3.22. Energy and Mineral Resources

Table 3-28 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for energy and mineral resources.

Options for Additional Management Consideration

Management direction for energy and mineral resources in existing LUPs varies considerably, which makes it difficult to provide a consistent approach to managing these uses while providing protection to other resources such as wildlife, special status species, vegetation, and water. The management direction identified below will allow for the exploration and development of fluid and locatable minerals and the disposal of mineral materials while providing for plant and animal species diversity, protecting fish and wildlife habitat, providing soil stability, protecting surface waters and habitats, and providing enhanced recreation and aesthetic values:

- Recognize the Nation's need for domestic sources of minerals and other resources.
- Encourage development of a stable domestic minerals industry and the orderly and economic development of domestic mineral resources.
- Promote alternative and renewable energy sources, reduce dependence on foreign sources of energy, and increase domestic production of minerals.
- Increase the production of clean renewable fuels.
- Allow for energy and mineral development concurrently or sequentially with other resource uses, providing that appropriate stipulations or conditions of approval are incorporated into authorizations to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation and reduce environmental impacts.
- Recognize that energy and mineral development can occur concurrently or sequentially with other resource uses, providing that appropriate stipulations or conditions of approval are incorporated into authorizations to prevent undue degradation and mitigate environmental impacts.

Table 3-28. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for energy and minerals resources.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
All public lands with federally reserved mineral rights are to remain open to the leasing and exploration of minerals under the appropriate laws (oil, gas, geothermal), with the following exceptions: (1) Lands within the Hell's Half Acre and Cedar Butte wilderness study areas (WSAs) will not be leased, and (2) No surface occupancy will be allowed on China Cup Butte, Big Southern Butte, Quaking Aspen Butte, and the omitted lands on the Snake River.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, October 1981. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision needs to be updated to identify which public lands are available or not available for leasing and to update surface occupancy stipulations (fluid minerals) for the protection of other resources on those public lands that are available for leasing.	In order for the BLM to comply with the Mining and Minerals Policy Act and the Energy Policy Act, which require that lands be made available for leasing and development, fluid mineral stipulations need to be identified for the protection of resources/resource uses on public lands that are available for leasing.
All public lands are to remain open to mineral entry under the 1872 Mining Law. Work with mining companies to mitigate impacts on the following resources: (1) Sage-grouse strutting and nesting areas, (2) Big Southern Butte, (3) Hell's Half Acre, (4) Box Canyon of the Big Lost River, (5) Snake River omitted lands, (6) Firth River bottoms, (7) China Cup Butte, (8) Cedar Butte, (9) Quaking Aspen Butte, (10) Slopes greater than 15%, (11) Soil associations 8 and 14, (12) INL, and (13) Kings Bowl.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, October 1981. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision needs to be updated to state that public lands will remain open to mining claim location unless withdrawn from mineral entry. The decision needs to identify which public lands are withdrawn from mineral entry and where conditions of approval are needed to protect other surface resources.	Conditions of approval need to be identified that will protect other surface resources should exploration and development proposals be received.
All public lands are to remain open for the disposal of saleable materials except the following: (1) Snake River omitted lands and Firth River bottoms, (2) Big Southern Butte, (3) Kings Bowl (Crystal Ice Cave), (4) China Cup Butte, (5) Cedar Butte and Hell's Half Acre WSAs, (6) Quaking Aspen Butte, (7) Box Canyon of the Big Lost River, (8) and Hell's Half Acre lava flow east of Interstate-15 (open for competitive sales only).	**Decision Status:** Implemented, October 1981. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Those areas that were identified for protection have some value for saleable mineral development. The decision needs to be updated to identify other lands where mineral material disposal will not be allowed.	Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Conduct only competitive sales on that portion of the Hell's Half Acre lava flow that lies east of I-15 near Firth, Idaho	**Decision Status:** Not implemented **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision needs to be deleted because of lack of public demand for mineral materials east of I-15. No competitive interest exists and none is expected.	Community pits and common use areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials.
Big Lost MFP		
The federal mineral estate now open to mining claim location will remain open to exploration and mining under the U.S. Mining Laws	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 12-15-1983. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision needs to be updated to state that public lands will remain open to mining claim location unless withdrawn from mineral entry. The decision needs to identify which public lands are withdrawn from mineral entry and where conditions of approval are needed to protect other surface resources.	Conditions of approval need to be developed that will protect resources should exploration and development proposals be received.
All federal mineral estate presently open will remain open to exploration and development of leasable minerals under the appropriate laws, subject to stipulations to protect: (1) seasonal wildlife values—sage-grouse strutting and nesting 02/01 to 06/15, deer fawning and elk calving 05/15 to 07/15, deer, elk, and antelope wintering ranges, 12/01 to 04/01, (2) live waters, (3) WSAs, (4) soils with high erosion potential, and (5) slopes greater than 25% without providing erosion control.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 12-15-1983. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision needs to be updated to identify which public lands are available or not available for leasing and to update surface occupancy stipulations (fluid minerals) for the protection of other resources on those public lands that are available for leasing.	In order for the BLM to comply with the Mining and Minerals Policy Act and the Energy Policy Act, which require that lands be made available for leasing and development, fluid mineral stipulations need to be identified for the protection of resources and resource uses on public lands that are available for leasing.
Open federal mineral estate will remain open to the exploration and development of salable minerals under the appropriate laws. New material sales will be established as necessary to meet public demand.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 12-15-1983. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Mineral materials have been and will continue to be made available to the	Mineral material sources should be established where there is a demand for these materials by local, county, state, or federal entities.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Approve Free-Use-Permits and conduct sales at newly or previously established areas. Provide for use of mineral materials in support of BLM projects.	public.	
No mineral material extraction is permitted within WSAs being considered for inclusion in the national wilderness system. Mining of material at new or existing sites will be allowed except where the impact of such material removal would have unacceptable consequences to other resource uses and values.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 12-15-1983. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The BLM cannot authorize mineral material disposals in WSAs because of the non-impairment standard.	Mineral material sources should be established where there is a demand for these materials by local, county, state, or federal entities.
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
On public demand, provide for the sale or free use of mineral materials at existing sites. Provide for the use of materials for BLM projects. Establish new material sites on public demand. Assure that material extraction is conducted in a manner that minimizes environmental or other resource damage. Allow mineral material use within wilderness inventory units only when/if they are dropped from further wilderness consideration.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 10-15-1981. Updated January 1988. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The reference to wilderness inventory units needs to be deleted. BLM cannot authorize mineral material disposals in WSAs because of the non-impairment standard.	Mineral material sources should be established where there is a demand for these materials by local, county, state, or federal entities.
Allow mining claim location and exploration under the Mining Laws. Assure that mining and prospecting operations are conducted in a manner that minimizes environmental or other resource damage. Unless otherwise provided by law, approve mining plans within wilderness inventory units only if they will not affect the unit's wilderness suitability characteristics.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 10-15-1981. Updated January 1988. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The reference to wilderness inventory units needs to be deleted. The BLM cannot authorize surface disturbing activities on mining claims in WSAs because of the non-impairment standard.	Conditions of approval need to be developed that will protect resources should exploration and development proposals be received.
Approve plans submitted for the development of geothermal and oil/gas leases. Approve geothermal	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 10-15-1981. Updated January 1988. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No	In order for the BLM to comply with the Mining and Minerals Policy Act and the

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
exploration notices and allow the leasing of geothermal and oil/gas resources not already leased. Assure that exploration and development operations are conducted in a manner that minimizes environmental or other resource damage. Approve operations within wilderness inventory units only if they conform with current management policy and guidelines for lands under wilderness review.	**Adequacy:** Not adequate. The reference to wilderness inventory units needs to be deleted. No oil and gas or geothermal leases exist in the WSAs. It is the BLM's policy not to issue leases in WSAs.	Energy Policy Act, which require that lands be made available for leasing and development, fluid mineral stipulations need to be identified for the protection of resources and resource uses on public lands that are available for leasing.
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Management Area (MA) 1 – Medicine Lodge: None of the lands will be closed to minerals leasing and only 160 acres will be closed to mining claim location. A total of 31,900 acres are open to leasing under seasonal occupancy restrictions and 12,500 acres open under no surface occupancy. The majority of the area, 132,500 acres, is open to mineral leasing and exploration with standard stipulations. The majority is available for sale of mineral materials with only 14,900 acres closed to protect other values.	**Decision Status:** Implemented, 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.
MA 2 – Table Butte/Twin Butte: None of the lands will be closed to mineral leasing. About 400 acres will be open to leasing under no surface occupancy restrictions and 39,100 acres will be open under seasonal restrictions. Only 80 acres will be closed to mining and 1,300 acres to sales of mineral materials.	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
		mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.
MA 3 – Camas Creek: No areas will be closed to mineral leasing or mining claim location and only 1,800 acres will be closed to sale of mineral materials. Seasonal restrictions apply to 8,200 acres in the unit and 800 acres are restricted to no surface occupancy for mineral leasing and exploration.	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.
MA 4 – Scattered Tracts: Mining, mineral leasing, and mining claim locations will essentially continue as they are being handled at present with no changes.	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
MA 5 – Sands: Mineral leasing, material sales, and locatable minerals actions will be the same as the present situation. For maintenance of important wildlife areas, most of the area will have continued seasonal occupancy restrictions for mineral leasing, 4,340 acres can be leased under no surface occupancy and 2,160 acres will be closed to leasing. About 1,140 acres are closed to mining claim location and 11,000 acres closed to sale of mineral materials.	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.
MA 6 – Sand Mountain: All of this area would be open to sales of mineral materials, mining claim location and also open to mineral leasing with seasonal restrictions provided that Congress and the President accept the recommendation as non-suitable for this WSA. Until Congress acts, the area will be managed under the Bureau's Interim Management Policy, essentially closed to new mineral leases or developments. No new mineral actions can be allowed until Congress acts.	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.
MA 7 – INEL (Now INL): At the present time, about 125,040 acres in the Medicine Lodge Resource Area portion of the INL are closed to mineral leasing and mining claim location, and 56,520 acres are closed to the sale of mineral materials. Following the review of the INL	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** BLM and the Department of Energy need to determine whether the existing withdrawals will be revoked or	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
withdrawal, 106,840 acres will be opened for mineral leasing and the 125,040 acres open for sale of mineral materials.	continued. Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.
MA 8 – Willow Creek/Tex Creek: Management of the mineral estate in this management area will continue as under the present situation. No new management decisions are needed.	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to Federal, State, and County roadways should be made available for mineral materials to maintain those roads.
MA 9 – Snake River: Mineral management decisions are designed to complement wildlife and recreation used in this management area. About 10,400 acres will be closed to mining claim location, where 3,000 acres are currently closed. No change in management of salable minerals is needed. About 13,600 acres remain available for mineral material sales and 7,200 acres remain closed to sales.	**Decision Status:** Implemented 12-24-1985. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Existing restrictions on mineral exploration and development need to be reviewed to determine if they are still applicable or need to be updated.	Make low, moderate, and high potential areas available for oil and gas and geothermal leasing. Develop standard stipulations that would protect other resources during locatable mineral development. Mineral material disposal areas should be established where there is a demand for mineral materials. Lands adjacent to federal, state, and county roadways should be made available

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
		for mineral materials to maintain those roads.

3.23. Special Designations

3.23.1. ACECs

Table 3-29 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs and applicable plan amendments for ACECs.

Options for Management Consideration
Since the designation of the China Butte RNA in 1965, only one of the four current LUPs (Medicine Lodge RMP) designated additional ACECs and RNAs. Consideration of management direction such as identified below would protect the remaining unique geological, vegetative, recreational, scenic, cultural, and/or wildlife resource values.

- Retain or discontinue existing ACECs.
- Designate or discontinue consideration of proposed ACECs.
- Expand or contract boundaries of existing or proposed ACECs.

In addition, a written comment received during public scoping suggested management of tiger beetle habitat be considered as part of management for the Nine Nile Knoll ACEC.

Table 3-29. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for ACECs.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	Options for Change
Big Desert MFP		
Accomplish the following actions for China Cup Butte: **A.** China Cup should be included in a signing program and in any interpretive information discussing volcanic features of the Desert. **B.** Do not allow any environmental modification within the withdrawal unless required for scientific research. Closely monitor any such research to	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Signs have been placed at the butte to prohibit off-road use of the area. No interpretive signs have been developed. The butte has not been fenced even though past OHV use has caused resource damage. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate, direction for management of this research	Consider developing direction regarding how the unique characteristics of the RNA would be managed.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
minimize and mitigate disturbances. **C.** If OHV or other problems develop, fence off the Butte from the southern access road. The entire butte may require fencing due to the nature of the surrounding topography.	natural area (RNA) needs to be more specific.	
Close China Cup Butte to OHV use.	**Decision Status:** Completed. The area has been closed, but enforcement is difficult. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Signage has not stopped OHV damage from occurring.	Consider travel management restrictions as appropriate to prevent continuing damage.
Big Lost MFP		
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)/RNAs are not addressed in the Big Lost MFP.		
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
ACECs/RNAs are not addressed in the Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP.		
Medicine Lodge RMP		
Three areas are designated as ACECs: Nine Mile Knoll, North Menan Butte, and the Snake River. A Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) designation will be applied to the Sand Dunes complex and also the Snake River. RNAs are designated for North Menan Butte, Game Creek, the North Junipers, and three islands of the Snake River.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The Snake River ACEC is managed according to the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (BLM 2008f). Activity plans for the other two ACECs have not been developed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Only one of the three ACECs has been addressed.	With the exception of the Snake River ACEC, consider developing direction regarding how the unique characteristics of the RNA would be managed.
Designate 375 acres in Game Creek as an RNA. No changes in vegetation will be allowed in the RNA.	**Decision Status:** Completed. No management direction was provided for this RNA except that no changes in vegetation would be allowed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. No specific direction for management	Consider developing direction regarding how the unique characteristics of the RNA would be managed.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	of these areas was included in the decision.	
This resource management plan designates the Nine Mile Knoll Area of Critical Environmental concern (see Map 3b) which will be managed according to an ACEC management plan. Constraints in use of the Nine Mile Knoll ACEC include no disposal of public land, no new roads or major ROWs, a winter vehicle closure, and seasonal occupancy for oil and gas exploration and development. The St. Anthony Sand Dunes SRMA will also be managed under a specific management plan consistent with the objectives for this management area and the Nine Mile Knoll ACEC management plan. (Refer to Management Area 6). There are 1,780 acres designated in the North Junipers as an RNA. No changes in vegetation will be allowed in this RNA.	**Decision Status:** Not completed. Management plans for Nine Mile Knoll ACEC and North Junipers RNA (St. Anthony Sand Dunes RNA) were never completed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Although some specific direction for management of this area was included in this decision, more specifics are needed.	Consider developing direction regarding how the unique characteristics of the ACECs would be managed.
Snake River ACEC: Wildlife habitat will be managed in accordance with the South Fork of the Snake River Memorandum of Understanding and the Pacific States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan. A management plan for the Snake River ACEC will be in .accordance with these and will be implemented on completion.	**Decision Status:** Completed. A management plan was written in 1991 and revised in 2009. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The decision will protect the unique cottonwood ecosystem, scenic values, bald eagle habitat, and other wildlife species and their habitats.	None
Snake River ACEC: About 1,191 acres will be managed for general OHV use while the balance of the area will be either closed to OHVs (6,020 acres) or restricted to existing roads and trails. About 8,320 acres of the area will be managed as semi-primitive non-motorized. A management plan for the Snake River SRMA will be developed to manage the recreation values and uses. If feasible, a single management plan including both the Snake River SRMA and Snake River	**Decision Status:** Completed. The Snake River SRMA and the Snake River ACEC is managed according to the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (BLM 2008f). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The decision will protect the unique cottonwood ecosystem, scenic values, bald eagle habitat, and other wildlife species and their habitats.	None

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
ACEC will be completed rather than separate plans for the same area. This plan will provide for more detailed management of all public land resources including cultural and historical values.		
Special designations for this management area include the following: a. North Menan Butte ACEC, 1,120 acres b. Snake River ACEC, 11,120 acres c. Snake River SRMA, 14,759 acres d. North Menan Butte RNA e. Menan Butte National Natural Landmark, 1,120 acres (currently in effect) f. Cress Creek National Recreation Trail, 1 mi g. South Fork of the Snake River recommended for further study as a recreation or scenic river, 61 mi. Constraints that apply to the North Menan Butte ACEC include no surface occupancy for oil and gas operations, the area will be closed to grazing, OHV, and mining under the 1872 law. No changes in the vegetation will be allowed in the North Menan Butte RNA, or in the 3 Snake River islands. Constraints on uses of the Snake River ACEC and Snake River SRMA are itemized in these management decisions for the management area.	**Decision Status:** Completed, however, North Menan Butte has never been closed to mining through a Federal Register notice. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. The decision does not specifically list RNA islands on the Snake River. Although some specific direction for management of this area was included in this decision, more specifics are needed.	Consider developing direction regarding how the unique characteristics of the respective ACECs and RNAs would be managed. Consider developing direction criteria for mineral withdrawals to protect resources.
Snake River ACEC: Cultural and historic resources and values will be managed under the ACEC management plan.	**Decision Status:** Completed. The Snake River ACEC is managed according to the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan (BLM 2008f). **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Cultural and historic resources are addressed in the ROD.	Consider incorporating direction from the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan regarding the management of similar cultural and historic resources across the FO planning area.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
If the Snake River Islands WSA is not designated wilderness, the islands will be managed as part of an ACEC and a SRMA. Detailed management plans will be developed for areas within the Snake River System.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. WSA hasn't been designated as wilderness, pending Congressional action. The islands are currently managed under the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The decision protects the unique cottonwood ecosystem, scenic values, bald eagle habitat, and other wildlife species and their habitats.	None
Egin–Hamer Plan Amendment – 1987		
Enlarge Nine Mile Knoll ACEC to 40,090 acres to protect wintering elk.	**Decision Status:** Completed. The amendment was completed in 1987. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The decision protects habitat for wildlife, particularly big game.	Consider direction which would designate and expand the boundaries of Nine Mile Knoll ACEC to aid in protection of additional big game winter habitat to the north and east of the current designation.
Medicine Lodge RMP Amendment to Designate the Henry's Lake ACEC – 1997		
Designate the Henry's Lake area as an ACEC.	**Decision Status:** Completed. The amendment was completed in 1997. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The decision protects riparian, wildlife, recreation, special status species, and water quality resources.	None

3.23.2. WSAs

Table 3-30 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for WSAs.

Options for Management Consideration

WSAs within the Upper Snake FOA have been identified, with recommendations made to Congress regarding their suitability of being designated as a wilderness area. Management direction in current LUPs is to manage these areas under BLM Manual (H-8550, BLM 1995) Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review until Congress makes a final determination.

Consideration of management direction as identified below would assure these public lands, if released from consideration by Congress, would improve in plant and animal species diversity, providing fish and wildlife habitat, and improving water quality/storage values.

- Develop management direction for WSAs should they be released from wilderness consideration by Congress.

Table 3-30. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for WSAs.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Desert MFP		
Roadless inventory units, Hell's Half Acre, Cerro Grande (Cedar Mountain, China Cup Butte Instant Study Area) are going thru the Wilderness Review Process and are under Wilderness Interim Management Policy (IMP) rules for management and protection until they are released from the process or designated wilderness.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No Congressional action taken on Idaho wilderness recommendations to date. These WSAs are managed under BLM Manual H- 8550-1, Interim Management Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Parcels are currently managed under IMP guidance.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status.
Big Lost MFP		
The decision for Appendicitis Hill and White Knob Mountain Study Areas (WSAs) is to recommend to Congress both areas as not suitable for addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System. (This is a preliminary decision because Congress may not choose to follow this recommendation.) Should Congress not designate the two WSAs wilderness, the management of the areas will be guided by decisions made in the MFP for other multiple uses. Should Congress decide to designate either or both of the WSAs as wilderness, future management of the area or areas will be guided by the 1964 Wilderness Act and BLM's wilderness management policy. A wilderness management plan	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No Congressional action taken on Idaho wilderness recommendations to date. These WSAs are managed under BLM Manual H- 8550-1, Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Parcels are currently managed under IMP guidance.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
will be developed for each area that is designated wilderness.		
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Grant Wilderness Study Area (WSA) status to Hawley Mountain 32-3, Black Canyon 32-9, and Pass Creek 32-16. Manage these areas under the IMP guidelines.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No Congressional action taken on Idaho wilderness recommendations to date. Hawley Mountain and Black Canyon are WSAs and managed under BLM Manual H- 8550-1, Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. Pass Creek was dropped from the 1989–1990 wilderness review process for not possessing wilderness characteristics. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Parcels currently managed under IMP guidance.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status.
Medicine Lodge RMP		
The 21,870 acres within the two Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs Sand Mountain and Snake River Islands) will be recommended as non-suitable. These areas will be managed under IMP until Congress makes final determination.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No Congressional action taken on Idaho wilderness recommendations to date. These WSAs managed under BLM Manual H- 8550-1, Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Parcels are currently managed under IMP guidance.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status.
Recommend the Sand Mountain WSA as non-suitable for addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System. If the Sand Mountain WSA is not designated wilderness, it will be managed as part of an ACEC and SRMA. Detailed management plans will be developed for both areas. If the WSA is designated wilderness, it would be managed under BLM's Wilderness Management Policy. Specific management provisions would be formulated	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No Congressional action taken on Idaho wilderness recommendations to date. These WSAs managed under BLM Manual H- 8550-1, Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Parcels are currently managed under IMP guidance.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
in a wilderness management plan developed for the Sand Mountain Area.		
Sand Mountain WSA would be open to sales of mineral materials, mining claim location and also open to mineral leasing with seasonal restrictions provided that Congress and the President accept the recommendation as non-suitable for this WSA. Until Congress acts, the area will be managed under the Bureau's IMP, essentially closed to new mineral leases or developments. No new mineral actions can be allowed until Congress acts.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. No Congressional action taken on Idaho wilderness recommendations to date. These WSAs managed under BLM Manual H- 8550-1, Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** No **Adequacy:** Adequate. Parcels are currently managed under IMP guidance.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status, such as but not limited to: close area to fluid mineral leasing and mineral materials availability.
If the Snake River Islands WSA is not designated wilderness, the islands will be managed as part of an ACEC and an SRMA. Detailed management plans will be developed for areas within the Snake River System. If the islands are designated wilderness, they will be managed under BLM's Wilderness Management Policy. Specific management provisions will be formulated in a wilderness management plan developed for the islands.	**Decision Status:** Completed. The Snake River Islands are included in the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan and are managed as part of an ACEC and SRMA. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The islands are managed under IMP guidelines and as part of an ACEC/SRMA under the ROD for the Snake River Activity/Operations Plan.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status.
The small section 202 WSA has 350 acres adjacent to the USFS recommended suitable Rare II Lion's Head Roadless Area. Of the 350 acres, 340 acres are recommended suitable for wilderness and 10 acres are recommended non-suitable for wilderness.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. The area is identified as a WSA in Idaho State Wide WSA report to Congress of 1991. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. The area is currently managed under IMP guidance.	Manage these parcels under IMP guidance as WSAs until Congress acts on the recommendation. Develop management direction for parcels released from WSA status.

3.24. Public Safety—Hazardous Materials/Abandoned Mine Lands

Table 3-31 presents current management direction based upon existing LUPs for public safety—hazardous materials/abandoned mine lands.

Options for Additional Management Consideration
Abandoned mine lands and hazardous material disposal on BLM-administered public lands pose a serious threat to human health and safety and resources (e.g., soils, water, vegetation, wildlife). Consideration of management direction such as that identified below would achieve desired resource conditions and address reducing the potential threat to human health and safety.

- Maintain inventory of sites and monitor them periodically to ensure compliance.
- Remove and remediate hazardous material dump sites.
- Remediate abandoned mine land sites.
- Investigate responsible parties for cost recovery for both abandoned mine lands and hazardous materials if possible.
- Promote partnerships, inform and educate the public.
- Reduce hazardous materials/wastes and ensure all permitted/authorized activities comply with federal and state rules and regulations.

Table 3-31. Current management direction, adequacy of, and options for change for hazardous materials/abandoned mine lands.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
Big Lost MFP		
VRM-4. Schedule 8 unauthorized dump sites for cleanup.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction is site specific, needs to address all situations and types of waste that may be encountered throughout the field office area.	Consider developing criteria to prioritize the cleanup the various types of wastes and materials encountered throughout the entire field office.
WS 2.1. Control pollution from the Last Chance Mine Group on Champagne Creek. Initiate action by 1986.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. A passive, bioremediation pond system, installed in 1999. Many improvements and maintenance actions continue to be taken here. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Not adequate. Direction is site specific, needs to address all	Consider developing criteria to prioritize the cleanup of abandoned mine land (AML) environmental sites throughout the entire field office.

Current Management Direction	Adequacy of Management Direction	
	Decision Status, Responsiveness and Adequacy	**Options for Change**
	AML environmental hazard sites situations encountered throughout the field office area.	
Little Lost/Birch Creek MFP		
Lands #4. Clean up existing unauthorized dumps.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Approximately 21 dumps have had hazardous materials or both solid and hazardous materials removed. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Needs to address all situations that may be encountered throughout the field office area.	Consider developing criteria to prioritize the cleanup the various types of wastes and materials encountered throughout the entire field office.
Lands #5. Fence and sign mine shafts and tunnels in Scott Butte area identified as potential safety hazards.	**Decision Status:** Completed in 1987 and 2004 with fencing and signage. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Needs to address all mine hazards, situations that may be encountered throughout the field office area.	Consider developing criteria to prioritize the cleanup of AML environmental sites throughout the entire field office.
Recreation #1. Eliminate open mine shaft hazards.	**Decision Status:** Ongoing. Approximately five AML sites have been removed or remediated. **Decision Responsive to Issues:** Yes **Adequacy:** Adequate. Need to address all mine hazards, situations that may be encountered throughout the field office area.	Consider developing criteria to prioritize the cleanup of AML environmental sites throughout the entire field office.

3.25. Budget and Staffing

In general, appropriations for the BLM have remained static or slightly declining for the past 5 to 10 years. This trend affects the Upper Snake FO annual budget and staffing and thus its ability to meet increasing public demands made for both the use of and restoration of BLM-administered public lands in areas such as renewable energy; minerals and energy development; recreational opportunities and experiences; land use authorizations; clean water; invasive species/noxious weeds, and healthy, functioning ecosystems. Balancing these demands with limited budget and staffing makes public land management more complex in determining how best to use available funds and staff to implement LUP decisions to achieve the greatest benefit for the public lands.

LUPs and planning decisions are the basis for every on-the-ground action the BLM undertakes and ensure that the public lands are managed in accordance with the intent of Congress as stated in FLPMA (43 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.) under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. The Upper Snake FO planning effort will provide reasonable direction and decisions necessary for resources and resource uses without regard to budget or staffing levels. This resulting LUP will be an all inclusive plan that will enable the Upper Snake FO to manage both resources and resource uses as funding becomes available through Congressional appropriations. Implementation of the Upper Snake FO final RMP will take time and may not be fully implemented based upon current and future budget and staffing levels.

The BLM is implementing a new approach entitled *Establishing Resource Management Plan Implementation Priorities* (BLM 2007d), which is a systematic method to plan for and achieve the desired outcomes for RMPs based on anticipated funding. The method uses a four-step process:

- outline the work to implement the RMP,
- identify priority projects for the next 3–5 years,
- identify the tasks required to complete projects and estimate budget needs, and
- develop a communications strategy.

The first two steps are achieved through a workshop in which the FO staff outlines its workload and establishes priorities based on the RMP decisions and anticipated budget and staffing. Steps three and four are used to integrate the identified specific tasks with required funding and to create a communication strategy to describe the action and funding priorities. This information is then used in the BLM budget process to acquire necessary funding to implement the RMP. The communications strategy is also shared with the public through various means (e.g., project press releases). The Upper Snake FO will use this method in identifying priorities, funding, and staffing needs for implementation of the final RMP once it is approved.