Table of Contents

Minnesota Management Framework Plan (MFP)
I - III

MFP I: Resource Recommendations
* (1) MFP II: Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations
* (1) MFP III: Decision

Lands	Wildlife Management
Minerals	Cultural Resources
Forest Products	Recreation Management
Peat	Visual Resources Management
Soil, Water, and Air	Range Management

(1) Cross Referenced from selected MFP I: Resource Recommendations to the numbered MFP II and MFP III Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations and Decisions.

1. Voyageur's National Park
2. Lower St. Croix Wild & Scenic River
3. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
4. State Parks
5. Local Parks
6. State Public Access Areas
7. Public Sale
8. Withdrawal Restoration
9. Trespass
10. State Forests
11. State Wildlife Management Areas
12. State Wild & Scenic Rivers
13. State Boating & Canoeing Rivers
14. Aitkin County
15. U.S. Forest Service Exchange
16. Upper Mississippi Wild & Scenic Rive
17. BLM Interim Management
18. Signing
19. Koochiching County
20. Kandiyohi County

Appendix: Overlays and MFP Chart

A Summary of Minnesota Planning Procedures

The Lake States Office staff began revising the Unit Resource Analysis (URA) in June of 1979. The original URA was prepared in 1975. At that time the decision was made to prepare URA's for the following activities: Lands, Minerals, Peat Production, Forest Products, Range, Watershed, Wildlife, Recreation, Wilderness, Cultural, and Visual Resources. An Ecological Profile was not prepared because of the inclusion of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern evaluations into each activity. Also, since these lands have such a heterogeneous variety of vegetative, soil and climate types, the profile would be too voluminous and time consuming for the benefits derived. Of the potential opportunities, only mining and timber harvest will significantly alter the ecology. Instead, ecological evaluations will be included in the Environmental Assessments on individual actions such as timber sales, peat harvest, etc. when they are proposed.

The two major objectives of the Minnesota Land Use Plan are: to determine transfer potential of lands that can best be managed by other government agencies or public sale and to determine the best mix of resource use for the remaining public lands. BLM planning manuals were utilized along with supplemental ESO guidance where applicable to meet these objectives.

Major revision of the 1975 URA's were necessary for all activities except Range and Watershed. Peat, Wilderness, Cultural and Visual Resources were not covered in the original URA. The URA Steps I and II Physical Profile was revised to include new and updated information.

The URA Step III Present Situation sections were prepared in accordance with the BLM Manual 1605 with guidance from ESO concerning the degree of detail necessary. Federal, state and local agencies were contacted to determine their interest in acquiring BLM lands or entering into a cooperative agreement for management. Their comments on how the public lands should be managed were also requested. Ownership maps and a brief explanation of the BLM planning process was sent to each agency.

Disposal Procedures in the Minnesota URA and MFP

Some adjustments were made in the planning process since emphasis is placed on possible transfer of lands out of BLM jurisdiction. More emphasis was placed on who should own/manage the land and less emphasis on the traditional resolution of conflicts between activities to determine how, under BLM, the surface should be managed.

The alternatives listed were considered through MFP Step II. Tracts or islands were dealt with on a group basis where possible, but mostly on an individual tract by tract basis.

Alternatives:

A. Surface Ownership/Management

1. Retention by BLM
   a. Management by BLM staff
   b. Management by agreement with local, state or other federal agency

2. Transfer from BLM ownership to:
   a. Other federal agency
   b. State
   c. Local agency or other (Management through agreement is considered during the interim period)

Alternatives A. 1 a and b, were done on a "best mix" management proposal where resource conflicts have been resolved through trade-offs, etc. and a dominant use recommended. This was accomplished through standard MFP-2 procedures.

Alternatives 2. a, b and c, were done considering the "best mix" management proposal where conflicts have been resolved. These "best mix" proposals were used to determine which agency is most capable in expertise and location to manage the resource values identified on individual tracts or islands.

B. Mineral Ownership/Management

1. Retention and Management by BLM
2. Transfer of Mineral Rights

Problems encountered in URA Step 3:

1. The degree of detail in resource inventory data varied between activities. For example, the wildlife and forestry activities contained detailed data on specific sites as a result of previous inventories. Opinions on the degree of detail necessary to meet the objective of disposal varied between activity specialists.

2. Gathering and presenting data on over 1,400 tracts of land in several vegetative and physiographic types scattered throughout the state was difficult. We had to be as site specific as possible for all opportunities. Islands were grouped by similar resources and location as much as possible. This problem occurred in all subsequent planning steps (URA Step 4, MFP Step 1, 2 and 3).

The Public Participation Plan was written by the ESO Public Affairs staff during the preparation of the URA Step 3. The plan contains a course of action with schedules, public meeting requirements, federal register publication needs, etc. This work was completed substantially as planned with the assistance of the Public Affairs staff. Also covered are sections on Publics Affected, Issues of Special Significance, Public Affairs Program

Coordination, Evaluation and Analysis and Documentation. The evaluation and analysis of public participation in the Minnesota MFP is being prepared by the Public Affairs staff now.

The URA Step 4 Opportunities sections were prepared according to the BLM Manual 1605 identifying all resource management opportunities. Additional sections were prepared to cover the following opportunities:

1. Each activity (lands, minerals, etc.) identified opportunities for transfer that are advantageous for that activity. The lands activity identified all reasonable opportunities on specific tracts for transfer or disposal even if they were in conflict with each other. All normal lands actions (trespass, rights-of-way, etc.), plus areas within boundaries of state or other federal agencies were identified.

2. Another round of contacts with non-responding government agencies was made to determine their interest in BLM lands. Every effort was made to obtain and document responses.

3. A summary of contacts made with other agencies was prepared and is a part of URA Step 4. It is a documentation of contacts even though opportunities for transfer may or may not have resulted.

   Public meetings were held throughout the state (International Falls, Detroit Lakes, Brainerd and St. Paul) to gather comments and input to the URA.

Problems encountered in URA Step 4:

1. The degree of interest on the part of other government agencies varies. Generally, other federal agencies are interested and provided meaningful comments. The Minnesota DNR provided good resource data but was slow in responding. Communications between field personnel and the St. Paul Office is probably the reason. Contacting appropriate persons in the counties was time consumming. Seventy-one counties were involved. In many cases, two letters and several telephone calls were necessary to obtain a response. Due to BLM scattered ownership and the fact that these lands are producing very little income, our planning requests are not high priority for these agencies. Time needed to obtain responses was originally underestimated by several months.

2. Lack of public awareness of the presence of BLM in Minnesota was troublesome throughout the process, but especially in this step. Many local agencies were unaware of BLM land occurring in their jurisdiction.

3. The BLM planning manuals are based on the assumption (except for a few scattered tracts) of BLM retention of ownership. Interjecting the opportunities for transfer into the activity opportunities and recommendations further complicated the process. Resolving conflicts within and among activities is difficult enough without the resource specialists' having to resolve potential conflicts concerning transfer.

4. About the time we were beginning to contact other agencies concerning their interest in acquiring BLM lands, the ESO Program Policy Study Team was contacting many of the same agencies. Some agencies were given the impression that the BLM could "give away" all of these lands. Little or no consideration was given to what authority BLM has for transfer or disposal. The result was confusion on the part of these agencies between the policy study and our planning efforts.

The MFP-I brought forward all feasible opportunities identified in the URA Step 4 as per BLM Manual 1608. A Planning Area Analysis was not prepared because it is felt that activities on BLM lands will have virtually no economic effect on the planning area. The revised SEP provides adequate data.

Along with resource management recommendations, each activity contains an objective and set of recommendations dealing with BLM retention and disposal. All realistic alternatives are discussed. A separate document was prepared analyzing a complete disposal opportunity involving the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and local governments (for qualifying R&PPs).

The major problem encountered in the preparation of the MFP-I was keeping track of over 1,400 separate tracts of land, the resources values and opportunities for each.

This was solved by preparing an MFP Matrix or "superchart". The BLM lands were listed on the vertical access and activity opportunities, recommendations and decisions, listed on the horizontal axis. This matrix permits the tracking of the planning process for each tract. This chart is considered a part of the MFP and many of the recommendations, rationale and decisions refer to it. Each recommendation (activity or multiple-use) pertaining to each island or tract is identified by a circle in the appropriate column.

The opportunities identified in MFP-I were carried through to MFP-2 by activity as recommendations. Included in each activity was a recommendation concerning the retention/disposal question.

A multiple-use analysis was accomplished by convening the LSO resource staff specialists and the manager and discussing the opportunities and activity recommendations on an island by island or tract by tract basis. All opportunities and recommendations were identified on the MFP matrix by a circle. Conflicts between activity recommendations were discussed and a multiple-use recommendation or recommendations were selected along with a recommendation for transfer or disposal. These are represented on the MFP matrix as a darkened circle. A multiple-use analysis was prepared for each MFP-I recommendation. All tracts and islands were grouped together for the analysis by a retention/disposal recommendation.

Each tract or island is in one of these 20 groups (see Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Numbers 1-20). Each has a list of islands or tracts. Many resource recommendations required a more thorough or specific multiple-use analysis than the group analysis provided. These individual recommendations were carried through from recommendation to multiple-use analysis to decision on the 1600-21 MFP forms. Public meetings were held in early January to obtain comments from agencies and the public on our multiple-use recommendations.

Problems encountered in MFP-2:

1. With over 1,400 individual tracts of land to work with, tracking of each one through the process and from the MFP matrix to written page to the group lists was difficult. Complicating this are the dual recommendations (resource and retention/disposal and continuously changing transfer opportunities and interest expressed by other agencies). Individual island numbers may have been lost in the preparation of written documents and lists. Therefore, the MFP matrix or chart illustrates all opportunities and recommendations and should be reffered to as the basis for any analysis or decisions. The MFP matrix or chart is the basic tool for reference to recommendations, opportunities and to URA information that will be necessary in preparing for management, (cooperative or by BLM), transfer or other disposal.

2. A final response from the State of Minnesota DNR has not been received. We know that there will be changes from their original request for BLM lands as a result of our MFP-2 Recommendations. Their original request and the MFP-2 recommendations form the basis for the decisions regarding transfer to the state.

Statewide Analysis of Retention/Disposal Recommendation

If all the multiple-use recommendations for retention/disposal were to be accomplished, the BLM will end up with ownership of 558 out of nearly 1,400 tracts or islands in 42 counties scattered statewide. However, the resources on those transferred will receive adequate, if not more intense, management than BLM could provide without greatly increasing programs and staff. The recommendations will not decrease the BLM's responsibility for the resources on the remaining lands. It only decreases the BLM's management in total acreage and in intensity. The plan does provide for transfer of tracts that will require more than custodial or surveillance level of management in the near future; for instance, the islands in the Twin Cities Metro area. The Interim Management Recommendation encourages pursuance of transfer and cooperative agreements which may eventually lead BLM closer to the objective of transfer to appropriate agencies.

No significant adverse environmental, social, institutional or economic impacts will result from the retention/disposal recommendation statewide. Individual actions (R&PPs, withdrawals, cooperative agreements, etc.) may create local impacts which will be addressed at the time these actions are taken.

Complete transfer of all BLM lands in Minnesota is described in a separate memorandum prepared in LSO entitled "Minnesota Land Transfer Proposal". The decision on this is to follow the MFP decisions.

The Management Framework Plan III Draft Decisions reflect the multiple-use analysis, the statewide analysis and public input.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-1

Objective: Intensive Use

Provide BLM lands for industrial or commercial development in areas of demonstrated need.

Rationale:

Bureau Policy, as outlined in BLM 1603. 12A (3), is to attempt to satisfy local government and private needs for land for commercial and industrial purposes.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-1.1-Intensive Use-Industrial

Transfer two islands, located in the Mississippi River in the Twin Cities Area and identified as Ramsey County Nos. #001 and #002, to the St. Paul Port Authority for development of additional off-channel barge fleeting areas.

Support Needs: Cadastral survey support to officially establish federal ownership of the islands.

Rationale

The subject islands are located immediately adjacent to existing off-channel barge fleeting areas which were dredged by the St. Paul Port Authority within the past 10 years. Plans prepared by the Port Authority for expansion of the capacity of this fleeting area include the subject two islands. Transfer of the islands to the Port Authority is consistent with Bureau policy to attempt to satisfy local government needs for land for industrial and commercial purposes. Planning input from the Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department notes that the islands are within the proposed barge fleeting expansion area as well as being adjacent to the proposed Pigs Eye Lake Regional Park. If the proposed dredging is not done, the Parks and Recreation Department would like to acquire the islands as part of the Regional Park.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The physical characteristics supporting federal ownership of these two unsurveyed islands are very weak. Therefore, a cadastral survey is being requested before any action is taken.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(L-1.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Retain Recommendation with the requirement that a cadastral survey be completed prior to transfer.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Determine ownership status of Ramsey County numbers 001 and 002 by officially verifying ownership through cadastral survey.

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 13.

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 13.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-2

Objective: Public Purposes

Transfer BLM lands to Federal, State, and local government agencies and non-profit organizations for the following public purpose uses: National Parks, National Wild & Scenic Rivers, National Wildlife Refuges, National Waterfowl Production Areas, Minnesota State Parks, Local Government Parks, Public Access Sites, and Group Camps.

Rationale:

It is Bureau policy, as stated in BLM 1603. 12A (1), to make land tenure adjustments in support of other agency programs and to provide lands for public purpose uses.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.1 - Public Purposes-Voyageurs National Park

Transfer, by withdrawal, 64 unsurveyed BLM islands and a 20.06 acre water-frontage lot to National Park Service jurisdiction as part of Voyageurs National Park. See MFP Step 1 Table for identification of lands included in this recommendation.

Rationale

These lands are located within the boundaries of the Voyageurs National Park and, therefore, should properly be managed by the Park Service under their regulations.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #1.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.2 - Public Purposes - Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway

Transfer, by withdrawal, 17 surveyed and unsurveyed islands located in the St. Croix River to the National Park Service as part of the National Scenic Riverway. See the MFP Step 1 table for identification of the islands included in this recommendation.

Rationale

These islands are located on the Minnesota side of the St. Croix River between St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin and Stillwater, Minnesota. They are best suited for management by the National Park Service in conjunction with other federal lands in this area which are managed as part of the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway. These islands are currently managed by the Park Service under a Cooperative Agreement.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #2.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.3-Public Purposes-National Wildlife Refuges/Waterfowl Production Areas

Transfer, by withdrawal, 87 BLM islands to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for management as part of the National Wildlife Refuge system or as Waterfowl Production Areas. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the islands included in this recommendation.

Support Needs: 1) In their letter of August 7, 1980, the Fish and Wildlife stated that they will require that all islands have a clear title upon transfer. In order to meet this requirement, cadastral survey support will be needed on the islands included in this recommendation.
2) Resolution of the suspected trespass cases involving McLeod County #007 and #008, Meeker #010, and Swift County #004.

Rationale

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has identified these islands as being suitable for management either in conjunction with or as new National Wildlife Refuges or Waterfowl Production Areas. Eighty-five of these islands were requested for transfer in their letter of August 7, 1980, while two others located in Hungry Lake (Becker County Nos. #013 and #014) are included in Fish and Wildlife Service withdrawal application, ES-14837. Transfer of these lands to the Fish and Wildlife Service is consistent with the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to seek divestiture of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

The Fish and Wildlife Service also indicated interest in acquiring BLM island Swift County No. 001 only in the event that the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources does not request it for Munson Lake State Park. The DNR, however, is interested in acquiring this island, so it was dropped from this recommendation.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

(L-2.3 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #3.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.4 - Public Purposes - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Besides the lands included in Lands Recommendation L-2.3, pursue transfer of ten islands and four upland tracts totalling 44.97 acres to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service jurisdiction.

Support Needs: Cadastral surveys will be needed to insure that the two islands included in this recommendation have clear title as requested as a condition of transfer by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Rationale

Some of these BLM lands are located adjacent to existing Wildlife Refuges or Waterfowl Production Areas while others are located within lakes where the Fish and Wildlife Service has requested transfer of some, but not all of the BLM ownership in that particular water body. Encouraging the Fish and Wildlife Service to accept management responsibility for these lands would insure that BLM is not left with management responsibility for the residual lands in these lakes as well as help meet the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface ownership in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #3.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.5-Public Purposes-Minnesota State Parks

Transfer ownership, under the Recreation and Public Purpose Act, of 38 BLM islands and one surveyed tract of .56 acres to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources as additions to existing units of the Minnesota State Park System. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the BLM lands included in this recommendation.

Rationale

These BLM tracts are located either within or adjacent to existing State Parks. Nearly all of them were formerly leased under the R&PP Act to the DNR from 1973 through 1978. The DNR, in their BLM land use planning input, as well as in contacts with the Lake States Office, has expressed interest in re-acquiring management responsibility for these lands as part of their State Park System. Transfer of ownership will serve a public purpose and help meet the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #4.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
L-2.6-Public Purposes-Minnesota State Parks Besides the lands included in Lands Recommendation L-2.5, pursue transfer, under the Recreation and Public Purpose Act, of 37 islands and a 0.05 acre upland tract to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources as additions to existing State Parks. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the lands included in this recommendation. Support Needs: Revocation of E.O. 5003 Rainy Lake Watershed Withdrawal	These BLM tracts are located adjacent to Minnesota State Parks, but have not been requested by the Department of Natural Resources for transfer to their jurisdiction. Because of their location, it appears that these lands could best be managed by the DNR. Encouraging them to accept responsibility will help meet the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 4.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.7-Public Purposes-Local Government Parks

Transfer ownership, under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, of 12 BLM islands to local government agencies as additions to existing county, regional, or city parks. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the islands included in this recommendation.

Rationale

These islands are located either within or adjacent to existing public parks and have been requested for transfer by the respective park-managing agencies. Transfer of ownership will serve a public purpose as well as help meet the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 5.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.8-Public Purposes-Local Government Parks

Besides the islands included in Lands Recommendation L-2.7, pursue transfer, under the R&PP Act, of 7 BLM islands to local government units as additions to existing public parks. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the islands included in this recommendation.

Rationale

These islands are located adjacent to public parks, but have not been requested for transfer by the park-managing agencies. Because of their location, it appears that they could best be managed in conjunction with these parks. Encouraging the park managing agencies to accept management responsibility will help meet the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 5.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
L-2.9-Public Purpose-Public Access Sites	
Encourage development of 26 BLM lake frontage lots as public access sites by either the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources or local government units. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the lots included in this recommendation.	These lake lots appear to have potential for development as public access sites. Eleven of the lots are located on lakes where there is no public access site at the present time. Acquisition of public access to lakes and rivers is a high priority program with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Transfer of these lots to them for this use would support an important public purpose program.
Support Needs: Resolution of the suspected trespass cases involving Grant County #003, Itasca County #071, Murray County #002, Pope County #007, and Todd County #002.	

Multiple-Use Analysis

Thirteen sites in the MFP I Recommendation were eliminated for the following reasons:

Beltrami 09 - agriculture trespass,
Recommended for Agriculture use L-3.1

Cass 42 - Recommended for group camp L-2.10

Itasca 02 - Recommended for cooperative agreement
(ACEC-unique plants) See Multiple-Use Recommendation #17

Lake of the Woods 11 - State proposed unit (ACEC - shorebirds) See Multiple-Use Recommendation #10

Murray 02 - Agriculture trespass,
Recommended for agriculture use L-3.1

Ottertail 78 - Recommended for group camp L-2.10

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(L-2.9 Continued)

Ottertail 82 & 83 - Lake has public access - not needed; Recommended for cooperative agreement, See Multiple-Use Recommendation #17

Pope 07 - Agriculture trespass, Requested by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - See Multiple-Use Recommendation #3

St. Louis 23 - Recommended for U.S. Forest Service exchange - See Multiple-Use Recommendation #15

Swift 01 - Requested for state park - See Multiple-Use Recommendation #4

Todd 02 - Agriculture trespass, Recommended for group camp L-2.10

Wright 14 - Not needed for access, Recommended for cooperative agreement, See Multiple-Use Recommendation #17

Seven tracts were added during the Multiple-Use Analysis conflict resolutions. These were identified by Recreation Management Recommendation R-1.2.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #6.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-2.10-Public Purposes-Group Camps

Provide BLM lake frontage tracts on a request basis as potential sites for development of group camp facilities by non-profit organizations. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the fifteen lake lots included in this recommendation.

Support Needs: Resolution of suspected trespass cases involving Pope County #007 and Todd County #002.

Rationale

The Lake States Office has received requests from non-profit organizations for lands suitable for development as group camps for underpriviledged youth, mentally or physically handicapped, etc. These fifteen lake lots, varying in size from 0.95 to 40.0 acres, appear suitable for such development and, thus, would help meet this public purpose need.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations No. 9 and 17 which includes group camp opportunities. Only four sites were recommended after Multiple-Use Analysis. Others were recommended for public access (#6) or transfer to other agencies. See MFP Matrix.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-3

Objective - Agriculture

Pursue disposal of BLM tracts statewide which have identified potential for agricultural purposes.

Rationale:

It is Bureau Policy, as stated in BLM 1603. 12A (3), to attempt to satisfy private needs for lands for agricultural purposes.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Lands

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
L-3.1 - Agriculture	
Offer 31 parcels of BLM land totalling approximately 850 acres for lease or sale for agricultural development. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the parcels included in this recommendation.	For the most part, these are small isolated BLM parcels located in the portion of the State where the predominant land use is agriculture. Nineteen of the tracts have in the past or continue to be farmed in trespass. In some cases, the claimants may qualify for relief under the Color of Title Act. According to 43 CFR 2430.5(a), lands which have value for agricultural purposes will be considered chiefly valuable for that purpose and such lands are considered suitable for transfer from Federal ownership.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-4

Objective: - Withdrawal/Restoration

Revoke all public land withdrawals which are no longer necessary and restore the lands to operation of the public land laws.

Rationale:

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act mandates that BLM conduct a withdrawal review program with the objective of revoking those withdrawals which are no longer serving any useful purpose.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-4.1 - Withdrawal/Restoration

Seek revocation of Power Site Reserves Nos. 148, 208, and 391 and E.O. 5003-Rainy Lake Watershed Withdrawal which combined segregate more than 20,000 acres of BLM surveyed uplands as well as 16 unsurveyed islands from operation of the public land laws. The MFP Step 1 table identifies the lands included in these withdrawals.

Rationale

These withdrawals are extremely old and apparently no longer serve any useful purpose. As such, they are needlessly encumbering the public land records and the lands are unnecessarily segregated from operation of the public land laws. Revocation of these withdrawals is necessary in order to accomplish several of the other Lands MFP Step 1 recommendations. Revoking these withdrawals is consistent with Bureau Policy outlined in BLM 1603.12A (3) to accomplish realty transactions necessary for land management purposes.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 8.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-5

Objective: - Trespass Resolution

Resolve all identified trespass cases in the State following BLM Policy Guidance contained in BLM 9230, 9232, and 9234.

Rationale:

Bureau Policy, outlined in BLM 1602.42B and 1603.12A (3), provides that trespass cases be promptly investigated and resolved in order to minimize damage to the public lands and discourage additional instances of trespass.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-5.1 - Trespass Resolution-Termination

Subject to valid existing rights or special circumstances, resolve all suspected trespass cases using the following general guidelines:

A) Cabinsites, boat docks, private claims, etc. - Terminate trespass with subsequent removal of improvements from BLM land.

B) Agriculture - If agriculture is proper land use, collect back rent for trespass use and offer land either for direct sale or lease authorizing continued agricultural production. Otherwise, terminate agricultural use.

See MFP Step 1 table for identification of BLM lands with suspected trespass.

Support Needs: Cadastral surveys will be needed to resolve many of these suspected trespass cases.

Rationale

Policy guidance contained in BLM 9230, 9232, and 9234, provides for the termination of existing trespass cases. The cabinsite and other occupancy type trespasses are, for the most part, located on unsurveyed lake islands having high resource values with excellent potential for public use. For this reason, the trespasses should be terminated and the improvements on the islands removed if a valid claim does not exist. This action is supported by public input which has been significantly in favor of retaining the islands in public ownership. Most of the agricultural trespasses, on the other hand, are located on small isolated BLM parcels which have little potential for resource management or public use. In many cases, agriculture is the highest and best use for the trespassed land. For these reasons, the trespasses should be terminated by collecting back rent for use of the land followed by offering a lease or direct sale encouraging continued agricultural use of the land.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(L-5.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
L-5.2 - Trespass Resolution-National Park Service Resolve two cabinsite trespasses located on BLM islands within Voyageurs National Park by allowing the National Park Service to settle the trespass under their regulations. The two islands involved are identified as St. Louis County Nos. 269 and 299.	The two islands are among those included in Lands Recommendation L-2.1 recommending withdrawal and transfer to the National Park Service. The Park Service has notified BLM that they would prefer to resolve the trespass cases under their regulations after the islands are transferred to their jurisdiction.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Lands

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-5.3-Trespass Resolution-Legalization

Resolve two cabinsite trespass cases involving lake islands identified as Crow Wing No. 036 and St. Louis County No. 275 by offering the claimants a life-estate lease.

Rationale

Both claimants were led to believe by BLM during the late 1960's that their occupancy would be legalized under the provisions of the Small Tract Act. Both subsequently filed small tract applications, following encouragement from BLM, but have not received any relief under this Act which has since been repealed by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. Because of the encouragement given these claimants by BLM several years ago, these trespasses should be resolved by offering them a long-term or life-estate lease with the land reverting to Federal ownership at expiration of the lease term.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-6

Objective: - Trespass Prevention

Initiate a trespass control and prevention program covering all BLM lands within the State.

Rationale:

It is BLM Policy, as stated in BLM 1603. 12A (3), to discourage occupancy trespass through prevention programs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-6.1 - Trespass Control

Take the following actions to prevent and control trespass on BLM lands:

A) Place BLM ownership signs on islands and uplands where trespass is likely to occur.

B) Pursue cooperative agreements or contracts with appropriate county of local government agencies to conduct periodic surveillance checks of BLM lands in order to detect new trespass cases during their early stages.

Rationale

Trespass on BLM lands is a major problem in the Lake States primarily because of the widely scattered BLM land ownership pattern and the absence of a BLM field presence. These trespasses ordinarily result in damage to the affected lands as well as reduced opportunities for the public to use and enjoy these lands. It is Bureau Policy as stated in BLM 1602 and 1603, to discourage occupancy trespass in order to minimize damage to public lands from trespass activities.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-7

Objective: - Lands Quality

Protect the environmental values of BLM lands located in areas where those values are being threatened by adjoining land uses.

Rationale:

It is Bureau Policy, as stated in BLM 1602, that in all land use decisions, the need for protection of environmental values be considered.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-7.1 - Lands Quality-Open Space

Dedicate 95 BLM islands and upland tracts which are located in environmental problem areas, as open space with no development permitted. If these lands are transferred from BLM ownership, place appropriate stipulations in leases or patents to insure that the open space values are protected. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the parcels included in this recommendation.

Rationale

This BLM ownership is located either within lakes with high density development or in areas where the adjacent shoreland use creates a poor quality environment. In many cases, the BLM lands are the main source of undeveloped land in these areas. Dedication of these lands as open space would insure that they do not further contribute to the environmental degradation which has already taken place. Such action is consistent with Bureau Policy, as stated in BLM 1602 and 1603, to protect the lands, resources, environment, and public values therein from avoidable destruction, abuse, and deterioration and to insert suitable provisions and stipulations in leases, permits, or patents to protect these public values.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The open space values noted in this recommendation have been considered in the Group Recommendation on land disposal and interim management.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Visual Resource Management Recommendation 1.1.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-8

Objective: - Land Disposal

Transfer ownership and/or surface management responsibility of all BLM lands in the State to other Federal, State and local government agencies or the private sector.

Rationale:

The Eastern States Office Policy and Program study completed in April, 1980, directs that BLM seek to divest itself of surface management responsibilities in the Lake States area.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.1-Land Disposal-State Forests

Transfer ownership or surface management responsibility for 138 BLM islands and 21,543.77 acres of surveyed BLM uplands to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources as part of the State Forest System. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the BLM lands included in this recommendation.

Support Needs: 1) Coordination meetings with the DNR encouraging them to accept surface management responsibility for these lands.

2) Development of appropriate means for conveyance of ownership and/or management responsibility for said lands to the DNR.

3) Revocation of E.O. 5003-Rainy Lake Watershed Withdrawal and Power Site Nos. 148 and 391.

4) Resolution of the suspected trespass cases involving Hubbard County #011 and #012, Itasca County #063, #071, #088, and #089, St. Louis County #152, #153, #161, #197, and #309, and Wabasha County #002 and #004.

Rational

This BLM ownership is located either within or adjacent to existing units of the Minnesota State Forest System where it could be managed by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Transfer of ownership or management functions to the DNR could help meet the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States. It would also be consistent with the public input received to date which has strongly favored retention of these lands in some form of public ownership. The DNR has shown interest in acquiring ownership or pursuing cooperative management on approximately one-fifth of this ownership (eight islands and 4,766.91 acres of uplands.)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

(L-8.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #10.

Note: Many of the parcels in this recommendation have dropped out primarily for two reasons; 1) they have been included in other Group Recommendations on land disposal or, 2) the Minnesota DNR has said they are not interested in acquiring the land.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.2-Land Disposal-State Wildlife Management Areas

Transfer ownership or management responsibility for 12 BLM islands and 11 upland tracts totalling 165.15 acres to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources as additions to the State system of Wildlife Management Areas. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the BLM lands included in this recommendation.

See MFP Chart under Topo's in Map Room

Note: This recommendation includes two islands in Lake Johanna (Pope County Nos. 002 and 003) applied for under R&PP Application M-24182 by the DNR.

Support Needs: 1) Development of appropriate means for conveyance of ownership and/or management responsibility for said lands to the DNR in the event that the proposed use does not qualify under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

2) Resolution of the suspected trespass cases involving Aitkin County #008 and Murray County #002.

Rationale

These BLM lands are located either within or adjacent to existing State Wildlife Management Areas where they could be managed by the DNR. The DNR has indicated interest in acquiring ownership or pursuing cooperative management on nearly all of these lands. Said transfer of ownership or management responsibility would be consistent with public input which favors retention of these lands in public ownership and would also support the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(L-8.2 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #11.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP): Minnesota
Activity: Lands
Overlay Reference: Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.3-Land Disposal-State Wild & Scenic Rivers

Transfer ownership or management responsibility of 68 BLM islands and two upland tracts totalling .17 acres to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources in support of the State Wild & Scenic River System. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the BLM lands included in this recommendation.

Support Needs: 1) Coordination meetings with the DNR encouraging them to accept management responsibility for these lands.

2) Development of appropriate means for conveyance of ownership and/or management responsibility for said lands in the event that the proposed use does not qualify under the R&PP Act.
3) Resolution of the suspected trespass cases involving Redwood County #001 and Sherburne #009.

Rationale

These BLM lands are located within designated segments of the State Wild & Scenic River Program where they could be managed by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Transfer of ownership or management responsibility to the DNR would be consistent with public input which favors retention of these lands in public ownership and would also support the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States. Input provided by the DNR, to date, shows that they are interested in acquiring or pursuing cooperative management on only nine of these islands. They have, however, expressed interest in 49 other river islands which are located in State Boating and Canoeing Rivers or in river segments still being studied for inclusion in the State Wild & Scenic River System.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(L-8.3 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #12.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.4-Land Disposal-State Proposed Units

Transfer ownership or management responsibility for 17 BLM islands and 26 surveyed upland tracts totalling 1957.76 acres to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources for development of new State management units. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the BLM lands included in this recommendation.

Support Needs: 1) Development of appropriate means for conveyance of ownership and/or management responsibility for these lands to the DNR in the event that the proposed use does not qualify under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

2) Revocation of E.O. 5003-Rainy Lake Watershed Withdrawal.

Rationale

The DNR has expressed interest in acquiring or pursuing cooperative management of these lands as new State management units. Most of this ownership is located in the northern part of the state and would be managed primarily for recreation and wildlife. Transfer of ownership or management responsibility would be consistent with public input which favors retention of these lands in public ownership, and would also support the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.5-Land Disposal-County Government

Transfer ownership or management responsibility for 88 BLM islands and 31,996.93 acres of surveyed BLM land to County Government agencies for resource management purposes. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the lands included in this recommendation.

Support Needs: 1) Development of appropriate means for conveyance of ownership and/or management responsibility for these lands to County Government agencies.

2) Resolution of the suspected trespass case involving Aitkin County #008.

Rationale

Aitkin, Kandiyohi, Koochiching, and Stearns Counties have indicated interest in either acquisition or cooperative management of these lands for forestry, recreation, and wildlife purposes. Said transfer of ownership or management responsibility would be consistent with public input which favors retention of these lands in public ownership and would also support the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 14, 19 and 20.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Lands

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.6-Land Disposal-U.S. Forest Service Exchange

Designate BLM lands statewide as available for use by the U.S. Forest Service for land exchange purposes.

Support Needs: Cadastral survey support would be required on all Forest Service exchanges involving unsurveyed islands.

Rationale

The Chippewa National Forest has expressed considerable interest in using BLM lands for exchange purposes for non-federal lands within the Forest boundary. Itasca County, which includes part of the Chippewa National Forest, has indicated that they would consider a land exchange involving 560 acres of BLM surveyed uplands for county lands in the National Forest. Other exchanges would occur on an opportunity basis over the next several years. Such exchanges would support the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 15.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Lands

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.7-Land Disposal-Cooperative Agreements

Seek cooperative agreements with appropriate State, County, and local government agencies for management of BLM lands not suitable for disposal by other means.

Rationale

Cooperative agreements offer the opportunity to transfer management functions for BLM lands where existing disposal authorities are either inadequate or where they impose certain requirements which are unacceptable to the logical managing agency. For example, payment of fair market value for lands where the proposed use would not qualify for the reduced pricing available under the R&PP Act. Cooperative agreements also have the advantage of permitting transfer of management responsibility for unsurveyed BLM islands without requiring cadastral surveys. Said cooperative agreements would be consistent with public input which favors retention of these lands in public ownership and would also support the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(L-8.7 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Minnesota
Activity: Lands
Overlay Reference: Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
L-8.8 Land Disposal-Public Sale	
Offer for public sale all BLM lands where there is no identified opportunity for transfer to some other form of public or quasi-public ownership.	Public sale would fulfill the ESO Policy and Program Study decision of complete divestiture of BLM surface ownership in the Eastern States area.
Support Needs: Cadastral surveys of unsurveyed islands would be required prior to sale.	

Multiple-Use Analysis

Public input gathered throughout the land use planning process has been significantly opposed to public sale of the islands. Several upland tracts with agricultural potential are recommended for sale as noted in Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
L-8.8 Land Disposal-Public Sale	
Offer for public sale all BLM lands where there is no identified opportunity for transfer to some other form of public or quasi-public ownership.	Public sale would fulfill the ESO Policy and Program Study decision of complete divestiture of BLM surface ownership in the Eastern States area.
Support Needs: Cadastral surveys of unsurveyed islands would be required prior to sale.	

Multiple-Use Analysis

Public input gathered throughout the land use planning process has been significantly opposed to public sale of the islands. Several upland tracts with agricultural potential are recommended for sale as noted in Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Lands
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

L-8.9 - Land Disposal - State Boating and Canoeing Rivers

Transfer ownership or management responsibility of 223 islands and upland tracts located within state-designated Boating and Canoeing Rivers to either the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources or in the case of the Upper Mississippi River, to the coalition of county Governments studying management and protection of the River. See MFP Step 1 table for identification of the lands included in this recommendation.

Support Needs:

1) Coordination meetings with the DNR and the coalition of counties encouraging them to accept management responsibility for these lands.
2) Development of appropriate means for conveyance of ownership and/or management responsibility for said lands in the event that the proposed use does not qualify under the R&PP Act.
3) Resolution of the suspected trespass cases involving Itasca #027 and Wabasha #004.

Rationale

These BLM lands are located within State Boating and Canoeing Rivers where they could be managed by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. To date, the DNR has expressed interest in acquiring or pursuing cooperative management on only 39 of these parcels selecting just the larger islands suitable for primitive campsite development. Another seventy-three of these islands and upland tracts, including 10 which the DNR has requested, are located in the Upper Mississippi River segment being studied for management by a coalition of eight northcentral Minnesota counties. Transfer of ownership or management responsibility for these lands to the DNR or the coalition of counties would be consistent with public input which favors retention of these lands in public ownership and would also support the ESO Policy and Program Study decision to dispose of BLM surface management responsibilities in the Lake States.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota	
Activity Lands	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(L-8.9 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 13 and 16.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Objective Number	M-1

Objective:

Make available for mineral exploration, development, and extraction the Federally-owned mineral estate not presently open.

Rationale:

The general policy of the BLM as per Manual 1602.11 is to encourage private industry initiative in exploration for and mining of Federally-owned minerals where environmentally acceptable. A Bureau-wide long-term objective in the Minerals Program Activity Policy Statement (BLM Manual 1603.12B) is to make minerals available and to provide for orderly and timely development.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Minerals

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
M-1.1 Seek statutory authority from the United States Congress for the disposal of the so-called "hardrock" minerals of the public domain in the Lake States area outside of the Superior and Chippewa National Forests. The Bureau and Department of the Interior should actively sponsor legislation and/or assist members of Congress in doing so.	This recommendation will aid in meeting Objective M-1 and is in accordance with the Eastern States Supplemental Guidance, 1603.12B4C.

Multiple-Use Analysis

There is no impact from this recommendation upon the economic, social, institutional, environmental, and other resource values of the study area per se. Of course, should mineral exploration and development be legalized for the unreserved public domain subsequent prospecting and mining may ensue. Nevertheless, issuance of permits and leases would presumably be discretionary and subject to stipulations protecting the environment. Economic and social impacts would most likely be minimal because of the small acreage involved. Cumulative impacts with adjacent state and private mineral holdings could become significant.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Same as MFP Step I Recommendation.	See objective M-1.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:	
Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.	This decision supports Recommendation #2 of the Decision Memorandum, Eastern States Office Policy and Program Study in which states, ESOs primary mission is minerals management.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
M-1.2 Seek favorable interpretations of existing acts concerning disposition of acquired "hardrock" minerals or seek statutory authority to dispose of "hardrock" minerals acquired through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.	Same as Recommendation M-1.1 plus additional guidance concerning energy minerals, because the uranium prospecting in Carlton County, Minnesota is directly affected by this proposal.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation has no bearing on the BLM islands and upland tracts, but rather on acquired federal minerals under Bankhead-Jones Land Utilization Projects or Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation holdings. Thus, the other resources addressed in the Unit Resource Analysis do not consider these lands. Implementation of this recommendation will not impact these lands per se. Any subsequent exploration or mining would be subject to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior with provisions for protection of the environment.

Multiple Use Recommendation	Reasons
Same as MFP Step I Recommendation.	See objective M-1.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:	
Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.	This decision supports Recommendation #2 of the Decision Memorandum, Eastern States Office Policy and Program Study in which states, ESOs primary mission, is minerals management.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Objective Number	M-2

Objective:

Encourage applications for prospecting and leasing of Federally-owned mineral estate in Minnesota regardless of surface ownership jurisdiction within the constraints of environmental and mineral leasing laws.

Rationale:

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for "management, development, and protection of the public lands for.... mineral production...." (BLM Manual 1602.11). National long-term objectives are to make minerals available to meet market demand (BLM Manual 1603.12B) and the primary mission of the Eastern States Office is recognized as minerals management (ESO Policy & Program Study-Recommendation M-2).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
M-2.1 The Federal Minerals Management Mapping Project in Minnesota should continue and publish the remaining thirty-four quads with greater than 1,000 acres of FMO.	The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for "management, development, and protection of the public lands for.... mineral production...." (BLM Manual 1602.11). National long-term objectives are to make minerals available to meet market demand (BLM Manual 1603.12B) and the primary mission of the Eastern States Office is recognized as minerals management (ESO Policy & Program Study-Recommendation M-2), and Recommendation M-6 of the ESO Policy & Program Study recognizes delineation of FMO as a high priority.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation will not impact the study area except to help advertise the availability of federal minerals, especially those under non-federal surface which may have been ignored by the mining industry. Protection of the environment is still ensured in the permitting and leasing process.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reason
Same as MFP Step I Recommendation.	Mapping is essential to the minerals and planning programs.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.	This program provides a public service, advertises the location and availability of federal minerals and aids in preventing, locating and resolving mineral trespass.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
M-2.2 Modify the current procedures for processing prospecting permits and preference-right lease applications to eliminate inordinate delays. Change 43 CFR 3500 "hardrock" regulations to reflect "non-bedded" character of these types of deposits and consequent problems in discovering orebodies. Define and coordinate roles of BLM, surface managing agencies and USGS to eliminate duplicative functions while maintaining environmental safeguards.	The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for "management, development, and protection of the public lands for...,mineral production...."(BLM Manual 1602.11). National long-term objectives are to make minerals available to meet market demand (BLM Manual 1603.12B) and the primary mission of the Eastern States Office is recognized as minerals management (ESO Policy & Program Study-Recommendation M-2).

Multiple-Use Analysis

Implementation of this recommendation is without direct impact on BLM managed natural resources and would conserve human resources. This effort should evolve more workable regulations and agency functions. The annual inter-agency Eastern Minerals Conference is a logical place to pursue these goals.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Same as MFP Step I Recommendation.	See analysis above.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:	
Implement Management Framework Plan II Recommendation.	Implementation will streamline the procedures for processing applications for prospecting permits and preference right leases and eliminate duplicative functions with USGS.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
M-2, 3 Maintain the surface estate in Federal ownership for those BLM uplands and islands with hypothetical mineral potential identified in URA Step 4 in order to keep encumbrances to exploration and development at a minimum and decision-making within one agency.	ESO Policy & Program Study; Recommendation M-2.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Crow Wing 045 is postulated to contain iron and manganese resources. Mines on the nearby Cuyuna Range are inactive and have reserves, therefore, the potential for developing a new mine is slight. Transfer of surface ownership is not unwarranted from a minerals standpoint.

Koochiching units 033, 034, 042, 045, 046, 050-055, 057, 061 and 062 are prospectively valuable for base metals and precious metals. Cooperative agreements with the county to manage the surface of these tracts without transfer of title should not interfer the permitting and leasing of mineral rights if and when statutory authority is granted for these activities.

The remaining tracts with hypothetical mineral potential will remain in BLM ownership with or without cooperative agreements for management of surface resources. Such action is consistent with the original minerals recommendation.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Retain MFP Step I Recommendation for the following units: Beltrami 008 Cook 003, 004 Crow Wing 028 Itasca 004, 023, 036 St. Louis 032, 047, 072, 219 Refer to Multiple-Use Recommendation #2 for Crow Wing 045 Refer to Multiple-Use Recommendation #19 for Koochiching 033, 034, 042, 045, 036, 050-055, 057, 061, 062	Keeping title to these tracts in federal ownership will aid in mineral prospecting and development.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(M-2.3 Continued)

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Maintain the surface estate in federal ownership for those BLM lands with hypothetical mineral potential:
Beltrami 008
Cook 003, 004
Crow Wing 028
Itasca 004, 023, 036
Koochiching 033, 034, 042, 045, 046, 050-055, 057, 061, 062
St. Louis 032, 047, 072, 219

Multiple-Use Recommendation and Decision #19 supports this decision.

Follow Multiple-Use Decision #11 for management of tract Crow Wing 045.

To keep encumberances to exploration and development at a minimum. Is consistent with ESO Policy and Program Study; Recommendation M-2.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Minerals
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
M-2.4 Maintain the surface estate in Federal ownership for those BLM uplands and islands with sufficient speculative mineral potential to warrant identification in URA Step 4 in order to keep encumbrances to exploration and development at a minimum and decision-making within one agency.	ESO Policy & Program Study; Recommendation M-2.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Upland tracts Carlton 013, 027-030 have speculative potential for uranium resources. However, recent drilling in the region has not disclosed any ore and industry interest has waned considerably. Lake of the Woods units 019 and 021 have similar potential. As the outlook for future exploration is dim, surface ownership could be transferred without undue restriction of mineral exploration interest.

Roseau 014, 015, 039 and 040 tracts are speculatively valuable for base and precious metals. Transfer of surface ownership could slow but not deny mineral opportunities. Recently the Beltrami Wildlife Management Area has allowed prospecting activities on FMO. Thus, transfer is not unwarranted from the minerals resource viewpoint.

The small size of Wabasha 001 negates any real value that might exist for placer gold. Transfer is not excluded by this resource.

Itasca 055 and St. Louis 158 have potential for base metals and precious metals. Transfer to the U.S. Forest Service for exchange purposes could leave the mineral estate severed from the surface estate eventually. The time frame concerned though and the liklihood of exploration interest are such that transfer may still be recommended.

The remaining parcels with speculative mineral potential will remain in federal ownership with or without cooperative agreements for management of surface resources. Such action is consistent with the original minerals recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Minerals

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(M-2.4 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Retain MFP Step I Recommendation for the following units: Becker 049 Cass 016 Itasca 082, 084, 085 Koochiching 001 Pine 011 Refer to Multiple-Use Recommendation #10, Carlton 013, 027-030; Lake of the Woods, 019, 021 Refer to Multiple-Use Recommendation #11, Roseau 014, 015, 039, 040; Refer to Multiple-Use Recommendation #3, Wabasha 001; Refer to Multiple-Use Recommendation #15, Itasca 055, St. Louis 158.	See Multiple-Use Analysis M-2.4
Management Framework Plan III Decision:	
Maintain the surface estate in federal ownership for those BLM lands with speculative mineral potential (Becker 049, Cass 016, Itasca 082, 084, 085, Koochiching 001 and Pine 011). Refer to Multiple-Use Recommendation numbers 3, 10, 11, and 15.	To keep encumbrances to exploration and development at a minimum. Is consistent with ESO Policy and Program Study; Recommendation M-2.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)	Minnesota
Activity	Minerals
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
M-2.5 Reserve ownership of the mineral estate, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the minerals thereon, for all BLM uplands and islands in which surface jurisdiction is transferred to non-Federal ownership except where such reservation is interferring with non-mineral development that is demonstrated to be a more beneficial use of the land than mineral development.	Public Law 94-579, Federal Land Policy & Management Act, Section 209.

Multiple-Use Analysis

At this stage of planning, reservation of mineral rights to the federal government is not known to be interferring with plans for transfer and development of the surface estate. Anticipation of passage of a law to allow exploration and mining of public domain "hardrock" minerals could hinder a public sale or transfer to state government. However, the vast majority of islands and uplands is of low enough potential to deem this very unlikely.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reason
Same as MFP Step - 1.	See analysis above.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:	
Implement the Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.	Public Law 94-579, Federal Land Policy.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Management
Objective Number	F-1

Objective: Timber Products

To produce and harvest merchantable forest products.

Rationale:

Bureau Manual 1602.11, Basic Guidance, states that the BLM is authorized and directed to manage and develop public lands to provide a wide range of benefits including timber production. 1602.12 states that the management shall provide the maximum public benefits and meet public and industrial needs. 1602.42C states that the productive capacity of the land will be retained and that the ecosystem approach will produce the widest range of public benefits.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Forest Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.1-Timber Production

Harvest 51,250 cords of merchantable forest products from lands classified as commercial forests. The following Control Numbers identify lands involved in this recommendation:

Aitkin	036	Kittson	002	St. Louis	219
	037		003		220
Carlton	013	Koochi-			245
	027	ching	035		277
	028		042		307
	029		054		308
	030	Lake of			311
Cass	016	the Woods	012		
	018		018		
	019		019		
	050	Otter-			
Cook	003	tail	076		
Crow		Pine	011		
Wing	041	Roseau	014		
	045		039		
Hubbard	043		041		
Itasca	007	Morrison	001		
	038	St. Louis	023		
	055		071		
	081		119		
	082		154		
	083		158		
	084		181		
	085		182		

Rationale

The majority of the commercial forest lands involved in this recommendation are nearing maturity. If not harvested, the volumes will decline and the stands will become subjected to wind throw. The volumes represented do not constitute a major contribution to the local economy in the form of wood products, however, the value of healthy vegetative communities to other activities is high. To maximize the benefits of these lands to the public in the form of wildlife producing lands and recreational opportunities, the vigor of these stands must be retained or improved through harvesting.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(F-.1.1Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Twenty-one of the 51 parcels have been dropped from this recommendation by the Multiple-Use group. Higher resource values include ACEC, public sale, state boating and canoeing rivers, wildlife management areas and lake access. Lands dropped were:

Aitkin	036	Koochiching	035
Cass	019	Lake of the Woods	012
Cook	003		018
Crow Wing	045	Ottertail	076
Itasca	007	Roseau	014
	038		039
	055		041
	081	St. Louis	158
	083		277
Kittson	002		307
	003		

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Management for forest products by the agency recommended for transfer or by BLM in cooperation with another agency under a cooperative agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17, and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Forest Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.2 - Timber Production

Harvest 20,250 cords of merchantable forest products from lands classified as non commercial forest lands. The following Control Numbers identify those lands involved in this recommendation.

Aitkin	034	Mille Lacs	001
Carlton	027	Roseau	015
	028		
	029		
Itasca	002		
	007		
	055		
	078		
	085		
Koochi-ching	Several		
Lake of the Woods	003		
	006		
	007		
	016		
	017		
	018		
	019		
	021		
	022		

Rationale

A substantial volume of commercial forest products now exist on public lands classified as non commercial forest land. A number of these timbered stands are adjacent to lands classified as commercial forest land and would enhance the harvest opportunity they offer. The involved volumes do not constitute a major contribution to the wood fiber industry, but if unharvested, these stands will continue to mature and be lost at some future date.

To maintain certain wildlife and recreational values, the vegetative community must be maintained in a healthy, vigorous condition through periodic cutting.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

(F-1.2 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Two tracts have been recommended for harvesting by the Multiple-Use group. The remainder were dropped in favor of higher resource values. The two parcels are Aitkin 034 and Koochiching 033.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.3 - Timber Production

Regenerate commercial tree species by means of natural regeneration following the harvest of forest products. Natural regeneration is recommended for the following lands.

Aitkin	034	Lake of	
Carlton	013	the Woods	017
	027		018
	028		019
	029		021
	030		022
Cass	016	Mille	
	050	Lacs	001
Cook	003	Morrison	001
Crow		Ottertail	076
Wing	045	Pine	011
Itasca	002	Roseau	014
	007		015
	038		039
	055		041
	078	St. Louis	023
	081		071
	083		072
	084		119
	085		154
Kittson	002		158
	003		181
Koochi-			182
ching	All		219
Lake of			245
the Woods	003		277
	005		307
	006		308
	007		
	012		
	016		

Rationale

Natural regeneration offers an inexpensive means of establishing a second stand of commercial forest trees following logging. When the stand to be established involves Black Spruce, Tamarack, Jack Pine, White Cedar or members of the hardwood family, this method has proven to be very successful and, if conducted properly, results in fully-stocked stands of good distribution at reduced costs.

The reduced cost of establishing the new stand may permit the land manager to harvest commercial forest products on land of lower site quality and still show an acceptable cost-benefit ratio at the end of the rotation period.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(F-1.3 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Forestry recommendations 1.3 through 1.6 involve accepted methods of regenerating and establishing a stand of commercial trees following logging. On those lands recommended for commercial harvest, these cultural treatments have been carried through. See Forestry Recommendations F-1.1 and F-1.2 for identification of these tracts.

- - - -

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Forest Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.4 - Timber Production

Regenerate commercial tree species by means of planting following the harvest of forest products. The following lands are recommended for planting.

Aitkin	037
Carlton	027
Cass	018
	019
Crow Wing	041
Hubbard	043
Itasca	055
	082
	083
	084
	085
St. Louis	220
	308
	311

Rationale

The establishment of second growth stands of White Spruce, White Pine and Red Pine, has met with poor results when accomplished by means of natural regeneration. Where the goal of ' management is continued, production of these species or the conversion from another species to Red Pine, White Pine or White Spruce, best results will be obtained through planting.

Failures in attempts to regenerate naturally, have resulted in costly replantings and site preparation treatment several years after logging and have produced unattractive cost-benefit ratios at rotation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

(F-1.4 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Forestry recommendations 1.3 through 1.6 involve accepted methods of regenerating and establishing a stand of commercial trees following logging. On those lands recommended for commercial harvest, these cultural treatments have been carried through. See Forestry Recommendations F-1.1 and F-1.2 for identification of these tracts.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Forestry recommendations 1.3 through 1.6 be carried out on those lands recommended for commercial harvest. This will be accomplished by the managing agency. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations No.s 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.5 - Timber Production

The control of brush or hardwood suckers by mechanical or chemical means on those sites being regenerated by planting. Brush control is recommended for the following stands.

Aitkin	037
Carlton	027
Cass	018
	019
Crow Wing	041
Hubbard	043
Itasca	055
	082
	083
	084
	085
St. Louis	220
	308
	311

Rationale

To insure proper establishment and rapid growth of planting stock, compilation from other species of trees and grass must be reduced. Red Pine, White Pine and to some extent, White Spruce, do not do well when forced to compete for available soil nutriants and moisture and excessive compilation results in planting failures or at best, poor distribution of the deserved tree species. The resulting stands yield lower volumes of less desirable products at rotation age and less attractive cost-benefit ratios.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(F-1.5 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Forestry recommendations 1.3 through 1.6 involve accepted methods of regenerating and establishing a stand of commercial trees following logging. On those lands recommended for commercial harvest, these cultural treatments have been carried through. See Forestry Recommendations F-1.1 and F-1.2 for identification of these tracts.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Forestry recommendations 1.3 through 1.6 be carried out on those lands recommended for commercial harvest. This will be accomplished by the managing agency. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations No.s 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Forest Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.6 - Timber Production

In those stands to be regenerated through natural means, a controlled burn is recommended following tree harvest. This recommendation involves the following public lands.

Aitkin	034	Lake of	
Carlton	013	the Woods	019
	027		021
	028		022
	029	Mille Lacs	001
	030	Morrison	001
Cass	016	Ottertail	076
	050	Pine	011
Cook	003	Roseau	014
Crow Wing	045		015
Itasca	002		039
	007		041
	038	St. Louis	023
	055		071
	078		072
	081		119
	083		154
	084		158
	085		181
Kittson	002		182
	003		219
Koochi-			245
ching	All		277
Lake of			307
the Woods	003		308
	005		
	006		
	007		
	012		
	016		
	017		
	018		

Rationale

The successful natural establishment forest stands following logging is highly dependent upon proper site preparation. To promote rapid establishment and growth compilation from undesirable species; must be reduced and mineral soil exposed for proper germination of seed. Jack Pine requires heat to open cones and release seeds, while all species require abundant sunlight for proper initial growth.

Controlled burning is inexpensive and efficient method of creating these conditions and will result in greater volumes of the desired species at rotation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(F-1.6 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Forestry recommendations 1.3 through 1.6 involve accepted methods of regenerating and establishing a stand of commercial trees following logging. On those lands recommended for commercial harvest, these cultural treatments have been carried through. See Forestry Recommendations F-1.1 and F-1.2 for identification of these tracts.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Forestry recommendations 1.3 through 1.6 be carried out on those lands recommended for commercial harvest. This will be accomplished by the managing agency. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations No.s 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Forest Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.7 - Timber Production

The harvest of hardwood material in the form of firewood, from non commercial stands not offering an opportunity for commercial harvest of commercial forest material on the following public lands.

Cass	015
	019
Kittson	002
	003
Lake of the Woods	003
	005
	006
Mille Lacs	001

Rationale

The opportunity to harvest commercial forest products is based, to a great extent, on the distance of this material from utilization centers and the species involved on lands which involve long haul distances, the cost of transportation may eliminate any opportunity for commercial sale and the harvest of firewood under a free use may be the only means by which a healthier vegetative community can be maintained.

Multiple-Use Analysis

All lands in this recommendation have been recommended for transfer to another agency or BLM management under a cooperative agreement. The decision to carry out this recommendation should be left with the managing agency since it depends heavily upon demand and access.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Forest Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
F-1.8 - Timber Production Convert the following commercial forest stands to upland conifer species upon completion of the harvest operation. Aitkin 037 Carlton 027 Cass 018 019 Crow Wing 041 Hubbard 043 Itasca 055 082 083 084 St. Louis 220 308 311	The Control Numbers listed identify upland sites of high site quality. In most cases, these sites are now occupied by Aspen-White Birch or a mixture of Aspen-White Birch with scattered old growth Red Pine. Conversion to Red Pine or White Spruce will produce a second growth stand with larger volumes and a product of much greater value. All sites appear capable of producing the more desirable soft wood species and on suitable sites, conversion is an acceptable forestry practice.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Forestry recommendations 1.8 and 1.9 involve decisions which depend heavily upon economic situations. The lands involved have been recommended for transfer or cooperative management and the option to adopt or reject these recommendations should be left with that agency.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15 and 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15 and 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Forest Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
F-1.9 - Timber Production Obtain access to the following tracts of public lands to facilitate forest products removal. Aitkin 036 Carlton 013 Cass 016 Cook 003 Lake of the Woods 018 Ottertail 076 St. Louis 023 071 158 245	These lands lack physical access and most are surrounded by private ownership and present an access problem of greater magnitude than other public lands. To permit the harvesting of forest products access agreements must be obtained.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Forestry recommendations 1.8 and 1.9 involve decisions which depend heavily upon economic situations. The lands involved have been recommended for transfer or cooperative management and the option to adopt or reject these recommendations should be left with that agency.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15 and 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15 and 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Management
Objective Number	F-3

Objective: Non Commodity Products

To protect and preserve sensitive vegetative communities and to reduce BLM's surface management responsibility in Minnesota.

Rationale:

Bureau Manual 1602.11, Basic Guidance, states that the BLM is authorized and directed to -- manage and protect public lands to provide a wide-range of services including environmental values. 1602.12 states one of the Bureau's objectives is the protection of the environment from avoidable destruction, abuse and deterioration. 1602.33A states that we may assume that environmental values will become increasingly important and that more emphasis will be directed toward this facet of management. 1602.42 C3c states that management standards will include the protection of natural--elements in the environment having aesthetic value of natural beauty, harmony and uniqueness.

The ESO Policy and Program Study Report recommends that surface jurisdiction be transferred to other agencies where valuable minerals are not involved.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
F-3.1 - Non Commodity Products The relinquishment of all or a portion of the forest management responsibility of the following lands to another agency. See Table #12, Page #38, URA.	Another governmental agency has expressed a willingness to accept full or partial management responsibility on these lands for timber production. This can be accomplished either through transfer or cooperative agreement, either method will reduce BLM's surface management responsibility in Minnesota.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Table No. 12

Opportunities to Relinquish all or a Portion of the Forest Management Responsibility to the State DNR or the County Where Lands Are Located

County	Inventory Control No.	Interested Agency
Aitkin	034	County
	036	County
	037	County
Crow Wing	Some	County
Itasca	007	County
	034	County
	038	County
	055	County and State
	078	County
	081	County
	082	County
	083	County
	084	County
	085	County
Koochiching	001	County
	017	County
	027-033	County
	036	County
	038-040	County
	042	County
	045-055	County
	057	County
	059-062	County
	064	County
	067	County
Lake of the Woods	016-026	State

NOTE: The County and/or State DNR have expressed a willingness to manage the above public domain lands for forest products.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Forest Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
F-3.2 - Non Commodity Products	
Nominate the following areas for inclusion in BLM's ACEC Program. See Table # 10, Page # 36, URA.	These areas either possess unique and sensitive plant communities involving bog orchids and remnant plants or are riparian lands. Both categories require some type of special requirement to protect the vegetative communities.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Six were not recommended for ACEC nomination by the Multiple-Use Analysis group. All involve water frontage on lakes or rivers which warrant special management considerations to protect aquatic values in adjacent water. All sites have been recommended for transfer, cooperative management or BLM retention and the agencies receiving management responsibility are fully qualified to manage sensitive resources.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Nominate those areas carried through by the Multiple-Use Analysis group for inclusion in the ACEC program. Prepare management plans for those areas receiving designation and recommend that the managing agency consider the sensitive values in their management goals.

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 6, 10-11, 13, 15-17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Review these sites to insure they meet the criteria established in the ACEC Policy and Procedures guidelines set forth in the Federal Register of 8-27-80.

Some of these sites may not be significant to warrant nomination as ACEC.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Products (Peat)
Objective Number	F-1

Objective:

Inventory potential peat resources on all Bureau peatlands in Minnesota prior to disposal of land or sale of peat resources by BLM.

Rationale:

Because there are many types of peat (see URA) and a required minimum depth for economical operations in harvesting peat, it is necessary to inventory the resource to know if the BLM boglands have peat resources and the quantity and quality of the resource, if present.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Forest Products (Peat)

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-1.1
Contract with the State of Minnesota to inventory peat on BLM land, preferably beginning with those Bureau lands within Minnegasco application (T. 156N., R.28W., Koochiching County). Then inventory the remaining blocks of Bureau land with peat potential in Lake of the Woods and Koochiching Counties. When these are done, the inventory could proceed to the small parcels of scattered Bureau uplands most likely to contain peat, prior to their disposal or management by BLM. If a contract cannot be worked out with the State, the Bureau should find another source to complete the work, such as the University or private contractors.

Support needs: Budget the finances necessary to implement the contract.

Rationale

The State owns the majority of the peatlands in Minnesota and is actively inventorying these lands. In most cases, the BLM lands are surrounded or bordered by State lands and the cost should be less if the Bureau's peat was inventoried in conjunction with the State land. Also, the State is experienced in peat inventory work and it would be beneficial to the BLM to take advantage of this expertise.

In considering potentials for disposal, the State would be the most likely recipient as they are actively involved in peat management. Inventory would be necessary in this respect, as the State would need to know what peat resource is available before wanting to acquire the lands. Also, the Bureau would need to know the value of the resource prior to disposal.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Forest Products
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(F-1.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

The Minnegasco Pilot Peat Gasification study will determine the feasibility of converting peat to gas. Until the feasibility is determined, there is no proposed project involving BLM lands. However, harvesting for horticultural purposes is a potential for scattered tracts.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
If the Minnegasco project shows use of peat as an energy source is feasible, BLM lands in T.156N., R.28W., will be inventoried to determine the extent and value of this resource. Inventory other peat lands (see MFP chart) as adjacent lands are inventoried or before disposal.	See Rationale attached. Inventory of peat is necessary before disposal. The state has the expertise.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Proceed with the Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.	It is necessary to know the extent of the peat resource if it is to be utilized or transferred. If Minnegasco's project proves uneconomical, the peat will have no known value and an inventory will be of little value.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Products (Peat)
Objective Number	F-2

Objective:

Encourage sale of peat resources from BLM lands.

Rationale:

If the inventory of BLM boglands (Objective #1) shows there is marketable peat on these lands, it should be sold when this resource is needed for energy or horticultural uses. The Peat URA points out there are many uses for peat including the developing energy uses. If the BLM boglands contain peat, they will some day be a valuable resource which should be sold.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Products (Peat)
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

F-2.1
Using inventory data (Objective #1) and analysis of industry needs, set priorities on areas for energy and/or horticultural peat sales.

Rationale

It is necessary to know which areas have peat resources and what kind, inventory data will provide this information. Present technology in harvesting peat requires relatively large blocks of peatlands to set up an economical operation, from 1000 acres for horticultural harvesting to probably 100,000 minimum for energy harvesting of peat. Thus, the BLM peat resources would be used in conjunction with adjacent or surrounding lands, most likely state lands. Therefore, an analysis of industry needs will be critical in promoting Bureau peat sales.

The BLM peat resources can provide important raw material for this industry and should be utilized to the extent needed in Minnesota. Cooperative agreement will most likely be used with the state as a tool to promote wise harvesting methods and especially in the rehabilitation of the harvested areas.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Setting priorities is not in conflict with other resource values. However, on some areas, peat harvesting may conflict or compliment other resources' potential. Harvest will affect lands value.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Forest Products (Peat)
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(F-2.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Set priorities with consideration for other resource values and disposal. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 15 and #14.	Protection of environment and value of the peat lands before and after harvest.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Establish priorities for development of peat resources based on:

1) Demand
2) Environmental impacts and conflicts with other resources
3) Potential land use after peat harvest
4) Economic impact in terms of dollar return to government, jobs created and energy produced.

At this point in time, not enough is known about the potential of peat as an energy source to determine what the requirements of a commercial operation are. We do not know the impacts of peat harvest on hydrology or possible uses of the land after harvest. Priorities cannot be established until these questions are answered.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Forest Products (Peat)
Objective Number	F-3

Objective:

Disposal of small isolated parcels of BLM peat lands.

Rationale:

If the peat inventory shows the small isolated parcels of upland bog to contain commercial peat resources, they should be disposed of. Because of the large area needed to commercially harvest peat, these small areas would necessarily be included in an operation with the surrounding or adjacent state or private land. In most cases, these would be state lands. The State of Minnesota has been in the peat harvesting and studying business for several years and has a high degree of expertise in the management of this resource.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Forest Products (Peat)
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
F-3.1 Sell these peatlands which would be better managed in conjunction with the surrounding or adjacent land.	Considering the problems associated with administering small, scattered parcels of peatlands and the expertise the state has in managing peat, it would be beneficial for the resource to dispose of the land.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Harvesting of peat can be done cooperatively or in conjunction with adjacent land. Other agencies are not interested in buying these lands. Therefore, this recommendation is dropped from further consideration.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Drop the Management Framework Plan I Recommendation above from further consideration.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Drop Management Framework Plan I Recommendation from further consideration.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Watershed
Objective Number	W-1

Objective:

Inventory the soils on all BLM islands and uplands.

Rationale:

The objective in BLM Manual 7100 is to gather soil resource information for public lands. Basic soils information will assist in planning and development of multiple resource management decisions for all BLM program and support activities. No soils information on BLM lands has been gathered for use in this planning document.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Watershed
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
W-1.1 Conduct soil inventory on tracts where modern soil survey information is not available. A second order soils survey with erosion susceptibility ratings will be completed through a cooperative agreement with SCS.	Data is needed to determine soil productivity for forests and agricultural uses as well as erosion susceptibility in conjunction with other activities which disturb the vegetation and soil surface such as recreation, timber harvesting, etc. A tract by tract field inventory is not necessary unless a specific project is proposed which will affect the soil resource. No data is presented in the URA Step 3.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Soil inventory data would be helpful in the planning process and especially on tracts proposed for special projects where soil disturbance is anticipated. However, no such rojects have been identified.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Modify MFP Recommendation to read: Collect available soils data from other agencies, including an erosion susceptibility rating.	No specific needs identified.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Collect available soils data from other agencies, including an erosion susceptibility rating. Conduct soils inventory on tracts where modern soils survey information is not available through a cooperative agreement with SCS.	Future projects may require more intensive soils inventory.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Watershed
Objective Number	W-2

Objective:

Minimize erosion and soil loss from BLM islands and uplands.

Rationale:

The 1603 E BLM Manual Water Resource Program Activity Statement presents an objective to restore, maintain and improve soil productivity to enhance on-site resource uses. The watershed program activities are directed toward stabilization of soil resources.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Minnesota
Activity: Watershed
Overlay Reference: Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
W-2.1 Protect and produce maximum vegetative cover and density to reduce and prevent soil erosion by eliminating minerals development, recreation uses, harvesting and grazing of forest products on islands which have severe erosion susceptibility (Class II and III).	Minerals development, heavy recreation use, and harvesting of timber on these islands will destroy the vegetative cover necessary to stabilize the soil. Lack of adequate vegetative cover is probably already a main cause of the present erosion problem.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Minerals development, harvesting of forest crops, grazing and excess recreational use, all have a negative impact on the vegetation. The small size of the islands makes mineral development unlikely. Harvesting trees is generally an unacceptable practice due to impacts on the visual resource, however, in some instances this would be permitted to enhance waterfowl production, harvest of dead or down trees for firewood, may be permitted. Grazing is an unacceptable use of islands. Plans for recreational development must be closely reviewed and monitored to see that any erosion problems are mitigated.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Protect and enhance existing vegetation to reduce or eliminate erosion by eliminating minerals development and grazing from islands with severe erosion susceptibility. Closely review plans for removal of forest products to insure that this activity does not create additional erosion problems. Review plans for recreational development to insure anything that would cause erosion is mitigated. See Multiple-Use Recommendation 1-16.	See Rationale above. Vegetation should be protected and encouraged to reduce erosion problems.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.	See above.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
W-2.2 Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class.	The vegetative cover on these islands is probably what has stabilized the soil and prevented severe erosion from occurring resulting in a Class I or None erosion class. This will minimize the affect of erosion from BLM lands on water quality.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Class I designation of the islands or tracts identified for transfer (see group analyses and recommendations # 1-16) should not restrict the transfer. The recipients are considered either capable or required by law to protect lands from severe erosion. There are no conflicts on remaining islands.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class (see MFP chart).	Recipients capable and no conflicts.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation II as written.	No comments.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
W-2.3 Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands to meet Class I or better erosion class.	Meet long-term objectives in BLM Manual 1603 E to maintain soil productivity and surface and ground water quality.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Class I designation of the islands or tracts identified for transfer (see group analyses and recommendations # 1-16) should not restrict the transfer. The recipients are considered either capable or required by law to protect lands from severe erosion. There are no conflicts on remaining islands.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class (see MFP chart).	Recipients capable and no conflicts.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation II as written.	No comments.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Watershed
Objective Number	W-3

Objective:

Manage BLM lands within floodplains according to Floodplain Management Guidelines regarding transfer of public lands, minerals, and subsurface estates.

Rationale:

Management of the public lands is guided by these regulations and for floodplains in particular Executive Order 11988.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Watershed
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
W-3.1 Public lands must remain under BLM administration unless the proposed recipient either federal, state, public or private institution or party, has demonstrated the ability to maintain, restore and protect the floodplain.	To insure the protection of the watershed and prevent development within the floodplain. To prevent transfer to agencies or individuals who are not required to comply with adequate floodplain management.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Recommendation dropped because all public agencies are required to abide by Executive Order No. 11988 and 11990 regarding wetland and riparian habitat and floodplains. Private individuals are required to comply with floodplain zoning ordinances.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Objective Number	WL-1

Objective: - Habitat Expansion

Create approximately 500 acres of quality waterfowl habitat.

Rationale:

Basic Guidance 1602.11, states that it is the responsibility of the BLM to manage, develop and protect the public lands for fish and wildlife development and utilization. Supplemental guidance 1603.12D 3a, states that the long-term objectives are to maintain a maximum diversity of wildlife species in sufficient numbers to meet public demands.

Waterfowl numbers have declined over the past decade and the demand for this class of wildlife now exceeds the supply. Creating approximately 500 acres of quality waterfowl habitat will help meet this demand for greater numbers of this class of wildlife.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP): Minnesota
Activity: Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-1.1 - Habitat Expansion

Deepen 1-1/4 miles of abandoned road ditch found in Koochiching County within the black spruce-tamarack habitat type and construct a series of small check dams. The area involved is described in Koochiching County Report #042.

Rationale

Sometime in the 1930's, an attempt was made to construct a township road through two miles of black spruce bogs. Since its abandonment in the mid 1940's, the adjacent ditches have provided periodic nesting and brooding habitat for black ducks, mallards and to some extent, wood ducks. The deepening of the ditches and the construction of a series of small check dams will create five, three-acre ponds of value as waterfowl as nesting and brooding habitat. The area concerned in this recommendation is all but void of such habitat.

This action, although beneficial to waterfowl, would reduce the value of the habitat for a number of non game birds and a few mammals.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The lands involved in this recommendation have been recommended for county management under a cooperative agreement. The decision to drop or carry this recommendation through has been deferred and will be handled in the cooperative agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19. Defer any work until a decision is reached on the National Natural Landmark study the Heritage Cultural & Recreation Service.

The HCRS has nominated this area as a National Natural Landmark and a study is now underway. Upon completion of the study and HCRS recommendation, a decision will be made to determine if this is a permitted project depending on the impact on Natural Landmark values.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-1.2 - Habitat Expansion

Create small pot holes throughout 9,000 acres of muskeg bog habitat type in Koochiching County. The area involved in this recommendation is described in Koochiching County Report #045.

Rationale

The tract of land described in Koochiching County Report #045, contains very little open water or marsh of value to waterfowl. The pot holes created by this recommendation will attract several species of waterfowl who will use these structures for courtship, nesting and brooding activities.

Although beneficial to waterfowl, this action would have a detrimental affect on the total environment of the muskeg bog ecosystem and would undoubtedly reduce the value of the habitat for several species of wildlife.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The lands involved in this recommendation have been recommended for county management under a cooperative agreement. The decision to drop or carry this recommendation through has been deferred and will be handled in the cooperative agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19. Defer any work until a decision is reached on the National Natural Landmark study by the Heritage Cultural & Recreation Service.

The HCRS has nominated this area as a National Natural Landmark and a study is now underway. Upon completion of the study and HCRS recommendation, a decision will be made to determine if this is a permitted project depending on the impact on Natural Landmark values.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota
Activity
Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-1.3 - Habitat Expansion

Flood forty acres of marginal waterfowl marsh habitat described in Cass County Report #015, by construction of a check dam on the adjacent ditch.

Rationale

The present marsh provides marginal waterfowl habitat because of the inability to alter and control water levels. The adjacent area is managed by the Minnesota DNR for waterfowl production and is supplied with water by means of a ditch which adjoins 1/4 mile of public lands. The construction of a small check dam on this ditch would allow for periodic flooding of the public lands to maintain the optimum water level and maximize waterfowl production.

The environmental affects of this action are believed to be minimal and would not result in a drastic change in the species of wildlife presently using the habitat.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This tract has been recommended for transfer to the state as part of their wildlife management area. The decision to develop this tract for waterfowl will be left to that agency. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-1.4 - Habitat Expansion

Flood twenty acres of rank marsh-willow habitat along a small creek described in Cass County Report #018 by constructing a small dam.

Rationale

The present willow marsh receives no waterfowl use because of excessive vegetative growth. The small creek has an acceptable water flow to sustain the small waterfowl development created by the construction of a dam. The dam will permit water level control to create optimum conditions needed for waterfowl production in an area now void of this class of wildlife.

This action would change the habitat type and result in the displacement of several species, however, suitable habitat exists on adjacent land to accommodate displaced individuals.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This land parcel has been recommended for interim BLM management until a cooperative management agreement is entered into with a suitable agency. The specific wildlife recommendation will be addressed in this agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-1.5 - Habitat Expansion

Flood thirty-two acres of marsh habitat by constructing a dam on public lands described in Cass County Report #019.

Rationale

The present marsh receives little, if any, waterfowl use. A ditch has been constructed along the north and west extremities of public land for the purpose of draining private agricultural lands. The presence of this ditch has diverted the natural flow of surface water away from the public lands and resulted in a dry marsh with an inadequate water supply. The construction of a dam to restrict the flow of water and allow for diversion of this water supply to the public lands will create a marsh bond of great value to waterfowl.

This action would result in the displacement of several small mammal species of wildlife and a number of non game avian species, however, suitable habitat is available on adjacent lands to accommodate these individuals.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This land parcel has been recommended for interim BLM management until a cooperative management agreement is entered into with a suitable agency. The specific wildlife recommendation will be addressed in this agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Objective Number	WL-2

Objective:

Expand the range of the threatened Northern Timber Wolf in Minnesota.

Rationale:

Supplemental Guidance 1603. 12D 2a, state that the increasing public interest in non game wildlife species and concern for species threatened with extinction, will shift management efforts. 1603. 12D 4b states that BLM shall consider the welfare and habitat requirements of all wildlife, including predacious animals in programs affecting the public lands; The Endangered Species Act of 1973. The recovery plan for the Eastern Timber Wolf recommends that prey populations be increased through habitat management within zone #4.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-2.1 - Habitat Expansion

Conduct vegetative manipulations on public lands which will create conditions favorable for the increase of prey species populations of the Timber Wolf.

Rationale

Several public domain tracts are within zones designated by the Timber Wolf recovery team as management zones for this species. The management of the Timber Wolf consists primarily of actions to increase the populations of prey species, the White Tailed Deer and the Beaver.

By manipulating the vegetative cover, conditions can be created which will result in an increase in this prey species and be of great benefit to the threatened Timber Wolf.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The following county control numbers identify tracts of land where the recommendation to improve the food supply for the timber wolf has been carried through as a group multiple-use recommendation. All lands within the critical zone for this species are included. Several land parcels were dropped from this recommendation in favor of other resource values of higher priority.

Aitkin County	034
	037
Cass County	016
	018
Hubbard County	040
	043
Koochiching Co.	017-018
	027-029
	036
	038-039
	059-060
	064
	067
Lake of the Woods Co.	004-010
St. Louis County	071-072
	119
	154
	183
	210
	219-220
	230
	245
	308

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(WL-2.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1, 11, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1, 11, 14, 15, 17 and 19.

Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 1 conflicts with this decision because no vegetative manipulation will be permitted in the national park. The remaining recommendations are compatible with this recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Objective Number	WL-3

Objective: - Habitat Improvement

Improve the quality of wildlife habitat on public lands to provide optimum conditions for the management of selected species.

Rationale:

Bureau policy, as outlined in BLM 1602.11, provides for the management, development and protection of public lands for fish and wildlife development and utilization. 1603.12 D 2a and c makes the assumptions that the ecosystem approach to management and development will produce the greatest variety and populations of wildlife and that increased public interest in non game wildlife species and concern for threatened species will shift management efforts. 1603.12D 3a indicates the long-term objective of BLM is to maintain the maximum diversity of wildlife species in sufficient numbers to meet public needs.

This objective will satisfy this policy, statement, assumptions and long-term goals.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.1 - Habitat Improvement

Remove the trees from 228 islands located in lakes with high potential for waterfowl production. (See Page #154 a of the URA for County Control Numbers of involved lands).

Rationale

The presence of trees on islands seriously reduces the value of that island for waterfowl production. Avian predators are attracted to these forested islands and are believed to make substantial inroads in waterfowl populations through predation of young individuals. The benefits of tree removal to waterfowl are twofold. In addition to discouraging avian predators, these treeless islands become more attractive to nesting waterfowl and will attract many more nesting birds.

The resulting increase in waterfowl production is difficult to predict but, a 400 % increase does not seem unreasonable.

This increase in waterfowl numbers will not be accomplished without great sacrifices by other members of the wildlife community and will result in a loss of scenic quality of the islands involved. A number of non game birds will be displaced and will be forced to seek suitable nesting habitat in an area where forested land is in short supply.

(WL-3.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Thirty-three islands have been carried through the Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as suitable for tree removal to enhance waterfowl production. The following county control numbers identify these islands:

Becker	032	Polk	002
	034		
	050	Pope	008
	059		
		Stearns	016
Clay	007		
		Todd	016
Douglas	002		
	004		
	018		
McLeod	006		
Meeker	013		
Ottertail	024		
	025		
	030		
	032-034		
	036		
	048		
	059		
	068-069		
	071		
	074-075		
	079		
	091		
	100-102		

The remaining 196 islands recommended for tree removal have been dropped in favor of higher resource values, in most cases, this resource value was visual resources.

- - - -

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(WL-3.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 10-11, 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 10-11, 17.

The cooperative agreements and R&PP applications will cover this recommendation on a case by case basis. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service - Recommendation # 3 - will determine the needs on the lands they acquire from BLM.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
WL-3.2 - Habitat Improvement Install floating nesting platforms on 125 acres of shallow water areas and marsh to improve waterfowl nesting habitat. Tracts involved are identified in Lake of the Woods County Reports #021 and #024.	A significant number of Red-Necked Grebes, Horned Grebes, Eared Grebes and lesser numbers of Western Grebes, use this habitat for nesting. The annual fluctuation of water levels is thought to reduce nesting success because of nest flooding and would be eliminated by providing floating nest platforms. Western Grebes are identified in Minnesota's list of Uncommon Wildlife as a wildlife species of uncertain status and worthy of special consideration. This recommendation would have no adverse affects on the environment or other wildlife species.

10

Multiple-Use Analysis

These two tracts have been recommended for transfer to the state as part of the state forest system. The Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation has recognized the wildlife values and recommended they be made a part of the management objective for the area. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.3 - Habitat Improvement

Construct and place nesting boxes on islands to improve their suitability for cavity nesting waterfowl.

Rationale

Five species of waterfowl use tree cavities in old growth forests to carry out nesting activities. The availability of old growth forests has declined and cavity nest sites are in very short supply. Minnesota represents the southern limits of the breeding range for Hooded Merganser, Common Merganser, Common Goldeneye, and Bufflehead, while the wood enjoys a much expanded breeding range. This recommendation will substantially increase the number of nesting birds and would have no adverse affect on the environment or other species of wildlife.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The placement of waterfowl nesting boxes on islands is a non conflicting recommendation and has been carried through in all multiple-use recommendations.

Although not listed as a significant resource value in the Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation, placement of nesting boxes will be accomplished when the opportunity arises.

See MFP chart for specific tracts identified for this recommendation.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Same as MFP Step I Recommendation.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.

The placement of nesting boxes is a desirable practice, however, the costs involved on placing and maintaining them makes this a permitted rather than planned activity.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.4 - Habitat Improvement

The girdling of aspen and balsam fir within the black spruce habitat type. The lands involved are described in Koochiching County Reports #035, #040, #042, #045 and #061.

Rationale

Within the black spruce-muskeg bog habitat type in Koochiching County, occur small pockets of off-site aspen and balsam fir. These islands of deciduous trees within large areas of lowland conifers are of high value to wildlife. Balsam fir is replacing the mature aspen because of natural succession and, if unaltered, the aspen will eventually be replaced.

The girdling of both aspen and fir in small groups of 5 to 10 trees will benefit the wildlife community in several ways:

--The aspen will regenerate from root suckering and maintain the type.
--Both aspen and fir snags will provide feeding and nesting habitat for a number of cavity nesting wildlife species.
--The remaining mature aspen provides high quality winter food for sharp-tail grouse.

The more unique members of the wildlife community benefiting from this action are: Black-Backed Three-Toed Woodpecker,
Northern Three-Toed Woodpecker,
Hawk Owl,
Boreal Owl,
Saw-whet Owl,
American Kestral,
Northern Flying Squirrel,
Fisher

This action will have only minor affects on the environment and other wildlife species.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(WL-3.4 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

The lands involved in this recommendation have been recommended for management by the county under a cooperative agreement. Specific wildlife improvements will be incorporated into that agreement and addressed at a later date. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Include in cooperative agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

lude in cooperative agreement. See Multiple-
se Analysis and Recommendation # 19.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.5 - Habitat Improvement

Construct and place artificial nests in the black-spruce-tamarack habitat for the Great Gray Owl. The lands affected by this recommendation are described in Koochiching County Reports #035, #042, and #045, and Lake of the Woods County Reports #016, #017, #018, #021, #022, #023, and #024.

Rationale

Until recently, only one nesting pair of this species had been found in Minnesota and the Great Gray Owl was considered a winter resident only. Recent studies have found additional nesting evidence and established that this bird quickly accepts artificial nests and is capable of increasing its numbers in areas where these structures are provided.

The areas proposed for this action are a mixture of Black Spruce-Tamarack interspersed by areas of muskeg bog and represent excellent habitats which provide all the required components -- food, cover, and water. A very small number of Great Gray Owls are thought to use this habitat for nesting, however, competition for existing nests is high and population levels are severely restricted because of the lack of suitable natural nests.

This action would have no adverse affect on the environment, but could have a significant impact on small rodent populations which form the prey base for Great Gray Owls.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

(WL-3.5 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

The lands involved in this recommendation have been recommended for transfer to the state as part of the state forest system or management by the county under a cooperative agreement.

For lands in the N.W. Angle, the Multiple-Use Analysis team recommended that the wildlife values be considered in the state forest management plan for this area.

Lands in Koochiching County will be managed under a cooperative agreement and a decision on wildlife values will be covered in that agreement.

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 19.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.6 - Habitat Improvement

The periodic cutting of aspen-white birch stands in ten-acre cutting blocks in stands that occur adjacent to alder shrub habitat types. (See attached sheet for County Control Numbers of land parcels involved).

Rationale

The Ruffed Grouse is Minnesota's top upland game bird and provides countless hours of recreational hunting each year. Within roughly ten-year cycles, the successful management of this game bird is closely related to and dependent upon the manipulation of aspen-white birch stands to produce a mixture of ten-year age classes. Areas where these deciduous stands occur adjacent to the alder-shrub habitat type are of special importance to this species as these areas supply the missing link in total habitat needs.

By maintaining the deciduous stands in the proper mix of age classes adjacent to areas of alder-shrub habitat, Ruffed Grouse numbers can be maximized.

This action appears to be environmentally acceptable and will be of benefit to White-Tailed Deer and the threatened Timber Wolf.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(WL-3.6 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

This habitat improvement to create conditions favorable to ruffed grouse is considered by the Multiple-Use Analysis group to be a viable management goal.

Several agencies were recommended for management responsibility on the lands involved in this recommendation and include state forest, U.S. Forest Service and county governments. For those tracts being transferred, the group felt it would be improper to impose management recommendations, but it was felt the state and USFS would adequately provide for this species of wildlife. Lands to be managed by county government under a cooperative agreement offer an opportunity to incorporate this recommendation into the management plan.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 15, 17 and 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10, 15, 17 and 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.7 - Habitat Improvement

The periodic cutting of aspen-white birch stands in ten-acre blocks where these stands occur adjacent to deer wintering areas. (See attached page for County Control Numbers of lands involved in this action).

Rationale

The White-Tailed Deer is Minnesota's top big game species. Successful management of this species is centered around maintaining the aspen-white birch type in early stages of succession and maintenance of the thermal quality of deer yards. Deciduous stands in early stages of succession produce the abundance of forbs and browse required by deer. When these stands are located adjacent to wintering yards, they provide abundant food supplies during the critical spring, fall, and winter period and result in reduced winter losses of animals.

This action will be of benefit to the threatened Timber Wolf and to some extent, the Ruffed Grouse. The environmental affects will be minimal.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Two parcels of land involved in this recommendation have been carried through and appear in the Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation.

Carlton County 028 will be transferred to the state as part of the state forest system. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.

Hubbard County 043 will be managed by the county under a cooperative agreement and wildlife values will be covered in that agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

The remaining lands from this recommendation were dropped in favor of the higher resource value; forest management and ACEC nomination. Both of these resource values may result in accomplishing the intent of this recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(WL-3.7 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 17.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota

Activity Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.8 - Habitat Improvement

A portion of the grain crops now being produced on public lands described in Lake of the Woods County Report #003 and #012, be left standing to provide wildlife food.

Support Needs: The support of the cadastral survey section is needed to determine the extent of the unauthorized use and the support of the lands activity is needed to work out the agreement for payment.

Rationale

Two upland public domain tracts are being formed for the production of agricultural crops. Both tracts receive use by Sharp-Tailed Grouse and #012 is used by Sand Hill Cranes as a feeding area. Both species would benefit if a portion of this crop were to remain uncut as a food source in lieu of rental payment for the use of this public land.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation was not carried through in the Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation. Both tracts have been recommended for trespass resolution followed by conveyance into private ownership for the production of agricultural crops.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Transfer to private ownership through public sale following resolution of unauthorized use.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 7 and 9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.9 - Habitat Improvement

Eliminate unauthorized livestock grazing on four public islands in Cedar Lake. The lands involved in this recommendation are described in Meeker County Report #010 and #011 and in McLeod County Report #007 and #008.

Support Needs: Cadastral survey will be needed as well as support from the Lands activity.

Rationale

The present unauthorized livestock grazing on four islands in Cedar Lake has removed the natural shrub layer and annually removes all grasses. As a result, the habitat has been rendered unsuitable for a number of Avian wildlife species. The removal of livestock will allow the habitat to return to its natural state capable of producing a wider diversity of wildlife species.

This action will have a minimal impact on livestock industry as the AUM's produced on these islands are very small.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Livestock grazing was considered an unsuitable use for islands by the Multiple-Use Analysis group and this recommendation has been carried through. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation No. 9.

Following resolution of the unauthorized grazing, all islands have been recommended for transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service for management. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 3.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Resolve unauthorized grazing and transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3 and 9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.10 - Habitat Improvement

The removal of domestic livestock from public lands described in Kittson County Report #002.

Support Needs: Support of the range activity is needed to counsel the grazing lease.

Rationale

Grazing of domestic livestock has removed the shrub layer and annually removes grasses from the upland tract. This removal of vegetation has reduced the value of this habitat for White-Tailed Deer and wild turkey and has eliminated a class of non game birds. The removal of domestic livestock will allow the natural vegetative layers to develop and provide cover, food and nesting habitat for the wildlife species involved.

The impact of this action on the grazing industry will be minimal while the impact on the wildlife community will be quite beneficial, especially to wild turkey.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation was dropped by the Multiple-Use Analysis group in favor of livestock grazing. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Offer for public sale.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.11 - Habitat Improvement

The elimination of conflicts between nesting non game birds and human use of an island described in Swift County Report #004.

Support Needs: A cadastral survey is needed to establish ownership and Lands activity support is needed to eliminate the unauthorized use.

Rationale

A small island in Hassel Lake has been occupied for sometime by a Boy Scout troup as a camping area. The troop has constructed a small unauthorized cabin on the island and the use of this cabin represents a potential conflict with Great Blue Herons and Double Crested Cormorants using this island as a rookery. Both species appear on the State's list of Sensitive Wildlife Species and as wildlife worthy of special management consideration to insure continued survival.

Excessive human activity near the nest sites during the nesting period, will result in nesting failure or abandonment of the site by nesting birds. Removal of the cabin or restrictions on the time of use will decrease the potential for conflict.

This action will reduce the opportunity for enjoyment of the island by the Boy Scout troop and, if removal of the cabin is required, will result in some economic loss to the Boy Scout troop.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	, Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

(WL-3.11 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Swift County Soil and Water Conservation District has applied for a color of title and apparently has a valid claim. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #9.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Process a Color of Title application.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Process a Color of Title application.

This is a non descretionary action. If the applicant has a valid claim, BLM is obligated to issue a patent.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.12 - Habitat Improvement

The elimination of human use of a parcel of public land to permit use of the tract as nesting habitat. Lake of the Woods County Report #011.

Support Needs: The support of the lands activity will be needed to purchase or exchange the private lands involved.

Rationale

Recreational use of this lakeshore lot has eliminated non game bird nesting opportunities. The habitat is high quality sand beach on Lake of the Woods and can provide nesting sites for a number of shore birds and Franklin Gulls, if it were not for the abnormal amount of recreational use by patrons of the adjacent private camp grounds.

Two of the species involved in this recommendation, the Franklin's Gull and the Common Tern, are listed by the DNR as species which could become threatened, if actions are not taken to insure the integrity of their habitat. Another species, the Piping Plover, has been absent from the State's breeding bird list for the past twenty years until recently when twelve breeding pairs were found on an island within 1/4 mile of this site.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(WL-3.12 Continued)

Two possible solutions appear to be reasonable means of eliminating this conflicting use.

1. The purchase or exchange of private lands east of the public lands and the construction of a fence along the west edge of the public lands.

2. The fencing of the east and west boundaries of public lands to eliminate recreational traffic.

Both proposals would reduce the amount of lakeshore available to recreational users and may or may not cause an economic hardship on the adjacent private camp ground. Both proposals would have a positive affect on the environment and the wildlife community by allowing a natural ecosystem to develop which will provide habitat for a number of wildlife species.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Wildlife values were considered to be dominant on this tract of land by the Multiple-Use Analysis group and the recommendation was to transfer title to the state to manage for these wildlife values. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

ccept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.13 - Habitat Improvement

The restriction of human use on an island in Lake Johanna to protect nesting non game birds. Pope County Report #002.

Rationale

A small island in Lake Johanna has been recognized as one of the largest concentrations of breeding Herons, Egrets, and Cormorants found in Minnesota and is of great interest to the ornithological community. Until 1973, only a limited number of local residents were aware of its significance however, since that time a large numbe of well-meaning individuals visit the island each year for both birding and research.

A recent abandonment of the island by all but a few breeding birds has caused concern among members of the birding community who feel the increased number of visits may have contributed to the disappearance of breeding birds.

It is hoped that by reducing the number of visits to the island, birds will again find the conditions required for success ful nesting and return to carry out this function. All species formerly nesting on this island are considered sensitive by the Minnesota DNR.

This action would have no adverse affects on the economy or environment.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

(WL-3.13 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Wildlife values were considered dominant on this tract of land and transfer to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for management as a scientific area was recommended. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 3.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 3.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 3.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.14 - Habitat Improvement

The restriction of human use on an island in Mantrap Lake to protect nesting Northern Bald Eagles. Hubbard County Report #045.

Rationale

An island in Mantrap Lake has been used as a nesting site by Northern Bald Eagles for the past three or four years. From reports from local property owners, this pair of eagles has been among the most successful breeders found in the state, having fledged two or three young each year. The uniqueness of this species has drawn considerable interest among recreational users of the lake and the number of individuals visiting the island has increased steadily each year.

Local residents have voiced concern that continued interference by well-meaning people will eventually cause nesting failure or abandonment of the site by the eagles. The island must be posted to prohibit human use during the nesting period.

This action will limit the recreational opportunities on Mantrap Lake, but would have no adverse economic or environmental affects.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

(WL-3. 14 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Use of this island by nesting bald eagles was considered dominant and interim management by BLM under a cooperative agreement has been recommended. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Sign this island to restrict human use during the critical period of the year.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Sign this island with a sign informing public of the eagle nest and notifying them that harassment of a threatened or endangered species is a violation of federal law.

We do not have the capability of enforcing a "no trespassing" designation. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state both indicate a preference for informational rather than regulatory signing.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-3.15 - Habitat Improvement

Eliminate unauthorized agricultural use occurring on eight tracts of public land and restore wildlife habitat.

Beltrami #009
Brown #002
Itasca #027
Murray #001-#002
Redwood #001
Renville #009
Wilkins #008

Support Needs: The support of the lands and cadastral activities will be needed.

Rationale

The unauthorized agricultural use occurring on public lands has taken valuable wildlife habitat out of production. By eliminating this unauthorized use and allowing the land to revert to natural habitat, a number of wildlife species would benefit.

The loss of the use of these public lands will not pose an undue hardship on the local user, as the acreage represents a small fraction of their farms. Wildlife species benefitting from this action include pheasants, waterfowl and song birds.

All but two tracts are in a highly agriculturalized area where undeveloped wildlife habitat is at a premium.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(WL-3.15 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Beltrami 009 - Small portion is in agriculture use which benefits wildlife somewhat. No other impacts or conflicts.

Brown 002 and Wilkins 008 - Impact on user or other resources. A cooperative agreement for wildlife management has best potential. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Itasca 27 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 13 and 16.

Murray 001 and 002 - Lots are too small for management, have no access and Minnesota DNR is not interested in them for wildlife management. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 7.

Redwood 001 - Recommendation dropped - on County Highway ROW.

Renville 009 - Probable valid color of title - See L-5.3.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Beltrami 009 - Agricultural lease area now in cultivation and leave remainder for wildlife.	Agricultural land is productive and wildlife will benefit.
Redwood 001 and Renville 009 - Drop recommendation.	

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.	See above.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Objective Number	WL-4

Objective: - Habitat Maintenance

Habitat now occupied by wildlife and providing near optimum conditions for their survival, will be maintained in their present condition to insure these continued contributions to the wildlife community.

Rationale:

Bureau policy, as outlined in BLM 1602.11, provides for the management, development and protection of public lands for fish and wildlife development and utilization. BLM 1603.12D2a and c, assumes that the ecosystem approach to management will produce the greatest variety on numbers of wildlife and that increased public interest in non game wildlife and threatened species will shift management efforts. 1603.12D 3a deals with long-term objectives to maintain a maximum diversity of wildlife species and numbers to meet public demands and 1603.12D 4b and c, outline major principles and standards to consider all wildlife species and provide essential components of habitat--food, cover, and water--through the optimum "edge effect" approach to management.

This objective is consistent with Bureau policy statements, assumptions and goals, as it reflects benefits to all wildlife species.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.1 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the vegetative communities now present on thirty islands as possible future rookery sites for Heron's, Egrets and Cormorants. (See list of sites on Page #162 URA).

Rationale

Heron's, Egrets and to some extent, Cormorants, require mature living and dead lowland deciduous trees for nesting. Of possibly greater importance, is the need for isolation from human activity. Shallow lakes classified as game or marginal fish waters appear to be preferred over deep water lakes and produce large numbers of non game fish and minnows.

Islands in shallow lakes with abundant food supplies and vegetated with old growth ash and elm, are ideal rookery areas.

By maintaining these islands in their present condition, future expansion opportunities for Herons, Egrets and Cormorants will be assured.

This action has no foreseeable adverse affects.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Two of the original islands within this recommendation were dropped in favor of high wildlife values.

Blue Earth 002 will be transferred to the state as a part of a wildlife management area. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Hubbard 045 will be retained by BLM and managed for bald eagle nesting under a cooperative agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

The remaining 28 islands and an additional 17 islands which emerged from the Multiple-Use group discussion, have been carried through and have been recommended for transfer to the state or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or BLM retention and management under cooperative agreements.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(WL-4.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Transfer or manage according to the following Multiple-Use Analyses and Recommendations:

Becker	049	See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 3.	
	068-072	" "	
Big Stone	001-005	" "	
Douglas	001	See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.	
Clay	009-013	See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 3.	
Grant	002	See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.	
Hubbard	001	See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.	
	011-012	" "	Recommendation # 10.
Kandiyohi	011-012	" "	Recommendation # 20.
McLeod	009	" "	Recommendation # 3.
	011-012	" "	
Meeker	009-011	" "	
Ottertail	009-012	" "	
	022	" "	Recommendation # 17.
	040-041	" "	Recommendation # 3.
Pope	001-005	" "	
Rice	004	" "	Recommendation # 17.
Stearns	009	" "	Recommendation # 12.
Swift	004-005	" "	Recommendation # 3.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

(WL-4.1 Continued)

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.2 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the quality of gull nesting sites and loafing areas adjacent to these sites. (See list of Suitable Islands on Page #162 of the URA).

Rationale

Although several qualities determine suitability of a site for gull nesting, the two most predominant qualities appear to be freedom from predators and human activity during the nesting and brooding period. In most cases, islands meet the test for suitability by being free of mammal predators. To insure the future integrity of these islands presently occupied by gulls for nesting and islands utilized as loafing areas near by, human use must be restricted during the period April through August.

This action will result in a minimal loss of recreational opportunity to the public, but will have no other foreseeable adverse affects.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation was adopted on 45 tracts of land by the Multiple-Use Analysis group. See Recommendation Nos. 3, 4, 10 and 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Transfer to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state or retain in BLM ownership and seek cooperative agreements. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 4, 10 and 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 4, 10 and 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.3 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the quality of shorebird' nesting and migration loafing sites. (See Page #163 of the URA for County Control Numbers).

Rationale

Only a few species of shorebirds nest in Minnesota, but a great number of species visit the State on their annual spring migration to nesting grounds far to the north. Few species of non game wildlife generate the interest associated with this class of wildlife and because of this interest, they become a valuable addition to the wildlife community.

Their requirement for isolated stretches of waterfrontage to nest and migrate has reduced the acreage of habitat available to them, as much of this habitat has been developed for recreation or home sites. To insure the continued existence of this class of wildlife, suitable habitat must be buffered from human activity during the critical time of the year.

This action will result in the loss of areas to human recreational use, but no other adverse affects are foreseen.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(WL-4.3 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation has been carried through on 33 parcels of land. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3 and 10.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Transfer to state and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for management of wildlife values. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3 and 10.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3 and 10.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.4 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the quality of White Pelican habitat on three islands and four upland tracts. The lands involved in this recommendation are described in the following County Reports:

- Big Stone #006 and #007
  Sibley #001.
  Lake of the Woods #019, #020, #021 and #024.

Rationale

White Pelicans have been reported to be using the described public lands. It is not known whether these tracts provide nesting habitat or are used as loafing areas by non breeding birds. This species is known to nest in only two locations within the State and is considered very uncommon. The DNR lists this bird as one which could become threatened if measures are not taken to insure the quality of its habitat.

By restricting human use during critical periods of the year and by eliminating actions which will change the character of these lands, this species will be assurred of quality habitat to carry out its life functions.

This action will decrease the acreage of public lands available for unrestricted recreational use but will have no adverse affect on other wildlife species or the environment.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

(WL-4.4 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation has been carried through on all of the involved lands. Big Stone County 006-007 will be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 3.

Sibley 001 will be retained by BLM and managed under a cooperative agreement. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Lake of the Woods 019-024 will be transferred to the state as an addition to their state forest system to be managed for the wildlife values present. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 10 and 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 10 and 17.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.5 - Habitat Improvement

Maintain the integrity of active Bald Eagle and Osprey nest sites by restricting human use during the critical period. (See list on Page #165, URA).

Rationale

The Northern Bald Eagle is presently listed as a threatened species, and thus, desires special consideration. The Osprey has been included because of its uniqueness in the avian community and because it utilizes similar habitat. Although both will use upland sites, they prefer islands with old growth conifers which are wind firm. The nest site must be free of human activity, or at least buffered from such activity during the nesting period.

One Bald Eagle nest site is present on BLM administered lands and two additional sites have been reported by the Fish and Wildlife Service, but not yet confirmed. Three Osprey nesting sites are present on BLM islands.

Posting of these active nest sites to reduce interference by recreational users, will insure the continued productivity of these sites.

This action will reduce the acreage of public land available for unrestricted recreational use during the period April though August, but will have no adverse impact on the environment or other wildlife species.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(WL-4.5 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation has been carried through for all lands involved.

Hubbard 026 and 045 and St. Louis 045 and 051 will be retained by BLM and managed under a cooperative agreement as raptor nesting sites. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation No. 17.

Lake of the Woods 024 will be transferred to the state as an addition to their state forest system and managed to protect the wildlife values. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 10 and 17.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.6 - Habitat Maintenance

Retain the habitat qualities of seventy-two islands for future natural expansion of Bald Eagle and Osprey range. (See list on Page #95 of the URA).

Rationale

Both the Northern Bald Eagle and the Osprey show signs of recovering from the affects of pesticides here in Northern Minnesota. Recent surveys indicate increased productivity by both species which rank them as the most successful populations in the Lower 48 states. By retaining the vegetative qualities of potential nesting sites, future expansion of both species is insured and it is hoped that they will some day occupy a greater portion of their former range.

This action will have no adverse impacts on other wildlife species or the environment.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation has been carried through on all 72 islands. The following agencies were recommended to assume management responsibility:

BLM retention and cooperative agreement	54 islands
US Fish & Wildlife Service	7 islands
State-within wildlife management areas	2 islands
State-within state parks	4 islands
State-within state forests	3 islands
State-within wild and scenic rivers	2 islands
National Park Service	1 upland

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12 and 17 and MFP II Multiple-Use Recommendation chart.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota

Activity Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 Step 3

(WL-4.6 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1, 3, 4, 10-12, 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1, 3, 4, 10-12, 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
WL-4.7 - Habitat Maintenance	
Maintain the unique mix of vegetative communities present on two public domain parcels to provide nesting habitat for large numbers of non game Avian species. The lands involved are described in Itasca County Reports #055 and #083.	Both land parcels have a great diversity in habitat types and provide nesting habitat for a unique number of Avian species within such a small area. This richness of species diversity is not often found in natural ecosystems and is of considerable interest to the birding community. By maintaining this unique vegetative community, the maximum diversity of wildlife species will be produced. This action will have no adverse affect on the environment or wildlife community.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Recommended by Multiple-Use group for transfer to the U.S. Forest Service to be used as exchange land with the county. The wildlife values involved in this recommendation have been identified. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation No. 15.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 15.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 15.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
WL-4.8 - Habitat Maintenance	
a. Retain the mature lowland deciduous vegetative type found on islands in fifty-one counties in the southern and western portions of the State.	a. A great number of islands in the southern and western portions of the State are vegetated with mature lowland deciduous trees. The conversion of lands from mature forest to agricultural crops has greatly reduced the acreage of mature habitat types and, in many areas, islands constitute the only remaining nesting habitat for members of Avian Association #13. By retaining these remaining vegetative communities, the members of Avian Association #13 will be assured of at least a token acreage of suitable nesting habitat.
b. Retain the existing vegetative community on islands lacking specific wildlife values.	b. Islands represent a rather fragile environment and those lacking specific wildlife values, do provide general habitat for a number of wildlife species. The loss of vegetation could result in excessive erosion and eventual loss of the island. This action will have no adverse impacts on the ecosystem or the wildlife community.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

(WL-4.8 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Thirty-three islands will not meet the requirements of this recommendation. Wildlife Recommendation 3.1 includes these islands and involves removal of all trees to improve waterfowl production.

Recommendations on the remaining islands do not involve vegetation removal and will satisfy this recommendation.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Wildlife Recommendation 3.1 for those islands recommended for tree removal.

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1-17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota

Activity Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.9 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the vegetative composition of White-Tailed Deer winter yards. County Control Numbers of involved lands:
Aitkin #036
Carlton #028
Itasca #078, #081, #083, #084, #085
Koochiching #042, #050, #057, #062
Lake of the Woods #019
St. Louis #071, #157, #181, #220

Rationale

Dense stands of lowland and upland conifers provide good winter yarding areas for White-Tailed Deer. Within these stands the animals find the needed thermal protection for winter survival. Past over-cutting of the white cedar type and difficulties in regeneration of this type have resulted in a shortage of quality winter deer yards.

This action will insure continued availability of these stands as thermal cover and reduce winter deer losses during severe winters.

This action will have no adverse impacts on other wildlife or the environment.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation was dropped in favor of higher resource values on Itasca 084 and 085 and St. Louis 157. Forest management was considered by the Multiple-Use group as having high priority. On the remaining tracts, this recommendation has been carried through and will be suggested as a management goal in the transfer conveyance or cooperative agreement.

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations # 10, 14, 15 and 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(WL-4.9 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

The wildlife values involved in this recommendation be given full consideration by those agencies being given management responsibility.

The protection of wildlife values be a part of any cooperative agreement.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations # 10, 14, 15 and 17 as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota
Activity
Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.10 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain or limit the actions which will alter the vegetative communities of the black spruce-muskeg bog ecosystem. Lands involved in this recommendation are described in Koochiching County Reports #042 and #045 and in Lake of the Woods County Reports #016, #017, #018, #021, #022, #023, #024.

Rationale

Two parcels of public land represent extensive acreages of black spruce and muskeg bog and are large enough to provide year-round habitat for a number of rather unique species of wildlife. The wildlife community would benefit by an ecosystem approach to management which allows only small alterations of the vegetation and conducts these alterations where the adverse affects will be minimized.

The ecosystem approach to management will insure the integrity of the system and result in greater species diversity and have minimal impacts on the environment.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The lands involved in this recommendation in Koochiching County have been recommended for BLM retention and managed under a cooperative agreement. Wildlife values will be incorporated into this agreement.

The lands in Lake of the Woods County have been recommended for transfer to the state as an addition to the state forest system. The protection and enhancement of wildlife values will be a part of their management goal.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

The involved wildlife values be given full consideration in the cooperative agreement to manage the involved lands.
The wildlife values in this recommendation be given full consideration by the agency receiving management responsibility.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

(WL-4. 10 Continued)

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.11 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the quality of aquatic habitats by restricting alterations to the buffer riparian zone. Land involved:
Cass #013, #016
Crow Wing #041
Hubbard #002, #033
Itasca #002, #009, #023, #029, #030, #032, #038, #081
Lake of the Woods #016-#026
Roseau #001-#013
St. Louis #023, #307, #308

Rationale

Thirty-eight surveyed tracts of public land are thought to provide habitat for aquatic amphibians, reptiles and for fish. Although no specific surveys have been conducted to evaluate the habitat for these wildlife communities, the habitat is thought to be in an acceptable condition. All involved species are dependent upon water quality, as it relates to clarity and chemical enrichment for continued survival.

By restricting the alterations occurring within the buffer riparian zone, some degree of water quality will be achieved and the integrity of the aquatic ecosystem retained.

This action will have no adverse impact on the environment or other members of the wildlife community.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(WL-4.11 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

Cass 013 and 016 - No conflicts or impacts; carried through in cooperative agreements. See Multiple Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Hubbard 002 and 033 - Same as Above.

Itasca 002, 038 - Same as Above.

Crow Wing 41 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.
Itasca 009, 023, 081 - " " "
Lake of the Woods 016-026 - " "

Itasca 029, 030, 032 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 16.

Roseau 001-013 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

St. Louis 023, 308 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 14.

St. Louis 307 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 13.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Wildlife values be given full consideration by the agency receiving management responsibility and that wildlife values be a part of cooperative agreements for management.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendations as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.12 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the vigor of aspen-white birch stands within 1300 feet of active beaver developments. The following Control Numbers identify public land with active beaver colonies:
Cass #015, #016, #018, #019
Crow Wing #041
Hubbard #002, #043
Itasca #002, #038, #081, #085
St. Louis #307

Rationale

Beaver are highly dependent upon aspen-white birch stands for their survival. Although they will utilize large material up to one-half mile from their ponds, material under six inches in diameter and within one quarter mile of ponds represents optimum habitat. By maintaining stands in a thrifty, vigorous condition in the early stages of succession, this wildlife species is capable of normal population growth and is less likely to suffer winter losses.

This action may have an adverse impact on water quality for a short period of time because of accelerated runoff following logging, but filtering effects of beaver developments will likely offset the adverse impact.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Crow Wing 041 See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 10.
Itasca 081 - Same as above.

Hubbard 002, 043; Itasca 002, 038; Cass 016, 018, 019 - No conflicts or impacts - carry through in cooperative agreements. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

St. Louis 307 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 13.

Cass 015 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 11.

Itasca 085 - See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 15.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(WL-4.12 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

These wildlife values be given full consideration by the agency receiving management responsibility.

These wildlife values be covered in the cooperative agreement with various counties.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation as written.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-4.13 - Habitat Maintenance

Maintain the productive capability of islands having high or medium potential for waterfowl nesting by discouraging the establishment of trees.

Rationale

Islands lacking trees represent attractive nesting sites for waterfowl, As trees invade, these habitat sites become less attractive to nesting waterfowl and losses to predators increases. By discouraging tree growth, the productive potential of these sites will be returned.

Multiple-Use Analysis

One hundred and two islands have been carried through in this recommendation; all have been suggested for transfer to another level of government or retention by BLM and management through a cooperative agreement. See the following Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 5, 10-14, 16, and 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

This wildlife habitat improvement be given full consideration by the agency receiving management responsibility and on those islands remaining in BLM ownership. This recommendation be carried out as funding becomes available.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 5, 10-14, 16 and 17 as written.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Objective Number	WL-5

Objective: ACEC Nomination

To insure the continued integrity of critical habitat components and to provide the tools to accomplish this through multiple resource management.

Rationale:

Public Law 94-579, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Section 202 (c) (3), provides for special management considerations on areas of important--fish and wildlife resources through the ACEC nomination process.

Areas providing critical habitat components -- food, cover or water -- essential to the survival of a wildlife species or community are in need of special protection to insure their continued productivity.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-5.1 - ACEC Nomination

Nominate public lands with unique or sensitive plant and wildlife communities in need of special management consideration to the ACEC program. (See Table #28 of the URA).

Rationale

A number of public domain tracts are occupied by unique or sensitive plant and wildlife communities and require special management consideration to insure their continued survival. Other lands support vegetative communities which provide a critical component of habitat for wildlife species or have the potential of providing that critical component. The nomination of these areas to the ACEC program offers a means to insure adequate considerations of their qualities in future multiple use management decisions and to prevent degradation of the resources.

This action will have no adverse impact on the environment, but may have an adverse impact on some wildlife species.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Ninety-one sites were recommended for ACEC nomination. If designated as ACEC, use restrictions emerging from the management plan; will be considered by the agency receiving management responsibility. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 3, 4, 10-12, 14-17, and 19-20.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(WL-5.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Nominate these areas for consideration as ACEC and if accepted, prepare a management plan. Make the agencies receiving management responsibility aware of the resources involved and of the management restriction to insure consideration in their management goals.

Lands to be retained in BLM ownership for interim management, be managed to insure the preservation of unique qualities for which they were nominated.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Review these sites to insure they meet the criteria established in the ACEC Policy and Procedures Guidelines: Federal Register August 27, 1980.

Some of these sites may not be significant enough to warrant nomination as ACEC.

Table No. 10 Possible ACEC

County	Inventory Control No.	Acres	Critical Components
Cass	015 not carried thru	40	Riparian Zone - Marsh
	016	40	Riparian Zone - Lake
Cook	003 not carried thru	80	Pigeon River Watershed
Crow Wing	041	40	Riparian Zone - Little Pine Lake
Hubbard	002 not carried thru	40	Riparian Zone - Small Lake
	033 not carried thru	120	Riparian Zone - Kabekona River
	043 not carried thru	40	Riparian Zone - Hennepin Creek
Itasca	002	40	Riparian Zone - and Unique Bog Plants
	038	40	Riparian Zone - and Unique Bog Plants
	078	40	Unique Collection of Bog Orchids
	081	40	Unique Collection of Bog Orchids
Koochiching	Several	Undetermined	Unique Bog Orchids - Approximatel 30,000 Acres Have Been Nominated For a National Natural Landmark Because of the Unique Mix of Bog Plant Communities and Timber Types.
Lake of the Woods	011	6	Riparian Zone - Lake of the Woods
(NW Angle)	016-026	4683	All Public Domain Land on the Northwest Angle Has Been Nominated as ACEC by the County Because of Their Lack of Development and the Presence of Native Grasses and Unique Plants-Orchids
Ottertail	076 not carried thru	40	Riparian Zone - Fish Lake
Roseau	040	40	Bog Orchids
St. Louis	023	40	Riparian Zone - Birch River.
	307	17	Riparian Zone - St. Louis River
	308	21	Riparian Zone - Muckwa Lake

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Wildlife Management
Objective Number	WL-6

Objective: Reduction of BLM's Surface Management Role

Through relinquishment of all or a portion of BLM's surface management responsibility to another agency, lower management cost will be achieved and in some areas, a higher level of management will be possible.

Rationale:

The ESO Policy and Program Study report dated April 1, 1980, recommends that every effort be made to transfer surface management responsibility to other public agencies. The report recommends this be accomplished through transfer of ownership under authority of several acts or cooperative management of the resource through a cooperative agreement. The emphasis for this recommendation appears to be reduced costs of management.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Wildlife Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation

WL-6.1 - Reduction of BLM's Management Responsibility

Transfer all or a portion of BLM's wildlife management responsibility to agencies having the capabilities and desire to provide a higher level of management.

Rationale

The BLM, because of location, is unable to provide certain components of management required by the wildlife community. Several agencies are actively involved in the management of wildlife resources in close proximity to public lands and can provide a more intensive level of management at a much reduced cost.

The relinquishment of all management responsibility through transfer or the dual management of the resource through a cooperative agreement, will provide greater benefits to the wildlife community at reduced costs to the public.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See MFP II Multiple-Use Recommendation chart.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1-17, 19 and 20.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 1-17, 19 and 20.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Cultural Resource Mgmt.
Objective Number	C-1

Objective:

Preserve and protect the cultural resources on uninventoried BLM lands for future use.

Rationale:

BLM is mandated by various laws and executive orders (i.e. Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Antiquities Act) to preserve and manage cultural resource values.

It is the policy of the BLM to manage and protect the cultural resources under its jurisdiction or control so as to avoid inadvertent lease or destruction of these values.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Cultural Resource Mgmt.

Overlay Reference
Step 1 CR Step 3

Recommendation

C-1.1
Conduct a Class III cultural inventory on the following lands to identify cultural values of the sites.

Aitkin	005
Big Stone	007
Cook	003, 005-011
Itasca	001, 027
Koochiching	002-011, 024, 035, 036 & 039
Lake of the Woods	013-026
Ottertail	081
St. Louis	131, 132, 135, 136
Wadena	014

Support Needs: Contracting.

Rationale

These lands are specifically recommended for further cultural inventory in the Class I report, "A Cultural Resource Overview of the State of Minnesota" and the Class III report, "Archaeological Investigation of Islands and Uplands for BLM in State of Minnesota".

BLM inventory reports and Itasca County input.

Further inventory would clear the status and add to the cultural knowledge of the state.

Cultural inventory could clear sites for other resource uses.

Multiple-Use Analysis

A Class III inventory need not be conducted on lands proposed to other federal agencies prior to transfer; the recipient agency will be informed of the archaeological potential. A Class III cultural inventory will be conducted on any of the above listed lands prior to transfer or development. Those lands listed above that remain under BLM jurisdiction will be inventoried as the need or opportunity to include in other required inventories arises.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Transfer the above listed lands to other federal agencies without Class III cultura-inventories. Conduct Class III inventories on above listed lands prior to transfer to non-federal agencies. Conduct Class III inventories on above listed lands remaining under BLM jurisdiction prior to development or as the opportunity arises to include with other inventories.

Reason

These lands have a potential for archaeological values that require further study and protection.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Cultural Resource Mgmt.
Overlay Reference
Step 1 CR Step 3

(C-1.1 Continued)

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation II as written.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP) Minnesota
Activity Cultural Resource Mgmt.
Overlay Reference
Step 1 CR Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
C-1.2 Cooperate with other agencies (federal and state) to have BLM lands included in cultural inventories conducted on nearby lands. Excluding previously inventoried sites (see MFP I Recommendation Chart). Support needs: Contracting and lands.	Further inventory would clear the status and add to the cultural knowledge of the state. Cultural inventory could clear sites for other resource uses.

Multiple-Use Analysis

These lands were not considered to have high potential for cultural resources and are recommended for wildlife, visual and recreation uses. Such uses are not necessarily destructive to cultural resources, therefore, cultural features would probably stay in tact. Standard BLM procedure requires cultural inventory on any lands that have specific projects planned for them. If adjacent landowners are conducting cultural inventory, we could enter a cooperative agreement with them to inventory our lands as well. This would be on a case by case basis.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Cooperate with other agencies (federal and state) to have BLM lands included in cultural inventories conducted on nearby lands. Excluding previously inventoried sites (see MFP I Recommendation Chart).	See Group Recommendation # 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation II as written.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed
(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Cultural Resource Mgmt.
Objective Number	C-2

Objective:

Implement appropriate actions to transfer, prepare cooperative agreements or lease known cultural resource sites on BLM lands.

Rationale:

Transfer, cooperative agreements or leases could potentially provide more intensive management of cultural resources.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Cultural Resource Mgmt.
Overlay Reference
Step 1 CR Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
C-2.1 Conduct a cultural resource evaluation on all known cultural sites to determine significance and eligibility for designation on the National Register of Historic Sites.	Determination of significance of the site is necessary to determine the appropriate cultural resource management measures to take.
Blue Earth 001 Big Stone 001, 002, 003 Hennepin 005 Jackson 004 Lyon 001 Ottertail 011, 086	Designated National Historic Sites on federal lands must be managed consistent with the various federal laws.

Support Needs: Contracting.

Multiple-Use Analysis

These known sites may or may not be of significance. This determination requires a Class III inventory. The Historic Preservation Act requires significant sites be preserved.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Proceed with transfer of lands with known archaeological sites to other federal agencies after informing receiving agency of the site. Conduct cultural resource evaluations on all sites prior to transfer from federal ownership. Proceed with cultural resource evaluations on all known sites remaining under BLM jurisdiction.	Federal law requires that significant sites be preserved.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation II as written.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Cultural Resource Mgmt.

Overlay Reference
Step 1 CR Step 3

Recommendation

C-2.2
Transfer to or implement cooperative agreements and leases with other agencies to manage cultural resource sites.

State Historical Society

Blue Earth	001
Jackson	004
Ottertail	086

University of Minnesota

Hennepin	005

Support Needs: Lands.

Rationale

Transfer of surface management is desirable to these instances to improve managability. Other agencies are generally closer and better equipped to protect and manage the cultural resources on these sites.

Multiple-Use Analysis

To date, the above listed organizations have expressed no interest in managing these sites. Should a responsible agency or organization express such interest, a cooperative agreement or R&PP lease/transfer can be developed under Multiple-Use Recommendation # 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Drop C-2.2 from further consideration.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Drop C-2.2 from further consideration.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Recreation Management
Objective Number	R-1

Objective:

Recommend transfer of all BLM lands with recreational value to appropriate federal, state, and local recreation agencies or organizations capable of management and protection of these values.

Rationale:

Various federal, state and local recreation agencies have expressed interest in transfer of the lands, especially within existing units.

Transfer of lands to local agencies with existing recreation areas is a logical step considering the proximity of the BLM lands to the units and availability of on-site management.

Intensive management of the resource is becoming increasingly necessary to prevent undue degradation by over use. Transfer of lands to local managing agencies make intensive management more feasible.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-1.1 Transfer all BLM lands within the proposed Upper Mississippi Wild and Scenic River to the National Park Service or the recommended managing agency (If W & S River is designated) or develop a cooperative agreement with the Mississippi Headwaters Board.	The tracts lie with identified units of the Upper Mississippi Wild and Scenic Rivers as proposed for designation by the National Park Service. Transfer to the river managing agency is an obvious recommendation to avoid duplication and/or conflicts in management. The tracts will provide recreational sites along the river units. Transfer of the units is consistent with the BLM-ESO roles and goals study.

Wild and Scenic iver Unit	County	BLM No.
Heritage	Aitkin	30
Crow Wing	Crow Wing	3, 4, 5, 6
Ripley	Crow Wing	7, 10
	Morrison	26-38
Islands	Benton	1-4
	Morrison	54-71, 73, 74, 75

Support Needs. Lands and Realty

e: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

(R-1.1 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 16.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 16.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 16.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota

Activity Recreation Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-1.2 Transfer all upland lots on lakes and rivers to the state DNR for use in their access program. (The feasibility of each site for access must be evaluated on a site by site basis; some may be more appropriate for land exchange or another use).	Transfer will provide lands for the DNR to utilize for its public access program. Transfer will partially fulfill the disposal mandated of the roles and goals study of the BLM-ESO. Transfer will make intensive management more feasible due to the closer proximity of state DNR offices to the resource. Transfer may provide additional public accesses that would not be available under BLM management.

County	BLM No.
Aitkin	16, 18, 23, 30
Brown	3
Carlton	12
Cass	13, 14, 28, 30, 36, 42, 44
Clay	4
Crow Wing	1, 2, 41, 50
Grant	3
Hubbard	1, 2, 9, 27, 32, 33, 41
Isanti	1
Itasca	13-21, 24-30, 32, 38, 45, 71
Kittson	2

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

R-1.2 Continued

County	BLM No.
Koochiching	12, 18, 31, 32, 37
Lake of the Woods	11, 13, 16-26
Murray	1, 2, 3
Nicollet	3
Ottertail	19, 50, 76, 78, 82, 83, 85
Pine	8
Polk	9
Pope	7
Red Lake	2, 3, 4
Redwood	1
Renville	9
St. Louis	65, 112, 209, 210, 213, 214, 215, 217, 274, 307
Swift	1
Todd	2
Wabasha	1
Wilkins	7, 8
Wright	14, 23

Support Needs. Realty, lands

(R-1.2 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 6, 7, 17, 19.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 6, 7, 17, 19.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 6, 7, 17, 19.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-1.3 Transfer all of the following islands and uplands to the Minnesota DNR for management as part of their existing state park, wild and scenic river and boating and canoeing river programs.	These islands and uplands were identified by the Minnesota DNR as tracts they would be interested in having transferred to them. The tracts lie within or adjacent to the established DNR units and have been identified by BLM for potential transfer. The DNR is better capable by their presence near the resource to intensively manage it. Disposal would fulfill the mandate by roles and goals BLM-ESO study.

DNR Unit	County	BLM No.
Bear Head Lake S.P.	St. Louis	35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 52, 53, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64
Itasca S.P.	Becker	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 80
	Clearwater	1
Jay Cooke S.P.	Carlton	7, 8, 9, 10, 11
Maplewood S.P.	Ottertail	85
Monson Lake S.P.	Swift	1
Sibley S.P.	Kandiyohi	19
Tower Soudan S.P.	St. Louis	102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109
William O'Brian S.P.	Washington	4 (Being transferred to St. Croix Wild and Scenic River)

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

R-1.3 Continued

DNR Unit	County	BLM No.
Cloquet B & C River	St. Louis	12, 13, 148, 149
Crow Wing B & C River	Cass	5, 6
	Todd	9, 10, 11
Minnesota W & S River	Chippewa	1, 3, 4
	Renville	2
	Yellow Medicine	1, 2
Mississippi B & C River	Anoka	2, 3
	Benton	5
	Dakota	1, 2, 4, 5, 6
	Goodhue	1, 2
	Hennepin	1, 2
	Itasca	24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33
	Morrison	75
	Ramsey	1, 2, 4
Red B & C River	Pennington	1
	Red Lake	1, 2, 3, 5, 7
St. Croix W & S River	Washington	1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 19
St. Louis B & C River	St. Louis	144, 216

Support Needs. Lands and Realty

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(R-1.3 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 4, 12, 13.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 4, 12, 13.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 4, 12, 13.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation

R-1.4
Transfer the following islands to the Minnesota DNR for management as part of the existing state parks, boating and canoeing and wild and scenic rivers programs.

Rationale

The tracts lie within or adjacent to the existing DNR management units (state parks, wild and scenic or boating and canoeing rivers).

Disposal of these lands to the state DNR Would be consistent with the disposal mandate of the roles and goals study of BLM-ESO.

Disposal will provide for recreation management capabilities in closer proximity than present.

DNR Unit	County	BLM No.
Savanna Portage S.P.	Aitkin	24, 25, 26
,ay Cooke S.P.	Carlton	5, 6
Crow Wing St. P.	Cass	3, 58
Scenic S.P.	Itasca	79
Grand Mound S.P.	Koochiching	24, 25, 26
Split Rock Lighthouse S.P.	Lake	4, 5
Crow Wing S.P.	Morrison	21, 23, 24, 26
Lindbergh S.P. & Wildlife Refuge	Morrison	77
Maplewood S.P.	Ottertail	49, 86
Fort Snelling State Historical Park	Ramsey	4
Upper Sioux Agency S.P.	Renville	1, 2, 3

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

R-1.4 Continued

DNR Unit	County	BLM No.
Red Lake (B & C) River	Red Lake	4, 6, 8
Minnesota (W & S, B & C) River	Redwood	1, 2, 3
Minnesota (W & S, B & C) River	Renville	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9
Cloquet (B & C) River	St. Louis	8, 9, 10, 14-22, 29, 30, 31, 112, 145, 146, 147
St. Louis (B & C) River	St. Louis	172-176, 184, 185, 213, 214, 215, 307
Mississippi (W & S) River	Sherburne	1, 2, 6, 8-20, 23, 24, 25
Mississippi (W & S) River	Stearns	1-10, 20-23
Crow Wing (B & C) River	Todd	5, 6, 7, 8, 13
Crow Wing (B & C) River	Wadena	1-13
Mississippi (W & S) River	Wright	1-13

Support Needs. Lands and Realty, Surveying

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 4, 12, 13.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

R-1.4 Continued

DNR Unit	County	BLM No.
Sakatah Lake S.P.	Rice	3
Bear Head Lake S.P.	St. Louis	39, 40
Tower Soudan S.P.	St. Louis	100, 101, 106
Murphy-Hanrahan S.P. Reserve	Scott	1, 2, 6, 7
Monson Lake State Memorial Park	Swift	1
Kettle (W & S) River	Carlton	3, 4
Rum (W & S) River	Isanti	1
Kettle (W & S) River	Pine	1, 2, 3
Mississippi (B & C) River	Benton	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9
St. Louis (B & C) River	Carlton	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26
Crow Wing (B & C) River	Cass	3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58
Mississippi (B & C) River	Itasca	22, 28
Little Fork (B & C) River	Koochiching	12, 13, 14, 15
Big Fork (B & C) River	Koochiching	18-26, 30-32
Mississippi (B & C) River	Morrison	8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26-74, 76, 77
Minnesota (B & C) River	Nicollet	3

Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

(R-1.4 Continued)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 4, 12, 13.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 4, 12, 13.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation

R-1.5
Transfer all of the following lands to appropriate county/regional park which surrounds or is adjacent to the units as listed below:

Rationale

The tracts lie within or adjacent to existing established parks and recreation sites.

The proximity to existing management units allows for intensive management of the BLM tracts by the managing agencies.

Interest in transfer of these tracts have been identified by the counties and regional parks.

Disposal would be in compliance with Eastern States transfer policy.

Park	County	BLM No.
Coon Rapids Dam Req. Park	Anoka	3
Chain of Lakes-Rice Creek Req. Park	Anoka	4-9
Lions Park	Benton	8
Daly Co. Park	Blue Earth	1
Hyland Lake Park Reserve	Hennepin	5
Loon Lake Co. Park	Jackson	2
Pigs Eye Lake Req. Park	Ramsey	1, 2
Hidden Falls Req. Park	Ramsey	4
Chisholm City Park	St. Louis	246, 247
Cottingham Co. Park	Wadena	6
McGivern Park	Wadena	8

Support Needs. Realty and lands, surveying

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Recreation Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

(R-1.5 Continued)

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 3, 5, 13, 17.

- -

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 3, 5, 13, 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 3, 5, 13, 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-1.6 Transfer ten islands in Black Bay to Voyageurs National Park for management as part of the National Park.	The islands lie in Black Bay adjacent to Voyageurs National Park. The National Park can provide intensive recreation management on the islands. Transfer is consistent with the roles and goals study of BLM-ESO.

Island Units	BLM No.
Koochiching	2-11

Support Needs. Realty and lands

Multiple-Use Analysis

These islands lie adjacent to Voyageur's National Park in Black Bay. Negotiations between the State of Minnesota and Voyageur's National Park resulted in deleting all of Black Bay from the park. The state has requested these islands as part of a proposed Wildlife Management area in Black Bay. The National Park Service has no interest in managing these islands.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reason
Drop Recommendation R-1.6.	See Recommendation # 11.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Drop Recommendation R-1.6.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Recreation Management
Objective Number	R-2

Objective:

Provide undeveloped recreation sites for day use and occasional overnight camping.

Rationale:

Public input has expressed the concern that the lands remain in public ownership and natural condition open to public recreation.

Accessable public land is needed to meet the high demand for places to camp, picnic and enjoy other recreation activities in a natural setting. These lands are often the only public lands available in the vicinity, especially in southern and western Minnesota.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-2.1 Identify and sign all BLM public lands on Lake of the Woods as available for recreation: include location map at all access points and printed flyers, etc. See Table No. R-1.	These lands could provide excellent recreation sites for day use and occasional overnight camping as well as emergency landing sites. Providing recreation sites are an obvious product of recreation management. The three (3) islands are some of the few pubicly-owned islands that would be available for public use.

Support Needs. Signing.

Multiple-Use Analysis

BLM has no authority to place location maps at access points not under BLM jurisdiction. The distribution of printed flyers is not a land use function; this is a public information service and should not be considered in this document.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 18.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 18.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Recreation Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-2.2 Identify and sign all (BLM) public islands and waterfront upland lots as open for recreation use, include location maps at access points on major use lakes, e.g. Vermillion Lake, Lake Minnetonka, Pelican Lake, etc.	The islands and uplands provide suitable recreation sites for day use and occasional overnight use. Many of these sites are the only public ownership on the lakes and rivers other than the developed access points.

Support Needs. Signing.

Multiple-Use Analysis

BLM has no authority to place location maps at access points not under BLM jurisdiction.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 18.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 18.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-2.3 Remove all structures and private signs from BLM public lands and sign them as public lands open for recreation. See Table Recreation MFP-1: Recommendations.	The presence of structures and signs give the appearance of private ownership and deny the public of recreational use of the land.

Support Needs. Sign, lands and realty.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 9 (Trespass) and # 18 (Signing).

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 9 (Trespass) and # 18 (Signing).

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 9 (Trespass) and # 18 (Signing).

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-2.4 Design and construct permanent campsite/picnic sites on islands in high use lakes. Monitor and maintain thorough cooperative agreement with counties. See Table Recreation MFP-1: Recommendations.	These sites are known to receive frequent recreation use and are often the only available public land on the lake aside from access points. The frequent use often degrades much of the island. Permanent facilities could help minimize degradation by establishing use areas.

Support Needs. Recreation facility design, lands, construction maintenance.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Construction of permanent facilities is not a feasible recommendation for BLM management due to the BLM ownership pattern. Heavily used/degradated sites are unmanageable from the BLM standpoint, unless it is through cooperative agreements. Cooperative agreements are covered by Group Recommendation # 17. Under cooperative agreements the cooperating agency or BLM may develop specific sites to be maintained by the cooperating agency. This would be handled on a case by case basis. The environmental impacts would be discussed at the time of the proposal.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Drop Recommendation R-2.4 above.	Refer to Recommendation # 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Recreation Management
Objective Number	R-3

Objective:

Maintain public ownership of the lands for public recreation use.

Rationale:

Public input has expressed the concern that the lands remain in public ownership and natural condition open to public recreation.

These lands are often the only public lands available in the lakes, especially in southern and western Minnesota. Retention in public ownership provides recreation opportunities not otherwise available when all lands are privately owned.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Recreation Management

Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-3.1 Sign all BLM lands to identify them as public lands open for recreation use.	Public comments have expressed desire for these lands to remain in public ownership. Public ownership provides recreation opportunities not available on privately owned lands. Signing is needed to deter trespass use, private claims and notify public of the resource availability.

Support Needs. Signs and installation.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 18.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 18.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 18.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-3.2 Remove all structures and private signs from BLM public lands and sign them as public lands open for recreation. See Table Recreation MFP-1: Recommendations.	The presence of structures and signs give the appearance of private ownership and deny the public of recreational use of the land.

Support Needs. Sign, lands and realty.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 9, 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 9, 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 9, 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Recreation Management
Objective Number	R-4

Objective:

Maintain the lands in a natural condition.

Rationale:

Public input has expressed the concern that the lands remain in public ownership and natural condition open to public recreation.

The general small size and access limitation created by water restricts development of recreation facilities.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-4.1 On lakes where there is no public ownership, establish cooperative agreements with private landowners to maintain the islands in a natural condition as open space and for sight seeing from adjacent lands and roads. The islands should be identified or signed as public lands.	BLM is not in a position to develop access to these lands. The natural lands have value for non-consumptive use for sight seeing and landscape diversity. Held in a natural condition, the lands retain their recreational value for the future when shoreline conditions and public access may change.

Support Needs. Lands.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota
Activity
Recreation Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 R-M Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
R-4.2 Develop cooperative agreements with reimbursements to counties to monitor conditions and use on public lands to preserve the natural condition.	BLM at present is not in a position to monitor the uses on the lands to preserve the natural conditions.

Support Needs. Lands.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Recommendation # 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Visual Resources
Objective Number	VRM-1

Objective:

The overall objective is to maintain the present visual resource value of the natural BLM islands and uplands or enhance (through rehabilitation via natural processes or manual) culturally modified sites to an equal VRM class as lands in the region in which it is located.

The subsidiary objective is to determine who can best manage the lands to meet the overall objective.

Rationale:

BLM Manual Section 1602 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, point out the importance of visual resource consideration in land use decisions made to prevent environmental degradation ...that sociological and psychological values are as important as economic factors and resource management principles...that public values will not only be protected for the present, but for future generations as well.

The public has expressed concern for retaining the BLM lands, especially islands, in their present state.

Management required to maintain the present character must be increasingly intensified to prevent degradation of the visual resource as recreation pressure and unauthorized uses put greater demand on the lands. (It has been assumed that transfer, R&PP leasing, or cooperative agreements will improve the monitoring and control over the visual resources as opposed to the present custodial management).

Current unauthorized uses have degradated the visual resources.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Visual Resources

Overlay Reference
Step 1 VRM Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
VRM-1.1 Protect the present visual resource of all natural BLM lands in each VRM class from development beyond acceptable contrast levels. Support Needs. Monitoring and use control. Enforcement capabilities.	The high visual sensitivity and foreground - middleground distance zone of most BLM lands couples with the small size, especially for islands and general lack of topographic features, limits the acceptable types of developments. The public has expressed a wish to keep the lands in a natural condition open to recreation uses.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Visual resource management is compatible with most recommendations and proposed transfers will not have an adverse impact on visual quality. Most proposed transfers are to agencies concerned with visual resource management; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that they would place waterfowl production over visual management in some instances, this aspect is covered in Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #3. Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17 and the MFP Matrix identifying specific tracts having important visual resources values that should be protected in management and transfers.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reason
Review R&PP applications to see that visual resources values identified are protected. Review withdrawal applications by other federal agencies to see if critical visual resource values are endangered and inform receiving agency of these values. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.	Development and use plans for R&PP applications can be used to protect visual resources. Identification of known resources to receiving agencies will aid in their management program.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*	Minnesota
Activity	Visual Resource
Overlay Reference	Step 1 VRM Step 3

(VRM-1.1 Continued)

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation II as written; accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 17.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Visual Resources
Overlay Reference
Step 1 VRM Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
VRM-1.2 Remove all cabins, docks, bridges, hunting shacks, causeways and trailers from all BLM lands. (See Lands Table No. 14, URA Step 3). Support Needs. Realty, contracting, fire protection.	The location of these structures create high visual contrast on the small islands and tracts. They also give the appearance of private ownership. They are visible from lakeshores, roads and water surfaces. Removal of the structures will upgrade the visual resource to equal the VRM class for the region.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Recommendation # 9.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

See Recommendation # 9.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

See Recommendation # 9.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Minnesota

Activity
Visual Resources

Overlay Reference
Step 1 VRM Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
VRM-1.3 Allow agricultural and grazing use to continue on BLM lands. (See Lands Table No. 14, URA Step 3). Support Needs. None required.	Agricultural uses are extensions from existing fields and, therefore, do not create a visual contrast with the existing setting. Grazing use occurs on some islands, but does not have a high impact on the visual quality.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This is not a valid recommendation. The determination that grazing use is compatible with VRM is a VRM responsibility; the recommendation to continue a use that may be illegal is not.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reason
Drop this from further consideration.	See Multiple-Use Analysis.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Drop MFP VRM 1.3 from further consideration.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)* Minnesota
Activity Visual Resources
Overlay Reference
Step 1 VRM Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
VRM-1.4 Transfer, lease or make cooperative agreements with other agencies as shown on Recreation Table No. 9. Support Needs. Realty.	The transfer of BLM lands to other agencies will benefit the visual resources by providing more immediate management capabilities for monitoring and controlling use. Physical presence also makes enforcement easier.

Multiple-Use Analysis

VRM 1.4 is addressed in Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 1 through # 17.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

VRM 1.4 is addressed in Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 1 through # 17.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

VRM 1.4 is addressed in Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 1 through # 17.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600–21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Minnesota

Activity
Range

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
RM-1.1 Offer grazing leases on public lands currently in agriculture and grazing (unauthorized) to produce an estimated 1,120 AUMs on 134 acres and continue current leases on 294 acres. Support Needs: Cadastral survey to determine boundaries on trespasses.	These tracts are currently receiving unauthorized grazing use and are capable of producing the AUM for which the federal government should be receiving payment.

Multiple-Use Analysis

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 7 and 9.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 7 and 9.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 7 and 9.

Note Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP): Minnesota
Activity: Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation	Rationale
RM-1.2 Offer grazing leases on all potential grazing lands where AUM capacity per acre estimates equal or exceed 5 AUMs per acre. Support Needs: Cadastral survey of tracts currently in trespass.	This would utilize approximately 1,707 acres to produce an estimated 8,966 AUMs.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation would require intensive range inventories and management which is in contrast with the ESO Policy and Management Study recommendations. See RM-1.1 for recommendation on those lands currently in agriculture and grazing, both authorized and unauthorized. See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 7 and 9.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

See Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 7 and 9.

Management Framework Plan III

Decision:

Accept Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation Nos. 7 and 9.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed
(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

MINNESOTA MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN II

Multiple-Use Analysis

MFP I Recommendations Dropped

F-3.1	Sale of Peatlands
W-3.1	Public Lands remaining under BLM
WL-3.15	Habitat Improvement-eliminate unauthorized agricultural use
C-2.2	Transfer, lease or cooperative agreement with University of Minnesota or Minnesota Historical Society
R-1.6	Transfer of Black Bay islands to N.P.S.
VRM-1.3	Allow agricultural or grazing use to continue on BLM lands
WL-3.11	Eliminate Conflict (nesting birds-human use) Apparent Color-of-Title on Swift County #004

MINNESOTA MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN II

Multiple-Use Analysis

Recommendations and Decisions Not Covered by the Minnesota Group Recommendations and Decisions

L-1.1	Intensive Use-Industrial
M-1.1	Authority for Disposal of Hardrock Minerals on P.D.
M-2.1	Continuation of Federal Minerals Management Mapping Project in Minnesota
M-2.2	Modification of Procedures for Processing Prospecting Permits and Preference Right Lease Applications
M-2.3	Maintenance of Surface in Federal Ownership on Tracts with Hypothetical Mineral Potential
M-2.4	Maintenance of Surface in Federal Ownership on Tracts with Speculative Mineral Potential
F-3.2	Nomination of ACECs (plants)
F-1.1 (peat)	Peat Inventory on BLM Lands
F-2.1 (peat)	Establish Priorities for Peat Development
W-1.1	Collection of Soils Data From Other Agencies
W-2.1	Protect Vegetation on Severely Eroded Islands
WL-3.3	Nesting Boxes on Islands
WL-4.8	Retain Vegetation
WL-5.1	Nomination of ACECs
C-1.1	Class II Cultural Inventory Prior to Transfer
C-1.2	Cooperative Cultural Inventory
C-2.1	Class III Cultural Inventory
VRM-1.4	Protect VRM Values in Transfer, Lease or Cooperative Agreements

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 1

Voyageur's National Park

Analysis:

The National Park Service requested the transfer of BLM islands 229, 231-244, 254-273 and 278-306, and upland number 230, to be managed as a part of Voyageur's National Park. All are within the boundaries of Voyageur's National Park. This withdrawal is currently being processed by the Eastern States Office. Numbers 269 and 299 have trespasses (cabin) that the Park Service is aware of; the Park Service has agreed to resolve these trespasses. The law establishing the park authorizes land acquisition by the National Park Service.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer the following tracts to the National Park Service for management as a part of Voyageur's National Park: St. Louis County numbers 229, 230-244, 254-273, and 278-306.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II recommendation as written.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 1

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.1	Public Purposes-Voyageur's National Park
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-2.1	Conduct vegetative manipulations to increase prey species of timber wolf
WL-4.6	Retain habitat-Eagle-Osprey

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 2

Lower St. Croix Wild and Scenic River

Analysis:

The National Park Service, the administering agency for the St. Croix Wild and Scenic River System, requested the transfer of BLM islands in Washington County 01-08 and 16-20, Chisago 1, 2, 4, and 5, to be managed as part of the river system. Recreation use by boaters has become an environmental and administrative problem. Currently, a cooperative agreement is in effect. The islands receive heavy recreation use and with transfer, the Park Service will have complete administrative control which is beneficial to the resource values. The withdrawal is currently being processed by the Eastern States Office. Number 04 is in a state park and was requested by the state for transfer.

The National Park Service has the expertise, the physical presence and authority to adequately manage the resources of these islands.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer Washington County tracts 01-08 and 16-20, Chisago 1, 2, 4, and 5 to the National Park Service for management as a part of the Lower St. Croix Wild and Scenic River.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 2

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.2	Public Purposes - Lower St. Croix Wild and Scenic River
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation #3

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Analysis:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has gone on record as supporting the transfer of all of the islands that they had requested to the State of Minnesota to be managed as WMAs. (See attached letter dated September 1, 1981). The state has requested all of these islands as WMAs.

Decision:

Add all of the listed islands in Recommendation #3 to the list to be transferred to the state by R&PP for Wildlife Management Areas, Recommendation # .

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 3

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Analysis:

One hundred forty-six BLM islands are in lakes with Waterfowl Production Areas (WPAs) or Wildlife Refuges or in an adjacent lake which have identified wildlife values and could be managed as part of an existing WPA. The Fish and Wildlife Service originally requested 87 BLM islands. Their second request contained a list of 71 islands. Twelve of these were also requested by local governments (Scott-Hennepin County Park Reserve District, Scott 01-04, 06-07, Hennepin 05 and City of Shakopee, Scott 08-09, 11-13, and are within county or regional parks. We believe these in local parks can best be managed by the local governments, eliminating the problem of dual management. Their further analysis eliminated four more islands (Polk 07 & 08, Pope 07 and Swift 04) from their request and added two (Becker 68 & 69). The Fish and Wildlife Service's latest request includes 144 islands for transfer of management responsibility. They will be managed as WPAs or refuges. On all of these, wildlife is the dominant resource value. Management as WPAs or refuges may eliminate human use completely or during nesting seasons. Most of these are not desirable for human use, therefore, the impact is slight. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will also do some vegetative manipulation in the form of tree removal and burning on some of these islands to promote waterfowl production. This will impact the visual resource values, however, in resolving conflicts between waterfowl production and visual resources we considered the type of vegetation present on the island, the type of lake, open water or vegetated, the shoreline development and distance from public roads, so this impact should be minimal.

Significant resource values associated with these islands are:

Becker 49 & 70-72 have potential heron nesting habitat.

Big Stone 07 has pelican habitat.

Clay 09-13 have potential heron habitat.

Cook 05-19, 21-25 have gull nesting habitat and shorebird habitat.

Douglas 10 has gull habitat.

Ottertail 09-12, 40 & 48 have potential heron habitat.

Pope 02 has a heron rookery.

Pope 03-05 have potential heron habitat.

Swift 05 has potential heron habitat.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Continued:

In addition to the identified values, there are some known and potential archaeological sites on these lands.

The BLM can transfer unsurveyed islands, however, before any investment is made, the BLM claim to the island should be verified. During our meeting with the Fish and Wildlife Service on December 4th, it was agreed that BLM and Fish and Wildlife Service could enter into a cooperative agreement for Fish and Wildlife Service management of the islands. The cooperative agreement would include signing by Fish and Wildlife Service as federal land which will "smoke out" any claimants. The Fish and Wildlife Service will, in the meantime, submit a withdrawal application for the islands.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Prepare a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for management of the following listed islands. Encourage the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to submit an application for withdrawal of these islands for wildlife management purposes in Waterfowl Production Areas and Refuges. Sign these islands as public land.

Refuges:

COUNTY	CONTROL NO.	LAKE OR RIVER
Hennepin	06-07, 09-15	Minnetonka
	16	Mooney
	17	Jubert
	18	Henry
Ramsey	03	White Bear Lake
Scott	05, 10	Prior Lake
	14	Howard Lake
	15	Unnamed
Lake	01-05	Lake Superior
Cook	05-19, 21-25	Lake Superior

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Continued:

WPAs

COUNTY	CONTROL NO.	LAKE OR RIVER
Becker	13 & 14	Hungry Lake
	49, 70-72	Boyer Lake
	68-69	Ida Lake
Bigstone	07	Larson Lake
	06	Benton
	08	Otrey
	01-05	Artichoke
Carver	01	Myers Lake
	02	Patterson Lake
Clay	01	Ness
	02	Tilde
	03	N. Thirteen
	04	Solum
	05-06	Anderson
	07	Overson
	08	Jugenson
	09-10	Christ Olson
	11-12	Moe
	13	Lake Fifteen
Dakota	07	Crystal
	08	Chub
Douglas	09	Red Rock Lake
	10	Wolley
Grant	01	Barrett Lake
Jackson	01-02	Loon
	03	Little Spirit Lake
Kandiyohi	15-16	Ringo Lake

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Continued:

WPAs

McLeod	07-14	Cedar Lake
Meeker	05-11	Cedar Lake
Ottertail	01, 03	Fish Lake
	9-12	Spitzer Lake
	17	Formo Lake
	32-33	Johnson Lake
	34	S. Turtle Lake Slough
	36-37	Little Anna Lake
	39-41	Anna Lake
	48	Unnamed
	74	N. Ten Mile Lake
	90 - 91	Franklin Lake
	92	Chantangue Lake
	95-97	Twelve Lake
	98-99	Grandrud Lake
	100	Helgeson Lake
	101	Haldorson Lake
	102	Gaard Lake
Polk	01	Halvorson Lake
	02	Turtle Lake
	03-04	Maple Lake
Pope	01-02	Johanna Lake
	03	Kittleson Lake
	04-05	Goose Lake
Stearns	15	Island Lake
	16	L. Watab Lake
	17	Long Lake
	18-19	Cedar Lake
Swift	03	Hassel Lake
	05	Oliver Lake
Todd	15	Lily Lake
	16	Juergon
Wabasha	01	Zumbro River

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 3

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Continued:

Management Framework Plan III:

Decison:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

These islands are best suited for wildlife management which WPA or refuge designation can provide. See analysis.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 3

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.3	Public Purposes - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
L-2.4	Public Purposes - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
L-2.9	Public Purposes - Public Access Sites
M-2.4	Maintain surface estate on lands with speculative mineral potential
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-3.1	Habitat Improvement - Waterfowl
WL-3.9	Habitat Improvement - eliminate grazing
WL-3.13	Habitat Improvement - restrict human use
WL-4.1	Habitat Maintenance - maintain vegetation
WL-4.2	Habitat Maintenance - maintain gull nesting sites
WL-4.3	Habitat Maintenance - maintain shorebird nesting sites
WL-4.4	Habitat Maintenance - maintain White Pelican habitat
WL-4.6	Habitat Maintenance - maintain Eagle-Osprey habitat
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - maintain waterfowl nesting
WL-5.1	ACEC Nomination
R-1.5	Transfer to county or regional parks
VRM-1.5	Lake Superior ACECs

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation #4

State Parks

Analysis:

Savanna Portage State Park - Three islands (Aitkin County 24-26) are located in Remote Lake, part of which is in the boundary of Savanna Portage State Park. Numbers 25 and 26 receive recreation use that can be controlled through management as part of the park. They also have potential eagle/osprey nesting habitat and value for visual resource protection.

Itasca State Park - Eight islands (Becker County 02-08 and 80) are located in Hernando DeSoto, Morrison, Twin Island and Hungry Man Lakes and (Clearwater County 01) in Squaw Lake and within the boundaries of Itasca State Park. These islands were under R&PP lease to the state in the past. Recreation use can be controlled through management as part of the park. Islands 02-05 and 08 have potential eagle/osprey nesting habitat.

Jay Cooke State Park - Seven islands (Carlton County 05-11) are located in the St. Louis River within the boundaries of Jay Cooke State Park. They receive very little use because of the rapids surrounding them but are high in scenic value and are viewed from the main park road. The state requested the transfer of numbers 07-11, but 05 and 06 are also in the park. Use and protection of these islands can best be managed by the state.

Crow Wing State Park - Five islands (Cass 03 and 58 and Morrison 21-24) are located in the Crow Wing River adjacent to Crow Wing State Park. They receive some use from boaters and are of aesthetic and scenic value. The state requested transfer for their inclusion into the Boating and Canoeing River Program. Their use and protection can best be managed by the state in either a park or boating and canoeing river.

Bear Head Lake State Park - Seventeen islands (St. Louis 35-43, 52-53 and 59-64) are located in Bear Head, Horseshoe and Eagle's Nest Number 3 Lakes within Bear Head Lake State Park. Island number 37 has habitat suitable for eagle/osprey nesting. These islands receive considerable recreation use. Administration and control of recreation use can best be managed by the state.

Tower-Soudan State Park - Ten islands (St. Louis 100-109) are located in Lake Vermilion within the boundaries of Tower-Soudan State Park. Numbers 102-105 and 107-109 were requested by the state for transfer. However, the other three are within or adjacent to the park. All ten were under an R&PP lease to the state until 1978. All possess aesthetic and natural values for wildlife and recreation. Island 101 has gull habitat potential and islands 103 and 108 have vegetation suitable for eagle/osprey nesting. Administration and control of use of these islands can best be managed by the state.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 4

State Parks

Continued:

Monson Lake State Park - One upland tract (Swift 01) is on Monson Lake in Monson Lake State Park. It was requested by the state for transfer and has natural wildlife and aesthetic values. Administration can best be managed by the state.

Scenic State Park - An island (Itasca 79) is located in Coon Lake within the boundaries of Scenic State Park. Use and protection of this island can best be managed by the state.

Sibley State Park - An island (Kandiyohi 19) is located in Swan Lake within the boundary of Sibley State Park. The island has waterfowl and visual or aesthetic value but receives little use. Use and protection of this island can best be managed by the state.

Maplewood State Park - Two islands (Ottertail 85 and 86) are located in Lake Lida and adjacent to Maplewood State Park. Number 85 has waterfowl and shorebird habitat. Administration of the use of these islands can best be handled by the state. Number 86 has known archaeological values that must be protected.

Most of these tracts are now being managed by the state as part of the park system. This should be continued and, if the state so desires, a Cooperative Agreement developed to grant the state this management authority.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer the following listed islands and uplands to the state to be managed as part of the state park system.

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.	
Aitkin	Remote Lake	24-26	all missing
Becker	Hernando DeSoto Lake	02, 04-05	
	Morrison Lake	03	
	Twin Island Lake	06-08	
	Hungry Man Lake	80	
Clearwater	Squaw Lake	01	
Carlton	St. Louis River	05-11	(06 not requested) 06 missing
Cass	Crow Wing River	03, 58	
Morrison	Crow Wing River	21-24	22 missing

State Parks

Continued:

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.
St. Louis	Bear Head Lake	41-43, 35-38
	Horseshoe Lake	39, 40 - not requested 39-40 not requested
	Eagle's Nest #3	52-53, 59-64
	Vermilion Lake	100-109 - also 98-99 98&99 asked for
Swift	Monson Lake	01
Itasca	Coon Lake	79
Kandiyohi	Swan Lake	19
Ottertail	Lida Lake	85-86 86 on WMA 86 not requested

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

Common sense dictates that these lands be managed as part of the state park system.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 4

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.5	Public Purpose - Minnesota State Parks
L-2.6	Public Purpose - Minnesota State Parks
L-2.9	Public Purpose - Public Access Sites
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all island in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-4.2	Habitat Maintenance - gull nesting sites
WL-4.6	Habitat Maintenance - eagle-osprey habitat
WL-5.1	ACEC
R-1.3	Transfer to State DNR
R-1.4	Transfer to State DNR

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 5a

City of Shakopee

Analysis:

The City of Shakopee has requested transfer of the islands, Scott County 08 and 09 and 11-13 in O'Dowd Lake to the City to be managed as a part of a park presently in the development stage. The City has acquired adjacent shoreline property on both sides of the lake. These islands would make a desirable addition to the park for water-based recreation.

The songbird and aesthetic values identified can be protected by park management, if no development is planned. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also requested these islands, but we believe that transfer to that agency would not solve the problem of dual agency management. If, for some reason, the park is not established or the City no longer needs the islands for the park, a transfer to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be pursued. No adverse environmental impacts are anticipated.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer Scott County islands 08, 09 and 11-13 in O'Dowd Lake to the City of Shakopee by R&PP for management as a portion of the city park.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

These islands were requested by the City of Shakopee, their inclusion in a park will protect the identified resource values and enhance the park.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 5b

Scott-Hennepin County Park Reserve District

Analysis:

The Park Reserve District has requested transfer of islands, Scott County 01 and 02 in Murphy Lake, 06 and 07 in Hanrahan Lake, 03 and 04 in Cleary Lake, to the district to be managed as parts of Murphy-Hanrahan Regional Park and Cleary Lake Park, respectively. The district has also requested transfer of island 05 in Hennepin County for a part of Hyland Lake Regional Park. These islands are used by park visitors and all are within the boundaries of these parks.

These islands have waterfowl and aesthetic value which will be consistent with regional park management, providing no development is proposed on the islands. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also requested these islands. Transfer to that agency will not solve the problem of dual agency management. No adverse environmental impacts are anticipated.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer Scott County islands 01-04 and 06-07 and Hennepin County island 05 by R&PP to the Scott-Hennepin County Park Reserve District for management as portions of their regional parks. Inventory and protection of the archaeological site on Hennepin 05 must be adequately addressed in the R&PP plan.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

Islands were requested and will make good additions to the park. Inclusion in a park will protect the resource values identified and enhance the park as a whole.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 5c

Lake Lura - Daly County Park

Analysis:

Blue Earth County has requested transfer of island 01 in Lake Lura to the county to be managed in conjunction with Daly County Park. The island is nearly connected to the mainland which is a county park. The island is used as park land now. This use would be legalized with transfer, lease or cooperative agreement. Park use is consistent with the resource values identified including a known archaeological site for which a Class III inventory is needed.

Multiple - Use Recommendation:

Transfer Blue Earth County island 01 in Lake Lura to Blue Earth County by R&PP for management as part of Daly County Park. Inventory and protection of the archaeological site must be adequately addressed in the R&PP plan.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

Island 01 was requested and will make a good addition to the park. This use is consistent with resource values identified.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 5d

Lake Elysian-Waseca County Park

Analysis:

Waseca County has requested transfer of the island, Waseca County 01, to be managed as a park. There is developed public access to the lake which is classified for recreational development by the Minnesota DNR.

The wildlife value for songbirds and aesthetic quality identified, could be maintained under use as a public park. No adverse environmental impacts are anticipated in transfer of the land. Impacts of development must be addressed during the development stage.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer Waseca County island 01 to Waseca County for use and development as a county park by a R&PP lease.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

This island was requested by the county for use as a public park; the park would be compatible with the values identified.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 5

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.7	Public Purpose - local government
L-2.8	Public Purpose - local government
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
R-1.5	Transfer to county or regional parks

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 6

Minnesota State Public Access Areas

Analysis:

We have identified twenty BLM tracts (see attached list) that have potential for at least legal access and, in most cases, physical (developed site) access to lakes and rivers. In some cases, there is no developed public access at the present time making these BLM tracts more valuable. Sizes of these tracts range from .1 acre to 40 acres; all have public road access. They receive very little use due to lack of development and publicity. The state is presently evaluating these sites. If the state is not interested in the transfer and development, local government agencies should be contacted and given the opportunity to acquire these tracts for development. If the local government agencies are not interested, these lands should be retained by BLM to provide undeveloped public access to public water.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer the tracts on the following list to the state or local units of government for development as public access sites: (see attached). Manage for undeveloped access by BLM or through cooperative agreement until transfer can be carried out.

anagement Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.	The sites provide needed access to the lakes. This use is consistent with resource values identified.

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.
Becker	Stakke Lake	77
Beltrami	Sandy Lake	07
Cass	Hay Lake	28 (1.25 ac)
	N. Haynes Lake	30 (2.95 ac)
	Lizzard Lake	44 (1.55 ac)
Crow Wing	Pine River	01-02 (2.15 ac & .98 ac)
	L. Pine River	41 (40.0 ac)
	Butterfield Lake	50 (.68 ac)
Grant	Horseshoe Lake	03 (.64 ac)
Hubbard	11th Crow Wing Lake	09 (.15 ac)
	Skunk Lake	27
	Horseshoe Lake	32
	Spider Lake	41
Itasca	Little Rice Lake	28 (14.75 ac)
	Little Moose Lake	45 (.55 ac)
	Sturgeon	71 (.75 ac)
Ottertail	Mason Lake	19 (.95 ac)
	Fish Lake	76 (40.0 ac)
St. Louis	Floodwood Lake	274 (.1 ac)

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 6

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.9	Public Purposes - public access
L-2.10	Public Purposes - group camps
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
R-1.2	Transfer to DNR - public access

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 7

Public Sale

Analysis:

Public sale is not a preferred alternative for tranfer of lands from BLM ownership, particularly islands, due to the overwhelming opposition to transfer of islands from public ownership voiced in the input from special interest groups and government agencies.

Ten surveyed upland tracts are small, have good agricultural potential and may best be utilized for agricultural production. The island in Mud Lake (Washington County No. 21) does not have agricultural potential, but is surrounded by private shoreline owned by one individual who disallows public access to the lake. These tracts have very limited resource management potential due to their small size and access problems. Even though seven are lakeshore lots, it is felt that sale of these tracts will best meet the public interest. Thirty-one parcels were recommended for public sale in L 3.1 of the MFP. Only eight remain recommended for public sale. Nineteen of the 23 dropped from this recommendation have unauthorized use and are included in the MFP II Recommendation # 9, Trespass Resolution. The remaining four were dropped for other resource values, primarily wildlife and public access. Although some of these are wetland or riparian, in whole or in part, and are, therefore, subject to Executive Order 11990, the small sizes of the tracts and the scattered ownership make it difficult to administer leases or control use.

Kittson 02 is in the floodplain of the Red River of the North and is subject to Executive Order 11988, provision to prevent development on this tract will be required in the patent.

Lake of the Woods Tract #12 had high wildlife values identified. These values are a result of the agricultural use; this tract is currently leased for agricultural purposes to an adjoining landowner.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:	Reason:
Offer the attached listed tracts for public sale.	See analysis above.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:	
Offer all of the attached listed tracts for public sale with the exception of Washington County #21. Add Washington County #21 to Multiple-Use and Analysis Recommendation # 17.	Washington County #21 is an island, the only public land on the lake; at some future date, public access may be available. Sale to the individual rewards him for not permitting public access.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 7

COUNTY	CONTROL NO.	LAKE OR RIVER	ACREAGE
Beltrami	05		.09 ac.upland Agric.
Crow Wing	28	Rabbitt Lake	1.81 ac. upland
Hubbard	42		2.73 ac. upland Agric.
Kittson	02	Red River	13.9 ac. upland Agric.
Lake of the Woods	12 (Section 31)		280 ac. upland Agric.
Murray	03	Sarah Lake	0.1 ac. upland Agric.
Wabasha	02,03, 04		0.2 ac. upland Agric.
Washington	21	Mud Lake	4.0 ac. island

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 7

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-3.1	Agriculture development
L-8.8	Land Disposal - Public Sale
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-3.8	Habitat improvement - wildlife food
WL-3.10	Habitat improvement - remove livestock
WL-3.15	Habitat improvement - eliminate agricultural use
R-1.2	Transfer to DNR - public access
RM-1.1	Lease for grazing
RM-1.2	Lease for grazing

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 8

Withdrawal Restoration

Analysis:

More than 20,000 acres of the BLM uplands as well as 16 unsurveyed islands are segregated from operation of the public land laws by various withdrawals. These withdrawals are extremely old and apparently no longer serve any useful purpose. As such, they are needlessly encumbering the public land records. Revocation of these withdrawals is necessary in order to accomplish some of the other recommendations on land disposal.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Seek revocation of Power Site Reserves Nos. 148, 208, and 391 and Executive Order 5003-Rainy Lake Watershed Withdrawal which segregate the following BLM lands from operation of the public land laws.

4/1/05 Ed: Tells me that P.S.R. must be revoked by Congress - Re-evaluated every 50 yrs by FERC in the relicensing process. Not a workload saver BLM - unless FERC says they don't need it

Power Site Reserve No. 148

St. Louis County - 023

Power Site Reserve No. 208

Cook County - 003

Power Site Reserve No. 391

Koochiching County - 018, 030-032

Executive Order 5003-Rainy Lake Watershed

Koochiching County - 002-011, 016, 024-026, 033-044, 050-055, 057, 063

Lake of the Woods County - 003-012

Continued:

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

Revocation will open these tracts to application of public land laws and multiple-use opportunities identified in this MFP.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 8

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-4.1	Withdrawal restoration - power site or watershed
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 9

Trespass

Analysis:

The Lake States Office trespass register shows 58 cases of suspected unauthorized use, occupancy, or title conflict involving BLM islands and uplands in the state. The types of trespass vary from summer homes on islands to cultivated crops on small (less than 1.0 acre) tracts in high value agricultural areas. In some cases, the trespasser may have established a valid claim under the Color of Title Act and in a few instances, applications have been filed with BLM for relief under this Act. Settlement of most of the trespass cases involving unsurveyed islands will require a cadastral survey to officially establish federal ownership of the island.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Subject to valid existing rights, resolve all trespass cases in accordance with BLM trespass policy and procedures. The following list shows the trespass cases and pending color of title applications. Besides the BLM general trespass policy, it is recommended that the Minnesota trespass cases be resolved using the following general guidelines:

A) Cabinsites, boat docks, private claims, etc. - Terminate trespass with subsequent removal of improvements from BLM land.

B) Agriculture - If land is suitable for continued agr. use, ~~agriculture is proper land use~~, collect back rent for trespass use and offer land either for direct sale or lease authorizing ~~continued~~ agricultural production. Otherwise, terminate agricultural use.

The background data for this approach is located in Lands URA IV and MFP I.

In addition, to control the incidence of new trespass on BLM lands, it is recommended that the following actions be taken on lands which have not been identified for immediate transfer:

A) Place BLM ownership signs on islands and upland tracts where trespass is likely to occur.

B) Pursue cooperative agreements or contracts with appropriate county or local government agencies to conduct periodic surveillance checks of these lands in order to detect new trespasses during their early stages when they are easier to resolve.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 9

Trespass

Continued:

Management Framework Plan III :

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.	To clear title and ownership claims on the public lands.

Recommendation #9

COUNTY	CONTROL NO.	TRESPASS TYPE	
Aitkin	07	Occupancy	
Becker	15	Occupancy	
	26	Occupancy	
	79	Occupancy	
Beltrami	09	Agriculture	
Brown	02	Agriculture	
Cottonwood	02	Agriculture	
	03	Agriculture	
Crow Wing	18	Agriculture	
	36	Occupancy	
Grant	03	Agriculture	
Hennepin	08	Occupancy	
Hubbard	04	Occupancy	
	11	Occupancy	
	12	Occupancy	
Itasca	21	Agriculture	
	27	Agriculture	C-1.1
	63	Occupancy	
	71	Occupancy	
	88	Occupancy	
	89	Occupancy	
Kittson	02	Agriculture	RM-1.1
Lake of the Woods	03	Agriculture	
McLeod	07	Agriculture	
	08	Agriculture	
Meeker	10	Agriculture	
Mille Lacs	01	Occupancy	

Recommendation #9

COUNTY	CONTROL NO.	TRESPASS TYPE
Morrison	02	Occupancy
	04	Occupancy
Murray	01	Agriculture
	02	Agriculture
Ottertail	08	Occupancy
Pope	07	Agriculture
Redwood	01	Agriculture
Renville	09	Agriculture
St. Louis	81	Occupancy
	82	Occupancy
	134	Occupancy
	138	Occupancy
	152	Occupancy
	153	Occupancy
	161	Occupancy
	180	Occupancy
	197	Occupancy
	199	Occupancy
	204	Occupancy
	269	Occupancy
	275	Occupancy
	299	Occupancy
	309	Occupancy
Sherburne	09	Occupancy
Swift	04	Occupancy
Todd	02	Agriculture
Wabasha	02	Agriculture
	04	Agriculture
Wilkins	08	Agriculture
Wright	16	Agriculture
	17	Agriculture

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 9

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.10	Public Purposes - group camps
L-5.1	Trespass Resolution -termination
L-5.2	Trespass Resolution - NPS
L-5.3	Trespass Resolution - legalization
L-6.1	Trespass Resolution - Control
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-3.8	Habitat Improvement - wildlife food
WL-3.9	Habitat Improvement - eliminate livestock
R-2.3	Structure Removal
R-3.2	Structure Removal
VRM-1.2	Structure Removal
RM-1.1	Lease for grazing
RM-1.2	Lease for grazing

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 10

State Forests

Analysis:

The state, as a result of our inquiry, has requested nine islands and 14 upland tracts to be transferred to them for management as part of the state forest system. However, there are 14 additional upland tracts which, through the analysis of opportunities, could be managed as parts of state forests. These tracts are within state forest boundaries and have either some commercial timber, recreation value or fisheries value (Itasca 04 and 23).

It may be possible to transfer those with recreation and fisheries value under the R&PP Act. Those with commercial timber will have to be sold to the state since the R&PP Act excludes forest management. The state is not likely to purchase these lands due to a shortage of acquisition funds, the requirement of payment in lieu of taxes by state to counties, the cost of management, and the appearance of a "land grab" by the state. In view of this, a cooperative agreement may be a more feasible alternative. A cooperative agreement for those with recreation and fisheries potential is also a possibility. The possibility of an exchange with the state to consolidate BLM, U.S. Forest Service and state ownership, also exists.

Some significant resource values associated with these sites that should be considered in management practices are:

Carlton County 13 and 27-29 have minerals and peat potential.

Crow Wing 41 has potential for development as a public access site. This tract is also included in MFP II Multiple-Use Recommendation #6.

Hubbard 11 and 12 have unauthorized occupancy that must be resolved.

Hubbard 12 has raptor habitat that merits protection.

Lake of the Woods 16-18 and 22-24 have peat potential.

All Lake of the Woods tracts are habitat for shorebirds, aquatic species, pelicans and wolves. All will be nominated as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).

All Lake of the Woods tracts have a good potential for cultural sites.

St. Louis 154 has peat potential and is a deer wintering yard.

State Forests

Continued:

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer the following islands and upland tracts to state for management as a part of the state forest system. If transfer is not feasible, develop a cooperative agreement with the state to manage identified resources. The transfer or cooperative agreement will provide for management of the following resource values:

Raptor habitat on Hubbard 012.

Habitat for shorebirds, aquatic species, pelicans and wolves on all Lake of the Woods County tracts, as identified in the ACEC Management Plan.

A deer wintering yard on St. Louis County 154.

Development of the public access on Crow Wing 41.

A cultural inventory on all Lake of the Woods County tracts.

Peat values and the environmental impact of harvest on Carlton County 13, 27-29; Lake of the Woods 16-18, 22-24, and St. Louis County 154.

Resolve the unauthorized occupancy on Hubbard number 11-12.

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.
Becker	Two Inlets Lake	01
Carlton	Uplands	13, 27-29
Crow Wing	Little Pine (Upland)	41
Hubbard	West Crooked Lake	10, 13
	East Crooked Lake	11, 12
	Pickerel Lake (Upland)	23
	Mantrap Lake (Upland)	25
Itasca	Upland	09
	Pokegama Lake (Upland)	04, 23
	May	76, 77
	Erskine	86
	Larson	87

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 10

State Forests

Continued:

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.
Lake of the Woods	Uplands	16-26
St. Louis	Island	27
	Upland	154
		248

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

See analysis for reasons.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 10

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.9	Public Purpose - public access
L-8.1	Land Disposal - state forests
M-2.4	Maintain federal surface - speculative minerals
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
F-1.1	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.2	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.3	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.4	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.5	Control of brush for regeneration
F-1.6	Control burn for regeneration
F-1.7	Harvest of firewood
F-1.8	Stand conversion
F-1.9	Access for timber removal
F-3.1	Transfer
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-3.1	Habitat Improvement - tree removal
WL-3.2	Habitat Improvement - nesting platforms
WL-3.5	Habitat Improvement - owl nests
WL-3.6	Habitat Improvement - ten acre cutting blocks
WL-3.7	Habitat Improvement - ten acre cutting blocks
WL-4.1	Habitat Maintenance - maintain vegetation

Recommendation # 10, Contd.

WL-4.2	Habitat Maintenance - maintain gull nesting sites
WL-4.3	Habitat Maintenance - maintain shorebird nesting sites
WL-4.4	Habitat Maintenance - maintain white pelican habitat
WL-4.5	Habitat Improvement - Eagle-osprey sites
WL-4.6	Habitat Maintenance - Eagle-osprey habitat
WL-4.9	Habitat Maintenance - deer wintering yards
WL-4.11	Habitat Maintenance - aquatic habitat
WL-4.12	Habitat Maintenance - aspen-white birch
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
WL-5.1	ACEC nominations

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 11

State Wildlife Management Areas

Analysis:

The islands and upland parcels listed are within or immediately adjacent to established or proposed state wildlife management areas. Our inventories show these lands to have high wildlife habitat potential and they should be managed primarily for wildlife, regardless of ownership. Some were requested by the state for transfer, others are recommended by BLM for transfer to the state due to their close proximity to State WMAs. These lands could be managed by the state as parts of these WMAs. Both FLPMA and the Sikes Act give BLM authority to establish cooperative management agreements with states. This is an alternative to transfer.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer the islands and uplands listed below to the state to be managed as parts of wildlife management areas. If transfer is not possible under the R&PP Act, they should be managed by Cooperative Agreement with the state for wildlife management.

Those with special values are:

Blue Earth 02 - waterfowl habitat
Cass 15 - speculative minerals
Crow Wing 45 - hypothetical minerals and timber wolf habitat
Itasca 05 & 06 - potential eagle-osprey habitat
Jackson 04 - cultural site
Koochiching 01-11 - recommended for cultural inventory
Roseau 14, 15, 39, 41 - speculative minerals
Roseau 40 - sandhill crane
Aitkin 07 and Wright 25 - need trespass resolution

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.
Aitkin	Elm Island	06
	Cedar	07, 08 & 19
Blue Earth	Eagle	02
Cass	Upland	15
	Hardy	49
Crow Wing	Upper Dean	57
	Upland	45

State Wildlife Management Areas

Continued:

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER.	CONTROL NO.
Dakota	Mississippi River	05 & 06
Faribault	Walnut Lake	01
Grant	Ash Lake	08
Hubbard	First Crow Wing Lake	01
Itasca	Little Siseebakwet Lake	05 & 06
	Island Lake	43
	Fawn Lake	44
Jackson	Plum Lake	04
Kanabec	Upland	01
	Fish Lake	02
Kittson	Upland	01
	Upland	03
Koochiching		
	Rainy Lake	02-11
Lake of the Woods	Lake of the Woods	04-12
Lincoln	Hawks Nest Lake	01
	Ash Lake	02
McLeod	Eagle Lake	04-05
	Upland	01
	Whitney Lake	06
Nicollet	Swan Lake	01 & 02
Rice	Sakatah	03

State Wildlife Management Areas

Continued:

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.
Roseau	Lake of the Woods	01-13
	Upland	14-15, 39-41
Swift	Hollerberg Lake	02
Wright	Swan	25

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

The state has the physical presence and well qualified personnel available to manage these lands for wildlife purposes. They have existing plans or are willing to develop plans for the management of these lands.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 11

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-8.2	Land Disposal - state wildlife management areas
L-8.4	Land Disposal - state proposed units
M-2.3	Maintain surface estate in federal ownership
M-2.4	Maintain surface estate in federal ownership
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-1.3	Habitat Expansion - flood waterfowl marsh
WL-2.1	Habitat Expansion - increase prey species of wolf
WL-3.1	Habitat Improvement - waterfowl
WL-3.12	Habitat Improvement - eliminate human use
WL-4.1	Habitat Maintenance - maintain vegetation
WL-4.6	Habitat Maintenance - maintain eagle-osprey habitat
WL-4.11	Habitat Maintenance - aquatic habitats
WL-4.12	Habitat Maintenance - maintain aspen-white birch stands
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
WL-5.1	ACEC nomination

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands - see MFP Chart drawer under topo's in map room

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 12

Minnesota State Wild and Scenic River System

Analysis:

There are 60 BLM islands or uplands in or fronting on state designated wild and scenic rivers. The state has requested only three BLM islands (Anoka 03, Hennepin 01-02) in the Mississippi River and six BLM islands (Chippewa 01, 03-04, Renville 02 and Yellow Medicine 01-02) in the Minnesota River for transfer into their Wild and Scenic River System. In addition, there are 48 more BLM islands (Sherburne 01-02, 06, 08-17, 18-20, 23-25, Stearns 01-10, 20-23, and Wright 01-13, 28-29) in the Mississippi and eight more BLM islands (Redwood 02-03, Renville 01, 03-05, 08-09) in the Minnesota that are within the designated wild and scenic portions. Also, there are three islands in the Kettle (Pine 01-03) and one in the Rum (Isanti 01) Wild and Scenic Rivers. All possess natural and aesthetic values which contribute to the wild and scenic character of these rivers. Most receive considerable recreation use from boaters and canoers enjoying the rivers.

Management consistent with the wild and scenic river management plans is necessary. This can best be accomplished by transfer of all these islands and uplands to the state under the R&PP Act. If transfer cannot be accomplished for all of these lands, a cooperative management agreement should be established to insure that the management of all of these tracts is consistent with the Wild and Scenic designation.

Sherburne County 09 has an unauthorized occupancy to be resolved before transfer can be accomplished.

Stearns County 09 has suitable habitat for herons that requires protection in the transfer or agreement. Until such a transfer or agreement is consummated, BLM should manage these tracts in a manner that compliments the Wild and Scenic designation.

Multiple-Use Recommendations:

Transfer islands or uplands listed to state for management as portions of the state Wild and Scenic River System. Resolve the trespass on Sherburne County 09 and provide for protection of heron habitat on Stearns County 09.

If transfer cannot be accomplished for all of these tracts, a cooperative management agreement should be established to cover all tracts.

Continued:

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Transfer islands or uplands listed to the State DNR for management as portions of the State Wild and Scenic River System. Resolve the trespass on Sherburne County 009 (See Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation # 9).

If the transfer cannot be accomplished for all of these tracts, a cooperative agreement will be established for management of these islands or uplands consistent with the State Wild and Scenic River System Management Plans.

The state has requested transfer of some of these tracts. The others identified by BLM are also located within the sections of the rivers designated as wild and scenic. The BLM position is that all of these islands should be managed as a unit by one agency and that this management conform with or, preferably, compliment the Wild and Scenic designation.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 12

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.
Anoka	Mississippi River	01-02
Chippewa	Minnesota River	01, 03-04
Hennepin	Mississippi River	01, 02
Isanti	Rum River	01
Pine	Kettle River	01-03
Redwood	Minnesota River	02, 03
Renville	Minnesota River	01-05, (08-09) — Not Requested
Sherburne	Mississippi River	01-02, 06, 08-17, 18-20, 23-25 06, 08-10 - Not Req.
Stearns	Mississippi River	01-10, 20-23 01, 09-10, 20-23 Not Req.
Wright	Mississippi River	01-13, 28-29 28-29 Not Req
Yellow Medicine	Minnesota River	01-02

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 12

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-8.3	Land Disposal - state wild and scenic rivers
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-4.1	Habitat Maintenance - maintain vegetation
WL-4.6	Habitat Maintenance - maintain eagle-osprey habitat
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
WL-5.1	ACEC nomination
R-1.3	Transfer to State DNR
R-1.4	Transfer to State DNR

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 13

Minnesota State Boating and Canoeing Rivers

Analysis:

State designated boating and canoeing rivers contain 139 BLM islands. The state has requested 41 BLM islands for transfer to the state. In addition, there are 98 more BLM islands (list attached) that are in the designated rivers. All possess natural and aesthetic values which contribute to the general scenic and natural character of these rivers and enhances the recreational use. The islands in the most heavily used rivers (Mississippi, Kettle and Crow Wing) receive considerable recreation use.

Management, which in this case is not very restrictive, consistent with state management programs is desirable. This can best be accomplished by transfer of these islands to the state under the R&PP Act. However, the state has only shown interest in those they may consider capable of development. Transfer of some islands and a cooperative management agreement for the remainder is an alternative method to manage these islands. Such an arrangement has been discussed with the state DNR.

Itasca 27 has an agriculture trespass to be resolved as well as a potential archaeological site.

Ramsey 01-02 have been requested by the St. Paul Port Authority for mooring sites and by Ramsey County as a regional park.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer the following lands that qualify under the R&PP Act to the state; enter into a cooperative agreement with the state to provide management for the remainder of the lands on these rivers.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Transfer all islands in a given river to the state under the R&PP Act. If this is not feasible, enter into a cooperative agreement for management of all islands in a river. Do not pass title to some islands in a river and retain title to others.

The islands in a river should be owned and managed as a unit. Transferring a few selected islands to the state while retaining title to other islands for management under a cooperative agreement is not desirable because cooperative

Minnesota State Boating and Canoeing Rivers

Continued:

Do not include Ramsey 01 and 02 in this recommendation until a cadastral survey is completed. We have discussed the proposal, conflicts and opportunities for mitigation with the Port Authority.

agreement normally have a clause permitting either party to cancel upon written notice. Should the state experience a shortage of funds or change in policy, BLM could end up managing some islands while the state retained and managed the more desirable islands obtained under the R&PP Act.

The BLM claim to Ramsey 01 and 02 is questionable. A cadastral survey is required to verify BLM ownership.

A decision on the use of these islands should be postponed until we can determine if individual use is compatible with the identified wildlife and recreational values.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 13

COUNTY	LAKE OR RIVER	CONTROL NO.	
Anoka	Mississippi River	03 — S-Hen Co. P.R.D.	
Benton	Mississippi River	01-09	03 Not Req.
Carlton	Kettle River	03-04	
	St. Louis River	16-26	16,17 Not Req.
Cass	Crow Wing River	04-10, 51-57	7,8 Not Req. 57
Dakota	Mississippi River	01-04	
Goodhue	Mississippi River	01-02	
Koochiching	Little Fork River	12-15	
	Big Fork River	18-26, 30-32	19 Not req.
Morrison	Crow Wing River	08-10, 14, 16-18	16-18 Not Req.
Nicollet	Minnesota River	03	
Pennington	Red Lake River	01	01 Not Req.
Ramsey	Mississippi River	01-02, 04	
Red Lake	Red Lake River	01-08	06 Not Req.
St. Louis	Cloquet River	08-10, 12-22, 29-31, 112, 145-149	22, 112 Not R
	St. Louis	144, 172-176, 184-185, 213-216, 277, 307	
Todd	Crow Wing River	05-11, 13	
Wadena	Crow Wing River	01-13	01-13 Not Req.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 13

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-1.1	Intensive Use - industrial
L-8.9	Land Disposal - state boating and canoeing rivers
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-3.15	Habitat Improvement - eliminate agricultural use
WL-4.11	Habitat Maintenance - aquatic habitat
WL-4.12	Habitat Maintenance - maintain aspen-white birch stands
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
R-1.3	Transfer to State DNR
R-1.4	Transfer to State DNR
R-1.5	Transfer to county or regional parks

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 14

Aitkin County

Analysis:

The islands in Aitkin County have wildlife, recreation and natural values, and public ownership of which is beneficial to the public (See MFP Chart). Aitkin County is capable of providing management for these resources. Aitkin County has requested all of these islands and uplands be transferred to them. However, some have been requested by the state or are within State Wildlife Management Areas, state parks or in the Mississippi River, which is currently under study by the Mississippi Headwaters Board and the National Park Service. The county is willing to purchase the upland tracts. Islands 01-05, 09-15, 17, 20-22, 27-29, 31-33, and 35 are recommended for transfer to the county. Tract numbers 34, 36 and 37 are recommended for sale to the county.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer by R&PP, Aitkin County islands numbers 01-05, 09-15, 17, 20-22, 27-29, 31-33 and 35 to Aitkin County to manage for wildlife and visual (aesthetic) resources. Sell to Aitkin County upland tract numbers 34, 36 and 37 for forest and wildlife management.

Specific resource values have been identified on some of these tracts; management practices should protect or enhance these values.

Numbers 15 and 33 have habitat suitable for eagle/osprey nesting. Numbers 12, 17, and 31-32 have habitat suitable for waterfowl. Number 36 has a deer wintering yard. Number 34 is non commercial forest and timber wolf habitat. Number 37 is commercial forest and timber wolf habitat.

If the transfer is not possible, seek cooperative agreement with the county for management.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Transfer by R&PP, Aitkin County island numbers 01-05, 09-15, 17, 20-22, 27-29, 31-33 and 35 to Aitkin County to manage for wildlife and visual (aesthetic) resources. Sell to Aitkin County upland tract numbers 34, 36 and 37 for forest and wildlife management.

Since a patent cannot be restricted, the protection of the deer wintering yard and wolf habitat cannot be stipulated in the sale. Timber cutting will actually benefit the wolf since it will increase deer browse.

See analysis above.

Decision, Continued:

Specific resource values have been identified on some of these tracts; numbers 15 and 33 have habitat suitable for eagle/osprey nesting. Numbers 12, 17, and 31-32 have habitat suitable for waterfowl. Management practices will protect or enhance these values.

If the transfer is not possible, seek cooperative agreement with the county for management.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 14

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-8.5	Land Disposal - county government
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
F-1.1	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.2	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.3	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.4	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.5	Control of brush for regeneration
F-1.6	Control burn for regeneration
F-1.8	Stand conversion
F-1.9	Access for timber removal
F-3.1	Transfer
F-2.1	Prioritize areas for peat sales
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-2.1	Conduct vegetative manipulations to increase prey species of timber wolf
WL-4.9	Habitat Maintenance - deer winter yards
WL-4.11	Habitat Maintenance - aquatic habitat
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
WL-5.1	ACEC nomination

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 15

U.S. Forest Service Exchange

Analysis:

The Supervisor of the Chippewa National Forest proposed an exchange between the Forest Service, state and BLM in that the BLM would transfer all lands to the Forest Service and they would, in turn, seek to exchange these lands for state land within the national forest. This proposal has some potential for lands that the state has interest in. However, since the state has only requested 184 parcels, the Forest Service would be left with the remainder outside the Forest Service boundaries presenting the same scattered land management problem the BLM now faces. The Minnesota DNR has indicated that an exchange program would be a relatively low priority item as far as they are concerned.

The U.S. Forest Service has expressed interest in obtaining state and county land within their boundaries. The BLM could transfer land to the county and the county could transfer specified tracts of their land within the national forest to the Forest Service. The BLM would lose land ownership, but both the counties and the U.S. Forest Service would benefit by consolidating their ownership. Itasca County suggested the exchange involving their lands. We have identified BLM lands intermingled with county lands that appear to have a potential for use in such an exchange.

The following tracts have significant resource values:

Itasca	55	A unique number of nesting songbirds.
	78	Deer wintering area and unique collection of bog orchids
	81	Deer wintering area and a unique number of orchid species (minimum of seven)
	83	A unique number of nesting songbirds - forty species

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 15

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Enter into a three-way exchange in which the following tracts are transferred to the counties with the understanding that the counties will transfer equal value land holdings within the national forests to the U.S. Forest Service:

COUNTY	CONTROL NO.	ACREAGE
Cook	03	80.0
Itasca	07	109.1
	34	40.0
	35	.6
	55	40.0
	65	.3 (Three Island Lake)
	66	1.0 (Three Island Lake)
	78	40.0
	81	40.0
	82	40.0
	83	40.0
	84	360.0
	85	40.0
		151.0
St. Louis	23	40.0
	157	40.0
	158	40.0
	220	40.0
	308	101.2

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

This action will benefit both the counties and the federal government.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 15

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.9	Public Purposes - public access
L-8.6	U.S. Forest Service exchange
M-2.4	Maintain federal surface-speculative minerals
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
F-1.1	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.2	Harvest merchantable forest producgs
F-1.3	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.4	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.5	Control of brush for regeneration
F-1.6	Control burn for regeneration
F-1.8	Stand conversion
F-1.9	Access for timber removal
F-3.1	Transfer
F-2.1	Prioritize areas for peat sales
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-2.1	Habitat Expansion - increase prey species of wolf
WL-3.6	Habitat Improvement - ten acre cutting blocks
WL-4.7	Habitat Maintenance - vegetative mix-non-game birds
WL-4.9	Habitat Maintenance - deer wintering yards
WL-4.12	Habitat Maintenance - aspen-white birch
WL-5.1	ACEC nominations

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 16

Upper Mississippi Wild and Scenic River

Analysis:

The Upper Mississippi River from its source in Clearwater County to St. Cloud, has been studied for inclusion into the federal wild and scenic river system by the National Park Service. A coalition of eight counties (Clearwater, Hubbard, Beltrami, Cass, Itasca, Aitkin, Crow Wing and Morrison) has prepared a study and alternative plan for local administration of the river. This coalition is attempting to get Congressional approval of this plan as an alternative to federal wild and scenic river designation. The NPS is "putting their plan on the shelf" pending the approval or disapproval of the local plan. At this time, it appears that the local plan will be approved.

There are 83 BLM islands or small upland tracts in the river above St. Cloud and 74 of them are within the eight county study area. Aitkin County has requested the four tracts in Aitkin County and the Minnesota DNR has requested ten in Itasca County and one in Morrison County. These islands or tracts range in size from .1 acre to 75 acres and provide natural and aesthetic value to the river's character. They receive moderate recreation use from boaters and canoers and some waterfowl hunting.

Crow Wing 07, 08 and 10, have potential for developed recreation such as primitive campsites.

Itasca 27 has a trespass which needs resolution and an archaeological site which has been recommended for a field inventory.

Itasca 29, 30 and 32 are potential public access sites and have good waterfowl habitat.

Management of these lands should be consistent with whatever plan is finally approved for the river. Transfer or cooperative agreements are possibilities and may depend on what agency or group of counties finally have administration authority.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Maintain BLM ownership and management consistent with the natural character of the river until a management plan has been approved.

If the local plan is accepted, enter into a cooperative agreement for management of the lands listed below until the management capabilities of the coalition of counties has been ascertained. If the NPS is assigned management responsibilities, the lands will be transferred to the Park Service.

If neither plan is accepted, these islands will be considered for transfer to the state to be managed as part of their State Boating and Canoeing Rivers System (See Recommendation #13).

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 16

Upper Mississippi Wild and Scenic River

Continued:

COUNTY	CONTROL NO.	RIVER
Aitkin	16, 18, 23, 30	Mississippi River
Crow Wing	03-10	Mississippi River
Itasca	22, 24-27, 29-33	Mississippi River
Morrison	26-77	Mississippi River

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written for the above described land.

BLM lands in the Mississippi river should be managed as a unit consistent with the management policies for the river.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 16

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-8.9	Land Disposal - state boating and canoeing rivers
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-3.15	Habitat Improvement - eliminate agricultural use
WL-4.11	Habitat Maintenance - aquatic habitat
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
WL-5.1	ACEC Nominations
R-1.1	Transfer or Cooperative Agreement - Upper Mississippi River

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 17

BLM Interim Management

Analysis:

Some of the BLM lands had no transfer or specific cooperative agreement opportunity identified. These lands are recommended for interim management by BLM in accordance with BLM policy for the most significant resource values. The resource values were identified in Unit Resource Analysis Step 4 and the Management Framework Plan Step 1, as shown on the MFP I chart. The attached table displays the resource category under which the specific value occurs; Example: if the MFP I chart shows high value for loon nesting, the attached table will show wildlife marked.

During the planning process the specific transfer opportunities listed below were identified. These were pursued, but failed to materialize.

1. Lake Vermilion - There are 82 BLM islands in Lake Vermilion which we believe should be managed as a group. Since state forest lands surrounds the lake and Tower-Soudan State Park includes some of the islands, the state would be a logical choice for management. The state was approached with this idea, but were not interested except for ten islands (St. Louis 100-109) within the state park. (These are included in the Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and Recommendation #4).

2. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was asked to assume management of Polk 07-08 for wildlife purposes. They declined this land because they were small uplands which lacked access.

Additional or revised responses from agencies will, in all probability, delete some tracts from transfer. Some of the other Multiple Resource Recommendations may fail because the recipient is incapable or unwilling to accept management responsibilities. These lands will be included in this recommendation.

Additional time and effort may disclose opportunities to enter into Cooperative Agreements and develop R&PP applications. These will be examined on a case by case basis to determine if they will provide adequate resource protection and, if they do, the transfer of management responsibility will proceed.

The level of BLM management on the lands included in this recommendation will be that required to protect existing resource values; in most cases, this will be at a surveillance level. If development is necessary or desirable, every effort will be made to accomplish it through Cooperative Agreements or R&PP actions.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 17

BLM Interim Management

Multiple-Use Recommendations:

1. Transfer of these lands will be considered as opportunities arise. These should be analyzed through the EA/EIS process as authorized in 43 CFR 1601.8 b(3) or the MFP amendment.

2. Seek cooperative agreements with recipients who have a closer physical presence to the lands and are capable of managing the resource values present. Agreements should be written to assure the protection of the resource values described in the Management Framework Plan.

3. Until proposed transfer or cooperative agreements are developed, BLM should manage the lands to the extent necessary to protect existing resource values.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

The large number of tracts precludes development of a rigid land use plan. This decision provides BLM the opportunity to develop additional transfers, cooperative agreements and entertain R&PP applications that may improve the quality or reduce the cost of management.

It also provides for BLM management of the lands until such agreements or transfers are developed.

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION TABLE

County	BLM Tract No.	Lands	Min-erals	Forest Product	Peat	Wild-life	ACEC	Cul-tural	Rec. Mgt.	Visual Res. Mgt.
Anoka	04-10									X
Becker	09									X
	10-12					X				X
	15-31					X				X
	32-34					X				
	35-48					X				X
	50					X				
	51-57					X				X
	58-59					X				
	60-67					X				X
	73-76					X				X
	78-79					X				X
	80					X			X	X
ltrami	01					X				
	02					X				
	03					X				X
	04					X				
	06					X				X
	08					X				X
Brown	03	X								
	04					X				
Carlton	01-02					X				X
	12					X				
	14-15					X				X
	30			X		X				
Cass	01-02					X				X
	12					X				X
	13					X				
	14					X				X
	16					X				
	17					X				X
	18-19					X				
	20-21					X				X
	22-24					X				
	25-27					X				X

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 17

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION TABLE

County	BLM Tract No.	Lands	Min-erals	Forest Product	Peat	Wild-life	ACEC	Cul-tural	Rec. Mgt.	Visual Res. Mgt.
Cass	29					X				X
	31-32]					X				X
	35							X		
	36					X				
	37-41					X				X
	42					X			X	X
	43					X				X
	45-48					X				X
	50			X						
Chisago	6-12					X				X
Clearwater	02-03					X				X
ok	01-02					X				X
	04					X				X
	20					X				X
Cottonwood	01					X				X
Crow Wing	11-16					X				X
	17					X				
	19-27					X				X
	29-35					X				X
	36									X
	37-40					X				X
	42-44					X				X
	46-48					X				X
	49									X
	51-56					X				X
Douglas	01					X	X			X
	02-04					X				
	05-07					X				X
	08									X
	11-17					X				X
	18					X				
aribault	02					X				X

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 17

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION TABLE

County	BLM Tract No.	Lands	Min-erals	Forest Product	Peat	Wild-life	ACEC	Cul-tural	Rec. Mgt.	Visual Res. Mgt.
Grant	02					X	X			
	04-06					X				X
	07					X				
Hennepin	08	X				X		X		
Hubbard	02					X	X			
	03-07									X
	08					X				
	14-22					X				X
	24					X				X
	26					X	X			X
	28-31					X				X
	33-36					X				
	37-40					X				X
	43					X				
	44					X				X
	45					X	X			X
Isanti	02							X		
Itasca	01							X		X
	02			X						X
	03							X		X
	08									X
	10-12					X				X
	13-21					X			X	
	23					X				X
	36-37					X				X
	38			X						
	39-42					X				X
	46	X								
	47-54					X				X
	56-64					X				X
	67-70					X				X
	72-75					X				X
	80					X				X
	88-92					X				X

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION TABLE

County	BLM Tract No.	Lands	Min-erals	Forest Product	Peat	Wild-life	ACEC	Cul-tural	Rec. Mgt.	Visual Res. Mgt.
Lake	06					X				X
Lake of the Woods	13-15							X	X	
LeSueur	02-04					X				X
Lyon	01					X		X		
Martin	01					X				X
McLeod	02-03					X				X
Meeker	01-03					X				X
	04					X				
	12					X				X
	13					X				
	14-15					X				X
Mille Lacs	01			X		X				
Morrison	01			X		X				
	03					X				X
Norman	01-02					X				X
Ottertail	02					X				
	04-08					X				X
	13-16					X				X
	17					X				
	20-21					X				X
	22					X	X			X
	23-29					X				X
	30					X				
	31					X				X
	35					X				X
	38					X				X
	42-47					X				X
	49-50					X				

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION TABLE

County	BLM Tract No.	Lands	Min-erals	Forest Product	Peat	Wild-life	ACEC	Cul-tural	Rec. Mgt.	Visual Res. Mgt.
Ottertail	51-67					X				X
	68-69					X				
	70					X				X
	71					X				
	72-73					X				X
	75					X				
	77					X				X
	78									X
	79					X				
	80					X				X
	81					X	X			X
	82-84					X				X
	87-89					X				X
	93-94					X				X
	103					X				X
Pine	05-10					X				X
	11			X						
Polk	05					X				X
	06					X				X
	07-08					X				
	09					X				X
Pope	06					X				X
	08					X				
	09					X				X
Rice	01					X				X
	02					X				X
	04					X				X
St. Louis	01-07					X				X
	11					X				X
	24-28					X				X
	32			X		X				
	33					X				
	45					X	X			X
	46-50					X				X

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 17

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION TABLE

County	BLM Tract No.	Lands	Min-erals	Forest Product	Peat	Wild-life	ACEC	Cul-tural	Rec. Mgt.	Visual Res. Mgt.
St. Louis	51					X	X			X
	54-58					X				X
	65								X	
	66-70					X				X
	71-72			X		X				
	73-80					X				X
	83					X				X
	85					X				X
	86-87					X				X
	89-99					X				X
	110					X				X
	111									
	113								X	
	114-118					X				X
	119			X		X				
	120-130					X				X
	131-132					X		X		X
	133-134					X				X
	135-136					X		X		X
	137-143					X				X
	150-153					X				X
	154			X		X				X
	155-156					X				X
	159-171					X				X
	177-180					X				X
	181-182			X		X				
	183					X				X
	186-188					X				X
	189-200					X				X
	202-208					X				X
	209-210								X	
	211-212					X			X	X
	217-218					X				X
	219			X		X				
	221-228					X				X
	245					X				
	246-247					X			X	X
	249-253					X				X

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 17

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION TABLE

County	BLM Tract No.	Lands	Min-erals	Forest Product	Peat	Wild-life	ACEC	Cul-tural	Rec. Mgt.	Visual Res. Mgt.
St. Louis	274					X			X	X
	276					X				X
	309					X				X
	311			X		X				
Sherburne	26					X				X
Sibley	01					X	X			X
Stearns	11-14					X				X
Todd	01					X				X
	02					X			X	
	03-04					X				X
Wadena	14					X		X	X	
Watonwan	01					X				X
Wilkin	01-04					X				X
	05					X				X
	06					X				X
	07-08					X				
Wright	14-15					X				X
	17-24					X				X
	26-27					X				X

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 17

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-2.9	Public Purpose - public access sites
L-2.10	Public Purpose - group camps
L-7.1	Lands Quality - open space
L-8.1	Land Disposal - state forest
L-8.7	Land Disposal - cooperative agreements
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
F-1.1	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.2	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.3	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.4	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.5	Control of brush for regeneration
F-1.6	Control burn for regeneration
F-1.7	Harvest of firewood
F-1.8	Stand conversion
F-1.9	Access for timber removal
F-3.1	Transfer
WL-3.6	Habitat Improvement - ten acre cutting blocks
WL-3.7	Habitat Improvement - ten acre cutting blocks
WL-3.14	Habitat Improvement - restrict human use
WL-3.15	Habitat Improvement - eliminate agricultural use
WL-4.1	Habitat Maintenance - maintain vegetation
WL-4.2	Habitat Maintenance - maintain gull nesting sites
WL-4.4	Habitat Maintenance - maintain white pelican habitat
WL-4.5	Habitat Improvement - eagle-osprey sites

WL-4.6	Habitat Maintenance - eagle-osprey habitat
WL-4.9	Habitat Maintenance - deer wintering yards
WL-4.11	Habitat Maintenance - aquatic habitat
WL-4.12	Habitat Maintenance - aspen-white birch
WL-4.13	Habitat Maintenance - waterfowl nesting
WL-5.1	ACEC Nominations
R-1.2	Transfer to State DNR - public access
R-1.5	Transfer to county or regional parks
R-2.4	Permanent campsite/picnic site
R-3.2	Remove Structures
R-4.1	Cooperative agreement - maintain natural condition
R-4.2	Cooperative agreement with counties
VRM-1.1	Protect present visual resource

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 18

Signing

Analysis:

Signing of BLM lands may have both positive and negative effects. On the positive side, signing would identify the lands as public lands open to public use for recreation, etc. This also would help abate trespass and unauthorized use of the land or bring to our attention any private claims or Color of Titles.

The negative aspect of signing would be probable increase in use by the public, possibly leading to site degradation from abuse; wood cutting and other illegal uses may also increase due to lack of presence of the managing agency. The problem will be at least partially mitigated by interested public reporting such illegal activities. Increased private claims and potential illegal uses would lead to an increased work load in the lands activity calling for more funding and additional personnel to handle the cases in a timely manner. The cost of signing, and periodic checking would also increase management costs for the lands.

Any signing program developed should be "tailored" to protect specific resource values such as signing against human use on lands that have particular wildlife value that are in conflict, i.e. human use on a heron rookery during nesting season.

Signing should be prioritized, based on problems, critical resource values, and isolated public lands in highly developed lakes. Signing emphasis should be toward lands under cooperative agreements that can be checked on a regular basis. The remaining lands could be signed as cooperative agreements are made or on an as-visited basis.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Sign all islands and uplands that are to remain in the interim management category (BLM management, cooperative agreement) as public land, open to all legal uses. Prioritize signing on the following: (1) on lands under cooperative agreements (as established) (2) on problem areas or those with critical resource values such as eagle nests (3) on isolated public lands in highly developed lakes.

Public lands where conflicts between human use and threatened or endangered species use is resulting in degradation of habitat, should be signed limiting or restricting human use during certain critical periods or completely.

Signing

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.

Public lands need to be identified as such, especially where public land is scarce as in certain areas of Minnesota. The public has a right to know where these lands are located. This is public service in its purest form.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 18

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

R-2.1	Sign all public lands on Lake of the Woods
R-2.2	Sign all public islands and upland lots
R-2.3	Removal of structures and private signs
R-3.1	Sign all public lands to identify them as open for recreation use

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 19

Koochiching County

Analysis:

The Koochiching County Board/Commissioner has passed a resolution requesting management responsibilities for BLM lands in the county. From our discussions with them, it is evident that they are more concerned with upland tracts than the islands.

Koochiching County has a viable forest management program with established allowable cuts and provisions for recreational opportunities. BLM lands are intermingled with county lands creating a favorable management situation.

The lands involved are primarily peat bog. Resource values identified include wildlife, commercial forest land, unique vegetation and peat formations, use of peat as fuel and mineral potential. Some of the wildlife and vegetation values are significant enough that ACEC designation was recommended on some of these tracts.

Tracts 33-40, 42, 45-55, 57,60-62 have been nominated as a National Natural Landmark. The Heritage Cultural and Recreation Service (HCRS) has contracted for study of this area, but have not yet submitted their recommendation.

Our inventories were intensive enough to ascertain the existance of these values; they were not intensive enough to determine the extent or interrelationships between the various resources.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

BLM enter into a Cooperative Agreement with Koochiching County to provide for county management of BLM upland tracts in Koochiching County.

Should these areas be accepted for ACEC designation, the cooperative management agreement will be coordinated with the ACEC Management Plan.

Management Framework Plan III :

Decision:

Enter into a Cooperative Agreement with Koochiching County to provide management for the following tracts of BLM lands in Koochiching County: Control #01, 16, 17, 27-29, 33-54, 55, 57-64 and 67.

The BLM inventory of these tracts identified occurrences of some of these values which are identified in the analysis above. More study is required to determine the extent of their occurrence. The HCRS Study will aid in providing needed data.

Koochiching County

Continued:

Decision:

Such agreement will provide for forest management and peat development after environmental analyses have been completed to determine the impact of these activities on other identified resource values. Those values and management practices identified in the Heritage Cultural and Recreation Service recommendation will be included in the environmental analysis as well as those emerging from the BLM ACEC management plan.

Timber harvest opportunities have been identified, but the impact of timber sales on unique vegetation or peat pattern is unknown. The value of peat and impacts of its harvest are unknown. Use of peat for power will depend on the economic feasibility, the extent of the BLM peat resources. The impacts on the land and hydrology of the area and reclamation plans as disclosed by an environmental assessment or impact statement.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 19

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-8.5	Land Disposal - county government
M-2.3	Maintain surface estate in federal ownership
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
F-1.1	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.2	Harvest merchantable forest products
F-1.3	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.4	Regeneration of commercial species
F-1.5	Control of brush for regeneration
F-1.6	Control burn for regeneration
F-3.1	Transfer
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-1.1	Habitat Expansion - waterfowl
WL-1.2	Habitat Expansion - waterfowl
WL-2.1	Habitat Expansion - increase prey species for wolf
WL-3.4	Habitat Improvement - girdling aspen and balsam fir
WL-3.5	Habitat Improvement - owl nests
WL-3.6	Habitat Improvement - ten acre cutting blocks
WL-5.1	ACEC Nominations
WL-4.10	Habitat Maintenance - maintain bog ecosystem
R-1.2	Transfer to State DNR - public access

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan II
Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis
and Recommendation # 20

Kandiyohi County

Analysis:

The islands in Kandiyohi County have wildlife, recreation and natural values, public ownership of which is beneficial to the public (see MFP chart). Kandiyohi County is capable of providing management for these resources. Kandiyohi County has requested that all of the islands be transferred to them. However, number 19 in Swan Lake is in Sibley State Park and has been requested by the state for inclusion in the park. Islands number 15 and 16 have been requested by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to be managed as waterfowl production areas; our evaluation of them indicates that this is their best use. Islands 01-12, 14, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are recommended for transfer to the county.

Multiple-Use Recommendation:

Transfer by R&PP to Kandiyohi County islands number 01-12, 14, 17-18, 20 and 21 to be managed for wildlife and visual (aesthetic) resources.

Number 12 is a cormorant nesting site which should be protected.

If the transfer is not possible, seek cooperative agreement with the county for management.

Management Framework Plan III:

Decision:

Proceed with Management Framework Plan II Recommendation as written.	See analysis above.

Minnesota Multiple-Use Analysis and
Recommendation # 20

References to MFP I

Refer back to the following MFP I Recommendations concerning the islands or tracts mentioned in the above Recommendation:

L-8.5	Land Disposal - county government
M-2.5	Reserve ownership of mineral estate
W-2.2	Maintain vegetative cover on all islands in Class I or better erosion class
W-2.3	Maintain vegetative cover on all uplands in Class I or better erosion class
WL-5.1	ACEC Nominations

Refer to MFP Chart for recommendations on specific islands

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III
Decisions

The Management Framework Plan III Decisions in this document reflect the Bureau and ESO Policies on Disposal of Public Lands and the multiple-use and state-wide analysis along with public input. The decisions provide for complete disposal of all BLM surface ownership in Minnesota. Every parcel of BLM land is listed in one of the 21 Decisions in this summary.

The Management Framework Plan II Recommendations which will be pursued along with the disposal decisions are:

1. Authority for leasing of hardrock minerals on Public Domain will be pursued.

2. Federal mineral ownership will be maintained in disposal actions which require this retention; however, applications for conveyance of minerals under authority of FLPMA 209 will be encouraged so that split estate will not occur where there is no mineral value or where retention of the mineral estate interferes with surface development and the surface development is more beneficial than mineral development.

3. Conduct any inventories or clearances required by law to accomplish the proposed transfers.

The following decisions constitute the final Minnesota Management Framework Plan III Decisions.

#1. Transfer the following tracts to the National Park Service for management as part of Voyageur's National Park; St. Louis County numbers 229-244, 254-273 and 278-306.

#2. Transfer Washington County 01-08 and 16-20 and Chisago County 01-02 and 04-05 to the National Park Service by withdrawal for management as a part of the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway.

#3. Eliminate MFP II Recommendation #3 which recommended transfer of over 200 islands to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from further consideration.

#4. Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by the State of Minnesota for the tracts to be included as part of the listed state parks (list in Decision Analysis #4 in MFP III).

#5a. Process the existing R&PP application for Scott County islands 08-09 and 11-13 in O'Dowd Lake to the City of Shakopee for management as a portion of the city park.

#5b. Process the existing R&PP application for Scott County islands 01-04 and 06-07, Hennepin County island 05 and Anoka County island 03 to the Hennepin County Park Reserve District for management as portions of their regional parks.

#5c. Process the existing R&PP application for Blue Earth County island 01 in Lake Lura to Blue Earth County for management as part of Daly County Park.

#5d. Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by Waseca County for Waseca County island 01 in Lake Elysian for use and development as a county park.

#5e. Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by Itasca County for Itasca County number 045 near Little Moose Lake for use and development as a public access site.

#6. Upon receipt, process the R&PP application for five tracts to the State of Minnesota for development as public access sites (list in Decision Analysis #6 in MFP III).

#7. Offer all of the following tracts for public sale:

Beltrami	05	Lake of the Woods	12 (280 ac)
Crow Wing	28	Murray	03
Hubbard	42	Wabasha	02-04
Kittson	02	Wright	14

#8. Seek revocation of Power Site Reserves Nos. 148, 208, and 391 and Executive Order 5003 - Rainy Lake Watershed Withdrawal which segregates BLM lands from operation of the public land laws.

#9. Subject to valid existing rights, resolve all trespass cases in accordance with BLM trespass policy and procedures. Besides the BLM general trespass policy, it is recommended that the Minnesota trespass cases be resolved using the following general guidelines:

A. Cabinsites, boat docks, private claims, etc.
Terminate trespass with subsequent removal of improvements from BLM land;

B. Agriculture
If land is suitable for continued agricultural use, collect back rent for trespass use and offer land either for public sale or lease authorizing agricultural production. Otherwise, terminate agricultural use.

#10. Eliminate MFP II Recommendation #10 which recommended 33 BLM tracts for acquisition by the state for state forest purposes from further consideration.

#11. Upon receipt, process the R&PP applications by the State of Minnesota for the BLM islands and uplands to be managed as Wildlife Management Areas (list in Decision Analysis #11 in MFP III).

#12. Upon receipt, process the R&PP applications by the State of Minnesota for the BLM tracts to be included as part of the State Wild and Scenic River System (list in Decision Analysis #12 in MFP III).

#13. Upon receipt, process the R&PP applications by the State of Minnesota for the BLM tracts to be included as part of the State Boating and Canoeing Rivers System (list in Decision Analysis #13 in MFP III).

#14. Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by Aitkin County for Aitkin County island numbers 01-05, 09-15, 17, 20-22, 27-29 and 33 to be managed for wildlife and visual (aesthetic) resources. Sell to Aitkin County upland tract numbers 34, 36 and 37 for forest and wildlife management.

#15. Initiate a three-way exchange in which the following tracts are transferred to Itasca County and Itasca County will transfer equal value land holdings within the national forest to the U.S. Forest Service.

Control #	Acreage
007	109.1
055	40.0
078	40.0
082	40.0
083	40.0
084	360.0
085	40.0
Total	669.1

#16. Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by the State of Minnesota for the BLM tracts to be included as part of the Boating and Canoeing Rivers Program: Aitkin 16, 18, 23 and 10; Crow Wing 03-10; Itasca 22, 24-27, 29-33; and Morrison 37-71 and 73-77. Also, upon receipt, process the R&PP application by the State of Minnesota for the BLM tracts to be included as part of Wildlife Management Areas: Benton 03 and Morrison 26-36. (See Decision Analysis #11 and #13).

#17. Make all remaining BLM lands available to the U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service as an exchange base with third parties. Those lands not identified for exchange will be made available for public sale (list in Decision Analysis #17 in MFP III).

#18. Eliminate MFP II Recommendation #18 which recommended signing of BLM lands from further consideration.

#19. Eliminate the cooperative agreement alternative from further consideration and place the following BLM tracts in Decision Analysis #17-Disposal; Exchange, Withdrawal or Public Sale; Koochiching County numbers 01, 16, 17, 27-28, 33-55, 57-64, and 67. Place Koochiching County number 29 in Decision Analysis #21-State Scientific and Natural Areas. Place Koochiching County numbers 16, 41, 43, 44 and 63 in Decision Analysis #13-State Boating and Canoeing Rivers. Place Koochiching County number 58 in Decision Analysis #11-State Wildlife Management Areas.

#20. Eliminate the transfer of the BLM islands in Kandiyohi County to the county from further consideration and place numbers 01-18 and 20-21 in Decision Analysis #11-State Wildlife Management Areas. Place number 19 in Decision Analysis #3-State Parks.

#21. Upon receipt, process the R&PP applications by the State of Minnesota for the BLM tracts for management as State Scientific and Natural Areas (list in Decision Analysis #21 in MFP III).

9/1/82
Date

G. Curtis Jones, Jr.
G. Curtis Jones, Jr.
Eastern States Director

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III
Decisions

The Management Framework Plan III Decisions in this document reflect the Bureau and ESO Policies on Disposal of Public Lands and the multiple-use and state-wide analysis along with public input. The decisions provide for complete disposal of all BLM surface ownership in Minnesota. Every parcel of BLM land is listed in one of the 21 Decision Analysis Groups in this summary.

The Management Framework Plan II Recommendations which will be pursued along with the disposal decisions are:

1. Authority for leasing of hardrock minerals on Public Domain will be pursued.

2. Federal mineral ownership will be maintained in disposal actions which require this retention; however, applications for conveyance of minerals under authority of FLPMA 209 will be encouraged so that split estate will not occur where there is no mineral value or where retention of the mineral estate interferes with surface development and the surface development is more beneficial than mineral development.

3. Conduct any inventories or clearances required by law to accomplish the proposed transfers.

The following Decision Analysis Groups constitute the final Minnesota Management Framework Plan III Decisions.

8/10/82
Date

Richard D. Harms
Richard D. Harms, Manager
Duluth Field Office

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #1

Analysis: The National Park Service requested the transfer of 64 BLM islands and one upland parcel to that agency for management as part of Voyageur's National Park. These lands are located in six lakes, within the park boundary and the law establishing the park (P.L. 91-661, 84 Stat. 1971) authorizes acquisition of any federal property location within the boundaries of the park. The National Park Service filed a withdrawal application for these lands on February 22, 1977. A land report which included a land use analysis and a recommendation to transfer by withdrawal, was prepared and approved by the Lake States Office Manager on September 20, 1977.

Tract number St. Louis 230 has potential for habitat manipulation for prey species of the timber wolf and has the habitat qualities for natural expansion of the bald eagle and osprey range. The existence of these values should be considered by the National Park Service. In accordance with the withdrawal application and land report, the National Park Service has agreed to resolve the cabinsite trespasses located on St. Louis County numbers 269 and 299 after receipt of the islands from BLM.

Decision: Transfer the following tracts to the National Park Service for management as part of Voyageur's National Park; St. Louis County numbers 229-244, 254-273, and 278-306.

Justification: The withdrawal is in accordance with P.L. 91-661 which authorizes land acquisition in the park. The National Park Service has filed a withdrawal application for the BLM islands and one upland tract. The National Park Service has the authority and expertise to manage these lands' resource values. No other public agency has an interest in acquiring these lands. Public sale would be contrary to the intentions of P.L. 91-661.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #2

Analysis: The National Park Service, the administering agency for the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway, requested the transfer of BLM islands in Washington County 01-08 and 16-20 and Chisago County 01-02, and 04-05 to be managed as part of the river system. The law establishing the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of October 2, 1968 (82 Stat. 916) and the Lower St. Croix River Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 1174, as amended) authorizes acquisition of any federal property listed within the boundaries of the riverway. The National Park Service filed a withdrawal application for the 17 islands on February 4, 1977. A land report which included a land use analysis and a recommendation to transfer by withdrawal was prepared and approved by the Lake States Office Manager on December 15, 1977.

Island number Washington 04, was requested by the State of Minnesota for inclusion in William O'Brien State Park. However, for the purpose of management consistency, it is recommended that this island be managed as the others in the riverway system. Since the National Park Service's application for withdrawal was filed, these islands have been managed by the National Park Service under a cooperative agreement which expires this year.

Decision: Transfer Washington County 01-08 and 16-20 and Chisago County 01-02 and 04-05 to the National Park Service by withdrawal for management as a part of the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway.

Justification: The withdrawal is in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the Lower St. Croix River Act which authorize land acquisition in the riverway. The National Park Service has filed a withdrawal application for the BLM islands and the land report recommends approval. The National Park Service has the authority and expertise to manage the islands' resource values. No other public agency has an interest in acquiring these islands with the exception of Washington 04. Public sale would be contrary to the intentions of P.L. 93-621. Recreation use by boaters has become an environmental and administrative problem and with the transfer, the National Park Service will have complete administrative control, which is beneficial to the resource values.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #3

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Analysis: The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service requested over 200 BLM islands for transfer to that agency for management as Waterfowl Production Areas. In July of 1981, the State of Minnesota requested these islands to be managed as Wildlife Management Areas. As a result, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service withdrew their request since the state would manage them for wildlife purposes.

Decision: Eliminate MFP II Recommendation #3 from further consideration.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #4

State Parks

Analysis: BLM islands are located within the boundaries of ten state parks in ten counties. These tracts are now being managed as part of the state parks. Many were under an R&PP lease to the state up until a few years ago. The leases were not renewed pending the results of BLM planning.

Itasca 02-05 and 08, St. Louis 37, 103, 108 have potential eagle/osprey habitat.

Aitkin 24-26, Carlton 06, Morrison 22, St. Louis 39-40 and Ottertail 86 were not requested by the state for state park lands as was recommended in MFP II. These were requested for WMAs (see Decision Analysis #11). Washington 04 was requested by the state but is within the Lower St. Croix Riverway and is recommended for transfer to the National Park Service.

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by the State of Minnesota for the following tracts to be included as part of the listed state parks.

State Park	County	Control #	Lake or River
Itasca	Becker	02, 04-05	Hernando DeSoto
		03	Morrison
		06-08	Twin
		80	Hungry Man
	Clearwater	01	Squaw
Jay Cooke	Carlton	05, 07-11	St. Louis River
Crow Wing	Cass	03, 58	Mississippi River
	Morrison	21, 23-24	Mississippi River
Scenic	Itasca	79	Sandwick
Sibley	Kandiyohi	19	Swan
Maplewood	Ottertail	85	Lida
Tower Soudan	St. Louis	98-109	Vermilion
Bearhead Lake	St. Louis	41-43, 35-38	Bear Head
		52-53, 59-64	Eagles Nest #3
Monson Lake	Swift	01	Monson

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #4

Justification: The administration and control of use on these islands can best be controlled through management as part of the parks. Most of these islands were under R&PP lease in the past. Transfer will solve dual management problems.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #5a

Analysis: The City of Shakopee has requested transfer by R&PP of the islands, Scott County 08-09 and 11-13 in O'Dowd Lake to the city. The islands will be managed as part of a park being developed on the lake. The city has acquired shoreline property on both sides of the lake.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also requested these islands for future exchange base. Transfer to that agency will not solve the problem of dual agency management. If, for some reason, the city no longer needs the islands for the park, a transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service should be considered.

The City of Shakopee applied for an R&PP on June 23, 1981. A land report along with an Environmental Analysis which recommended approval of the R&PP, was submitted to ESO on April 7, 1982. The songbird and aesthetic values identified will be protected by park management according to the development plan submitted with the R&PP application. No adverse environmental impacts are anticipated.

Decision: Process the existing R&PP application for Scott County islands 08-09, and 11-13 in O'Dowd Lake to the City of Shakopee for management as a portion of the city park.

Justification: The BLM islands will make a desirable addition to the park for water-based recreation. The transfer will provide local administration of the islands and solve dual agency management problems.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #5b

Scott-Hennepin County Park Reserve District

Analysis: The Park Reserve District has requested transfer of islands, Scott County 01 and 02 in Murphy Lake, 06 and 07 in Hanrahan Lake, 03 and 04 in Cleary Lake, to the district to be managed as parts of Murphy-Hanrahan Regional Park and Cleary Lake Park, respectively. The district has also requested transfer of island 05 in Hennepin County for a part of Hyland Lake Regional Park and island 03 in Anoka County for a part of Coon Rapids Dam Regional Park. Anoka 03 was originally recommended for transfer to the state but the state consented to its transfer to the park district. These islands are used by park visitors and all are within the boundaries of these parks.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also requested the islands in Scott County for future exchange base. The transfer to that agency will not solve the dual agency management problem within the parks.

The Scott-Hennepin County Park Reserve District applied for an R&PP on July 28, 1981. The land report and Environmental Analysis is being prepared by the Duluth Field Office. The waterfowl and aesthetic values identified will be protected by park management according to the development plan submitted with the R&PP application. No adverse environmental impacts are anticipated. An excavated archaeological site exists on Hennepin County 05. The inventory, protection and interpretation of the archaeological values is addressed in the development plan.

Decision: Process the existing R&PP application for Scott County islands 01-04 and 06-07, Hennepin County island 05, and Anoka County island 03 to the Hennepin County Park Reserve District for management as portions of their regional parks.

Justification: The islands in Murphy, Hanrahan and Hyland Lakes have been managed as parts of these parks in the past. They make good additions to the parks. Local administration of these islands will provide adequate protection of the resource and cultural values which now is difficult for BLM to provide. The transfer will solve the dual agency management problem.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #5c

Analysis: Blue Earth County has requested transfer of island 01 in Lake Lura to the county to be managed in conjunction with Daly County Park. The island is nearly connected to the mainland which is a county park. The island is used as park land now. Park use is consistent with the resource values identified including a known archaeological site for which a Class III inventory is needed.

Blue Earth County applied for an R&PP on August 13, 1981. A land report and Environmental Analysis will be prepared for the R&PP application. The development plan submitted with the R&PP application will have to adequately address the protection of the archaeological site.

Decision: Process the existing R&PP application for Blue Earth County island 01 in Lake Lura to Blue Earth County for management as part of Daly County Park.

Justification: The BLM island will make a desirable addition to the park for water-based recreation. The transfer will provide local administration. The island has been managed as part of the park.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #5d

Lake Elysian - Waseca County Park

Analysis: Waseca County has requested transfer of the island, Waseca County 01 to be managed as a park. There is developed public access to the lake which is classified for recreational development by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

The wildlife value for songbirds and aesthetic quality identified, could be maintained under use as a public park. No adverse environmental impacts are anticipated in transfer of the land.

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by Waseca County for Waseca County island 01 in Lake Elysian for use and development as a county park.

Justification: The BLM island will make a desirable addition to the county park for water-based recreation. The transfer will provide local administration.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #5e

Itasca County

Analysis: BLM tract number Itasca 045 is a .55 acre tract lying immediately adjacent to a county-owned public access site to Little Moose Lake. In fact, the land is used as a part of the access site now. No significant resource values were identified for this tract. The MFP II recommended transfer of this tract to the DNR for public access but the DNR rejected this tract.

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by Itasca County for Itasca County number 045 near Little Moose Lake for use and development as a public access site.

Justification: This tract will make a logical addition to the public access site and the transfer will provide local administration.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #6

State Public Access Areas

Analysis: Twenty tracts were identified as having potential for legal and developed access to lakes and rivers. These tracts were offered to public agencies for this purpose or other public purposes. The state has requested only five tracts for acquisition as access sites. The MFP II Recommendation stated that if local government agencies were not interested in acquisition, these lands should be retained by BLM to provide undeveloped public access to public waters. However, since the ESO policy is to dispose of all lands, these should be considered for exchange or other disposal in Decision Analysis #17 of the MFP III. Pine County # 01 and #02 were requested by the state for the State Boating and Canoeing Rivers program (see Decision Analysis #13). Itasca #045 was requested by Itasca County for an addition to their public access site (see Decision Analysis #5e).

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP application for the following tracts to the State of Minnesota for development as public access sites:

County	Control #	Lake or River
Todd	02	~~Child~~ Dahn Lake
Cass	42	Child Lake
Cass	44	Lizard Lake
Crow Wing	41	Little Pine Lake
Crow Wing	50	Butterfield Lake

Justification: The state has a public access program and these tracts could provide public access to lakes which may not presently have public access. The state can best provide this public service.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #7

Public Sale

Analysis: Public sale is not a preferred alternative for transfer of islands from BLM ownership due to the overwhelming opposition voiced in the input from special interest groups and government agencies.

Ten surveyed upland tracts are small, have good agricultural potential and may best be utilized for agricultural production. These tracts have very limited resource management potential due to their small size and access problems. Even though seven are lakeshore lots, it is felt that sale of these tracts will best meet the public interest. Although some of these are wetland or riparian, in whole or in part, and are, therefore, subject to Executive Order 11990, the small sizes of the tracts and the scattered ownership make it difficult to administer leases or control use.

Kittson 02 is in the floodplain of the Red River of the North and is subject to Executive Order 11988; provision to prevent development on this tract will be required in the patent.

Lake of the Woods tract #12 had high wildlife values identified. These values are a result of the agricultural use; this tract is currently leased for agricultural purposes to an adjoining landowner.

Wright County #14 was suggested for state acquisition as a public access site but the topography is too steep and it is on a freeze-out lake. Therefore, the state did not request it.

Decision: Offer all of the following tracts for public sale:

Beltrami	05	Lake of the Woods	12 (280 ac)
Crow Wing	28	Murray	03
Hubbard	42	Wabasha	02-04
Kittson	02	Wright	14

Justification: The nine surveyed upland tracts have good agricultural potential and will best be utilized for agricultural production. No other public agencies are interested in acquiring these lands and have no objections to their sale. These tracts have very limited public value due to small size and lack of access.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #8

Withdrawal Restoration

Analysis: More than 20,000 acres of the BLM uplands as well as 16 unsurveyed islands are segregated from operation of the public land laws by various withdrawals. These withdrawals are extremely old and apparently no longer serve any useful purpose. As such, they are needlessly encumbering the public land records. Negotiations have been initiated on the revocation of Executive Order 5003 on the Rainy Lake Watershed with the Corps of Engineers.

Decision: Seek revocation of Power Site Reserves Nos. 148, 208, and 391 and Executive Order 5003 - Rainy Lake Watershed Withdrawal which segregates the following BLM lands from operation of the public land laws.

Power Site Reserve No. 148

St. Louis County - 023

Power Site Reserve No. 208

Cook County - 003

Power Site Reserve No. 391

Koochiching County - 018, 030-032

Executive Order 5003 - Rainy Lake Watershed

Koochiching County - 002-011, 016, 024-026, 033-044, 050-055, 057, 063

Lake of the Woods County - 003-012

Justification: These withdrawals are extremely old and apparently no longer serve any useful purpose. Revocation of these withdrawals is necessary in order to accomplish the objective of land disposal.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #9

Trespass

Analysis: Numerous cases of suspected unauthorized use, occupancy, or title conflict exist involving BLM islands and uplands in the state. The types of trespass vary from summer homes on islands to cultivated crops on small (less than 1.0 acre) tracts in high value agricultural areas. In some cases, the trespasser may have established a valid claim under the Color-of-Title Act and in a few instances, applications have been filed with BLM for relief under this Act. Settlement of most of the trespass cases involving unsurveyed islands will require a cadastral survey to officially establish federal ownership of the island.

Decision: Subject to valid existing rights, resolve all trespass cases in accordance with BLM trespass policy and procedures. Besides the BLM general trespass policy, it is recommended that the Minnesota trespass cases be resolved using the following general guidelines:

A. Cabinsites, boat docks, private claims, etc.
Terminate trespass with subsequent removal of improvements from BLM land;

B. Agriculture
If land is suitable for continued agricultural use, collect back rent for trespass use and offer land either for public sale or lease authorizing agricultural production. Otherwise, terminate agricultural use.

Justification: Unauthorized use or occupancy cases need to be cleared up according to BLM authorities, policies and procedures. Conflicts of title need to be cleared up to continue BLM management, to transfer lands to other agencies or to offer for public sale.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #10

State Forests

Analysis: The MFP II Recommendation for state forests listed a possible 33 tracts for acquisition by the state for state forest purposes. Since the R&PP Act does not apply to forestry and the state is not willing to purchase these tracts, this transfer proposal is no longer valid.

Many of these tracts, however, have been requested for other purposes and are consistent with the resource values identified.

Becker County 01 requested as WMA (See Decision Analysis #11, State WMAs)

Hubbard County 10-13

Itasca County 76 and 77, 86 and 87

St. Louis 27

Lake of the Woods 16, 19-26

- -

Carlton 13 and 27-29 (See Decision Analysis #17, BLM Retention)

Hubbard 23 and 25

Itasca 09, 04 and 23

St. Louis 154 and 248

- -

Crow Wing 41 (See Decision Analysis #6, State Public Access)

- -

Lake of the Woods 17 and 18 (See Decision Analysis #21, State Scientific and Natural Areas)

- -

Decision: Eliminate MFP II Recommendation #10 from further consideration.

Justification: The R&PP Act does not apply to forestry purposes and the state is not willing to purchase the BLM lands.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #12

State Wild and Scenic Rivers

Analysis: The MFP II Recommendation #12 included a list of 70 BLM islands or tracts to be transferred to the State DNR for management in the state wild and scenic river system. The state's final request lists 55 tracts for acquisition in the system. All possess natural and aesthetic values and receive considerable recreation use.

Renville 08 was not requested for wild and scenic river purposes but for WMA purposes (see Decision Analysis #11).

Renville 09 was not requested by the State DNR so is available for exchange (see Decision Analysis #17).

Sherburne 06 and 08-10 and Stearns 01, 09-10, and 20-23, were requested for State Scientific and Natural Areas (see Decision Analysis #21).

Wright 28-29 were requested for State Boating and Canoeing Rivers (see Decision Analysis #13).

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP applications by the State of Minnesota for the following tracts to be included as part of the State Wild and Scenic River System:

County	Lake or River	Control #
Anoka	Mississippi River	01-02
Chippewa	Minnesota River	01, 03-04
Hennepin	Mississippi River	01, 02
Isanti	Rum River	01
Pine	Kettle River	01-03
Redwood	Minnesota River	02-03
Renville	Minnesota River	01-05
Sherburne	Mississippi River	01, 02, 11-20, 23-25
Stearns	Mississippi River	02-08
Wright	Mississippi River	01-13
Yellow Medicine	Minnesota River	01-02

Justification: The transfer will provide for management of the islands as units by one agency and the addition of these BLM lands will compliment the management and designation of the wild and scenic rivers.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #11

State Wildlife Management Areas

Analysis: The MFP II Recommendation #11 identified 71 BLM islands and tracts for transfer to the Minnesota DNR for WMAs. Over 200 more tracts were added to this category when the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service withdrew their request in favor of DNR management as WMAs. The request from the DNR dated April 21, 1982, lists 18 tracts as additions to existing WMAs, 39 tracts as additional WMAs and the remaining BLM islands (those not elsewhere listed in the other Decision Analysis Groups) for WMAs to be acquired by the DNR by R&PP.

Cass County 49, Crow Wing 45 and Lake of the Woods 10 were not requested by the state and are, therefore, available for exchange (see Decision Analysis #17).

Itasca 05 and 06 and Hubbard 12 have potential eagle/osprey habitat. Jackson 04 has a known cultural site. Cass 15, Crow Wing 45, and Roseau 14, 15, 39 and 41 have mineral potential. Roseau 40 has sandhill crane habitat. St. Louis 154 has a deer wintering yard. Big Stone 07 has pelican habitat. Douglas 10 and Cook 05-19 and 21-25 have gull habitat. Becker 49, 70-72, Clay 09-13, Ottertail 09-12, 40 and 48, Pope 01-05 and Swift 05 have heron habitat.

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP applications by the State of Minnesota for the islands and uplands on the attached list to be managed as Wildlife Management Areas.

Justification: The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has requested acquisition of these tracts for WMAs. In some cases, the transfer will eliminate dual ownership problems. The transfer will provide for local management.

EXISTING WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREAS

COUNTY	BLM UNIT	LAKE/STREAM	MANAGEMENT UNIT
Aitkin	008	Cedar	Cedar WMA
Crow Wing	057	Upper Dean	Upper Dean WMA
Dakota	005	Mississippi River	Gores Pool #3 WMA
	006	Mississippi River	Gores Pool #3 WMA
Faribault	001	Walnut	Walnut Lake WMA
Grant	008	Ash	Shuck WMA
Kanabec	002	Fish	Tozier Creek WMA
	001	Upland	Tozier Creek WMA
Kittson	001	Upland	Caribou WMA
Lincoln	001	Hawks Nest	Hawks Nest WMA
	002	Ash	Ash WMA
McLeod	004	Eagle	Ras-Lyon WMA
	005	Eagle	Ras-Lyon WMA
Nicollet	001	Swan	Brooks Island WMA
	002	Swan	Brooks Island WMA
Rice	003	Sakatah	Sakatah WMA
Roseau	011	Lake of the Woods	Warroad WMA
Swift	002	Hollerberg	Hollerberg WMA

Other State WMAs

COUNTY	CONTROL NUMBER
Aitkin	06-07, 19, 24-26
Anoka	04-10
Becker	01, 09-76, 78-79
Beltrami	01-04, 06, 08
Benton	03
Big Stone	01-08
Blue Earth	02
Brown	04
Carlton	01-02, 14-17
Carver	02
Cass	01-02, 07-08, 12, 17, 20-27, 29, 31-32, 35, 37-41, 43, 45-48, 57
Chisago	06-12
Clay	01-03, 05-13
Clearwater	02-03
Cook	10-25
Cottonwood	01
Crow Wing	11-17, 19-27, 29-40, 42-44, 46-49, 51-56
Dakota	07-08
Douglas	01-18
Faribault	02
Grant	01-02, 04-07
Hennepin	06-18
Hubbard	01-08, 10-19, 21-22, 24, 26, 28-31, 33-40, 43-45
Isanti	02
Itasca	01, 03, 05-06, 10-12, 35-37, 39-44, 46-54, 56-70, 72-77, 80, 86-90, 92
Jackson	01-04
Kandiyohi	01-12, 14-18, 20-21
Koochiching	02-11, 72-78, 58
Lake	01-06
Lake of the Woods	13-15, 28-40
LeSueur	02-04
Lyon	01
McLeod	02-03, 06, 07, 09, 11-14
Martin	01

COUNTY	CONTROL #
Meeker	01-15
Morrison	02-04, 16-18, 26-36
Norman	01-02
Ottertail	01-18, 20-49, 51-75, 77, 79-81, 84, 86-102
Pennington	01
Pine	05-07, 09-10
Polk	01-05
Pope	01, 03-06, 08 & 09
Ramsey	03
Red Lake	06
Renville	08
Rice	01-02, 04
St. Louis	01-07, 11, 22, 27, 24-28, 33, 39-40, 45-46, 48-51, 54-~~58~~ 57, 66-70, 73-83, 85-97, 110-111, 113-118, 120-143, 150-153, 155-156, 159-165, 167-171, 177-180, 183, 186-200, 202-208, 211-212, 218, 221-228, 246-247, 249-253, 275-276, 309, 312, 313, 314
Scott	05, 10, 14, 15
Sherburne	26
Sibley	01
Stearns	11-19
Swift	03, 05
Todd	01, 03-04, 15-16
Wadena	01-05, 07-10, 12-13
Washington	21
Watonwan	01
Wright	15, 17-22, 24-27

ADDITIONAL WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREAS

COUNTY	BLM UNIT	LAKE/STREAM
Cass	015	Upland
	018	Upland
	050	Upland
Kittson	003	Upland
Lake of the Woods	004	Lake of the Woods
	005	Lake of the Woods
	006	Lake of the Woods
	007	Lake of the Woods
	008	Lake of the Woods
	009	Upland
	011	Lake of the Woods
	012	Lake of the Woods (41.37 ac)
	016	Lake of the Woods
	019	Lake of the Woods
	020	Lake of the Woods
	021	Lake of the Woods
	022	Lake of the Woods
	023	Lake of the Woods
	024	Lake of the Woods
	025	Lake of the Woods
	026	Lake of the Woods
McLeod	001	Upland
Roseau	001	Lake of the Woods
	002	Lake of the Woods
	003	Lake of the Woods
	004	Lake of the Woods
	005	Lake of the Woods
	006	Lake of the Woods
	007	Lake of the Woods
	008	Lake of the Woods
	009	Lake of the Woods
	010	Lake of the Woods
	012	Lake of the Woods
	013	Lake of the Woods
	014	Upland
	015	Upland
	039	Upland
	040	Upland
	041	Upland

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #13

State Boating and Canoeing Rivers

Analysis: The MFP II Recommendation #13 included a list of 139 BLM islands to be transferred to the State DNR for management in the State Boating and Canoeing River System. The state's final request lists 174 islands or tracts for acquisition in the system. All of the islands possess natural and aesthetic values which contribute to the general scenic and natural character of the rivers. The islands in the Mississippi and Crow Wing Rivers receive considerable recreation use.

Itasca 27 has a potential archaeological site.

Anoka 03 was requested by the Scott-Hennepin County Park Reserve District for an addition to a regional park.

Benton 03, Carlton 16-17, Cass 07, 08, 57, Morrison 16-18, Pennington 01, Red Lake 06, St. Louis 22 and 112, and Wadena 01-13 were requested by the state for WMA.

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP applications by the State of Minnesota for the following tracts to be included as part of the State Boating and Canoeing Rivers System.

County	Lake or River	Control No.
Aitkin	Mississippi River	16, 18, 23, 30
Benton	"	01-02, 04-09
Brown	Minnesota River	03
Carlton	Kettle River	03-04
	St. Louis River	06, 18-26
Cass	Crow Wing River	04-06, 09-10, 51-56
Crow Wing	Mississippi River	03-10
Dakota	"	01-04
Goodhue	"	01-02
Itasca	"	22, 24-27, 29-33
Koochiching	Littlefork River	12-15
	Big Fork River	18-26, 30-32
Morrison	Mississippi River	37-71, 73-77
Morrison	Crow Wing River	08-10, 14, 37-71, 73-77
Nicollet	Minnesota River	03
Ramsey	Mississippi River	01-02, 04
Red Lake	Red Lake River	01-05, 07-08
St. Louis	Cloquet River	08-10, 12-21, 29-31, 145-149
	St. Louis	144, 172-176, 184-185, 213-216, 277, 307
Wabasha	Mississippi River	01
Wright	"	28-29
Todd	Crow Wing River	05-11, 13

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #13

Potential Canoe and Boating Routes

County	BLM Unit	Lake or Stream
Aitkin	31-32	Willow River
	35	Swan River
Cook	01-02, 04	Pigeon River
Crow Wing	01-02	Pine River
Itasca	08, 13-21	Swan River
Koochiching	16, 41, 43, 44, 63	Rainy River
Wilkin	01-06, 08	Ottertail
	07	Red River

Justification: The transfer will provide for management of the islands as units and provide for local administration. Management as parts of boating and canoeing rivers is not very restrictive and is consistent with the identified resource values and recommendations in this MFP.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #14

Aitkin County

Analysis: The islands in Aitkin County have wildlife, recreation and natural values and public ownership of which is beneficial to the public (see MFP Chart). Aitkin County is capable of providing management for these resources. Aitkin County has requested all of these islands and uplands be transferred to them. However, some have been requested by the state or are within State Wildlife Management Areas, state parks or in the Mississippi River, which is currently under management by the Mississippi Headwaters Board. The county is willing to purchase the upland tracts. Islands 01-05, 09-15, 17, 20-22, 27-29, 33 and 35 are recommended for transfer to the county. Tract numbers 34, 36 and 37 are recommended for sale to the county.

Numbers 31, 32 and 35 have been requested by the State Department of Natural Resources for management as part of the boating and canoeing river program. Specific resources values have been identified on some of these tracts; management practices should protect or enhance these values. Numbers 15 and 33 have habitat suitable for eagle/osprey nesting. Numbers 12 and 17 have habitat suitable for waterfowl. Number 36 has a deer wintering yard. Number 34 is non commercial forest and timber wolf habitat.

Decision: Upon receipt, process the R&PP application by Aitkin County for Aitkin County island numbers 01-05, 09-15, 17, 20-22, 27-29, and 33 to be managed for wildlife and visual (aesthetic) resources. Sell to Aitkin County upland tract numbers 34, 36 and 37 for forest and wildlife management.

Justification: Transfer will provide local administration.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #15

Itasca County-U.S. Forest Service Exchange

Analysis: The U.S. Forest Service (Chippewa National Forest) has expressed interest in obtaining county land within the national forest boundaries. The BLM could transfer land to the county and the county could transfer specified tracts within the national forest to the U.S. Forest Service. Itasca County has identified certain BLM tracts that they feel have potential for exchange. Tract number 55 has a unique number of nesting songbirds. Tract number 78 has a deer wintering area and a unique collection of bog orchids. Tract number 83 has a unique number of nesting songbirds.

Cook 03, Itasca 34 and 81, St. Louis 23, 157, 158, 220 and 308 were not requested by the respective counties and are available for general exchange (see Decision Analysis #17).

Itasca 35, 65 and 66 were requested by the State DNR for WMAs (see Decision Analysis #11).

Decision: Initiate a three-way exchange in which the following tracts are transferred to Itasca County and Itasca County will transfer equal value land holdings within the national forest to the U.S. Forest Service.

Control #	Acreage
007	109.1
055	40.0
078	40.0 To #21 SNAs
082	40.0
083	40.0
084	360.0
085	40.0
Total	669.1

Justification: The exchange will accomplish the following objectives:

1. BLM disposal;
2. Consolidation of federal lands in the Chippewa National Forest;
3. Consolidation of county-owned land outside the national forest.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #16

Upper Mississippi Wild & Scenic River

Analysis and Justification: The State Department of Natural Resources has requested that all of the following islands be transferred to the DNR to be managed as part of their Boating and Canoeing Rivers Program: Aitkin 16, 18, 23 and 30; Crow Wing 03-10; Itasca 22, 24-27, 29-33; and Morrison 37-71 and 73-77. The DNR has also requested that islands Morrison 26-36 be transferred to the DNR to be managed as wildlife management areas. Morrison 72 which is now Benton 03, was requested by the DNR as a wildlife management area. The transfers will be consistent with the Mississippi Headwaters Board Plan.

Decision: See Decision for State Boating and Canoeing Rivers #13 and State Wildlife Management Areas #11.

Minnesota Management Framework Plan III

Decision Analysis #17

Land Exchange Opportunities

Analysis: Some of the BLM lands were not requested by any other agency for acquisition other than by the U.S. Forest Service's blanket request of BLM lands for use as exchange base for private and state lands within the national forest. The State Department of Natural Resources was interested in some of these lands for forest management, but forestry does not qualify under the R&PP Act and the state declined to purchase them.

However, since the completion of the MFP draft recommendations in 1981, some interest in the BLM uplands has been expressed by the National Park Service for exchange base. Of course, the U.S. Forest Service remains interested in BLM lands as an exchange base. Also, the majority of these tracts (Koochiching County 33-40, 42, 45-44, 57 and 60-62) have been nominated as a National Natural Landmark. The National Park Service has not made a determination on its eligibility for designation.

Washington County 21 was requested by the state as other WMAs (see Decision Analysis #11).

These lands could be offered for public sale. This would be consistent with the Eastern States Office disposal policy. However, perhaps before they are offered for sale, all reasonable exchange opportunities should be explored.

Decision: Make all BLM lands listed on attached page available to the U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service as an exchange base with third parties. Those lands not identified for exchange will be made available for public sale.

Justification: The Forest Service and the National Park Service have requested that these BLM lands be made available for exchange to consolidate ownership with their boundaries.

Land Exchange

COUNTY	CONTROL NUMBER
Becker	77
Beltrami	07, 09
Brown	02
Carlton	12-13, 27-30
Cass	13, 14, 16, 19, 28, 30, 36, 49
Clay	04
Carver	01
Cook	03
Cottonwood	02, 03
Crow Wing	18, 45
Grant	03
Hubbard	01, 02, 09, 23, 25, 27, 32, 33, 41, 43
Itasca	02, 04, 09, 23, 28, 34, 45, 71, 81
Koochiching	01, 17, 27-28, 33-40, 42, 45-55, 57, 59-62, 64, 67
Lake of the Woods	03, 10
Morrison	01
Murray	01, 02
Mille Lacs	01
Pope	07
Redwood	01
St. Louis	23, 32, 65, 71-72, 112, 119, 154, 157, 158, 181, 182, 209, 210, 217, 219, 220, 245, 248, 274, 308, 311
Swift	04
Wright	16, 23
Ottertail	19, 50, 76, 78, 82-83, 103
Renville	09
Wadena	06, 11, 14
Pine	08, 11
Polk	06-09