

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 L-4.1, Step 3

Recommendation L-4.1

Confine all future power transmission lines to the designated corridor locations.

Rationale:

Confining transmission lines to corridors allows for a better utilization of land. The impacts to the aesthetics and to agricultural land are minimized.

Multiple Use Analysis

Power producing companies usually request routes for their lines that are the most direct route and in the most accessible sites to provide the least costly alternative. These route generally conflict with various resource values if the site does not already have a similar intrusion on it.

The corridors shown contain existing facilities so additional lines will not add as much intrusion as they would on sites that do not have exiting facilities. The present power lines that cross the planning unit are located where the impact to private agricultural lands are minimal. There are no physical constraints that would prevent future lines from being installed beside them.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept L-4.1 -
Confine future power transmission lines to the designated corridor locations. Refer to L-4.1 Impact Analysis for modifications and specific locations for VRM-1.1, VRM-1.7 and R-1.3.

Reasons:

To avoid additional adverse resource impacts by having these intrusions scattered through the planning unit.

Support Needs:

Cultural examination for all construction.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Allow lines to be put wherever the companies want them.
2. Establish additional corridors.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Twin Falls

Activity

Lands

Overlay Reference

Step 1 L-4.1 Step 3

Decision:

Modify the multiple-use recommendation. Allow future major power transmission lines (lines of at least 46-138RV which originate and terminate outside of the MFP area) to be constructed within the recommended corridors. Also allow construction of transmission lines between the corridors. Do not permit power lines to the west or the east of the two corridors. Exempt service lines from this restriction.

OK
ML
9-2-87

Rationale:

Utility corridors serve to accommodate major power lines in a designated route which minimized environmental impacts from construction and provides a feasible, economical route for power transmission.

Major transmission lines could cause serious adverse environmental impacts in the Foothills area, the Shoshone Basin, and along Salmon Falls Creek and Reservoir. For this reason, construction of major lines to the east and west of the two corridors is prohibited. Although it would be best to have all future lines confined to the corridors, allowing power lines between the corridors will provide for additional routes which may be more feasible than the two corridors.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step 1 L-4.2 Step 3

Recommendation: L-4.2

Confine future oil and gas pipelines to the designated corridor location.

Rationale:

Confining pipelines to designated corridors will allow for a better utilization of land. The impacts to the aesthetics and to agricultural land would be minimized.

Multiple Use Analysis

The corridor proposed in L-4.2 is the present location of natural gas pipelines. By continuing to use this existing location for a corridor the adverse impacts will be kept in one location. This corridor would minimize the adverse impacts to all resource values encountered.

Multiple Use Recommendation: (Decision)

Accept L-4.2 --
Confine oil and gas pipelines to the designated corridor locations.

Reasons:

The corridor is the present location of two natural gas pipelines. Keeping pipelines in this corridor will minimize adverse impacts to the resources and land uses.

Support Needs:

None.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Not to limit pipelines to a corridor.
2. Establish a corridor in a different location.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

OK
ML
9-2-87

Rationale:

Impacts to resource values can be minimized by routing future oil and gas pipelines to corridors where this use exists and is established.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	L-4.3
Step 3	

Recommendation: L-4.3

Should the Department of Highways choose to route the Twin Falls "Belt Route" across public lands northeast of Hollister, make the land available for highway R/W purposes.

Rationale:

The Idaho Transportation Department is proposing to construct a "belt" highway around the city of Twin Falls. This highway would allow traffic to move from Perrine Bridge around the city to highway 93, the main highway from Idaho to Wells, Nevada. One of the proposed routes involves public lands near Hollister. This route as well as any of the other routes may be used. It is not known which route will be selected.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Idaho Department of Highways is proposing to construct a highway around the city of Twin Falls from the Perrine Bridge to Hwy 93 to Nevada. One of the routes being studied involves public lands north east of Hollister.

The BLM should be involved with the Department of Highways in selecting the best route for the highway location.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept L-4.3 -
Make the land available for the highway R/W when the best route has been determined.

Support Needs:

RA Staff -
Coordination and planning.

Realty Specialist -
R/W processing.

Reason:

BLM needs to be instrumental in facilitating public needs.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Do not let the highway cross public land and keep it on the current Hwy. 93 R/W.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-5

Objective:

Grant Communication site rights-of-way only when the facility has the capability for multiple occupancy (modular design concept) and the color and design is such that it blends with a mountain-top setting.

Rationale:

Mountain-top communication sites can become easily congested with many small buildings and numerous antenna structures. This impairs the aesthetics of the area and results in poor land utilization. Multiple occupancy of a building allows for better land utilization, improved aesthetics, and more cost-effective construction and maintenance programs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	L-5.1
Step 3	

Recommendation: L-5.1

Require Autophone Inc. to construct a communication site on sugarloaf butte large enough to house multiple users, in a location approved by the Burley District, and painted a color approved by the Burley District.

Should the first building become overcrowded allow another building to be built on to the Autophone building following a modular design concept.

Rationale:

A building of a modular design and painted a color that would blend into the natural landscape will help mitigate adverse environmental impacts. A building large enough to accommodate Autophone's equipment plus several other users will allow the use of one building for several years. Other than Autophone, there has been no demand for communication sites on public land within the foreseeable future.

Support:

Landscape Architect to recommend the design and setting for a communication building.

District Engineer to evaluate building design.

Multiple Use Analysis

A location on Sugarloaf Butte has been examined and determined to be a desirable site for radio communication facilities and equipment. The location would provide good communication access over a lot of the Magic Valley area and is close enough to the Twin Falls area to facilitate access for maintenance.

A facility could be constructed that would accommodate several users, and could be added to if needed in the future.

A right-of-way for a Communication Site R/W has been granted for the site.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	L-5.1a (cont.)

Multiple Use Analysis

Since the application is analyzed and a decision has been made to allow the use, a land use decision is not needed for this recommendation.

All communication site needs for this general area will be directed to this site until it can be clearly shown that another site is better.

Decision:

Accept recommendation to allow construction of a communication site on Sugarloaf Butte. Should a second building be needed, it should be located a short distance away from the first, utilizing the same site.

Rationale:

Experience with communications sites in other locations show a rapid demand by other users develops after a site is established. The most common conflict develops between two way communication and FM Stations that are not compatible even with shielding. For this reason, a second building apart from the first, is often the most practical solution to the problem.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Objective Number	L-6

Objective:

Revoke or partially revoke all withdrawals on lands where the withdrawal is not serving the purpose for which they were withdrawn.

Rationale:

The Federal Land Management Policy Act requires the review of all withdrawals. The withdrawal review program is to be directed toward minimizing restrictions on the use of withdrawn lands, reduction in total acreage withdrawn, or the elimination of withdrawals. All withdrawals which, upon review and analysis, lack a demonstratable justification for continuation or extension must be recommended for either total or partial revocation.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Twin Falls
Activity	Lands
Overlay Reference	Step II-6.1 Step 3

Recommendation: L-6.1

Revoke the following withdrawals in their entirety:

1. Livestock Driveway Withdrawal
T. 11S., R. 18E., B.M.
Sec. 35: SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$
2. Twin Falls Military Reservation
T. 11S., R. 17E., B.M.
Sec. 29: E $\frac{1}{2}$
3. Buhl Military Range
T. 9S., R. 13E., B.M.
Sec. 25: S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$

Rationale:

1. The livestock driveway withdrawal near Rock Creek is an isolated 40 acre tract of land cut diagonally by a county road. Part of the tract is a gravel pit and is unuseable by livestock. Part of the tract is under agricultural trespass and is very close to a milking barn. No use of the tract by trailing livestock has been made in the recent past. Use of the tract in the future seems unlikely.

2. & 3. Both the Twin Falls and Buhl military reservations are used one or two weekends each year by the national guard for small arms target practice. The shooting facilities are in poor repair and have been that way for at least 5 years. Some other method of authorization could accomplish the intended use. A Temporary Use Permit for the intended weekend use could accomplish the same purpose of the withdrawal.

Multiple Use Analysis

Preliminary analysis of the withdrawals in Twin Falls MFP area shows that the three areas described in L-6.1 are either not being used for the purpose of the withdrawals or the use could be authorized by permit. The stock driveway withdrawal on T. 11 S., R. 18 E., Sec. 35: SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ is not used for livestock trailing. The two Military Reservation withdrawals are not needed to authorize the use that the military is making. A Temporary Use Permit for the specific needs could accomplish the needs on the military ranges.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)