Name (MED) Twin Falls Activity Visual Resource Management Objective Number

VRM-1

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1

# ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

## Objective:

Manage all public lands in a manner which will protect and maintain the existing visual qualities, provide for enhancement where consistent with management policies, and provide for rehabilitation of lands which presently do not meet the visual quality standards of surrounding lands.

## Rationale:

Visual resource values have been recognized as important elements of the human environment. Degradation of the visual resource represents an adverse impact to the human environment.

Public Law 91-190, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, states in part "...assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surrounding...'

Public Law 94-579, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, states in part that "the public lands be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental...values;" (Sec. 102 (a)(8)) and "regulations and plans for the protection of public land areas of critical environmental concern be promptly developed;" (Sec. 102 (a)(11)).

BLM Manual 1603 states that visual resource management techniques should be applied to all Public Lands through the planning system. These same techniques should be utilized in the analysis of specific development proposals initieated by the BLM or under permit.

An inventory of scenic quality in the planning unit was completed in the summer of 1980 in accordance with BLM Manual 8411 - Upland Visual Resource Inventory and Evaluation. Results of this inventory identified scenic quality (A, B, or C) throughout the planning unit and is documented in URA Step 3 for Visual Resource Management. In addition, cultural modifications were identified and visual significance identified.

Additional procedures, as outlined in the 8411 manual were completed before delineating the VRM Classes which form the basis for the following recommendations. These procedures include a seen-area analysis, distance zone mapping, a consideration of use volume, and an extensive (low level) survey to determine user interest in visual resources and their concern for changes in the existing landscape. Therefore, the importance of visual quality is determined for the planning unit using several criteria.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

#### Recommendation VRM-1.1:

Designate 3,665 acres as VRM Class I. These areas are to be managed primarily for natural ecological change only.

- Any management proposals which would a. not preserve or maintain present ecological and environmental resource values will be in conflict with this management classification.
- Any intrusions (dumps, old cars, etc.) for preservation as wilderness. b. exceeding 10 points when the visual contrast rating (BLM Manual 8431) is applied would need to be removed.
- No mechanical vegetation manipulation c. would be allowed. Minor range projects such as some fences, spring developments, etc., could be done with hand labor and using natural materials. Projects shall not exceed 10 on the visual contrast rating. DO or SO Landscape Architect should be consulted during the early planning stages of any project.

#### Support:

District Resource of Area Staff -Landscape Architect (should be hired) to perform visual contrast ratings and to identify areas where rehabilitation itation).

# Rationale:

For the protection and maintenance of these unique ecological and environmental resource areas. According to FLPMA, Sec. 603, the Bureau of Land Management is mandated to complete a wilderness inventory on all Public Lands in 1991. Until such a time as a parcel of land has been dropped from further wilderness consideration, it shall be managed in a manner so as not to impair the suitability of such areas

BLM Manual 8400.07 A. General Philosophy. one of the quality environment is its appearance, aesthetics is receiving more and more attention...Many of BLM's land manage ment activities involve some alteration of the natural character of the landscape. It is imperative that these alterations be understood and managed to fit the natural character and quality of the landscape. Public lands have a variety of scenic values, but management objectives of the many other resources may conflict with the protection of the visual resource. These different values and objectives warrant different levels of protection for the visual resource. Because it is not practical to provide the same degree of management to the visual resource on all BLM lands, it becomes necessary to have a system to evaluate the visual resources and to determine what degree of management is desirable and practical, is needed (and how to complete rehabil- including protection, rehabilitation and enhancement.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

this tractions on reported

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity Visual Resource Manageme Overlay Reference Overlay D.5 Step 1 VRM-1.1Step 3

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity Visual Resource Mgmt. Overlay Reference Step 1VRM-1.1 Step 3

# Multiple Use Analysis

Refer to Wilderness Recommendation WM-1.2 for discussion of Salmon Falls Creek Natural Area. Salmon Falls Canyon possesses important scenic qualities. Up to the present time, the canyon has, in effect, protected itself. Developments that would disturb the visual qualities of the area have not been economically feasible. Such protection can not be relied on completely. The natural area and VRM Class I designations would insure that all management proposals do maintain the ecological and environmental resource values that are currently found in the canyon. An analysis of other resource activities indicates no major proposal that would conflict with a Class I designation within the canyon.

The state director has issued a proposed decision concerning the wilderness inventory unit 17-26, the Salmon Falls Creek Unit. The proposed decision stated that this unit would be dropped from further consideration. An analysis of other resource activities indicates that no major proposals would conflict with either a Class I or Class II designation.

Reasons:

# ( Recence)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify VRM-1.1 -Manage Salmon Falls Canyon between the Salmon Falls Dam and Lilly Grade for natural ecological change in accordance with a VRM Class I designation. This designation would include only the area from rim to rim. Manage the canyon from Lilly Grade to Balanced Rock under a VRM Class II designation. 1,532 acres

#### Support Needs:

OVAC 14181

District Landscape Architect -Review future management proposals and to help mitigate any disturbances of visual resources. A large amount of public concern exists for the protection of the scenic beauty found in Salmon Falls Canyon. A VRM Class I designation will help protect and maintain a unique ecological area.

Alternatives Considered:

- 1. Reject VRM-1.1.
- 2. Disregard WM-1.2, NH-1.1, R-1.3a.
- 3. Disregard L-2.4, VRM-1.5.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# Recommendation VRM-1.2: (ilection)

Designate 12,695 acres as VRM Class II. This Class requires management activities to be designated and located to blend into the natural landscape and <u>not to be visu-</u> <u>ally apparent to the casual visitor</u>.

The following resource management guides shall apply:

1) Range Management

Juniper and sagebrush removal must be made to simulate adjacent natural openings.

Fences, water developments, etc., would require construction with mostly hand tools and be of natural materials. No red fence posts allowed.

#### 2) Structures

Structures must incorporate the natural lines, colors, and materials of the natural landscape. Skylined structures would be prohibited.

#### 3) Roads

Required roads must be concealed by vegetation, follow natural landforms, and be seeded as soon as possible. Overland "roads" may be necessary in some areas to protect the scenic values. Cut and fill areas that exceed 5 feet will generally not be accepted unless the fill can be replaced and vegetation established in 2 years.

#### Name (MFP)

Twin\_Falls\_\_\_\_\_\_ Activity Visual Resource Management Overlay Reference Overlay D.5 Step 1 VRM-1:2step 3

# Rationale:

Because of the scenic quality in these areas and the public sensitivity about resource managment activities as determined by an "extensive"(survey described in the Recreation PAA), these lands must receive careful environmental consideration design to minimize visual contrast.

See also Rationale with VRM Class I Recommendation - BLM Manual 8400.07A. General Philosophy.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# Recommendation VRM-1.3: (Decision)

Designate 32,819 acres as VRM Class III. (see overlay D.5). This class provides the management activities may be evident to the casual visitor; however, the activity should remain subordinate to the visual described in the Recreation PAA), these strength and natural character of the land- lands must receive careful environmental scape.

The following resource management guides shall apply:

#### 1) Range Management

Juniper and sagebrush clearings shall simulate typical natural openings.

Structures

Structures should incorporate the natural lines, colors and materials of the natural landscape. Skylined structures should be avoided, if possible.

#### 3) Roads

Roads should be partially concealed by vegetation, follow natural landforms, and be seeded as soon as possible.

Any intrusions (VRM-Class V) shall be rehabilitated to meet a level appropriate to Class III area.

# Support Needs:

District Resource or Area Staff - Landscape Architect to complete contrast ratings and to insure that visual considerations are incorporated into project lay-out and design.

Note: Attach additional screens, if reeded this protein out report

# Rationale:

Because of the scenic quality in these areas and the public sensitivity about resource management activities (as determined by an "extensive" survey consideration and project design to minimize visual contrast.

Name (1977)

See also Rationale with VRM Class I Recommendation - BLM Manual 8400.07A. General Philosophy.



Twin Ealls 1. 11. 11 **B**isual Resource Management Overlay Reference Overlay D.5 Step 1 VRM-1.3top 3

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# Recommendation VRM-1.4: (Decision)

Designate 184,252 acres as VRM Class IV. (See Overlay D.5). This class provides that management activities may be visually apparent to the casual observer and may also become dominant in the landscape.

The following resource management guides shall apply:

1) Range Management

Junipers and sagebrush clearings shall simulate typical natural openings.

- Structures should incorporate the natural lines, colors, and materials of the natural landscape.
- 3) Roads should follow the natural landforms and be seeded as soon as possible.

Any significant intrusions (VRM Class V) shall be rehabilitated to meet a level appropriate to Class IV areas.

#### Support:

District Resource or Area Staff - Landscape Architect to insure that

#### Multiple Use Analysis

VRM Class IV includes areas that have low scenery and public sensitivity values. Other resource activities generally dominate the natural landscape. Resource management guidelines are most liberal within this VRM class and other acitivity proposals can be reasonably sure of proceeding as recommended.



bestra. 1.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

and the second

 Name (WFP)

 Twin Falls

 Activity

 Bisual Resource Management

 Overlay Reference D.5

 Step 1 VRM-1, 4Step 3

# Rationale:

Due to their low scenic quality and public sensitivity values (as identified in an "extensive" level survey described in the Recreation PAA), management actions in these areas may dominate the natural landscape character.

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# Recommendation VRM-1.5: ( Alecision)

Rehabilitate areas identified as VRM Class V in order to bring the site back into character with the surrounding landscape (into the VRM Class of surrounding lands). These sites include garbage dumps (unauthorized), abandoned gravel pits, etc. Many of the sites have been identified during the scenic quality inventory (shown on overlay D.5), but other sites exist which have not yet been identified and will be added to the list as necessary.

Areas for rehabilitation have been identified at the following sites:

Garbage Dumps - T. 12 S., R. 18 E., Sec. 9: NE<sup>1</sup><sub>2</sub>SE<sup>1</sup><sub>2</sub>

- T. 12 S., R. 17 E., Sec. 28: NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>
   T. 16 S., R. 16 E.,
- Sec. 30:  $SE_{4}^{1}SE_{4}^{1}$
- T. 11 S., R. 14 E., Sec. 19: SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>
- T. 10 S., R. 14 E., Sec. 30:  $NE_4^1NE_4^1$

Gravel Pits - T. 16 S., R. 17 E., Sec. 2:  $NE_{4_{T}}^{1}NW_{4_{T}}^{1}$ 

#### Support Needs:

Other - Fire crews, YACC, etc., to complete cleanup operations at sites.

#### Multiple Use Analysis

Indiscriminate garbage dumps are visual intrusions found at various locations in the Planning Unit. These sites require rehabilitation. Unauthorized dumps are incompatible with land management objectives. Abandoned gravel pits are intrusive but not to the extent of dump sites. Other uses for gravel pits should be considered before rehabilitation is implemented. Alternative use possibilities could include an intensive ORV use area or a public shooting range.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

#### Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity Visual Resource Management Overlay Reference D.5 Step 1 VRM-1.5 Step 3

#### Rationale:

These sites are visually intrusive to the natural character of the landscape and are, particularly in the case of the garbage dumps, hazardous to human health, livestock, wildlife, etc.

This class applies to areas where the naturalistic character has been disturbed to a point where rehabilitation is needed to bring a site back into character with the surrounding landscape. This class applies to areas identified in the scenic evaluation where the quality class has been reduced because of unacceptable cultural modification. The contrast is inharmonious with the characteristic landscape.

÷.