

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-6.2 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis (cont.)

- (1) Drytown, Springtown, and Culdron Linn need protection from surface mining activity that could destroy the cultural resource and natural history values.
- (2) Rabbit Springs needs a protective withdrawal to avoid having a mining claim placed on the geodes that the minerals activity has recommended be kept available for rockhounding.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reasons:

Modify L-6.2

1. Revoke that portion of the Twin Falls Multiple Use Classification that segregated the public lands from appropriation under the Homestead Laws, Public Sale Laws and Mining Laws other than the exceptions listed below in part 2.

The Homestead Law and Public Sale Law were replaced by FLPMA. The Public Sale Act of 1964 expired on June 30, 1969. The segregation against DLE and Carey Act is no longer needed. Lands are identified for retention or disposal through the land use plan decisions.

2. Retain a segregative classification against mineral entry or initiate a protective withdrawal on the five sites identified in the M. U. analysis and described as:

These sites identified for protective withdrawal are subject total destruction through mining activity according to the mining laws. These sites have potential to contain minerals or mineral material that could be claimed and removed resulting in the loss of cultural, natural history, and recreational values.

T16S,R15E,Sec.2:SW1/4 Rabbit Sprg.  
Rec. Site

T9S,R18E, Sec.32: Lot 7,8  
Sec.33: Lot 2

T10S,R18E,Sec.4: Lot 4  
Dry Cataracts

T10S,R18E,Sec.11: Lots 3,4,7,8.  
NW12/4SW1/4 Springtown

T11S,R20E,Sec.4:Lot 3 Cauldron Linn  
Sec.6:Lot 1 Drytown

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-6.2# Step 3

Support Needs:

Realty -  
Prepare detailed farm unit management plans according to the land use plan decisions.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Reject L-6.2.
2. Accept L-6.2.
3. Recommend other sites for protective withdrawal.

Decision:

Accept multiple-use recommendation that revokes multiple use classification on public lands except for Rabbit Spring, Cauldron Linn, Spring Town, Drytown, and Dry Cataracts as described by legal subdivision.

OK  
JPD  
9-2-87

Rationale:

Lands are identified in a land use plan for retention or disposal and FLPMA repealed several disposal laws; therefore, the C&MU classification is no longer needed on most public lands. However, there are significant geological, historical, cultural and recreation values on the excepted tracts that require additional protection to prevent damage and destruction from mining activity. C&MU can continue to segregate and protect these areas from undue degradation.

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

1-7

Objective:

Complete the written exchange proposals currently in the District files. Proceed with the exchanges that are in the public interest and reject those that are not.

Rationale:

As the various resource plans are developed they will show the areas that have resource values. When these values are determined the exchange proposals can be evaluated. The proposals that have no public values will be dismissed and the applicants so notified by letter.

The cases in the District files represent a backlog upwards of 15 years or more in some cases. Action should be taken to process or dismiss every proposal that exists. Guidance based on resource, social, and economic values should be developed that more readily allows the manager to evaluate when an exchange proposal has public value.

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-7.1 Step 3

Recommendation: L-7.1

Complete Exchange I-6561 (Steve Ellis) as proposed in the application.

Rationale:

The Selected public lands are classified for exchange and a formal application had been filed with the BLM prior to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. Although the exchange was held up pending evaluation of the selected land for inclusion in the Cassia-Twin Falls isolated tract wildlife management program, it has been determined that no wildlife or public values are present on the tract. Exchanges of the public land is consistent with the Twin Falls MFP that was completed in 1974.

Acquisition of the offered land will block the public land, provide improved livestock management opportunities and would bring into public ownership the ruins of a historic rock homesteaders home.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Exchange I-6561 is nearly complete and is proposed to be completed according to the values identified in the exchange process.

No Multiple Use recommendation is needed.

Decision:

Accept recommendation to consummate exchange I-6561.

Rationale:

Public benefit would be derived from the exchange which has been identified as favorable in previous land use plans.

*Done  
9/28/87*

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 1-7.2 Step 3

Recommendation: L-7.2

Within one year after the MFP is approved, process all exchange proposals in light of the other resource activities to determine the initial feasibility of the exchange.

Rationale:

All exchanges made must be in the public interest and the values and objectives which the Federal land to be conveyed may serve if retained in Federal ownership must not be more than the values of the non-Federal lands and the public objectives they could serve if acquired (Sec. 206(a) Federal Land Management Policy Act).

Multiple Use Analysis

All exchange proposals on record in the District files have been evaluated by each resource activity. In the cases where no values have generated showing the offered private lands would benefit the Bureau programs they are being dropped. The individual applications will be notified in writing that their exchange proposal is being dropped. The reason for dropping it is that evaluation of the proposal through our land use planning process shows that the exchange would have little or no public value. Specifically it is not clearly in the public interest for the government to acquire the offered private lands.

The cases where the offered private lands are shown to have resource values that benefit the Bureau programs and values will be further evaluated and the exchange application processed according to procedures.

As a consequence of the MFP-Step II public meetings, the Idaho Department of Lands has responded to the Bureau with a showing of their lands classification for the State lands in the planning unit. This classification shows their proposed land tenure adjustments. They have identified State owned parcels that they would like to exchange to BLM for addition to existing State owned blocks. It appears that all the lands they have identified for exchange to BLM would add to the public values already existing thereon. The values are quite variable from tract-to-tract such as public access, perennial streams, springs, riparian habitat, wildlife ranges, livestock forage, and a combination of all resource values. These State owned lands should be acquired by the government through an exchange of public lands having less values.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify L-7.2  
A. Proceed with processing the

Reasons:

The patented lands in these proposals have, or appear to have, greater

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 7.2 (cont.)  
Step 2

Multiple Use Recommendation (cont.):

following list of exchanges to acquire the patented lands identified.

1. Neil Larsen (E-22)  
T.12 S., R.18 E., Sec. 15  
E 1/2 E1/2  
Recommended by wildlife and range.
2. Ralph Schnell (E-33 and E-71)  
*T.15 S., R.16 E.,  
Schnell.*  
Sec. 5: Lot 4, SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, W<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> SW, SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>
3.  
6: Lot 1, SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>  
8: NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, E<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, W<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> E<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, part of  
E<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> E<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> w. of fence  
18: SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>  
19: NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, E<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>  
20: SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>  
T.15 S., R.16 E., Sec.16 & 36 (M.U.)  
T.15 S., R.17 E., Sec.16 (wlife)  
T.16 S., R.15 E., Sec.16 & 36 (wlife)  
T.16 S., R.16 E., Sec.16 & 36  
(M.U. H<sub>2</sub>O)  
T.16 S., R.17 E., Sec.16 & 36 (M.U.)
4. David Chadwick (E-81)  
T.16 S., R. 18 E.,  
Sec. 3: 40 acres  
Sec. 10: Lot 2 (SE1/4 NW1/4)  
Sec. 11: S1/2 SW1/4  
Sec. 14: NE1/4 SE 1/4  
Sec. 15: Lot 1 (NE1/4 NW1/4)  
S1/2 NW 1/4  
SE1/4 NE1/4  
SE1/4 SE1/4  
Sec. 22: NE1/4 SE1/4  
Sec. 23: SW1/4 SW 1/4,  
NW1/4 NE1/4  
Sec. 26: N1/2 NW1/4

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Reasons (cont.):

resource values for public land management than public lands being desired for exchange. The values are specific for each case or tract and will have to be evaluated through the exchange process to determine the specific values and extent thereof.

1. These lands have mule deer winter range habitat. They also contain a water source that would be valuable for better management of all resource values in the area.
2. These lands have sage grouse and mule deer habitat values and contain a valuable water source that would add to the total resource management success of the area.
3. These lands have been proposed for exchange to the BLM by the Idaho Department of Lands. These tracts have all been identified as containing resource values that would add to the values of adjacent public lands. The identified values are recreation, wildlife habitat, stock driveway, grazing management, water, and total multiple resource management.
4. These lands lie within the USFS boundary and are identified as having grazing, wildlife, and visual values as well as sources of water that would allow better management of all resources present in the area.

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 1-7.2 (cont.)

Multiple Use Recommendation (cont.):

Reasons (cont.):

5. W. T. Williams (E-39)  
Proceed according to the application and acquire the offered lands for their wildlife and recreation values.  
T.12 S., R.17 E., Sec.28 S1/2 SW1/4  
SW1/4 SE1/4  
Sec.33 NW1/4 NE1/4  
N1/2 NW1/4  
S1/2 N1/2  
N1/2 S1/2  
Sec.34 SW1/4 NW1/4  
N1/2 SW  
SE1/4 SW1/4  
W1/2 SE1/4
6. J. D. McCollum (E-41)  
Proceed with the proposed exchange and acquire the private land west of the public land tract under the Perrine Bridge.  
T.9 S., R.17 E., Sec. 33: Lot 8 and access from the Canyon Rim Road
7. Erich Wegener (E-46)  
Proceed with the proposed exchange and acquire the patented land offered.  
T.11 S., R.15 E., Sec.3: SW1/4 SE1/4

5. These lands contain sage grouse, quail and mule deer habitat. Cottonwood Creek flows across a portion of the allotment. Acquisition of this land would also block up a portion of the public land and add to the public access to the area and to the National Forest.
6. This property is to be added to the existing parcel of public land and provide legal access to the tract from the Canyon Rim Road. The tract to be developed for a recreation site when funds are available as a cooperative BLM and County venture.
7. The resource values appear equal. The advantage is better range and livestock management and an even property boundary which would improve the total resource management on the area.

- B. Public lands to exchange and public lands to retain and manage for resource values identified in the land use plan (MFP-1 and 2) as shown in the MFP-2 multiple use recommendations. After the proposal has been evaluated and processed the lands not exchanged will be retained for multiple resource management according to the Land Use Plan.

All other lands in the Planning Unit will be retained in public ownership for multiple resource management.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

