MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFF) Twin Falls
Activity Wildlife - Mule Deer
Overlay Reterence Step WL-1.4 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Implement livestock grazing systems to insure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer.

The grazing dates for the following allotments which lie in critical mule deer winter range should not be extended past 9/30:

4031		Western	Stockgrowers	4/16		5/26
4036	-	Moore -	Lost Creek	5/1	-	5/3 1
4063	_	Soldier	Creek	6/15		8/14
4097	-	Cameron		7/1	-	9/15

Restrict livestock use after 9/30 in that portion of the following allotments which lie in critical mule deer winter range:

4034	_	Point Ranch	3/1	-	2/28
4037	-	North Big Creek	4/1	-	11/30
4040	_	Noh Sections	5/5	_	11/21
4043	_	PVGA - Frahm	5/1		10/31
4098		Schnell-Salmon Tr.	3/1	-	2/28
4108	_	Lost Creek - U2	4/20	-	1/7
4114	_	Squaw Joe	3/1	-	2/28
4119	_	Ridge	5/1		11/30

Limit livestock utilization of important winter forage shrubs to less than 20 percent of the annual growth on mule deer winter ranges.

No domestic livestock grazing should be allowed on native ranges prior to 5/15 each spring on the critical mule deer summer range located in the following allotments:

4034	-	Point Ranch	3/1	-	2/28
4041	_	PVGA - Mule Creek	5/1	_	11/30
4119	_	Ridge	5/1	-	11/30

The turn-out date for 4102---Sharp-Lost Creek 5/20-11/19 should not be made any earlier.

The management of livestock grazing has the greatest potential for affecting mule deer habitat. Intensive grazing systems combined with moderate stocking rates are needed to insure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer.

Domestic livestock often compete with mule deer for forage. Cattle use of browse during later summer and fall can result in a shortage of deer winter forage. Management should be aimed at providing maximum vigor and production of browse species on deer winter range areas. Excessive grazing can also eliminate grass and forbs that provide important spring and early summer deer forage. Restriction of livestock use on native summer ranges until after 5/15 will allow the vegetation to be more developed and will serve to reduce grazing pressure on important forage shrubs later in the grazing season. Management should be aimed at providing the maximum succulent forage possible during the spring/summer period.

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

From Tester 1 April 1 (78)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 WL-1. Step 3

Support (cont.):

Range - Livestock management on the above allotments to agree with the corresponding dates.

Wildlife - Coordination with range on designation of critical ranges which need livestock management.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with the existing fall use made on eight other allotments which include Point Ranch, North Big Creek, Noh Sections, PVGA-Frahm, Schnell-Salmon Tract, Lost Creek U2, Squaw Joe and Ridge. The portion of the recommendation which calls for no use on mule deer summer range before 5/15 does not conflict with any existing or proposed use. An analysis of available forage based on biological use levels of forage and dietary requirements of cattle and deer showed 34 competitive AUMs between 1980 deer numbers and livestock. An additional 37 competitive AUMs result from the projected mule deer population increase by 1990. Mule deer will receive the AUMs through the forage allocation recommendation RM-3.1 and WL-1.1.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows:
 Implement livestock grazing systems to insure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer on their critical winter ranges. These systems will be designed to eliminate or minimize grazing after September 30. Limit livestock utilization of important winter forage shrubs to less than 20 percent of the annual growth on mule deer winter range. No domestic livestock grazing will be allowed on native range prior to 5/15 each spring on the critical mule deer summer range.

Reason:

Intensive management systems will help to ensure adequate production of useable forage for mule deer. Eliminating or minimizing grazing on crtitical winter ranges along with the AUM computations used to determine competitive AUM's between cattle and deer were based on 20 percent biological use levels for shrubs. competitive AUM's will be allocated to deer, so 25 percent use by cattle will not conflict with existing or projected deer numbers. This allocation process also insures that livestock using critical deer winter range after 9/30 do not use more than is necessary to sustain wintering mule deer.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

	Name (MPP) Twin Falls
h in 11	Activity Wildlife - Mule Deer
1	Overlay Reference
	StepWL-1.5 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION: (Multiple like & Klerium) RATIONALE:

Provide high quality mule deer forage on public land by:

- (1) maximizing the "edge" effect;
- (2) planting wheatgrasses, alfalfa, four-wing saltbush and bitterbrush as the primary plants used in all reseeding efforts on mule deer range.

SUPPORT:

- Provide the "edge" effect in Range all land treatments and the above seed mixture on all reseeding efforts on mule deer range.
- Inclusion of seeding mixture Lands and "edge" effect in all land reports and EA's dealing with vegetative manipulation on mule deer range.
- Operations Layout and design, contract work, and on-the-ground work involving vegetative projects on mule deer range should include the "edge" effect and above seed mixture.
- Recreation Assistance in design to complement the natural landscape characteristics.
- Designation of "edge" effect Wildlife areas within a land treatment area. Identification of specific types and pounds of seed for the seed mixture. Close coordination with lands, range and operations in applying the above recommendation.

Land treatments are needed to set back plant succession to a more "desirable" community with respect to mule deer. Great plant species diversity is created when extensive big sagebrush stands and/or monotypic stands of crested wheatgrass seedings are altered. When done properly there is an increased "edge" effect. The size and shape of the treated area has a significant effect on the subsequent use of the area by mule deer. Specific guidelines are outlined in the URA Step IV opportunities wildlife narrative entitled "B.1. Mule Deer".

The recommended seed mixture should be used for the purpose of supplying succulent forage over a longer period. Sagebrush may have to be reseeded for range rehabilitation on some winter ranges. Additional important forage species have been identified in the URA Step III present situation wildlife narrative entitled "A.1. Mule Deer".

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

From Probable A relief

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Wildlife - Mule Deer Overlay Reference WL-1516p 3 Step 1

RECOMMENDATION:

(Deisies)

Acquire the following parcel of land to provide additional critical mule deer winter range habitat:

T. 12 S., R. 18 E. - South Hills Strip Sec. 15: E1/2 E1/2

SUPPORT:

Lands

- Preparation of land report and EA for land acquisition.

Range

- Assistance in acquisition for range benefits.

Watershed

- Assistance in acquisition for watershed benefits.

Recreation - Assistance in acquisition for hunter day benefits.

Wildlife - Assistance in acquisition.

RATIONALE:

Acquisition of this 160 acre parcel of lan will preclude any future private development on this critical mule deer winter range.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-579, Title II, Section 205(a) states that "Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary with respect to the public lands, is authorized to acquire pursuant to this Act by purchase, exchange, donation, or eminer domain, lands or interests therein..."

Multiple Use Analysis

This parcel of land identified for acquisition is located on critical mule deer winter range. It is important that this parcel of land remain in its natural condition, free from developments which would deter mule deer use on and around the area. The spring which exists is an important habitat component of mule deer. The lands recommendation L-7.2 identified this parcel as a proposed exchange. Acquisition of this parcel through an exchange supports this wildlife recommendation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept WL-1.6 -this 160 acre parcel of private land for critical mule deer habitat needs.

Reason:

BLM ownership and administration will Acquire through purchase or exchange insure that the land use and wildlife benefits provided will remain available.

8208 II

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS- JECISION

Name (MFP)
Twin Falls

Activity
Wildlife - Antelope

Over.av Reterence
StepWL-1.7 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

(Recision)

Maintain and enhance the existing habitat for the introduction of antelope in the following allotments:

SUPPORT:

Recreation - Assistance with HMP and EA since an increase in hunter days will come about.

IDFG - Transplanting of antelope into designated areas.

RATIONALE:

Pronghorn antelope numbers are below optimum in the Twin Falls Planning Unit. The available habitat is not being utilized due to the low antelope population. IV-IDFG fully supports an antelope transplant (Gary Will, 4-4-80, Personal Communication). By transplanting antelope, the available habitat would be more fully utilized since the antelope is a desirable species for which to manage. Currently, the demand for antelope exceeds the supply. Every effort should be made to build up the antelope population in Game Management Unit #47 so an allowable harvest will be available to the hunter. Unit #47 will be closed to antelope hunting starting in 1981 due to low antelope numbers. Hunter demand in the Planning Unit will increase in the future.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with Fire Management F.I.5, however, WL-1.8 is based on a need for high concentrations of forbs for spring and early summer antelope use. One of the primary results of fire is an increase of forb production for several years. The chances of the entire area burning off are relatively small in any given year. Additionally, burning enhances growth of rabbitbrush which is listed as a primary browse species for antelope. Proposed and existing grazing management systems will be expected to maintain and enhance habitat for antelope.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MEP) Twin Falls
Wildlife - Antelope
Overlay Reference

RECOMMENDATION:

Implement grazing systems on current and future antelope ranges which emphasize increasing the composition of forbs. No livestock grazing should occur from 4/15 to 6/15 in specific areas where forbs are present.

SUPPORT:

Range - Design grazing systems to deter livestock use in areas of forbs from 4/15 to 6/15.

wildlife - Inventory and designate forb concentration areas. Coordinate livestock non-use areas from 4/15 to 6/15 with range.

RATIONALE:

Antelope depend on areas where a high concentration of forbs can be found in the spring and early summer. Forbs and browse species should be considered when establishing grazing systems for livestock since they are key species for antelope. Livestock grazing systems which restrict, alter, limit or deleteriously affect the habitat requirement of antelope should be minimized and alternate procedures developed to enhance antelope habitat. Prescription grazing by livestock should be practiced in seedings and certain native ranges where high antelope habitat values exist.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation could conflict with existing livestock use on four allotments based on 4/15 to 6/15 deferrment in "forb areas." Wildlife URA III states that "The antelope-cattle conflict is very slight with respect to forage competition. The existing pasture of native vegetation should not be subject to any mechanical treatments to ensure adequate forage for antelope." Based on the current use made by antelope andthe dietarypreference stated in Wildlife URA III a total of 2064 pounds of browse, 2256 pounds of forbs, and 280 pounds of grass are needed to meet the existing needs of antelope in the planning unit. Projected 1990 population levels would require 17,696 pounds of browse, 11,952 pounds of forbs and 1552 pounds of grass for one year. This needed forage is not competitive with proposed livestock allocations. All of the allotments containing existing or potential antelope range have been proposed for intensive management to improve and maintain range condition.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

	Name (MFP)
	Twin Falls
-	Activity
	Wilalife
I	Overlay Reference
[Stan 1 111 1 OStan 3

(decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows:
Implement grazing systems on current and future antelope range which will emphasize increasing the composition of forbs. Maintain and improve range condition with emphasis on increasing the composition of forbs. Range improvement projects on the antelope ranges will be done in irregular patterns to increase edge and forbs will be included in seed mixtures in areas to be seeded.

Reason:

A good management system will provide for a balance of vegetative species including browse, grass and forbs. The deferred use on "forb areas" was modified. Wildlife URA III stated that any conflicts between antelope and cattle were "very slight."

Support Meeds:

Range Design grazing systems to maintain and improve range condition.

Wildlife -

Develop management plan for the introduciton of antelope. Inventory potential introduction areas to determine if possible habitat components are lacking.

Alternatives Considered:

- 1. Accept WL-1.8.
- 2. Reject WL-1.8.

Decision:

Accept the multiple-use recommendation.

Rationale:

Information in the URA indicates that sufficient forage currently exists to satisfy both the current and projected number of antelope. A good management system will insure that this situation is maintained or improved.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MEP)
Twin Falls

Active:
Wildlife - Antelope
Overlay Reference
Step WL-1.9 Step 3

RECOMMENDATION:

Improve existing and future antelope habitat by interseeding monocultures of crested wheatgrass seed—ings with forbs and shrubs. Improve dense stands of sagebrush in selected areas (draws out of wind, etc.) in areas of crested wheatgrass seedings. Include a minimum of six species each of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in all rehabilitation efforts. Do not consider sagebrush re—duction projects in proposed antelope in—troduction sites, at this time, so as to maintain adequate winter forage, fawning sites and fawn cover areas.

SUPPORT:

Range - Coordinate <u>all</u> land treatments with wildlife.

Watershed - Assistance in all land treatment projects to help protect the watershed.

Wildlife - Inventory and designation of areas to be seeded with forbs and shrubs, areas of sagebrush protection and improvement and seed mixtures.

RATIONALE:

An increase in the forb component of the vegetative composition in the existing antelope habitat and expansion areas would improve the spring and summer use areas for antelope. The forb component is very important for antelope in the spring and early summer. In the large stands of crested wheatgrass seedings this important component is quite limited. Antelope ranges having insufficient native plants for natural reproduction need to be seeded. High antelope densities are found in those areas associated with big sagebrush and/or silver sagebrush communities. A lack of cover in draws and similiar areas is a limiting factor to antelope in the winter in large crested wheatgrass seedings. Seeding mixtures of a variety of plant species have often proven beneficial to antelope, especially when legumes have been planted. All habitat components must exist in an area if wildlife species are going to do well. The fact that antelope exist in the Planning Unit indicates that the habitat is somewhat suitable. We still need more detailed information on important use areas, migration routes between Idaho and Nevada and between the Burley District and Boise District, etc.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with Fire Management 1.5, however, WL-1.8 and part of 1.9 are based on increasing the forb component of the areas involved. One of the primary results of fire is an increse in forb production for several years. Given the existing livestock use and fuel availability, the chances of the entire area burning off in one year are very small. The conflicts with range management center around that portion of the recommendation dealing with no sagebrush reduction projects in proposed antelope introduction areas and interseeding existing seedings with forbs and shrubs. These seedings were made to reduce brush competition.

Note: Attach additiona sheets, if needed

dustractions on reverse t

e general and the Name

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Twin Falls
Activity Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 WL-1.9Step 3

(Dicision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows:

- 1. Improve existing and future antelope habitat by interseeding crested wheatgrass seedings with forbs and shrubs or allow some areas to revert to brush if inventories and studies show a definite lack of browse available for antelope.
- Include a mixture of grasses, forbs, and shrubs in rehabilitation efforts.
- 3. Include a sizeable leave area in new land treatment projects to increase edge effect.
- 4. Improve dense stands of sagebursh in selected areas (draws out of wind, etc.) in areas of crested wheatgrass seedings.

Reason:

Interseed crested wheatqrass seedings when a definite lack of forbs and shrubs is noted. A mixture of grasses, forbs and shrubs in rehabilitation projects will improve conditions for both cattle and wildlife. Mixtures for each site should be determined based on physical conditions of the site.

Inclusion of leave areas and improvement of sagebrusdh areas will increase the edge effect and improve habitat conditions for not only antelope, but other wildlife species as well.

Support Needs:

Range Coordinate all treatment project
with wildlife to determine leave
areas.

Wildlife -

Inventory proposed introduction areas to determine the amount of forage deficiencies for antelope that do exist. Coordinate all interseeding projects with range.

Alternatives Considered:

- 1. Accept WL-1.9.
- 2. Reject WL-1.9.
- 3. Reject F-1.5.
- Reject all proposed range treatments in areas included in WL-1.9.