MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity Pance Management **Overlay Reference**

Step 1 RM-2.4 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

Drop 4109 Salmon Tract-U2

4121 Section 22 4122 Highway Unit

4125 Isolated Tracts-Kunkel -

These allotments are not in grazing management systems or proposed for grazing management systems. If a grazing management system were developed that provided for the physio-logical needs of the desirable vegetative species they would be moved up to priority 3.

4074 Amsterdam-Kumkel -Analysis of the cost of the projects required to implement the system proposed in RM-1.1 showed that it was excessive since the allotment is currently producing at a level exceeding the grazing preference. The proposed system was dropped and recommended for continued seasonal use management.

4001 Buhl Group-Berger -4012 Lanting-Berger 4013 Martens Berger 4014 Noh-Berger 4015 Parrot-Berger 4018 Smith-Berger

These allotments are crested wheatgrass seedings and the recommended treatments are on islands of brush that were too shallow and rocky for plowing treatment in the intial projects. These areas should be left in sagebrush cover to help keep a desirable vegetation complex and avoid developing a biological desert. Leaving these island will help meet Wildlife and Visual Resource needs in the Berger treatment area.

4031 Western Stockgrowers -

4034 Point Ranch

4044 South Mule Creek Projects numbered 20, 80 and 82 on Range URA 4 overlay 1.2 treatments are dropped as shown in the RM-2.4 Impact Analysis. Project 20 is a severe erosion-susceptable soil, project 80 is severe erosion-susceptible soil and sagegrouse winter range, project 82 is sagegrouse winter range and Visual Resoure Management Class III.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reasons:

Modify RM-2.4 -Treat the areas in the following priority and drop the ones in the Drop

These proposals add to the total management of these allotments. The acres shown are estimates and are

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1-

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Multiple Use Recommendation (cont.):

category. Refer to the Multiple Use Analysis for rationale. All accepted treatments will be modified as shown in the Impact Analysis for RM-2.4.

i		Increase
No. Name	Acres	AUM's
Priority #1		
4016 PVGA-Berger	· 340	113
4049 Peters	207	78
4066 Barton-Schutte	47	22
4108 Lost Creek-42	80	20
4114 Squaw Joe	570	157
4120 Gravel Pit-Salmo	n 500	84
Priority #2		
4098 Schnell-Salmon	1,618	754
4119 Ridge	202	104
Priority #3		
4035 Whiskey Creek	1,800	772

Drop

4001 Buhl Group-Berger 4012 Lanting-Berger 4013 Martens-Berger 4014 Noh-Berger 4015 Parrot-Berger 4018 Smith-Berger 4031 Western Stockgrowers 4034 Point Ranch 4044 South Mule Creek 4074 Ansterdam Kunkel 4109 Salmon Tract-U2 4121 Section 22 4122 Highway Unit 4125 Isolated Tract-Kunkel

Supports Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit cost analysis.

Alternatives Considered:

- Reject RM-2.4. 1.
- Accept RM-2.4. 2.
- 3. Different amounts of the recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Twin Falls

Name (MFP)

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-2.4 Step 3

Form 1600-21 April 1975

Activity Danne Management

other resoruce values in the

allotments, especially wildlife

habitat and visual resource needs.

reduced from the proposal to improve

Reasons (cont.):

Name (MFP) Twin Falls

Activity Pange Management

anne ranavenen

Overlay Reference Step 1 RM-2.4 Step 3

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Supports Needs (cont.):

R. A. Staff -AMP development, project planning, layout, design.

Operations -Treatment, cost-data, survey, design, contracting.

Administration -Contracting and procurement.

Archaeology -Cultural examinations.

Decision:

Modify the multiple use recommendation to use any best method or combination of treatment methods that will meet the stated management objectives.

Rationale:

These proposed projects will be coordinated with identified wildlife and watershed values to assure that all the identified values are provided for or improved. The acreages are estimates derived through the conflict analysis to mitigate adverse impacts on all identified resource values in each of the treatment sites.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 April 1975

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Recommendation:

RM-2.5 Plow and seed 638 acres of native rangeland to increase production and grazing condition on the areas described below:

#	Name	Acres	AUM's
	Point Ranch	362	185
	Highway-Kunkel	276	107

Rationale:

The treatments included in this recommendation will improve the grazing condition of the areas included. These areas currently dominated by big sagebrush, cheatgrass, and Sandberg's bluegrass. Implementation of grazing systems will not improve the condition of these areas.¹ Land treatments will provide for productive perennial forage species. The permittees involved have expressed a desire to treat the areas with plowing and seeding.

Name MEPE

Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-2.5 Step 3

Activity

Twin Falls

Range Management

The expected increases in capacity were determined by comparing the existing production of the proposed treatment areas with production of similar seeded sites in excellent condition.

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Layout) Archeologist: (Cultural Clearance)

> 1. Hironaka, M. and Fosberg, M.A., 19 Non Forest Habitat Types of Southern Idaho Interior Report. V of I Forest. Wildlife Range Experiment Station.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Distantion on recersed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity Range Management Overlay Reference Step 1 RM-2.5 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

The analysis for this recommendation is the same as shown in RM-2.3 which says that the sites have potential to produce and can be planned and developed in a manner that does not conflict with other resource uses. If these proposals have a positive benefit-cost ratio and funding is made available they would benefit the human environment. The benefit is not significant by itself, but if enough insignificant benefits are added together they do contribute to the whole.

(Auciriox) Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-2.5 -Implement the recommendations with the modifications shown in the Impact Analysis for RM-2.5.

4034Point Ranch181 acres4124Highway-Kunkel235 acres

Support Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit-cost analysis.

R. A. Staff – Planning, design, layout.

Operations -Cost-data, design, layout, treatment, contracting.

Administration -Contracting, procurement.

Archaeologist -Cultural examination.

Reasons: .

The sites have the potential to produce and can be developed to benefit wildlife at the same time. About 75 percent of the area can be treated in a broken irregular pattern to create "edge."

Alternatives Considered:

- 1. Reject RM-2.5.
- 2. Accept RM-2.5
- 3. Additional acres.
- 4. Other treatment methods.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Recommendation:

RM-2.6 Seed 600 acres of cheatgrass range located in 4031 Western Stockgrowers.

Same MERA
Twin Falls
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
 Step 1RM-2.6 Step 3

Rationale:

The proposed treatment will improve the grazing condition of 600 acres burned in the Cottonwood fire of 1973. The area was scheduled for rehabilitation after the fire, but was never reseeded. In addition to improving grazing condition, the fire hazard inherent in pure stands of cheatgrass will be reduced by replacement with less volatile perennial species.

The expected increase in capacity was determined by comparing the existing production of the proposed treatment area with production of similar seeded sites in excellent condition.

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Layout) Operations: (Seeding) Archeologist: (Cultural Clearance)

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

In that the on reversed

UNITED STATES	Name(MFP)
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	Twin Falls
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	Activity Range Management
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN	Overlay Reference
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION	Step 1 RM-2.6 Step 3

Multiple Use Analysis

The area burned in 1973 was scheduled for rehabilitation, but the Bureau ran out of seed. The site has potential to produce additional livestock and wildlife forage. Perennial vegetation would add to the stability of the soils from year to year. The increased forage would support facilitation of the proposed grazing system in the Western Stockgrowers Allotment and help reduce the grazing on McMullen Creek wetland/riparian habitat.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Reasons:

Reject RM-2.6 -

Drop the proposal and leave the area as is unless future analysis shows that more forage is needed to help keep stock out of McMullen Creek or the watershed and wildlife resource values are needed. Analysis of the costs of projects needed to implement the proposed system are too costly for the benefits that would be gained. Resource objectives should be achieved by continuing good management practices as described in RM-1.1 modification.

Support Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit-cost analysis.

R. A. Staff -Project planning, layout, design.

Operations -Survey, design, treatment.

Administration -Procurement.

Archaeologist -Cultural examinations.

Alternatives Considered:

- 1. Accept RM-2.6.
- 2. Reduced acreage.
- 3. Add tillage.
- 4. Add acreage.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 Apr:1

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Decision:

Rationale:

Modify the multiple use recommendation. Evaluate the site to determine if the watershed problem would be improved by seeding perennial species on the unstable soils. Seed perennial species that will stabilize or increase the stability of these soils.

Soils are the most important resource we manage and should be protected whenever there is an opportunity.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity

Range Management Overlay Reference

Step RM_2.6 Step 3

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Recommendation:

RM-2.7 Initiate limited fire suppression on 49,769 acres included in recommendations RM-2.1 and RM-2.4, with limited suppression defined as "taking whatever precautions the fire technician as fire boss deems necessary to contain the fire within the boundaries of the proposed project."

Rationale:

The areas included in this recommendation have been recommended for treatment by controlled burning. By allowing wildfire to accomplish the treatment, money will be saved.

Support:

Fire Organization

Multiple Use Analysis



This recommendation is made to include the existing seedings. It will be on the areas maintained as seedings and the areas that are proposed for conversion to seedings, RM-2.3, RM-2.4 and RM-2.5. These recommendations

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Name (MPP) Twin Falls

Range Management Overlay Reference - -----Step 1 8 M2.7 Step 3

UNITED STATES	Name (MFP)
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	Twin Falls
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	Activity
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN	Dande Management Overlay Reference
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION	Step I RM-2.7 Step 3

have been modified to contain areas that are not to be converted from sagebrush cover. In the existing seedings (RM-2.1) it is planned to keep the areas of sagebrush that were omitted from treatment in the original project. In the proposed burn and seed projects (RM-2.4 as modified) it is proposed to leave areas untreated by omitting strategic areas and by strip spraving. The Multiple Use Recommendations for RM-2.3, RM-2.4 and RM-2.5 have dropped some projects and been modified to eliminate wildlife and visual conflicts.

The limited suppression areas should include the existing seedings and the areas proposed for vegetation conversion. In the various wildlife areas, fire control measures will be taken to protect the important wildlife values that have been identified such as deer winter range, sagegrouse winter habitat, pheasant escape and winter habitat, sagegrouse nesting habitat, stream bank woody habitat, antelope winter range, and mule deer fawn rearing habitat.

(*Alecision*) Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-2.7 -

Practice limited fire suppression on the existing seedings and proposed seedings with modificatiins as shown in RM-2.3, RM-2.4 and RM-2.5 Multiple Use Recommendations that provide for normal fire suppression on sage grouse ranges, antelope and mule deer winter ranges, mule deer critical summer range and isolated tracts.

<u>Reasons</u>:

1.

2.

Some of the existing seedings need maintenance and others will on a recurring sequence. New projects will need periodic maintenance to maintain the resource management objectives. If wildfires start on these areas and can be managed to achieve these objectives the cost of the projects should be reduced significantly. Analyisis of existing seedings that have had wildfires shows that fire is an effective seeding maintenance tool.

Total area in limited suppression.

Do not consider wildlife habitat.

Alternatives Considered:

Total suppression.

Support Needs:

Complete the EIS and benefit-cost analysis.

R. A. Staff -Fire Management Activity Plan.

Operations -Fire Management Activity Plan.

Administration -Procurement of seed for rehabilitation projects.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1690-21 (April 147

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Recommendation:

RM-2.8 Treat existing seedings not included in recommendation RM-2.1 and any future seedings as the percent composition of sagebrush exceeds 20%.

Rationale:

This recommendation provides for future successional changes which will decrease the forage production as sagebrush increases.

Implementation of this recommendation will protect the existing and future public and private investments in land treatment involved.

Using the 20% sagebrush composition as the treatment criteria will ensure that sufficient perennial forage species are present to provide for natural reseedings.

Support:

Resource Area Staff: (Monitoring, Layout) Fire Crew: (Burning) Archeologist: (Cultural Clearance)

Note: Attach additional sheets, if reeded

Unstructions on reverse)

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity Range Management Overlay Reference

Step 1 RM-2.8 Step 3

Name (MFP) Twin Falls Activity Pande Management Overlay Reference Step 1 RM-2.8 Step 3

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Multiple Use Analysis

Experience in seeding management in the Twin Falls Planning Unit is showing that periodic maintenance will be needed to keep the sagebrush from reestablishing in most treatment areas. Studies in the Berger area show that sagebrush comes back into the areas no matter what the grazing treatment is. Sagebrush often comes back in areas totally excluded from grazing more rabidly than in many of the grazed areas. The method of treatment appears to influence how long it takes for sagebrush to come back. The plowed areas take longest to convert back to brush and the spraved areas seem to convert back the quickest. The areas that were treated and a few years later were burned maintain the grass type the longest. Range studies and observating are showing that the climatic conditions during the 1970's have been condusive to sagebrush establishment at the cost of the grass species. There have been two years of extreme drought, 1977 and 1979. Grazing use was reduced in these years but percent utilization was high, and in 1977 areas of crested wheatgrass actually died and had to be reseeded. In 1980 areas were observed with thick stands of sagebrush that is about 7 to 10 inches in height and thick stands about 1 to 4 inches in height. These invasions often occur in areas that have sparse scatterings of mature sagebrush plants.

It has been determined that if forage production is to continue at a level that will satisfy the dependency shown by the grazing preference, periodic maintenance will be needed to keep the sagebrush from reestablishing and replacing the crested wheatgrass. There are studies (ARS) in the area that show the relationship of diminishing pounds of grass production as sagebrush cover increases. Decisions were made in the past to convert suitable sites to a vegetative complex consisting predominantly of crested wheatgrass. In the Berger area most of the treatment cost was funded under an agricultural program to reduce the beet-leaf hopper insect that was a menace to some agricultural crops. The subsequent forage production has been formally adjudicated as grazing preference and allocated to livestock grazing on a sustained yield basis managed according to the principles of range management and directed through the initiation and adminsitration of allotment management plans. Through this process the affected ranching operations have developed a dependendcy on this forage production as demonstrated by the currently recognized grazing preference. As intensive seeding management areas need maintenance to meet resource management objectives, an interdisciplinary team approach should be used to ensure that all resource needs continue to be satisfied in the best way.

(Decision)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify RM-2.8 -

keep sagebrush reduced so that the

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Reasons:

The multiple resource objectives need Treat existing seedings as needed to to be maintained and experience has shown that sagebrush conversion to