

## Environmental Consequences

Impacts from managing the Boise Front as an ACEC would be the same as those discussed under Alternative A for the Boise Front SRMA.

A projected increase of 30% in big game numbers through improved habitat is expected to increase big game hunting opportunity by the same amount. Opportunities for non-consumptive uses would also increase as a result.

The effects of the Pickles Butte DLE would be the same as discussed in Alternative A.

Lands available for dispersed recreation would be reduced by the 35,727 acres identified for disposal.

Construction of 116 miles of timber harvest access roads (5.8 miles annually) will greatly increase recreational access potential in these areas. Some of these roads would be closed after harvesting is complete.

Eight miles and a 2,600 acre corridor of BLM land along the South Fork of the Payette River would be proposed for Wild and Scenic Rivers study.

Identification of special designation areas would cause a slight increase in hiking, sightseeing, and other casual visitor use.

### Visual

The positive effects of an intensively managed Boise Front ACEC would be the same as discussed in Alternative A.

Improved riparian habitat on 170 miles of rivers and streams would improve the visual resource in these locations.

Harvesting approximately 2.9 million board feet of timber and the resulting access roads may negatively impact the visual resource. Less obtrusive selective cutting would be the primary harvest method, although some clearcuts, not to exceed 40 acres each, may be proposed. All timber sales would be guided by the appropriate VRM class guidelines. Impacts from timber harvest would be minimal.

Wildlife improvement projects such as fences, guzzlers and vegetation manipulation could negatively impact the visual resource. With the use of standard mitigation measures on these projects, no significant adverse impacts would be expected.

Project development in the range program could negatively impact the visual resource. Fences, reservoirs, pipelines and vegetative manipulations are proposed and have been discussed in Alternative A. Impacts would not be significant.

Transferring 35,727 acres of land from public ownership could result in impacts on the visual resource. See discussion in Alternative B.

## MINERAL RESOURCES

### Leasables

#### Oil and Gas

The effects of a 2,600 acre withdrawal along the Payette River under this alternative would not be significant since this area is already covered by existing power site and Bureau of Reclamation withdrawals and is not classified as prospectively valuable for oil and gas.

No surface occupancy stipulations under this alternative total 7,731 acres. The lands involved are generally small and are not identified as prospectively valuable for oil and gas. The 500 acre Pickles Butte Play Area and the 3,000 acre Little Gem Cycle Park area "no surface occupancy" restrictions may be a significant adverse impact on oil and gas exploration and development in the areas involved.

Since the lands identified for transfer would have oil and gas reserved in areas identified as prospectively valuable for oil and gas, the impact of land transfers would be insignificant.

Based on the lack of any commercial oil or gas wells in Idaho, the thirty-five dry holes in the resource area, the low potential of the area, and the above analysis, the overall impacts of this alternative on the availability of oil or gas leasing and development would be insignificant.

#### Geothermal

The 2,600 acre withdrawal along the Payette River would not be significant since the area is already covered by existing power site and Bureau of Reclamation withdrawals.

"No surface occupancy" stipulations under this alternative total 7,731 acres. The lands involved are generally small parcels and represent a very small percentage of the total prospectively valuable area. The impacts would be considered insignificant.

Time stipulations for the protection of wildlife are consistent throughout the plan and would be insignificant. See Alternative A for the analysis.

Since the lands identified for transfer would have the geothermal estate reserved in areas classified as prospectively valuable, the impact of land transfers would be insignificant.

Based on the lack of any commercial geothermal electric projects in Idaho, the lack of any known large reservoirs in the area, the declining interest in geothermal resources and the above analysis, the overall impacts of this alternative on the availability of geothermal leases and development would be insignificant.

## Environmental Consequences

### Locatables

The resource area would have 93% of its lands open to mining activity. Those areas closed to mining include 31,177 acres of existing withdrawals, an overlapping withdrawal of 2,600 acres along the Payette River, and various small protective withdrawals amounting to 1,803 acres total. The 2,600 acre overlapping withdrawal would not be a significant impact. None of the 1,803 acres are within zones of current mineral interest and none have any record or history of mineral locations. Therefore, the impacts for these withdrawals would also not be significant.

A total of 35,727 acres of land are proposed for transfer from federal ownership under this alternative. No lands having valid mining claims or mineral potential would be transferred from federal ownership unless they are patented under the mining laws, the mineral estate is purchased at fair market value, or lands of equal overall values are obtained. The impact from land transfer on the availability of lands for mineral location and development would, therefore, be considered insignificant.

An analysis of the location of and activity on the existing mining claims and areas of mineral interest compared to an analysis of the actions proposed under this alternative indicates that there would not be any significant impacts on the availability of locatable minerals.

### Salables

The impacts of this alternative on mineral materials would be the same as that for Alternative A. Decisions on allowing or not allowing mineral material sales from any particular site would be made on a site specific basis.

## FOREST RESOURCES

### Timber

Under the high investment alternative the total acres of commercial forest land would be reduced by 1,339 CFL set aside acres. However the impacts of losing this 1,339 acres of commercial forest land would be minimal and with the intensive management of the available CFL the cut would increase to approximately 2.9 million board feet.

## FIRE MANAGEMENT

Fire occurrence and suppression costs adjacent to farming developments would remain at Alternative B levels. All other levels would remain the same as with Alternative A.

## ECONOMICS

### Crop Agriculture

Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A.

Livestock

The 5-year livestock forage level would be 63,966 AUMs. This would support 5,331 animal units which would generate earnings of \$2.6 million. This would be 10% of the total permittee earnings, 6% of the RMP area meat animal earnings, and 3% of total farm earnings. The total earnings (including the multiplier effect) would be \$6.9 million. This would be 0.3% of total RMP area 1983 earnings.

The direct earnings would generate 92 jobs. This would be 2.7% of the 1983 farm wage and salary employment. The total earnings would generate 318 jobs. This would be 0.3% of the RMP area 1983 wage and salary employment.

This initial stocking level represents a capital value of between \$3.6 and \$16.0 million.

The 20-year livestock forage level would be 76,613 AUMs. This would support 6,384 animal units which would generate earnings of \$3.1 million. This would be 12% of total permittee earnings, 7% of the RMP area meat animal earnings, and 3% of total farm earnings. The total earnings (including the multiplier effect) would be \$8.2 million. This would be 0.4% of total RMP area 1983 earnings.

The direct earnings would generate 111 jobs. This would be 3.2% of the 1983 farm wage and salary employment. The total earnings would generate 382 jobs. This would be 0.3% of the RMP area 1983 wage and salary employment.

This 20-year stocking level represents a capital value of between \$4.3 and \$19.2 million.

Recreation

Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A.

Lumber and Wood Products

Approximately 2.9 million board feet of wood products would be harvested annually with this alternative. This would generate earnings of \$645,000. This would be 0.2% of the RMP area durable manufacturing 1983 earnings. The total earnings (including the multiplier effect) would be \$1.5 million. This would be 0.07% of the total RMP 1983 earnings.

The harvest level would lead to 30 jobs (Youngblood 1983). This would be 0.2% of the 1983 manufacturing wage and salary employment. Total employment (including the multiplier effect) would be 77. This would be 0.06% of the total 1983 RMP area wage and salary employment.

Management Costs

Range and wildlife improvements associated with this alternative would cost approximately \$2.5 million.

## Environmental Consequences

### Summary

Total crop agricultural earnings and employment would increase by \$529,700 and 24 jobs. These are both less than one-tenth of one percent of the 1983 RMP area earnings and employment. The initial livestock stocking level would lead to earnings and employment (including the multiplier effect) of \$6.9 million and 318 jobs. These are both less than one-half of one percent of the RMP area earnings and employment. The 20-year stocking level would lead to total earnings of \$8.2 million and employment of 382 jobs. This alternative would not lead to any change in the recreation-related earnings and employment. The total (including the multiplier effect) lumber and wood product earnings and employment would be \$1.5 million and 77 jobs. These are both less than one-tenth of one percent of the 1983 RMP area earnings and employment. Project costs needed to implement this alternative would be \$2.5 million.