

## Environmental Consequences

A projected increase of 25% 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. The Canyon County Sanitary Landfill Site (T1) would transfer 320 acres from the ORV play area. ORV use would most likely continue on the Canyon County landfill area (320 acres) but not on the DLE transfer.

Lands available for dispersed recreation would be reduced by the 41,404 acres identified for disposal.

Construction of 68 miles of timber harvest access roads (3.4 miles annually) would increase recreational access potential to a greater extent than Alternative A on roads which remain open after harvests are completed.

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

### Visual

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

Improved riparian habitat on 176 miles of rivers and streams would improve the visual resource in these locations.

Harvesting approximately 1.7 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 activities 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. Pipelines could be constructed using a ripper to bury the pipe, thus minimizing the adverse impacts. Other range developments such as fences and reservoirs should not significantly impact scenic quality because the standard operating procedure for construction would mitigate potential impacts. Land treatments that are designed with feathered edges, multiple species seed mixtures and other mitigating measures should not cause significant adverse impacts.

Transferring 41,404 acres of land from public ownership could result in impacts on the visual resource. Acres transferred from federal ownership by sale or exchange, would no longer be under BLM control and visual quality would depend upon the management implemented by the new owner. Example: agricultural development would transform the areas' scenic views from one of sagebrush/grass dominance to one dominated by cropland and farming. The

visual quality of transferred land that is maintained primarily for grazing purposes would not change significantly from present conditions.

## MINERAL RESOURCES

### Leasables

#### Oil and Gas

This alternative proposes a 2,600 acre no surface occupancy restriction for a section of the Payette River. The area involved is covered by existing power site and Bureau of Reclamation withdrawals and is not classified as prospectively valuable for oil and gas. This overlapping restriction is therefore considered to have no impact on the availability of lands for oil and gas exploration or development under this alternative.

The remaining no surface occupancy stipulations under this alternative total 1,241 acres. The lands involved are generally small and outside of the lands identified as prospectively valuable for oil and gas. Impacts would, therefore, be insignificant.

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

Since the lands identified for transfer would have oil and gas reserved in areas classified 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 35 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

This alternative proposes a 2,600 acre no surface occupancy restriction for a section of the Payette River. The area involved is covered by existing power site and Bureau of Reclamation withdrawals. It is classified as prospectively valuable for geothermal resources and has a hot spring producing 176° F water. As this proposed overlapping restriction does not add to the total acreage restricted, approximately 94% of the resource area would remain open for leasing under this alternative. The impacts would therefore not be significant.

The remaining no surface occupancy stipulations under this alternative total 1,241 acres. The lands involved are generally small parcels and represent a very small percentage of the total prospectively valuable area. Impacts would, therefore, be insignificant.

Time stipulations for the protection of wildlife are consistent throughout this plan and would not be significant. See Alternative A for the analysis of their impacts.

## Environmental Consequences

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 considered insignificant.

Although various lands within the resource area have been classified as prospectively valuable for geothermal resources, the only KGRA within the area has been declassified and there are no geothermal leases within the whole resource area.

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 considered insignificant.

### Locatables

The resource area would have 94% of its lands open to mining activity. Those areas closed to mining are the existing withdrawals. A new withdrawal of 2,600 acres along the Payette River overlaps existing withdrawals. This overlapping withdrawal would not have any significant impact on the availability of lands for locatable mineral location and development. An 8 acre withdrawal to protect the Placerville historic site would not be a significant impact.

Although 40,489 acres of land are proposed for transfer from federal ownership, no lands having valid claims or mineral potential would be transferred from federal ownership unless they are patented under the mining laws, the mineral estate is paid for, or lands of equal overall values are obtained. The impact from land transfer on the availability of lands for mineral location and development is therefore 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

Mineral material needs are not expected to increase or decrease as a result of proposed actions under this alternative. Some existing sites would, however, be depleted within the timespan of this plan and new sites would be needed.

The 12,000 acre Boise Front ACEC would be closed to the sale or free use of mineral materials under the alternative. Road construction and other mineral materials would not be available for use in right-of-way construction and maintenance, road construction and maintenance, mining construction and maintenance, or any other use within or out of the area. This would be a significant impact on the availability of mineral materials from federal lands, particularly if an emergency situation requiring the use of these materials arises.

## FOREST RESOURCES

### Timber

The total acres of commercial forest land would be reduced by 1,044 CFL set aside acres.

The impacts of losing this 1,044 acres of commercial forest land would be minimal. The annual allowable cut would increase to approximately 1.7 million board feet.

## FIRE MANAGEMENT

Agricultural developments, or transfer acreages, about 8-10% of the total acreages, would gradually increase the number of fires and the cost of fire suppression. Fire suppression costs would increase to approximately \$115,000 per year, or 5% of the total costs per year. 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 61,857 AUMs. This would support 5,155 animal units which would generate earnings of \$2.5 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 \$6.7 million. This would be 0.2% of total RMP area 1983 earnings.

The direct earnings would generate 89 jobs. This would be 2.6% of the 1983 farm wage and salary employment. The total earnings would generate 308 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 \$3.4 and \$15.5 million.

The 20-year livestock forage level would be 71,076 AUMs. This would support 5,923 animal units which would generate earnings of \$2.9 million. This would be 11% 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 \$7.6 million. This would be 0.3% of total RMP area 1983 earnings.

The direct earnings would generate 103 jobs. This would be 3% of the 1983 farm wage and salary employment. The total earnings would generate 354 jobs. This would be 0.3% of the RMP area 1983 wage and salary employment.

## Environmental Consequences

This 20-year stocking level represents a capital value of between \$4.0 and \$17.8 million.

### Recreation

Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A.

### Lumber and Wood Products

Approximately 1.7 million board feet of wood products would be harvested annually with this alternative. This would generate earnings of \$387,000. This would be 0.2% of the RMP area durable manufacturing 1983 earnings. The total earnings (including the multiplier effect) would be \$926,900. This would be 0.04% of the total RMP 1983 earnings.

The harvest level would lead to 18 jobs (Youngblood 1983). This would be 0.1% of the 1983 manufacturing wage and salary employment. Total employment (including the multiplier effect) would be 46. This would be 0.04% of the total 1983 RMP area wage and salary employment.

### Management Costs

Range and wildlife improvements associated with this alternative would cost approximately \$1.9 million.

### Summary

Total crop agriculture 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 \$6.7 million and 308 jobs. These are both less than one-half of one percent of the RMP earnings and employment. The 20-year stocking level would lead to total earnings of \$7.6 million and employment of 354 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 products earnings and employment would be \$926,900 and 46 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 \$1.9 million.