UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name *(MFP)*
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Wilderness
Overlay Reference
Step 1 W-1.1 Step 3

Decision #1

Grant Wilderness Study Area (WSA) status to Hawley Mountain 32-3, Black Canyon 32-9, and Pass Creek 32-16. Manage these areas under the Interim Management Plan guidelines.

Reasons

This is a requirement of FLPMA and part of established procedure for inventory and management.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

Recommendations which were Rejected

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Wilderness
Overlay Reference
Step 1 W-1.2 Step 3

W-1.2

Administrative action, not a land use decision.

ote: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

WATERSHED

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Watershed	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #1

Reverse current trend of increasing erosion, promote soil development, and stabilize the second flood plain of Birch Creek by rotobeating and reseeding approximately 2000 acres. (W 1.1)

Reasons:

This area has a vigorous stand of Wymoning Sagebursh indicative of deep, fertile soil. However, the area is adjacent to Birch Creek and shows heavy use by livestock. Grass species make up only 7 percent density on the most productive site on this watershed. The area is crosshatched with rills and covered by an erosion pavement of small rock and gravel. Increased grass cover is needed to reduce erosion. Grazing management alone would not be expected to reduce erosion due to the slow response of the vegetation due to cold temperatures and low precipitation. Rotobeating and seeding with Siberian wheatgrass and yellow sweet clover will reduce erosion while minimizing adverse impacts to antelope.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Decision #2

Reduce erosion, increase vegetative cover, and improve watershed conditions through land treatments* or improved management on a maximum of 216,783 acres of public land where one or more of the following criteria are met:

(a) Treatment plus management would improve the SSF 10 points or more.

(b) Less than 15 percent density of perennial grasses.

(c) Thirty percent or more small rock density of desert pavement.

(d) Forty percent crown density or more of Wyoming Sagebrush, Basin, Big Sagebrush, Three-tip or Mountain Big Sagebrush.

(e) Fifty percent or more bare gravel.

*Land treatments include interseeding, chemical spraying, and roto-beating. Controlled burning may be feasible, but specific sites and prescriptions have not been identified. (W1.2)

Reasons:

The density, vigor, and viability of desirable vegetation - particularly perennial grasses - is very low. Soil development has deteriorated through erosion and trampling. Much of the area has a desert pavement. Recovery of native range will require many years, even with optimum management or complete non-use. Potential conflicts with wildlife habitat exist - primarily for antelope and sagegrouse. The potential conflicts for this 216,783 acres is considered low and projects will be designed to avoid ciritcal antelope areas, sagegrouse strutting and nesting areas, and other sensitive areas. Considering the outlook for funding, it is doubtful if much land treatment will actually be accomplished in the next few years.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Watershed
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Decision #3

Rotobeat or use other methods to remove sagebursh cover on 50 acres of sagebrush in Squaw Springs Valley. (W-3.2)

Reasons:

The valley in the vicinity of the springs has deep soil and a high water table. The sagbrush has grown rank, up to nine feet high with a closed canopy that suppresses other vegetation. Control of the brush will encourage growth of rhyzomonus and fiberous rooted plants that are better soil holders than the tap rooted sagebrush. There were no conflicts identified with other resources or programs.

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
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Watershed	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #4

Control headcuts and gullies in Hurst Creek by hand-constructing rock dams in the gully. Any additional gully control in the unit will be by hand-constructed rock check dams and not by mechanical water control or other artificial means. Do not divert water from gully channels. (W-3.4 and W-3.7)

Reasons:

The purpose of the hand-constructed check dams is to slow water, deposit silt and build the gully floor. A gully needs water to heal. A dry gully will remain static indefinitely. Also if water is diverted out of established gullies, it may start new erosion especially where the water returns to the main channel. Water should percolate through the hand-placed rocks and spill to the lower level thus reducing the channel gradient. Dams are meant to assist in natural reclamation of the gully; not to control massive heads of water. Artificial or mechanical reclamation of the gullies will cause more soil disturbance and soil loss than will occur naturally within the next 25 years. Protection from livestock grazing will not materially assist the recovery of the gullies and would disrupt the orderly grazing in various allotments.

Recommendations Dropped or Rejected

W 1.3 - Development of AMPs for all allotments were dropped because it is already covered in the Range Management section (RM 1.1, 1.2, 1.3).

W 1.4 - Rehabilitation of crested wheatgrass seedings was dropped since it is covered in the Range Management section (RM 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

W 2.1 - Livestock management to protect springs and riparian areas is adequately addressed in Range Management and Aquatic Wildlife sections.

W 3.1 - Protection of Squaw Springs is provided for in Aquatic Wildlife.

W 3.3 - Not a Land Use Decision

W 3.5 - Administration of this area will be handled by USFS in conjunction with National Forest, so the recommendation is rejected. Most of this drainage area is USFS so control is needed on upper drainage.

W 3.6 - This recommendation was rejected because the headcuts and gullies are not considered to need rock check dams.

W 4.1 - The proposal to return the Dry Creek Flume to its original channel was rejected because a right-of-way is in effect. The right-of-way cannot be cancelled. The Dry Creek Flume is addressed in Lands L-7.5.

WILDLIFE

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

IN REPLY REFER TO:

To : Area Manager, Big Butte Resource Area Date: 4/2/80

From : Wildlife Biologist, Big Butte Resource Area

Subject : Wildlife Numbers in Little Lost/Birch Creek

I have estimated changes in wildlife numbers resulting from AMP implementation on Williams Creek, Wet Creek, Warm Springs, Pass Creek, Bell Mountain and Uncle Ike Allotments. I have not been able to determine impacts on Spring Canyon or Jumpoff Allotments because I have not seen the AMPs.

Some changes in management plans subsequent to the ES have changed estimated wildlife numbers from those presented previously. The detailed descriptions of grazing plans provided by the AMPs allow more specific analysis of impacts to wildlife and quantification by an allotment basis is possible. Big game numbers changes are predicted, however bird populations are not known and changes are difficult to quantify. Some generalities are possible for birds (such as increases in sage grouse brood production would be expected with installation of wildlife waters on pipelines and decreases in brood production expected with brush control in nesting areas), however numbers are not available for accurate quantification. I have shown a plus or minus for upland game birds for each AMP I have reviewed. A plus indicates upland game would benefit, a minus indicates they would be adversly affected.

Discussion follows to document any changes in numbers from those presented in the ES. The forms required for cost benefit analysis are included.

Williams Creek - The AMP is already outdated and must be changed to incorporate 500 acres of plow and seed in the south pasture. A deferred grazing system is planned with use being confined to the proposed seeding until June 15th (after peak of sage grouse hatching and antelope fawning). Under this system, big game and upland game populations should increase.

Wet Creek - The grazing plan provides for wildlife values and future increases are expected.

Warm Springs - The grazing plan does not provide consideration for antelope fawning or sagegrouse nesting. Population decreases are expected.

Pass Creek - The grazing plan has changed significantly from what was proposed in the ES. Although cattle levels will increase, wildlife values have been considered and future increases are expected.

Bell Mountain - The grazing plan has changed significantly from what was proposed in the ES. Mule deer numbers should increase dramatically if the AMP objective to improve deer winter range is accomplished.

Uncle Ike - The grazing plan provides for wildlife values and future increases are expected.

Bob McCarty

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Wildlife	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #1

Maintain 366,000 acres of antelope habitat in the Planning Unit by:

a. Retain in public ownership 120,000 acres of antelope fawning areas, 170,000 acres of antelope winter range and all permenent water sources and riparian areas. Excludes 920 acres which may have agricultural potential in Howe, Idaho area. WL-1.1

b. Maintain the existing shrub production on 9,868 acres of critical antelope range on the Jumpoff Allotment. Allow land treatment on 800 acres. WL-2.1

c. Divising AMP's to consider antelope habitat requirements. WL-1.3

d. Allocating 6,822 AUMs for antelope. WL-1.4

e. Including mixtures of forbs, grasses and shrubs on reseeding treatments. WL-1.9

f. Maintain 35-40 percent native shrub composition on 169,000 acres of antelope winter range. WL-1.11

g. Maintaining diversity of vegetation on 191,000 acres of spring-summer antelope range to include 20-35 percent shrub composition. WL-1.12

Reasons

The PU contains year-long habitat which supports the largest antelope herd in the State of Idaho. Idaho Fish & Game projects an annual increase in hunter demand for antelope of 24 percent in Unit 51 (Little Lost Valley) and 14 percent in Unit 58 (Birch Creek Valley). The Idaho State Game Commission has indicated that antelope populations should be increased.

Antelope hunting provides a source of income to local businesses. Antelope provide many hours of observation value to the public, due to their habitat preference for open sagebrush occupied rangelands. Antelope add to the aesthetics of the PU and provide for a high quality human environment.

Winter range, fawning areas, and pernament water sources are critical areas to antelope populations in the planning unit. The Jumpoff Allotment is critical winter range and receives heavy use when snow conditions concentrate wintering antelope in this area. Antelope forage requirements can be insured in development of allotment management plans under the multiple use principal.

Reservation of adequate amounts of forage for antelope is necessary to realize IF&G objectives.

Inclusion of native grass, forb, and browse seed in vegetation manipulation and fire rehabilitation will enhance vegetative diversity on reseedings. Antelope habitat requirements are best met when maximum vegetative diversity is available throughout their range.

Maintenance of native vegetative diversity is necessary to provide food and cover requirements to antelope. 35 - 40 percent shrub cover on antelope winter ranges is necessary to provide winter feed to antelope.

Maintenance of native vegetative diversity is necessary to provide food and cover requirements to antelope. Succulent plants are preferred forage for antelope in the spring and summer and importance of shrubs for food and cover is high throughout the year. Maximum diversity of native vegetation is necessary to insure high quality spring/summer antelope habitat.

Decision #2

Enhance and expand antelope habitat in the PU by:

a. Maintaining livestock water developments full of water through October 1. WL-1.5

b. Constructing precipitation catchments at seven additional locations near Bird Canyon, Sands Canyon, Fallert, Eight Mile Canyon, O'brian Canyon, Rattlesnake Gulch, and Cedar Canyon. (WL 1.5)

c. Restricting livestock trailing during the fawning season (May 25 to June 21) to existing roads only. (WL-1.6)

d. Maintaining migration routes free from livestock concentration during spring (March 30 to May 30) and fall (October 1 to November 30) migrations. (WL-1.7)

Reasons:

Water is a limited resource in certain locations within the planning unit. Livestock and wildlife distribution can be enhanced through water development. Coordination between range and wildlife developments is necessary to insure non-duplication of effort. Water catchments should be excluded from livestock use to insure an adequate supply of water to wildlife throughout the hot, dry season. Restricting livestock trailing operations to existing roads would enhance antelope fawn survival with negligible impacts to other resource values.

The Dry Creek Flume is a hazard to resident wildlife in the Donkey Hills and Mulkey Bar area. Annually, antelope, mule deer, coyotes, badgers, reptors, and small mammals are killed in the flume. The major part of the flume occurs on public land under right-of-way permit. The design of the flume does not allow for escape once anything has become caught in the fast flowing water. Currently the flume is fenced on either side immediately adjacent to the flume. Animals which jump the fence, land directly in the flume. Wildlife crossings are limited at the present time. Freedom of antelope movement can be insured by restricting livestock concentrations from migration routes with negligible impacts to other resource values. See Lands L-7.5 for remedial action.

Decision #3

Maintain 91,661 acres of mule deer habitat within the Planning Unit by:

a. Designing allotment management plans to minimize dietary overlap between livestock and deer (WL-2.2). (WL-2.1)

b. Allocating 2,490 AUMs to deer. (WS-2.3)

c. Retaining all deer winter range in federal ownership. (WS-2.4)

d. Not treating winter ranges for brush control. (WL-2.6)

Reasons:

The planning unit contains habitat which presently supports an increasing population of mule deer. Idaho Fish & Game estimates that current annual population increases of more deer in the Planning unit equals 5 percent in the Little Lost and 2 percent in the Birch Creek Valleys. The Idaho State Game Commission has indicated that mule deer populations should be increased. Idaho Fish & Game estimates that current hunter demand far exceeds supply and hunter demand is projected to increase.

Mule deer hunting provides a source of income to local businesses. Mule deer add to the aesthetics of the planning unit.

Competition for forage between mule deer and livestock becomes significant when dietary overlap occurs. Livestock seasons of use can be designed to maintain proper use of important forage species for both deer and livestock. AMPs can be designed with deer winter range in mind utilizing herding, fencing, or rotational techinques to mitigate dietary overlap. Idaho Fish & Game estimates a current annual population increase of 5 percent in the Little Lost and 2 percent in the Birch Creek Valley. Allocation of forage is necessary to meet Idaho Fish & Game management objectives.

Critical winter range should be retained so that mule deer will be assured the habitat needed for this period fo high stress. Private ownership of these winter ranges could result in reducing or elimination of habitat requirements for mule deer.

The primary food source for deer in the winter is browse. Large scale brush control on deer winter range would reduce the availability of this primary food source.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Decision #4

Improve 5,000 acres of deer winter range by:

a. Designing allotment management plans to increase vegetative composition of important deer forage. (WL 2.2)

b. Thinning or pruning mountain mahogany to stimulate growth within reach of deer. (WL 2.5)

Reasons:

Browse provides the major food source for wintering mule deer in the PU. Livestock grazing seasons can be manipulated to favor growth of key deer forage species on winter ranges by concentrating use on grasses and minimizing use on shrubs. Advanced age composition and high lining of mountain mahogany has made most of this palatable browse species unavailable for deer use. Concentration of growth occurs in the upper portion of these shrubs which is out of reach of the deer. The age composition of these stands is such that mature shrubs occupy the majority of the site. Seedling establishment is minimal and young plant growth is stagnated due to the heavy competition for growing space from these over mature shrubs. Carrying capacity of the winter ranges on which these projects would occur would increase. By making more of this highly palatable, nutritious and digestable forage available, the deer utilizing these ranges would have more of a valuable food source to help survive a hard winter.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Decision #5

Maintain 8,254 acres of elk habitat in the PU by:

a. Removing all livestock by October 1. (WL-3.1)

b. Allowing brush control only if it is beneficial to elk. (WL-3.2)

c. Mahogany pruning on 595 acres of elk winter range (WL-3.3)

d. Allocating 1,177 AUMs to elk (WL-3.4)

e. Retaining all elk range in federal ownership. (WL-3.5)

Reasons:

The planning unit presently contains habitat which supports an increasing elk herd. Moderate hunting pressure with low success rates for elk occurs in the planning unit. The Idaho State Game Commission has indicated that elk populations should be increased. Elk hunting provides a source of income to local businesses. Elk add to the aesthetics of the planning unit.

Hawley Mountain allotment is large enough to absorb livestock use in other areas and not be cut by removing use from elk winter range. A small portion of Warm Springs allotment is impacted and management system design will insure forage for elk is left in that portion of the allotment involved in the winter range. Forage allocation procedures showed problems on elk winter ranges based on present elk numbers. Future elk population increases cound result in over allocation of forage in these areas if steps are not taken to insure adequate amounts of forage are reserved for elk.

Dietary preference of elk in the planning unit is presently under study. Until results from this study determine the importance of browse to wintering elk, maintenance of the browse density on elk winter ranges would insure a stable food source for these animals. No conflicts were identified it the planning system. No social or institutional values are impacted. Unregulated livestock use on elk range can result in insufficient forage supplies for elk and can cause long lasting range damage and reduction of elk population. Idaho Fish & Game estimates a current annual population growth rate of 8 percent for elk in the planning unit. Allocation of forage is necessary to meet IF&G management objectives. These forage allocations will provide for optimum elk population levels as identified by IF&G.

Critical elk range should be retained to insure adequate habitat is provided for these animals. Private ownership of these ranges could result in reduction or elimination of habitat requirements for elk.

Decision #6

Maintain 375,243 acres of raptor nesting and hunting habitat by:

a. Maintaining current vegetative diversity and aspect. (WL 4.1)

b. Minimizing human disturbance within 1 mile of all nest sites during nesting season for prarie falcons, ferruginous hawks, and golden eagles. (WL 4.2)

c. Retaining these lands in federal ownership. (WL 4.3)

Reasons:

Raptors are important indicators of environmental contamination as their food consists of primary and secondary consumers which may concentrate some pollutants. Birds of prey have significant aesthetic, observation, educational and scientific values. Raptors can exert a significant influence on control of small prey species. Idaho State Game Commission has identified the goal to develop programs to maintain or increase raptor numbers in Idaho. Raptors are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and are subject to federal law and state regulation.

Some species of raptors show very little flexibility or adaptability in utilizing a diversity of nesting sites or habitats. Prey abundance and an appropriate nesting site are both key factors in determining the suitability of an area for nesting. Diversity and abundance of prey are related to vegetative diversity and cover. Elimination of cover or reduction of vegetative diversity would result in a lower prey base for raptors and could affect nesting success. By reducing prey availability potential raptor nest site quality would be negatively impacted.

Maintenance of quality of nesting and hunting habitat is necessary to insure present and future populations of raptors are preserved. The general disturbance caused by human activity can discourage many raptor species from nesting in an area, even though other key factors are suitable. Golden Eagles and Prairie Falcons are particularly susceptable to disturbance and the end result could be a reduction of the number of total sites available to these birds.

The Ferruginous Hawk is presently on the Idaho State sensitive species list and steps to permit maximum nesting success are necessary to insure maintenance of the population level for this species in the planning unit.

These lands are critcal to the maintenance of existing raptor nesting and hunting habitat. Private ownership of these lands could result in degradation of the areas for raptor and elimination of critical habitat.

Decision #7

Maintain 375,000 acres of upland game and non-game habitat by:

a. Consider "The Guidelines for Manintenance of Sage Grouse Habitats" from the Western States Sage Grouse Committee in Vegetative Manipulation projects. (WL-5.1)

b. Retaining in federal ownership 250,500 acres of sage grouse nesting brood rearing and wintering habitat. (WL-5.2)

c. Maintaining vegetative diversity except on existing crested wheatgrass seedings. (WL-5.3)

d. Reserving approximately one-half the annual production of livestock forage for food and cover. (WL-5.6)

Reasons:

The planning unit presently contains habitat which supports many species of upland game and non-game wildlife. Medium to high densities of sage grouse inhabit the planning unit. Hunting pressure is presently moderate for sage grouse and hunter success for the planning unit exceeds statewide averages. IF&G projects sage grouse populations to increase 5 percent per year with hunter demand projected to increase 4 percent per year.

Upland game hunting provides a source of income to local businesses. Predator-prey relationships are dependent upon proper management of upland game and non-game species. Carnivorous mammals and raptors require upland game and non-game population maintenance to insure adequate food availability maintenance of habitat diversity and insurance of adequate cover and forage is necessary to provide habitat requirements to upland game and non-game species.

The Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners has prepared and periodically updates guidelines for protection of sage grouse habitats. It has long been recognized that sage grouse are dependent upon a sagebrush dominated environment.

Winter range, brood rearing areas, and permanent water sources are critical areas to sage grouse population in the planning unit. Private ownership of these lands could result in degredation of the areas for sage grouse and elimination of critical habitat. Maximum diversity of native flora is necessary to provide the habitat requirements for the various species of upland and non-game which inhabit the planning unit.

Allocation of forage for upland and non-game wildlife species would vary annually due to the cyclic nature of these species. Adhering to 50 percent proper use of primary livestock forage species would help provide food and cover requirements to these animals during most periods of these cycles.

Decision #8

Improve upland game and non-game habitat within the planning unit by:

a. Providing water for sage grouse, small mammals, etc. (WL-5.5)

b. Designing allotment management plans to consider sage grouse nesting and brood rearing habitat on 250,500 acres. (WL-5.4)

Reasons:

Permanent water sources are lacking in certain portions of the planning unit and are a major factor in proper distribution and utilization of habitat by certain wildlife species. Most of the existing livestock watering facilities are of a tank or trough design and do not allow access for small animals or young birds in the flightless stage. The protected seep areas will enhance brood habitat which will be beneficial to the area's gallinaceous birds. Improved distribution of non-game and upland game is desirable in the planning unit.

Concentrated livestock use on sage grouse nesting and brood rearing areas during the nesting season can result in nest desertion. Nest desertion would result in lower brood production. Livestock grazing systems designed to concentrate use on sage grouse nesting and brood rearing areas before June 15 would be in conflict with sage grouse production.

Livestock training operations will be confined to existing roads. Uncontrollable livestock concentrations such as sheep herds grazing through an allotment or cattle movements form one pasture to another will occur. AMPs will consider these periodic concentrations on sage grouse nesting and brood rearing areas.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

Recommendations which were Rejected

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Wildlife	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

1.8 - Existing crested wheatgrass seedings will be managed to maximize livestock production.

1.10 - Remedial action for Dry Creek Flume is found under Lands L-7.5.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

AQUATIC WILDLIFE

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Decision #1:

Modify existing irrigation diversion structures to allow fish passage and reduce erosion and siltation:

a. Divert Warm Creek back to its original channel to eliminate vertical drops which are a barrier to upstream fish passage and to reduce severe erosion and downstream siltation. (AQ 1.1) not viable. This would result in a loss of established stream channel. LD 1987

b. Develop a by-pass flow at the Williams Creek diversion or a series of shallow sloped drops which would allow fish to pass upstream to spawning areas. (AQ 1.3) ~~not viable~~ water only flows past the diversion during spring spreading out over the flow before reaching LL River LD 1987

c. Encourage development of a drop structure at the junction of Williams Creek and the Cedar Run ditch to prevent further deterioration of the creek. (AQ 1.4) There is no erosion problem here at present LD 1987

d. Remove barriers to fish passage (vegetation jams, rock drops, existing culvert) on Badger and Horse Creeks. (AQ 4.2) No barriers identified at present. As problems are identified action should be taken to remove them. LD 1987

Reasons:

Existing barriers preclude fish from passing upstream to spawning areas, contribute silt which degrades the aquatic habitat, and generally decreases the productivity of streams for fish production. Diversion of Warm Creek to its original channel would eliminate severe erosion caused by an existing vertical drop structure. Provision of by-pass flows at the Williams Creek diversion would ensure fish passage and re-establish spawning grounds upstream. This modification will require negotiations with the water user. Although the Cedar Run ditch is located on national forest lands, erosion is contributing silt and fine gravel to Williams Creek which is deteriorating the quality of the stream for fish production. Modification of this structure is consistent with Section 208 of PL 92-500.

e. Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Decision #2:

Replace the exisiting bridge over the Little Lost River at Clyde to reduce erosion and siltation, and to prevent the possible isolation of the road and bridge. (AQ 2.3)

Reasons:

The river makes a sharp bend against the road before flowing under the existing bridge. Current erosion pattern indicates the structure will wash out in the near future. Such an incident would isolate a high use recreation area and contribute a large silt load to the Little Lost River. The road and bridge are located on public land and constitutesa definite safety hazard. Records do not show who originally built the bridge.

Bridge upgraded and strengthened in present location Aug. 1986. Erosion has not progressed. no threat to road or bridge J

Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Decision #3:

Reduce siltation and degradation of stream and riparian areas through protective fencing to exclude livestock from concentrated use areas:

a. Fence 7 miles of Wet Creek (in conjunction with recreation site development) to prevent further degradation of stream quality. Water gaps will be used to provide livestock water. (AQ 3.1)

b. Fence the upper ½ mile of Summit Creek to prevent damage to riparian vegetation and streambanks by livestock, if this practice is shown effective in adjacent areas. (AQ 3.2)

c. Fence Squaw Springs to prevent continued erosion and siltation. (in conjunction with Watershed) (AQ 3.3 and 2.1)

d. Fence about 3 miles along Birch Creek; Sec. 5, 9, 16, T. 9 N., R. 30 E.

all done by 1986

Reasons:

Fencing to exclude livestock from areas currently receiving concentrated use can greatly reduce streambank erosion, damage to riparian vegetation, and siltation of existing streams. Just above Squaw Springs, a gully 10 feet deep by 20 feet wide approximately ¼ mile long has developed primarily from rapid snowmelt. Protective fencing in conjunction with watershed (W 3.1, W 3.7) would rehabilitate the area and reduce siltation upstream. Wet Creek receives about 1000 visitor days by hunters, 2000 visitor days by fishermen and an estimated 1500 use days for general recreation. The recreation use coupled with concentrated livestock pressure are degrading water quality, aquatic organisms, and riparian vegetation. Fencing to control use along Wet Creek would decrease erosion and damage to the stream.

Summit Creek begins as a series of springs in the Salmon District where it is fenced and considered an excellent fishery. That portion in the Idaho Falls District has potential for a high quality trout stream and study area. Concentrated livestock use has eliminated or damaged riparian vegetaion and contributed to erosion of streambanks and siltation of Summit Creek. Fencing to exclude livestock would allow rehabilitation of the area and ensure continued fish production. Fencing to reduce erosion is consistent with the requirements of PL 92-500.

Birch Creek is a valuable fishery and provides quality fishing opportunities. A fence exists on the east side of Birch Creek. Construction of about 3 miles of fence will allow excluding livestock from the most productive portion of the stream.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name *(MFP)*
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Fencing is necessary to protect riparian habitat along Birch Creek from livestock use which would be increased upon the reseeded area. Adequate water gaps will be constructed to provide livestock water. Fencing would run parallel to the west side of Birch Creek from the existing enclosure in Section 16 to the John Day Grave fence in Section 5 all in T. 9 N., R. 30 E. See Watershed W-1.1.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Decision #4:

Restore the Little Lost River to its original channel to reduce erosion and improve stream quality. (AQ 4.1)

Reasons:

A bend in the Little Lost River (Sec. 28, T. 9 N., R. 27 E.) has been cut by a large channel. The cut is about 300 feet long by 30 feet across with steep walls. Erosion of the banks is severe and there is a high silt load entering the river at this point. No right-of-way for the structure exists and the builder is not known The structure violates Section 208 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Restoring the river to its original channel will reduce siltation in future years and help protect fishery values of the river.

The newer channel cut is now stabilized. The old channel has reverted to dryland vegetation and has filled in. Restoring the creek to its original channel would not be beneficial at this time. LD 1987

e: 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
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity	Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #5:

Obtain a water right on Birch Creek.

Reasons:

Birch Creek is a valuable fishery and a Habitat Management Plan has already been prepared and partially implemented. The flow of Birch Creek is appropriated from mid April through mid October, but no water rights have been established for the remainder of the year. Instream flow is now recognized as a beneficial use of water following the 1978 change in Idaho Water Law. Establishment of a water right for instream flow would assure maintenance of the fishery as no new diversion would be allowed upstream.

5 CFS instream flow secured 1986 by virtue of Birch Creek Hydro Project

e. 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
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1AQ-6.1 Step 3

Decision #6

Modify Step 2 as Follows:

Continue to use water gaps on both Big Spring Creek and Birch Creek. Construct 2½ miles of fence on Birch Creek to exclude livestock grazing. Provide adequate water gaps for livestock. Construct 3½ miles of fence along LL road to exclude livestock from 4½ miles of Big Spring Creek and ½ mile of the Little Lost River.

Reasons

This is a change from what is shown in the LL/BC decision document which specifies elimination of the water gaps.

This action is taken due to the expense involved in providing alternate water sources and because of the additional fencing planned, which will mitigate the impact of existing water gaps on these streams. Livestock would be excluded from 7¼ miles of stream by the proposed fencing. Water gaps would remain on 2½ miles of Birch Creek.

An Environmental Assessment would be prepared prior to taking any actions.

Projects Completed 1983 LO

ote: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Recommendations Rejected or Eliminated:

AQ 1.2 - The Dry Creek Flume is considered in Lands L-7.5

AQ 2.2 - Not a Land Use Decision

AQ 2.4 - Not a Land Use Decision

AQ 2.5 - This has been accomplished as a condition of patent in the Robison UTA sale.

AQ 5.2 - Not a Land Use Decision

AQ 7.1 - Not a Land Use Decision, will be developed as follow up and result of MFP.

AQ 7.2 - Not a Land Use Decision

FIRE

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Fire Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Decision #1 - FM-1.2

Continue to maintain the lookout facility on Big Southern Butte.

Reasons

The lookout facility provides detection capability for approximately 50% of the Little Lost-Birch Creek Planning unit. The lookout is a valuable tool in the detection and prevention of the large fires.

In addition to the coverage of the Little Lost-Birch Creek Planning unit, the lookout provides 100% detection capability for the Big Desert Planning unit.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Fire Management	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #2 - FM-2.1

Establish fire management plans for Hawley Mountains and Donkey Hills to allow for limited suppression on fires meeting planning criteria.

Reasons

These areas have a history of low fire occurance and due to the steep rugged terrain access is very limited. Most fires are extinguished naturally rather than by suppression crews. Fire management plans will allow us to monitor these fires and take suppression action if extreme conditions warrant.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name *(MFP)*
Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity
Fire Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Decision #3 - FM-3.3

Prescribed burning for management objectives should begin in the planning unit by 1981.

Reasons

These areas will be identified and planning will be completed by 1981. Prescribed burning can be one of the most economical and environmentally sound practices to achieve range improvement.

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

Recommendations which were Rejected

Name (MFP)	Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity	Fire Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation - FM-1.1 - Not a land use decision.

Recommendation - FM-1.3 - Plan has been prepared.

Recommendation - FM-3.1 - Not a land use decision.

Recommendation - FM-3.2 - Not a land use decision.

Recommendation - FM-3.4 - Not a land use decision.

te: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

LITTLE LOST-BIRCH CREEK EIS MONITORING PLAN

Decisions made in the planning and environmental statement process have resulted in many changes in resource management on the Little Lost-Birch Creek Planning Unit. The changed management will result in impacts to the vegetative and animal communities. Changes in vegetative condition were predicted in the EIS and these changes must be documented. Also, forage production must be measured to form a basis for future adjustments in stocking rate. Therefore an orderly system of monitoring changes in the environment and documenting use intensities must be started to establish a basis for future management decisions.

The following monitoring programs will be used to evaluate management practices and measure impacts on the environment.

I. Livestock and Vegetation

A. Actual use records

Each operator will be required to submit actual grazing use reports. The reports will be required within 15 days after the close of an individuals grazing season.

The range conservationist assigned to the planning area will instruct the grazing operator on how to keep records on livestock numbers and use dates. Actual use data will be collected starting from the time the allotment is placed on actual use billing status. This information will be used for billing purposes then will be recorded in allotment folders.

B. Range use supervision

Range use supervision will be done by the range use supervisor and/or the range conservationists assigned to the planning unit. Use supervision will consist of a general schedule of allotment checks designed to detect and record allotment problems. Data collected will be kept in the allotment folder. Specific items and check methods will be as follows:

1 - Livestock numbers and location

(a) Periodic aircraft surveillance with records kept on livestock numbers and location by allotment.

(b) Ground checks will be conducted in each allotment during each grazing treatment. Records will be kept on livestock numbers and location. Livestock numbers and location will be monitored throughout the grazing season each year.

2 - Forage utilization checks

Forage utilization will be monitored in each allotment using the key forage plant method. Forage utilization will be checked within a week after the cattle move from a pasture. These checks will be initiated during the 1981 grazing season and will continue each year.

3 - Range condition and trend studies

These studies will be done in each pasture to establish a long-term record of plant response to the grazing system. The information will be collected from photo points (3' x 3' plot view and a general view) established in each pasture.

Information will also be collected from a 100 point vegetative transect that will be established in each pasture adjacent to the photo point. The condition and trend studies for the first eight allotments were established in 1980. The remaining allotments will have studies established in each pasture during 1981. Study plots will be read annually throughout the first cycle of the grazing system. Then only in rested or deferred pasture during subsequent grazing cycles.

C. Climatological Data

This information will be collected from the Weather Bureau's report station nearest to the planning unit. The Weather Bureau information will be supplemented by rain gauges set out at strategic locations. These rain gauges will be read throughout the year on the approximate dates as follows:

1 - April 1 (Beginning of growing season)

2 - June 15 (End of growing season)

3 - November 1 (Beginning of winter)

Effective rainfall will be monitored by four soil moisture blocks placed at key locations in the planning unit. These will be read in conjunction with the rain gauges. Rainfall and soil moisture data will be collected in an allotment until the vegetative improvement goals predicted by the ES are met.

Information from the above listed studies will be summarized annually and placed in the allotment folders. To collect data from the above listed studies will require an estimated 3 work months each grazing season.

II. Terrestrial Wildlife

Key wildlife habitat (big game fawning and wintering areas, sage grouse strutting grounds) will be monitored to detect changes in habitat condition, impacts of wildlife on habitat and the impacts of livestock on wildlife habitat. The area wildlife biologist will be responsible for establishing and reading the following studies.

A. Big game winter range

1 - Each pasture of allotments containing crucial deer, antelope, or elk winter range will have a study group consisting of one Cole method transect, one pellet group transect and a general photo point. Crucial big game winter range is mapped on pages 2-20 and 2-21 of the Little Lost-Birch Creek EIS.

2 - The Bell Mountain allotment will have a special study to determine the impacts of the cattle on the deer winter range. The special study will be done by the area wildlife biologist. Fecal samples will be collected weekly from November 15 to December 10 from cattle using the deer range. These samples will be analyzed and a copy of the information will be placed in the allotment folder.

3 - Big Game Polulation Trends

Starting in January 1982, annual counts will be made on big game using the planning area. These counts will be made in cooperation with the Idaho Fish and Game Department. Annual counts will require approximately 10 hours helicopter time and 5 hours fixed wing time.

Information from these counts will be summarized annually by allotment and the information placed in the allotment folder.

B. Antelope fawning grounds

Each pasture of allotments containing crucial antelope fawning grounds (see page 2-20 of EIS for map of fawning grounds) will have a study group consisting of one 200 point vegetative cover transect, one pellet group transect and a general photo point. Information from this study group will be summarized annually and placed in the allotment folder.

C. Sage grouse population

Sage grouse population trends will be monitored by conducting strutting ground counts. These counts will be made in cooperation with the Idaho Fish and Game Department. Counts will be made in 10 strutting grounds per year. Data from these studies will be summarized annually and placed in the allotment folders.

The above wildlife studies will require an estimated two work months.

III. Aquatic Life

Studies to assess the impacts of livestock on aquatic life and stream bank vegetation will be conducted annually. These studies will be set out and read by the District Fisheries Biologist, assisted by the Resource Area Wildlife Biologist.

Aquatic life studies will be started in an allotment at the same time the grazing system goes into effect. The following studies will be required:

1 - Photo points - these points will be set out at approximately one mile intervals on the fish producing streams mapped on page 2-27 of the EIS.

2 - Standard stream transects - these studies will be conducted on Wet Creek (layout done in 1980) and on streams where significant change in grazing use is expected: Big Creek, Summit Creek in Bell Mountain and Summit allotments, and Fallert Creek, Warms Spring Creek and Squaw Creek.

These transects will be read annually throughout the first cycle of the grazing system and thereafter at three-year intervals. Information from each reading will be summarized and placed in the allotment folders.

3 - Fish population studies - shocking transects are presently in place on Wet Creek and Birch Creek. The Wet Creek shocking study will be done at three-year intervals starting with the initial study in 1980. These studies will be done with BLM equipment and personnel.

Birch Creek is being monitored by the Idaho Fish and Game Department on a regular and continuing basis. This information will be obtained from the Idaho Fish and Game Department by the Resource Area Wildlife Biologist.

Information from the above studies will be summarized after collection periods and placed in the appropriate allotment folders.

The fish population and habitat studies will require an estimate of one work month annually to complete.

IV. WATER RESOURCES/WATERSHED MONITORING

1. ISSUE - A large portion of upper Wet Creek was fenced during the summer of 1980. The fishery is good containing wild rainbow and dolley varden trout. Monitoring is needed to determine the rate of stream improvement and fisheries enhancement.

ACTION - Upgrade present monitoring network to study level status for the "Alternatives to Fencing" Study. Study measurements will include: low level aerial photo reconnaissance with LMS analysis (every 1-3 years), channel transect analysis (yearly), invertebrate analysis (twice yearly), and population analysis thru electrofishing transects (yearly). See "Wet Creek Study Plan" for further details.

2. ISSUE - Birch Creek is intersected by a number of allotments each with a different grazing system or grazing intensity. Many have undergone recent grazing changes. The stream supports a blue ribbon fishery containing primarily wild rainbow trout and a few hatchery trout. The riparian zone should be monitored for long term changes as affected by the variety of grazing systems.

ACTION - A low level aerial photo flight will be made every 3-4 years with LMS analysis to determine riparian trend. (Trend data for the riparian area could be correlated to any shocking data obtained to determine the grazing impacts to the fishery.)

3. ISSUE - North Creek Ruth Millsite. This millsite was found to contain hazardous levels of lead. A cleanup of the mill tailings was initiated in summer 1983 and is expected to be completed during summer 1984. The channel requires monitoring for future migration of lead residues left from the cleanup process.

ACTION - Soil samples every 1-2 miles down the channel will be taken after each major runoff event to assess for increased levels of hazardous materials in the channel.

4. ISSUE - Sawmill Creek is channelized each year by the Little Lost Irrigation District. During summer 1981, the channel alteration was undertaken without the proper permits and under trespass on Public Lands. The channelization was accomplished with a bulldozer which was driven down the center of the channel. The outcome was a loss of channel silts and fines resulting in the dewatering of approximately 4-5 miles of stream on BLM and a large fish kill. Fish and Game sued the Irrigation District for this fish loss. Impacts to BLM were primarily loss of pool habitat and heavy bank erosion due to increased velocities.

ACTION - BLM will monitor the Irrigation District's efforts each year to encourage proper permits and proper channelization techniques. Irrigation water gains or losses from the action will be analyzed using the USGS gage installed by BLM/USGS personnel in spring 1983. There is some question of whether sufficient water is gain by this yearly action to warrant the resulting bank erosion and fishery impacts.

5. ISSUE - Unkle Ike Creek is undergoing development for a small hydroelectric plant. This will result in a loss of several miles of riparian habitat. Mitigation will require a series of exclosures to replace the riparian losses. Monitoring is needed to document riparian changes following the development.

ACTION - Photo points will be established on the existing stream channel below the diversion in Unkle Ike Creek and on each exclosure. Area range conservationists will help with photos.

6. ISSUE - A new fence on upper Horse Creek (roughly the upper 2 miles) should allow a reduced impact on the riparian zone. Previously, this area was grazed from May 1 to June 30 and November 16 to December 30 each year. At present two years out of three, grazing will occur for about 1 month between May and September. On the third year, no grazing will occur. The additional fence will allow reduced livestock access to the upper watershed.

ACTION - Photo points will be established on both the upper and lower riparian areas. The upper riparian will be surveyed by occular survey methods at least every two years. Area range conservationists will help take photos.