

RANGE MANAGEMENT

MFP STEP 1

STEP 2

Permits
+ facilities
split

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 1 - ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATION

Planning Unit Name	Magic
Program Activity	Livestock Forage
Activity Recommendation Area (code)	Entire Area

Activity Recommendation(s)

I. NATURAL POTENTIAL

- A. Implement intensive grazing management on all allotments in the unit to maximize its natural potential.

Rationale

The following table lists opportunities to increase forage production with intensive grazing management.

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Additional Production AUMs</u>
Magic	⁴⁷² 1269

Some AUMs of production are shown and/or not shown because it is felt they are needed to satisfy the present active demand. See tables in URA livestock forage, opportunities for development and MFP overlays.

The objectives (BLM, Manual 1603.12G 3 & 4) of intensive management will be to:

1. Protect resource rehabilitation investments.
2. Provide forage production to aid in stabilizing local and regional economics.
3. Provide additional forage production for dependent livestock operators.

The ultimate vehicle to document and implement intensive grazing systems will be allotment management plans developed with, and signed by the allotment users.

Definitions

1. Continuous Grazing - Livestock grazing during the same season year after year.
2. Intensive Grazing - Manipulation of livestock through a schedule system of pasture use which interrupts continuous grazing.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 1 - ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATION

Planning Unit Name	Magic
Program Activity	Livestock Forage
Activity Recommendation Area (code)	Entire Area

Activity Recommendation(s)

Rationale

II. ARTIFICIAL POTENTIAL

A. Consider artificial treatment only after a detailed allotment management plan on grazing system has been developed.

It is imperative that the development of a grazing system precede artificial treatments so that: (1) a precise determination of the areas to be treated by artificial methods can be made where attainment of objectives through grazing management systems is limited; (2) rest can be prescribed in the pasture receiving artificial treatment; and (3) the increased forage production and improved range conditions will be sustained over a longer period of time. (BLM Manual 1603. 12G3a & b, .12G4a,b,c & e.)

B. Reduce undesirable species (mainly big sagebrush) to improve range conditions.

It is estimated that forage production on the treated area can be approximately doubled with sagebrush control. Through the reduction of undesirable species (mainly big sagebrush) the quality and quantity of livestock forage species could be appreciably increased and the range conditions could be improved to good or excellent.

- (1) Sagebrush control methods to be considered are spraying, chaining, beating and other.
- (2) Mechanical methods such as plowing and seeding should be examined as the need is shown to help an allotment management plan work.
- (3) Aerial seeding should be examined in conjunction with the seed trampling treatment of rest-rotation grazing.

The following table lists identified opportunities for sagebrush eradication to increase production.

upland Veg
Mgmt
↓

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 1 - ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATION

Planning Unit Name	Magic
Program Activity	Livestock Forage
Activity Recommendation Area (code)	Entire Area

Activity Recommendation(s)	Rationale	Acres	Add. Prod.
	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Treated</u>	<u>AUMs</u>
	Magic	11,447	360
	<p>* See explanation on Page 1 (BLM Manual 1602.42C3 and 1603.12G4e.)</p> <p>It is important to remember that both grazing systems and brush eradication projects are needed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide for and improve the quality and quantity of feed to satisfy the present active qualifications while improving existing range conditions. It estimated that without these projects additional reductions in livestock would be required. 2. To provide additional forage to help satisfy the Class I privileges. <p>Each time a Knapweed area is chemically treated a program of seeding perennial grasses will follow and livestock removed from the area until seedlings are established.</p> <p>The BLM as a land owner in the State of Idaho is bound by the noxious weed law to control the spread of, and to eradicate, noxious weeds on Federal lands and is also bound by the Federal Law (Carlson Act) to control and eradicate noxious weeds on Federal lands.</p>		
C. Continue weed control program with the counties on the Knapweed (Centaurea spp.) problem. Specifically around the Macon Sheep Bridge approach and get a system whereby after the areas are treated they can be seeded and livestock kept off of the area until seedlings become established.			
III. ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT			
A. Control unauthorized livestock grazing on National Resource Lands and where necessary "increase trespass abatement".	Policy requires that all unauthorized livestock be prevented grazing use. Use must be controlled in an orderly manner by licensing procedures. Unauthorized livestock will be trespassed and damages collected. (BLM Manual 1602.42B.)		

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 1 - ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATION

Planning Unit Name	Magic
Program Activity	Livestock Forage
Activity Recommendation Area (code)	Entire Area

Activity Recommendation(s)	Rationale
<p>B. Allow changes in class of livestock only pursuant to allotment management plans or grazing systems.</p>	<p>Before allowing any change in class of livestock, there should be a determination made of whether or not all of the area is suitable for cattle or sheep use. Expected determining factors should be distance to water, season of desired use, etc. Also what additional management facilities would be needed in the area to accommodate the change, and when could installation of the facilities be expected. This type of evaluation would in most cases best be accomplished in the allotment management plan system. (BLM Manual 4112.22.)</p>
<p>C. Propose land exchanges to block up National Resource Lands for better livestock management and control. Also to aid in the resource management of existing National Resource Lands.</p>	<p>In some of the area around springs, waterholes, and reservoirs is in private, or state ownership. This type of ownership makes it difficult to manage the National Resource Lands. Consolidated blocks of National Resource Lands increase the possibilities for intensive livestock forage management and development. (BLM Manual 1603.12G and 1602.42H, .42I.)</p>
<p>D. Encourage private land owners to fence their private lands and pursue exchange of use agreements on unfenced lands remaining inside grazing allotments.</p>	<p>Grazing management of the National Resource Lands would be enhanced if more of the private lands were fenced out of the allotment boundaries and the remaining private lands were put under exchange of use agreements. There are at present private lands that are considered to be within the allotment boundaries. In some cases new boundaries should be drawn so that more time could be spent on the management of the National Resource Lands, and less time involved on private lands. This would expedite the development of sound allotment management plans. (BLM Manual 1603.12G4 & 43 CFR 4115.2-1(h).)</p>

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 1 - ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATION

Planning Unit Name	Magic
Program Activity	Livestock Forage
Activity Recommendation Area (code)	Entire Area

Activity Recommendation(s)	Rationale
E. Install cattleguards on all BLM fences crossing heavy use roads.	Some gates are left open by the public users. This allows livestock to drift out of their licensed use areas, cattleguards would help alleviate this problem.
F. There are several very small allotments in the unit in which the BLM must get more information; such as who uses these allotments currently, are the users in trespass, etc.	Grazing use must be controlled in an orderly manner by licensing procedures. In some of these allotments new boundary lines should be drawn and some of the smaller allotments would be absorbed by the larger surrounding allotments and better and more manageable use of the National Resource Lands could be accomplished.

ACTIVITY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
NATURAL POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS
(Allotment Management Plans)

BLM Manual 1602.33, .34, & .42C project developments, which will be needed to implement the allotment management plans (fencing, water developments, etc.,) can have adverse effects, such as:

- (1) Interference with natural big game migration routes.
- (2) Drowning of upland game birds and small mammals in water facilities.
- (3) Scenic distractions.
- (4) Intrusions within historic and archeological sites.

However, these projects can be laid out and designed in a manner which will eliminate or minimize adverse effects.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 1 - ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATION

Planning Unit Name	Magic
Program Activity	Livestock Forage
Activity Recommendation Area (code)	Entire Area

Activity Recommendation(s)	<p>Rationale</p> <p>The expected results of the allotment management plans, besides producing more livestock forage, include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Soil stabilization and decreased runoff.(2) Improved water quality.(3) Increased aesthetic values through improved range condition.(4) Improved wildlife forage. <p><u>ARTIFICIAL POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS</u> (Sagebrush Eradication)</p> <p>Sagebrush eradication (spraying, burning, etc.) can have adverse environmental effects, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Loss of wildlife habitat for mule deer, sagegrouse and other wildlife, when sagebrush is 100% eliminated in critical habitat areas.(2) The abrupt straight-line contrast between the sprayed and unsprayed, and dead sagebrush inside the sprayed area may be aesthetically displeasing to some people. <p>If the spray or other brush treatment project is laid out in an irregular pattern resembling natural openings (and only a partial kill on sagebrush), adverse aesthetic and wildlife habitat effects will be minimized.</p> <p>Sagebrush eradication is environmentally desirable (besides increasing livestock) for the following reasons:</p>
----------------------------	--

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 1 - ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATION

Planning Unit Name	Magic
Program Activity	Livestock Forage
Activity Recommendation Area (<i>code</i>)	Entire Area

Activity Recommendation(s)	Rationale
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="771 514 1461 577">(1) Immediate erosion control, generally within two years.<li data-bbox="771 609 1461 672">(2) Subsequent decreases in runoff and improvement in water quality.<li data-bbox="771 703 1461 861">(3) Increase in quantity of usable water. That is, by increasing infiltration and reducing evaporation-transportation, more water is available to recharge natural springs and other aquifers.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 2 - MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

Planning Unit Name Magic

Activity Livestock Forage

Multiple Use Recommendation(s)

B. Constrain the design and implementation of intensive grazing systems by the over-riding recommendations in Step 2 of the Watershed and Wildlife activities.

C. Lengthen the grazing season on the unit to include fall use to ensure livestock availability needed to implement sound range treatment practices.

D. Develop dependable livestock water as needed to facilitate implementation of recommendation A above.

Analysis

Necessary coordination in the development of AMPs in the Magic Unit are:

1. Watershed Activity- this activity has identified various soil types found within the unit and has, in Step 1, made certain recommendations for the management of these soil types. They are further identified in the Watershed Step 2 narrative and overlays No. ES--1, 2, and 3. These areas will be specifically treated in the coordination and objective sections of the individual allotment management plans as they are developed.

2. Wildlife Activity- The coordination and objective sections of all AMPs developed in the unit will incorporate the Wildlife Activity recommendation made for Habitat Expansion (birds and mammals) No. 1. , Habitat improvement No. 2, and 3, and Habitat Improvement No. 1 in the Step II Wildlife Activity.

Additional coordination, or mitigation of conflicts with the ~~allotment~~^{other} activities is discussed in the livestock forage multiple use recommendations made in the remainder of this section.

In order to fully utilize rest-rotation grazing in achieving full natural forage potential, a longer grazing season is needed on many of the allotments. Proper manipulation of livestock throughout a longer season would help to protect the environment as well as increase forage production. (BLM Manual 1602.42C and 1603.12G a & b.)

Livestock water development is the key to livestock manipulation in this unit. With the concentrated grazing seasons that occur in this unit, it is, or can become imperative that dependable water be developed to have enough water to hold livestock in certain areas during different periods of the grazing

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 2 - MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

Planning Unit Name Magic

Activity Livestock Forage

Multiple Use Recommendation(s)

E. Fence allotments into 3 or more pastures. Plan and locate fences to mitigate impacts on wildlife, recreation, and open space.

Analysis
season. (BLM Manual 603.12G4g.)

All proposed water developments in the unit will be reviewed for their adequacy as water for livestock, and also for wildlife and recreation water needs for the particular site.

On some of the smaller allotments variation in grazing seasons from one year to the next might be more desirable than fencing. Also some allotments may be combined to make a manageable area. Fencing may not be necessary on some of the sheep allotments but put them under an allotment management plan and a grazing system.

Fences are needed to facilitate recommendation A above (BLM Manual 1603.12G4g). Fences, their design and location, have a definite impact on wildlife, recreation, and open space values as brought out in the public meetings and the analysis of Step 1 recommendations of other activities. These multiple use recommendations for livestock forage attempt to put fencing in the Magic Unit in its most acceptable form to mitigate the impacts on the other activities on National Resource Lands.

Criteria for fences in the Magic Unit are as follows:

1. All fences will be located to blend into the surrounding environment, as much as possible
2. Interior allotment fences will be 3-wire fences with let down panels along big game migration routes if desirable.
3. Exterior fences may be 4-wire only in areas of livestock congregation, against private lands, or against major high speed highways.
4. Gates and/or cattleguards will be placed in all fences at roads and major

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 2 - MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

Planning Unit Name Magic

Activity Livestock Forage

Multiple Use Recommendation(s)

Analysis

F. Maintain livestock grazing under intensive management on all National Resource Lands except those small parcels identified in Wildlife and Recreation activity Step 2 recommendation?

trails or at least one gate per half-mile of fence.

There were several Step I recommendations in the lands, recreation, and wildlife recommendations that would have reduced total land and water available for livestock use. The size of those areas was reduced in Step 2 to those recreation sites that have some sort of development on them. (See Recreation Step 2 Overlay.) Also those areas around a few spring, and some portions of the Magic Reservoir shoreline as identified on the Wildlife Step 2 Overlay.

The public comments were in favor of maintaining livestock grazing on most of the National Resource Lands in the Unit. They expressed some concern that if the State Park proposal ever became a reality the livestock grazing might be eliminated.

II. Artificial Potential

A. Artificial treatment will be considered only after a detailed allotment management plan or grazing system has been developed. All artificial treatment will be constrained by over-riding wildlife and watershed multiple recommendations. *(Constraints covered in Analysis)*

It is imperative that the development of a grazing system precede artificial treatment so that: 1) a precise determination of the areas to be planned for treatment by artificial methods can be made where attainment of the multiple use objectives, through the grazing management systems, is limited, 2) rest can be prescribed in the pasture receiving artificial treatment, and 3) the increased forage production and improved range conditions will be sustained over a longer period of time. (BLM Manual 1603.12G3a&b, and 1603.12G4a b,d,&e.)

Through the reduction of undesirable species (mainly big sagebrush) the quality and quantity of livestock forage species could be appreciably increased and the range conditions could be improved to good or excellent.

See also the analysis for this section for 1-B, which applies to the coordination

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 2 - MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

Planning Unit Name Magic

Activity Livestock Forage

Multiple Use Recommendation(s)

Analysis

needed in planning any artificial treatment.

See the Livestock Forage Step 2 Overlay for the Identified Brush Control Areas. The area is separated into three types, as follows:

1. These areas are those that are located outside deer migration routes and outside the primary Sage Grouse nesting areas. The multiple use constraints on this area are to leave about 15-20% ^{forbs} ~~forbs~~ and 55-65% grasses. Also to leave patches for antelope fawning.
2. These areas are inside the deer migration routes and additional requirements to No. 1 above is considered management as such.
3. These areas are inside the identified primary nesting areas for sage grouse and are to be designed such that they will not have any adverse impacts on nesting grouse.

1. Sagebrush eradication methods to be considered are spraying, burning, chaining, beating, and other.

2. Mechanical methods such as plowing and seeding, should be examined as the need is shown to help an allotment management plan work. (See also Watershed Step 2 narrative)

3. Aerial seeding should be examined in conjunction with the seed trampling treatment of rest-rotation grazing.

It is important to remember that both grazing systems and brush control projects are needed for the following reasons: 1) to provide for and to improve the quality and quantity of feed to satisfy the present active qualifications while improving existing range conditions. It is estimated that without these projects additional reductions in livestock

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 2 - MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

Planning Unit Name Magic

Activity Livestock Forage

Multiple Use Recommendation(s)

Analysis

would be required. 2) to provide additional forage to help satisfy the Class I privileges.

The Step 2 Livestock Forage Overlay shows the location of the proposed brush eradication areas.

GUIDELINES FOR BRUSH CONTROL PROJECTS & FENCES

1. Project layout and methods of control used will be such that the projects will blend into the natural environment as much as possible. 1

2. No attempt will be made at a 100% brush kill on any given area. Brush is considered to be a desirable part of the vegetative makeup of any given block of land. In most of the areas to be treated about 15-20% of the vegetative cover in brush would be desirable.

3. Brush control projects that are proposed in all those areas shown on the Livestock Forage 2 Overlay will be considered only if it can be shown that their effect on wildlife or watershed activity recommendations can be sufficiently mitigated as to be acceptable to the resource review team and the State Fish and Game representative. (See Wildlife Step 2, Habitat Maintenance No. 1 Habitat Improvement No. 2 and 3, Habitat Maintenance (Mammal) No. 2, & 3.)

4. Those areas designated on the Livestock Forage Overlay are to be closely coordinated with the watershed activity to protect water yield.

5. Forbs ~~competition~~ ^{competition} at the desired level of 20-25% is the Wildlife accepted recommendation for the entire area. This goal puts additional constraints on spraying of sagebrush with chemicals which also reduce forbs. It may be that some reduction could be accepted for the short term, if long term

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 2 - MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

Planning Unit Name

Magic

Activity

Livestock Forage

Multiple Use Recommendation(s)

Analysis

benefits in forbs production could be attained. Another possible mitigating measure might be to aerial seed some forbs following a sagebrush spray project.

B. Continue weed control program with the counties on the Knapweed (Centaurea Spp.) problem. Specifically around the Macon Sheep Bridge approach and get a system whereby after the areas are treated they can be seeded and livestock kept off of the area until seedlings become Established.

Each time a Knapweed area is chemically treated a program of seeding perennial grasses will follow and livestock removed from the area until seedlings are established.

The BLM as a land owner in the State of Idaho has an obligation to control the spread of, and to eradicate, noxious weeds on Federal Lands and is also bound by the Federal Law (Carlson Act) to control and eradicate noxious weeds on Federal Lands.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

A. Control unauthorized livestock grazing on National Resource Lands and where necessary "increase trespass abatement".

Policy requires that all unauthorized livestock be prevented ~~grazing use~~. Use must be controlled in an orderly manner by licensing procedures. Unauthorized livestock will be trespassed and damages collected. (BLM Manual 1602.42B.)

B. Allow changes in class of livestock only pursuant to allotment management plans or grazing systems.

Before allowing any change in class of livestock, there should be a determination made of whether or not all of the area is suitable for cattle or sheep use. Expected determining factors should be distance to water, season of desired use, etc. Also what additional management facilities would be needed in the area to accommodate the change, and when could installation of the facilities be expected. This type of evaluation would be in most cases best accomplished in the allotment management plan system. (BLM Manual 4112.22.)

C. Propose land exchanges to block up National Resource Lands for better livestock management and control. Also to aid in the resource management of existing National Resource Lands.

In some of the area around springs, water holes and reservoirs the ownership is either private or State. This type of ownership makes it difficult to manage the National Resource Lands. Consolidated blocks of National Resource Lands increase the possibilities for intensive livestock forage management

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
STEP 2 - MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

Planning Unit Name

Magic

Activity

Livestock Forage

Multiple Use Recommendation(s)

D. Encourage private land owners to fence their private lands and pursue exchange of use agreements on unfenced lands remaining inside grazing allotments.

Analysis

and development. (BLM Manual 1603.12G and 1602.42H, .42I.)

Grazing management of the National Resource Lands would be enhanced if more of the private lands were fenced on property lines. Some small parcels of NRL are fenced in with large private holdings.