

**RANDOLPH
MFP
DECISIONS**



United States Department of the Interior

IN REPLY REFER TO

1608
(U-220)

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Salt Lake District Office
2370 South 2300 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119

June 17, 1980

Dear BLMer:

This booklet of Randolph MFP Decisions is being provided those of you working in Rich County for your easy reference and convenience. This booklet contains only the final decisions plus rationale for each of the seven resource activities, for the support activities and for the Laketown Canyon ACEC. The decisions for each activity are printed in a different color and the location and color of each activity are listed on the inside of the front cover. If you require background information or additional data relative to any of the decisions in this booklet, you should refer to the actual Planning System documents - URA, PAA, MFP - and the overlays for the Randolph Planning Unit.

The decisions contained in this booklet are the final MFP decisions for the Public Land in Rich County. These decisions and policies should be followed to the fullest possible extent in our management and administration of Public Land in Rich County. Any changes or deviations from these decisions must be processed through a formal MFP amendment and be approved by me. No exceptions will be made to this requirement. If at any time you feel that new or additional data indicate such a change is necessary, please contact the Bear River Resource Area Manager to initiate the amendment process. I wish to emphasize that these decisions are not locked in concrete, but if changes are deemed appropriate, they must be processed in the approved manner.

It is my hope that you will find this booklet useful in your work in Rich County and that you will take it with you to the field and consult it frequently in your work.

Sincerely,

Frank W. Snell
District Manager



Save Energy and You Serve America!

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Lands L-1.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M1-L-1 Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 1.1

Retain the W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 17, T. 13 N., R. 6 E., SLM, (80 acres) in public ownership.

RATIONALE LANDS 1.1

Retention of this parcel in public ownership will be in the best public interest even though it was identified as having potential for recreational-residential development in the Unit Resource Analysis. The Bear Lake area is experiencing steady growth and sites for public use are becoming scarce. The State Of Utah has expended significant sums of money to provide public recreation areas around Bear Lake. Disposition of the parcel for private development purposes would reduce the opportunity for accommodating expanding public recreational use or development of the area, reduce critical deer winter range in the area, and could aggravate an already serious sewage disposal problem in the Bear Lake Area. This parcel is currently segregated from all forms of appropriation, entry, location and selection under the public land laws pursuant to classification U-7040 made under the Act of September, 19, 1964.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Lands 1-2.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	M1-L-1
Step 3	Same

DECISION STATEMENT Lands 2.1

Provide Public Lands as needed in Rich County for sanitary landfills and/ or special dumping sites. Requests for such sites must be consistent with local land use plans and are contingent upon proper site planning and compliance with EPA standards and the environmental assessment process outlined in the National Environmental Policy Act.

RATIONALE STATEMENT Lands 2.1

Indiscriminate dumping and poorly maintained landfills are a constant problem within Rich County. Providing acreage for sanitary landfills will satisfy local needs for refuse disposal, accommodate future population growth and help to minimize indiscriminate dumping. Reduction of random dumping will enhance the environment and improve the scenic values of the county.

This decision will serve notice to local officials that public lands are available for their use for landfills. It should also encourage local government to plan for and take advantage of this opportunity to use public lands.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Lands L-3.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1 M]-L-] Step 3	Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 3.1

Monitor the use and development of 777 acres of land along the shores of Bear Lake to insure that the land remains available for public recreational use. This land was transferred to the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation in 1961 under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) for incorporation into the State Park System.

RATIONALE LANDS 3.1

The provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act require that the patent transferring the land to the State of Utah contain a perpetual "reversion clause" to insure that Public Land obtained under the Act is always used for the public purpose for which it was obtained. BLM is required by law to monitor lands acquired under the R&PP Act every five years to insure that the land is being used for the intended public purpose and that the land has not been sold or converted to a non-public use. Recreation is on the increase in the Bear Lake Area and the lands transferred to the State Division of Parks and Recreation will play an ever-increasing role in providing recreational opportunities to the general public.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Lands L-4.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M]-L-] Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS-4.1

Lease 80 acres, or more, of Public Land to Rich County for a public airport. Final location will be determined on the basis of Federal airport planning criteria and FAA approval. The tentative area identified for a public airport would be part of Section 25 and part of the S $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 26, T. 11 N., R. 6 E., SLM, Utah.

RATIONALE Lands-4.1

A need has been shown for an airport in Randolph-Woodruff communities to easily obtain farm machinery parts, veterinary services, and access to emergency facilities. The landing strip will be used by private as well as government agency personnel having business in the area. Recreational flights will also be more common with an improved facility.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Lands	L-5.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M1-L-1	Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 5.1

Make available for public sale under the Unintentional Trespass Act of 1968, 416 acres of Public Land identified in Bureau Motion Application U-16429 as described below. The Act requires the land be sold in "the smallest alliquot parts practicable."

- T. 9 N., R. 6 E., Sec. 24, Part of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$
- T. 9 N., R. 6 E., Sec. 23, Part of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$
- T. 9 N., R. 7 E., Sec. 4, Part of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$
- T. 10 N., R. 7 E., Sec. 15, Part of SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$
- T. 11 N., R. 6 E., Sec. 1, Part of Lots 2 & 4 and SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$
- T. 12 N., R. 7 E., Sec. 33, Part of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$
- T. 11 N., R. 8 E., Sec. 18, Part of Lot 2
- T. 12 N., R. 6 E., Sec. 19, Parts of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, and S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$
Sec. 30, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$
- T. 11 N., R. 7 E., Sec. 24, Lot 3
- T. 8 N., R. 7 E., Sec. 26, Parts of SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ and SE $\frac{1}{4}$

RATIONALE LANDS 5.1

The lands identified above have been used unintentionally for many years for private purposes. Specific examination of each tract identified has revealed that they meet the criteria of the 1968 Act in that they were: (1) under trespass prior to 1968, (2) not suitable for disposition under the provisions of the Desert Land Act (3) capable of being cultivated in whole or in part, and (4) not needed for a public purpose.

Demand for agricultural land in Rich County is high as ranchers need a significant land base to support the livestock industry and to help reduce feed costs. Sale of these parcels will help resolve a long-standing trespass problem in Rich County. Section 214(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act requires that BLM identify all parcels to be sold under the 1968 Act by October 21, 1979.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Lands	L-5.2
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M1-L-1 Step 3 Same	

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 5.2

Make Public Land suitable for agricultural use in Rich County available for disposition by entry under the provisions of the Desert Land Act of 1877 or by private exchange under the provisions of Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. Each application to obtain Public Land for agricultural purposes will be evaluated on its own merits. Suitability criteria for converting land to agricultural use will include availability of adequate irrigation water, proper topography and soils as determined by the U. S. Soil Conservation Service and a lack of public purpose value in the land.

RATIONALE LANDS 5.2

Demand for additional agricultural lands is high in Rich County. An additional supply of feed crops will help reduce ranching costs and will bolster the livestock industry in the county. Indications are the proposed enlargement of the Woodruff Narrows Reservoir will provide additional irrigation water to convert several hundred acres to crop production. Restricting disposition to DLE or private exchange will allow BLM to screen applicants and to be sure of their ability to successfully cultivate the land.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Lands	L-6.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M]-L-1	Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 6.1

Coordinate with Utah Power and Light to insure their survey of all existing power lines in Rich County is completed. After completion of the survey, require Utah Power and Light to apply for a right-of-way for all their powerlines not previously covered by a right-of-way grant.

RATIONALE LANDS 6.1

In 1962 the Swan Creek Electric conveyed their interest to Utah Power and Light under a Bill of Sale. It is suspected rights-of-way had not been obtained on all of the lines crossing Public Lands. Utah Power and Light is in the process of preparing a survey showing their existing lines and plans to submit this information as soon as possible.

This action will legalize any unauthorized lines and protect Utah Power and Light's tenure on Public Lands for the rights-of-way that are essential to the welfare of the community.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Lands	L-6.2
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3
	M1-L-1	Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 6.2

Advise Little Creek Irrigation Co. that the portion of their reservoir on Public Land, which was constructed after March 3, 1891, must be authorized by a BLM right-of-way grant. Assist the company in making proper application for the existing reservoir located in T. 11 N., R. 6 E., Section 23.

RATIONALE LANDS 6.2

At the time of construction of the dam, probably around 1913, it was believed no right-of-way was needed. The Act of March 3, 1891, provides that all canals, ditches, and reservoirs theretofore constructed were authorized. This act does not authorize rights-of-way constructed after this date.

This action will legalize the irrigation company's reservoir which is used for irrigation of crop lands. This action will give this beneficial use of Public Land proper tenure and serve to protect the irrigation company's interest.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Lands	L-6.3
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M-L-1 Step 3 Same	

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 6.3

Take action to assist Utah Board of Water Resources in correcting deficiencies in the legal description for their right-of-way grant U-01817 for Birch Creek Reservoir. This grant involves Public Land in:

T. 9 N., R. 5 E., SLM

Section 24

T. 9 N., R. 6 E., SLM

Section 19

RATIONALE LANDS 6.3

Utah Water and Power Board's survey is inaccurate and does not coincide with USGS quadrangle maps. BLM has also issued a portion of the grant across private lands.

This action will give the irrigation company proper authority for use of Public Lands and correct BLM's records. This action will also serve to perfect and protect the Board's interest in the land.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Randolph
Activity
Lands 1-7.1
Overlay Reference
Step 1 MI-L-1 Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT Lands-7.1

Take the following actions for the withdrawals of Public Land indicated below:

1. Request the Federal Power Commission to revoke Power Site Withdrawal 11 involving Public Lands in T. 11 N., R's 6 & 7 E. and T. 12 N., R. 6 E., SLM; and non-federal land in T. 12 N., R. 6 E., T. 13 N., R's 5 & 6 E.; and T. 14 N., R. 5 E., SLM.
2. Request the U. S. Geological Survey to revoke all unnecessary phosphate reserve withdrawals on Public and non-federal lands in Rich County after the U.S.G.S. finishes their classification to determine phosphate character in Rich County.
3. Retain the withdrawal for Public Water Reserve 107 on Public Land in SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 20, T. 11 N., R. 6 E., SLM.
4. Revoke the existing Recreation Classification Withdrawal U-027756 on Little Creek Reservoir - SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 23, T. 11 N., R. 6 E., SLM.

RATIONALE Lands-7.1

Section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 requires that BLM review all withdrawals of the Public Land to determine whether or not the withdrawn lands are being used for their intended purposes. (Numbered items below correspond to numbered items in Decision above).

1. This withdrawal was made for right-of-way purposes only. The Federal Power Commission has indicated they have no future plans for use of these lands and they are not being used at present. The Public Lands involved can best be managed by BLM under the principles of multiple use. Withdrawal of non-federal land serves no purpose.
2. Phosphate Reserves are no longer necessary due to a lack of demand resulting from a deflated market for phosphate. Many of the lands included in these withdrawals have seen little or no active phosphate mining since they were placed under withdrawal in the early part of this century. Public Lands involved can be managed by BLM under the principles of multiple use.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

3. Public Water Reserve 107 contains a developed spring-watering project which provides valuable water for livestock and wildlife. These facilities should continue to be reserved for public use.
4. The developed recreational facilities at Little Creek Reservoir are currently segregated from appropriation, entry, location or selection under the public land laws, including the general mining laws and from surface use and occupancy under the mineral leasing laws pursuant to classification U-7040 made under the Act of September 19, 1964. The recreation values of this highly used area are adequately protected by C&MU Classification U-7040 and the temporary protection afforded by Recreation Classification U-027756 is superfluous.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Lands L-8.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M1-L-1 Step 3 Same

DECISION Lands-8.1

Take necessary actions to resolve existing occupancy and right-of-way trespasses in Rich County and eliminate future trespass problems by making the public aware that permits and grants are necessary and available for long term use of the Public Land.

RATIONALE Lands-8.1

Unauthorized use of Public Lands is a continuing problem in Rich County which imposes a heavy administrative burden upon BLM. Much of this problem is attributable to the public being unaware that some form of authorization is necessary for long term use of the Public Lands. Resolving the existing trespasses and continual monitoring of Public Lands in Rich County for potential trespass problems will serve to create the needed awareness in the public. Working with the public to legitimize and legalize existing and future uses of Public Land where appropriate should help to minimize future problems.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Randolph

Activity
Lands L-9.1

Overlay Reference
Step 1 M1-L-1 Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT Lands-9.1

Take necessary action to discourage indiscriminate dumping on Public Land in:

T. 12N., R. 7E., SLM
Section 12, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$
Section 22, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$

Actions to be taken will include (1) posting "No Dumping" signs, (2) continuous monitoring of the areas and (3) making Public Land available to local government for sanitary landfills (Refer to Decision Lands-2.1).

RATIONALE Lands-9.1

Indiscriminate dumping in those areas poses a threat to public health and safety as well as degrading environmental and scenic quality. Uncontrolled dumping also sets an undesirable precedent for similar dumping in other areas.

A proper sanitary landfill plan for the county plus undertaking measures to control dumping in unauthorized areas of the Public Lands should substantially reduce the environmental problems associated with indiscriminate dumping.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/P)	Randolph
Activity Lands	L-9.2
Overlay Reference Step 1 M1-L-1	Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 9.2

Continue to monitor compliance with Recreation and Public Purposes lease terms for the Woodruff Sanitary Landfill in Section 4, T. 9 N., R. 7 E. giving due consideration to problems small communities have in meeting EPA standards for sanitary landfills.

RATIONALE LANDS 9.2

Although the Woodruff landfill is not in strict compliance with EPA standards for sanitary landfills, the Utah State Health Department considers this site one of the better in the state for its size. The Department of Health asks that BLM continue to encourage Woodruff officials to comply with the terms of their R&PP lease and to work with them to insure the landfill is operated to the best of their ability.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Lands L-10.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1 M1-L-1	Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 10.1

Make 2,865 acres of Public Land available for disposal as indicated below:

1. Dispose of 240 acres in Sec. 26, T. 14 N., R. 6 E., SLM, to the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. (Refer to Wildlife Decision 1.6)
2. Dispose of 864 acres in T. 13 N., R. 6 E.; T. 13 N., R. 7 E.; and T. 14 N., R. 6 E. by: (a) State or (b) private exchange under the provisions of Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) or (c) public sale under the provisions of Section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) (Refer to Wildlife Decision 1.6).
3. Dispose of 641 acres of Public Lands in T. 8 N., R. 5 E.; T. 8 N., R. 8 E.; and T. 9 N., R. 5 E., SLM, by (a) exchange under the provisions of Section 206 of FLPMA or (b) public sale under the provisions of Section 203 of FLPMA (Refer to Range Management Decision 3.4).
4. Dispose of all of Public Land in the Middle Ridge Grazing Allotment - T. 9 N., Rs. 5 & 6 E., SLM, by (a) exchange under the provisions of Section 206 of FLPMA or (b) public sale under the provisions of Section 203 of FLPMA (Refer to Range Management Decision 3.4).

Exchange is the preferred method for disposal of these lands unless otherwise indicated. Exchange of lands with the State of Utah or private parties will generally result in no loss of Public Land in the county and will allow both BLM and the other party to the exchange to block their land ownership for better management. Should the BLM receive no viable exchange offers, the lands identified in this decision will, as a final resort, be auctioned off at a public sale to the highest bidder.

RATIONALE LANDS 10.1

The lands identified in this decision are for the most part isolated parcels of Public Land and/or are difficult to manage with little or no public value to justify their retention.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

(The item numbers below refer to corresponding numbers above.)

1. This isolated parcel of Public Land has been identified as critical deer winter range. Disposal of this land to DWR will insure its retention and management for that purpose together with other nearby state lands.
2. These isolated parcels of Public Land are not within a grazing allotment and have no significant public value to justify their retention considering the expense and difficulty in managing them and lack of legal access to them.
3. These lands are isolated and difficult to manage and are of low multiple use value. The expense and difficulty in managing them far exceeds their value for retention.
4. The Public Lands identified in this section make up less than 15% of the Middle Ridge Allotment. This allotment would be better managed under private ownership considering the isolated-minority nature of the Public Land involved therein.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR DECISION L-10.1

Part 1:

T. 14 N., R. 6 E.

Section 26: $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$ 240.00 ac.

Containing 240.00 ac.

Part 2:

T. 13 N., R. 6 E.

Section 1: Lot 4, $SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$,
 $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$ 358.69 ac.

Section 12: $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$ 200.00 ac.

T. 14 N., R. 6 E.

Section 35: $S\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $N\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$ 160.00 ac.

T. 13 N., R. 7 E.

Section 6: Lots 3, 4, 5, and $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$ 145.62 ac.

Containing 864.31 ac.

Part 3:

T. 8 N., R. 5 E.

Section 8: $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$ 80.00 ac.

T. 9 N., R. 5 E.

Section 4: Lots 5, 6, $S\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}$ 321.77 ac.

T. 8 N., R. 8 E.

Section 28: Lots 3 and 4 80.77 ac.

Section 33: Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 158.66 ac.

Containing 641.20 ac.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR DECISION L-10:1

Part 4 - Middle Ridge Allotment:

T. 9 N., R 5 E.

Section 32: Lots 1 - 5 inclusive	10.62 ac.
Section 33: Lots 7 - 10 inclusive, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	210.00 ac.
Section 34: Lots 2 - 5 inclusive, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	247.76 ac.
Section 35: Lots 2 - 7 inclusive, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	394.94 ac.

T. 9 N., R 6 E. - Portion of the following subdivisions
south of Highway 39.

Section 19: Lots 8 - 13 inclusive, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	182.55 ac.
Section 20: SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	<u>75.00 ac.</u>

Containing 1,120.87 ac.

The areas described in parts 1 - 4 above aggregate 2,865 acres.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Lands	L-11.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M1-1-1	Step 3 Same

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS 11.1

Retain existing exchange classification on 3,880 acres of Public Land in Rich County as specified below:

1. U-12022 - 40 acres in T. 10 N., R. 5 E., SLM
2. U-12283 - 1,120 acres in T. 11 N., R. 6 E., SLM
3. U-9862 - 2,720 acres in T. 7 N., R. 7 E., SLM

Refer to Decision Lands 12.1 for priority in making exchanges.

RATIONALE LANDS 11.1

Retaining these exchange classifications will provide BLM a very useful tool to organize the Public Lands in Rich County into manageable blocks. Exchange of these lands will allow the private sector to obtain additional land near existing holdings while providing the public an opportunity to obtain valuable multiple use land.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Lands	L-12.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 None	Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT LANDS -12.1

When the opportunity exists for acquisition by exchange or other means, every effort should be made to acquire land in the following categories:

1. Land on the Creek in Laketown Canyon.
2. Other land on creeks and riparian habitat, especially headwater springs and creeks with fisheries potential. Priority within this category is to be on tracts that block with existing BLM ownership, and on isolated tracts as a second priority.
3. Any other land in the proposed Laketown Canyon ACEC.
4. Any other critical wildlife habitat or key potential recreation sites.

This decision is not meant to be limiting. If no opportunities exist for acquisition in the above prioritized areas, other areas may be acquired for other purposes.

RATIONALE LANDS 12.1

BLM objectives in exchanging land are to create manageable blocks of Public Land which will maximize benefits to the general public with the greatest possible efficiency and economy.

Priorities in exchanging lands are to protect important watersheds, provide essential habitat for key wildlife species and to provide the best possible recreation opportunities for the public.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Minerals M-1.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-M-1

DECISION STATEMENT Minerals 1.1

All of the Federal mineral estate administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Rich County currently open to mineral prospecting, location and development under the 1872 Mining Law will remain open for the present. Existing exclusions of mining on Federal mineral estate under the 1872 law will be reviewed over the next few years to determine in they are still proper.

RATIONALE Minerals 1.1

The Planning Area Analysis noted that there have been sub-economic discoveries of manganese, lead, zinc, and uranium within Rich County with the only recorded production being that of manganese during WWII. Because the United States has to import significant amounts of these and other minerals, the need to leave as much land as possible open to exploration is evident. It is also possible that areas currently unavailable for mineral production may be opened during the mandatory BLM withdrawal review.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Minerals M-1.2
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3M1-M-1

DECISION STATEMENT Minerals 1.2

All possible Federal mineral estate in Rich County will be open to oil and gas leasing and re-leasing subject to the standard lease provisions and the below listed special stipulations:

1. No seismic activity or drilling will allowed within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of active raptor eyeries during the period March 1 to July 15. (Refer to Decision Wildlife 2.3).
2. No surface disturbing activities will be allowed which would alter the character of known raptor nesting cliffs. (Refer to Decision Wildlife 2.3).
3. In order to protect mule deer winter ranges, no exploration, drilling or other developmental activity will be allowed in deer wintering areas between November 15 and April 30. This limitation doesn't apply to maintenance and operation of producing wells. Exceptions to this limitation in any year may be specifically authrized in writing by the District Engineer, U. S. Geological Survey with the concurrence of the District Manager, Bureau of Land Management. (Refer to Decision Wildlife 2.2).
4. In order to maintain aesthetic values, all permanent and semi-permanent facilities will be painted to blend with the natural surroundings. The paint or method of camouflage will be subject to approval by the District Engineer, U. S. Geological Survey with the concurrence of the District Manager, Bureau of Land Management.
5. No surface occupancy will be allowed on 4,123 acres of recreation sites on Public Land classified to exclude surface use and occupancy under the mineral leasing laws under the provisions of Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 (Refer to Decision Recreation 2.3 for a description of these sites). The existing C&MU classification will be reevaluated on 3,106 acres of those sites to determine if it is still serving the intended purpose. It is possible that the surface occupancy restriction will be removed from all or a portion of those Public Lands. Should the restrictions be removed from those lands, they will be subject to the same lease provisions and stipulations as other Public Lands in Rich County as specified in this decision.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed



(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

6. No drilling or storage facilities will be allowed within 600 feet of live water, reservoirs, springs, etc. This distance may be modified when specifically approved in writing by the District Engineer, U. S. Geological Survey with the concurrence of the District Manager, Bureau of Land Management. (Refer to Decision Wildlife 2.2).
7. No surface occupancy will be allowed on slopes greater than 30% within the Laketown Canyon ACEC. (Refer to ACEC Decision).
8. In order to protect sage grouse strutting grounds, exploration, drilling, and other developmental activity will not be allowed, between April 1 and June 15. This limitation does not apply to maintenance and operation of producing wells. Exceptions to this limitation in any year may be specifically authorized in writing by the District Engineer, U. S. Geological Survey with the concurrence of the District Manager, Bureau of Land Management. (Refer to Decision Wildlife 2.2).
9. Activities in Visual Resource Management Class II areas must be located and designed in a way which meets Class II Management criteria. (Refer to Decision Recreation 1.2).

RATIONALE Minerals 1.2

The United States is currently importing about 50% of its daily consumption of petroleum; most comes from unstable Middle Eastern sources. In order to lessen its dependence on foreign sources, the U. S. Government policy is to foster domestic production. The most recent significant petroleum discoveries have come in the Overthrust Belt, which includes all of the Randolph Planning Unit. In an effort to optimize petroleum exploration and development, no land has been withdrawn from leasing and only a small portion prohibits surface occupancy. Additional stipulations have been formulated to protect sensitive cultural, scenic, and natural values.



LEGEND

-  VRM Class II Areas
-  Streams
-  Reservoirs
-  Critical Deer Winter Range
-  Critical Erosion Areas
-  Laketown Canyon ACEC
-  Sage Grouse Strutting Group
-  Raptor Nesting Areas
-  Recreation Sites
-  Springs

FIGURE 27
LEASE STIPULATION AREAS

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Minerals M-1.3
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-M-1

DECISION STATEMENT Minerals-1.3

Issue prospecting permits and lease applications for phosphate in all of Rich County subject to site specific stipulations. Do not issue prospecting permits and leases in the Laketown Canyon ACEC.

RATIONALE Minerals-1.3

Until 1976, phosphate mining had been a major industry in Rich County. Depletion of high grade ore and increased mining costs forced mine closure. Still, many local residents work at the Leefe phosphate processing plant which beneficiates ore railed in from Idaho. The U.S. Bureau of Mines projects a 3% annual increase in demand for phosphate on a national basis. Thus, the rock units in Rich County known to contain phosphate will become important exploration areas. When applications for prospecting are received, the BLM will make an environmental assessment of the plan and determine under what stipulations the prospector must work in order to protect sensitive scenic, cultural, or natural values.

For the rationale of excluding phosphate development in Laketown Canyon, refer to the ACEC decision.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Minerals M-1.4	
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3 M1-M-1

DECISION STATEMENT: Minerals-1.4

Convert all existing material sites used by the Rich County Road Department into Free Use Permits during FY-80, and coordinate with the Rich County Commissioners and Maintenance Supervisor to determine which gravel pits are actively being mined and which ones are needed on a long-term basis.

RATIONALE: Minerals-1.4

Because the county currently takes gravel from BLM administered lands without authorization, the Rich County Road Department is technically in trespass. By having them apply for the material needed for county road maintenance under Free Use Permit procedures, the BLM not only clears up a significant trespass problem, but also identifies site reclamation stipulations through the NEPA process to enhance the disturbed areas.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Minerals	M-1.5
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	Step 3	M1-M-1

DECISION STATEMENT MINERALS - 1.5

Request the relinquishment of a material site right-of-way (SL-071877) for the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and convert it to a community pit for gravel. If the UDOT were to agree to give up this site, the BLM would then make an environmental assessment to identify development and reclamation stipulations as well as an appraisal to determine the fair market value of the material.

RATIONALE MINERALS - 1.5

The Randolph Planning Area Analysis (PAA) identified the need for additional gravel sources to meet the demand for road aggregate attendant to the recent oil and gas development within the county. The material from this site is centrally located for use in the northern part of Rich County, has good existing access, and is suitable for use as road base and fill material.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Minerals M-1.6
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 U2-PP-14

DECISION STATEMENT Minerals 1.6

Maintain or insure access on all existing roads crossing Public Land in Rich County to facilitate mineral exploration and development in accordance with the access policy as stated in Decision Support 2.1. Permittees or lessees may be required to maintain roads and if certain roads are causing sedimentation or other environmental problems, the permittee or lessee will be required to rebuild or modify the road to eliminate the problem.

RATIONALE Minerals 1.6

In order to adequately explore for and develop the mineral resources of Rich County, good access roads are necessary to transport vehicles, equipment and minerals. It is also true that some existing roads and trails are inadequate or improperly located for all weather use. These roads may have to be improved or closed to prevent excessive erosion and they may have to be maintained more frequently to keep them passable. In addition some roads within the Laketown Canyon ACEC may have to be closed to protect the various resource values found therein.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Randolph

Activity

Range Management RM 1.1

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT RANGE MANAGEMENT 1.1

Graze all areas in Rich County suitable for livestock grazing. Carrying capacities for each allotment will be based upon the forage production on suitable acreage in each allotment.

RATIONALE RANGE MANAGEMENT 1.1

Livestock grazing is an important social and economic concern in Rich County. Historically, suitable acreage has been grazed and a continuation of this practice is important to local communities. Multiple-use conflicts with grazing have been analyzed. Most, if not all, conflicts can be resolved through proper grazing management and proper consideration of other resource needs.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
Range Management RM 1.2	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT RANGE MANAGEMENT 1.2

Make adjustments in stocking rates and season of use and conduct range management activities in accordance with the decisions for each allotment as shown in the attached decision documents.

RATIONALE RANGE MANAGEMENT 1.2

Decisions for range management have been made in accordance with range data and multiple use needs for each allotment. The most recent range study information and the high or optimum deer population numbers as provided by DWR were used in formulating the individual allotment decisions and in making forage allocations.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Randolph

Activity
Range Management RM-1.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1 Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT RANGE MANAGEMENT - 1.3

Changes in class of livestock from cattle to sheep will be allowed and are encouraged in areas where sheep forage is available and other resource values are compatible with the change. Changes from sheep to cattle can only be allowed where the present range survey shows that cattle forage is available and all suspended non-use has been restored to cattle operators within the allotment. Conversion from horses to cattle will also be allowed and is encouraged. A conversion rate of one (1) horse animal unit for one and one-half (1½) cow animal units will be used.

These decisions concerning change of class of livestock on public lands will also apply to grazing exchange of use agreements for private lands within an allotment.

RATIONALE RANGE MANAGEMENT - 1.3

The 1978 Range Survey used a computerized overlap method as a tool for the manager to allocate forage. This method utilized proper use factors and input on dietary preference to determine the maximum forage available for each class of livestock. A management decision was made to give cattle the first priority in forage allocation in allotments with dual use. In these instances sheep forage available was computed from that left over after the cattle allocation.

Range survey data shows that at the present time more forage is generally available for sheep than is being used. For various reasons such as over utilization, downward trend, or wildlife conflicts, most sheep increases have not been allowed. A reduction in cattle stocking could make sheep use acceptable in some allotments. Proposals for changes to sheep will be considered and authorized where forage availability, range conditions, wildlife needs, or other resource values and management considerations are favorable to the change.

Range survey data shows that at the present time the cattle stocking level meets or exceeds the cattle forage available. Because the "overlap" method of computation was used in the range survey which considers differences in dietary preferences, taking away sheep does not mean that the resulting unused vegetation would be used by cattle. If additional cattle forage does become available, all cattle operators who have suspended nonuse should have a chance to have their use restored to an active status before a change in class from sheep to cattle is considered.

Since the dietary preference of horses is very close to that of cattle, a conversion between these classes of livestock could be granted without

creating a forage deficit. The conversion rate indicated would equalize the difference in forage consumption between the two classes.

Vegetation on private lands under exchange-of-use within an allotment was measured by the range survey as to plant composition and forage value. The basic reasoning for changes in class of livestock on Public Lands can, therefore, be applied to private lands under exchange-of-use.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
Range Management RM-2.1	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT RANGE MANAGEMENT - 2.1

Allotment Management Plans (AMP's) will be developed and implemented on allotments wherein approximately 2/3 or more of the permittees agree voluntarily to the AMP. Priority for development of AMPs will be as follows:

1. Eleven allotments which do not now have any type of grazing system: Bear Lake, Rabbit Creek, Dry Basin, Duck Creek, Laketown Canyon, Sage Creek, Kearl, New Canyon, Big Creek, Eastman and Stuart.
2. Do not develop AMPs on two allotments - South Woodruff and Deseret until such time as the Public Lands within those allotments can be consolidated into manageable blocks by exchange. AMPs should be encouraged once this process is completed.
3. Do not develop AMPs on two allotments - Middle Ridge and Sessions. Continue custodial management of these allotments until such time as the Public Lands therein can be disposed of by exchange or public sale for management by the private sector.

Implementation of AMPs will be as funds and manpower permit. AMPs will be developed with multiple use objectives. The development of grazing systems will consider and provide for wildlife, watershed, recreation and other resource needs as well as the needs of the livestock and the individual permittees within an allotment. A priority in AMP development will be to meet the permittees' need for early feed while also meeting the multiple use objectives established in the AMP. AMPs will be designed for individual allotments dependent upon on-the-ground conditions in each allotment. Key species, season of use, utilization levels and the grazing system will be determined on a case-by-case basis. AMPs will be developed in cooperation with the permittees, the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, the U. S. Forest Service, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, the Utah State University Extension Service, Salt Lake District - BLM Grazing Advisory Board, and Multiple Use Advisory Council and other agencies and groups as appropriate.

Additional AUMs of forage produced by the implementation of AMP grazing systems will be allocated to permittees only after the forage becomes available and a decision has been made allocating forage between competing uses in a formal Management Framework Plan Amendment. Where applicable, increases will be allocated to the permittees responsible for the increased production.

If at least 2/3 of the permittees in an allotment do not voluntarily agree to an AMP, it may be necessary to take some other actions to improve and

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

maintain the vegetation, soil and water resources within the allotment on a sustain yield basis. Such actions will be based upon the results of future utilization and trend studies and will include implementation of grazing systems by decision and further reductions in season and numbers as appropriate.

RATIONALE RANGE MANAGEMENT - 2.1

Intensive grazing systems cooperatively developed in Allotment Management Plans are the best tool for increasing the overall condition for a variety of reasons. Implementing grazing systems on allotments where 2/3 of the permittees agree to the plan will substantially increase the probability of the system working and also decrease the administrative load involved in implementing a plan that isn't agreed upon by most of the users. The local livestock industry will ultimately benefit from the stability and increased production fostered by the improved quality and quantity of desirable forage species which should result from the intensive grazing system.

BLM Range Management regulations allow for making increases in grazing capacity when conditions warrant and when the increase would assist in the stabilization of livestock operations. They also provide for apportioning that increase to the range users whose efforts were responsible for such increases (43 CFR 4110.3-2).

Although every effort will be made to manage the Public Land in the Planning Unit cooperatively with the users thereof, BLM cannot ignore the mandate of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act to manage the Public Land on a multiple-use sustained yield basis while giving proper protection to the public resources. In those allotments where approximately 2/3 of the permittees do not voluntarily agree to an AMP, it may be necessary to impose certain administrative decisions on an involuntary basis to fulfill the mandate of FLPMA.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Range Management RM-2.2
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT RANGE MANAGEMENT - 2.2

1. Evaluate the only operating AMP, Woodruff Pastures Allotment, as to whether it is meeting the objective of maintaining and improving the vegetation, soil and water resources on a sustained yield basis while allowing maximum possible livestock use. If it is found that this AMP is not meeting these objectives it should be altered according to the standards for AMPs as contained in RM-2.1.
2. Evaluate the effectiveness of existing grazing systems in the Twin Peaks, East Woodruff, and Meachum Canyon Allotments to see if they are meeting range management objectives. If the existing systems are adequately meeting the objectives, they will be incorporated into formal AMPs as in RM-2.1. If they are not effective, new grazing systems will be developed through the AMP process as outlined in RM-2.1.

RATIONALE RANGE MANAGEMENT - 2.2

Title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 4120.2-3(c) allows for evaluation of Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) and adjustment in the grazing schedules if necessary to meet objectives. Although only one of the four allotments with grazing systems has been operating under an AMP (Woodruff Pastures), the same principles would apply to the other allotments.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
Range Management RM-2.3	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT Range Management-2.3

Increase the amount of desirable vegetation by removing undesirable species through land treatment practices, and make available for grazing use by wildlife or livestock additional Animal Unit Months (AUMs) of forage created by these treatments.

Range improvement, including land treatment, will be planned in Allotment Management Plans (AMPs), and budgeted as part of each year's Annual Work Plan (AWP). Priority for funding of land treatment will be:

1. Where a completed, signed, and fully accepted AMP exists on an allotment.
2. To provide early feed or solve other management problems.
3. On the most productive sites so the greatest benefit can be derived from the investment.
4. To restore suspended non-use.

Prior to initiating any land treatment the following will be agreed upon by the permittees:

1. Rest on seedings will be one full year and an additional growing season. Rest on spraying areas will be for a full year and an additional growing season, however, exceptions may be made where conditions are acceptable as approved by the District Manager. Grazing use within an allotment during treatment rest periods will be adjusted to the carrying capacity for those portions of the allotment not being rested. This could result in some reductions in season of use and/or numbers during the rest period.
2. Cooperative agreements will set out maintenance responsibility in accordance with district policy and will be entered into before the project is programmed beginning in FY 1981.

Specific criteria for selection of treatment areas and design and implementation of treatments will include:

1. Juniper stands will be left in tact to provide cover for doe.
2. Comply with sage grouse guidelines with the reasonable flexibility that is provided for in these guidelines.

3. Chemical spraying will conform to project design specifications as stated in the Randolph Grazing ES, however, deviations may be made on a case by case basis where additional environmental analysis indicates that impacts will not be significantly greater than stated for the proposal in the ES.
4. Consider wildlife food and cover requirements in the planning and design of all treatments. Insure that desirable forage species for wildlife are included in re-seeding where reasonably possible. Range management objectives should include maintaining or improving these species in the composition.
5. The completed Soil Conservation Service (SCS) soil survey will be considered in project design to determine sites with the best chance of success and the greatest long term productivity.
6. Roads will not be constructed to project areas. Exceptions may be approved by the District Manager.
7. Fence lines will not be cleared, with exceptions approved by the District Manager.
8. Water sources will be fenced.
9. Areas disturbed in water developments and other surface disturbance areas will be recontoured and seeded.
10. Project requirements and specifications as set out on pages 1-25 and A8 - 1 and 2 of the Randolph ES will be followed except in cases where additional environmental analysis shows that deviation will result in less impact.

These are the minimum standards, and exact design specifications for projects will be determined for each project on a case by case basis.

The overall objective of treatment design will be to create a mosaic effect which will provide a diversity in vegetative types.

Ultimate target compositions for projects in deer winter areas will be:

30-40%	Shrubs
10%	Forbs
50-60%	Grass

Target composition in deer summer range will be:

20-30%	Shrubs
10%	Forbs
60-70%	Grass

Future allocations will not be made until forage actually exists on the ground. When forage has been determined to be available, it will be allocated on a non-renewable basis. Only when range utilization, actual use and trend studies show forage production can be permanently sustained, will a permanent allocation be made.

The allocation between livestock and wildlife will be made when the forage is actually available based on the most realistic demand figures that exist at that time. Wildlife population demand will be consistent with the carrying capacity of private as well as Public Lands.

RATIONALE Range Management-2.3

The purpose for much of the detail in the proposed decision was to satisfy needs for the Range ES. Good management requires that many decisions on treating specific areas not be made at this time.

BLM policy provides for concentrating improvement in and maintaining allotment management plans. It is estimated in the Unit Resource Analysis (URA) Step IV that an additional 26,242 AUMs could be generated over the present surveyed capacity by treatment.

Similar treatments in adjacent range areas have substantially increased productivity of desirable forage species (URA-3). This recommendation would help meet Planning Area Analysis projected demands for forage, and help alleviate causes of range deterioration stemming from poor distribution and localized over use by providing a more uniform forage supply throughout the unit. Pressure on heavily used areas will be reduced as they would support less of the total allotment use. Range users will be benefited by having a more uniform supply of high quality forage. This would benefit livestock productivity (i.e., weight gain, calf crops, and etc.).

Specific criteria for funding of land treatments were established to give direction and aid in AWP development. A top priority for funding land treatments in areas with fully accepted AMPs was stated because an effective grazing system outlined in an AMP should protect and enhance the life of a land treatment. This would insure a protection of the original monetary investment in the project. A second priority was given to provide early feed or solve other management problems. This priority was established because of the overall magnitude of the early turn out problem that was identified in the Randolph ES. A third priority was stated to treat the most productive sites. This priority was established so that funds would be concentrated where the greatest benefit would be produced from an investment. A fourth priority was to treat areas so that suspended non-use could be restored. This priority was established so that successful treatments might restore grazing rights suspended in past years.

Specific guidelines governing the rest requirements for land treatment projects and the need for the establishment of cooperative agreements with permittees were set forth in the hopes of maintaining an organized plan of sustaining a maximum benefit from a land treatment practice. Prior agreement with users on assigned maintenance and an agreement for protecting the treated area to improve plan vigor are essential parts of sustaining maximum benefit from these projects.

Specific criteria for selection of treatment areas, treatment objectives, and design stipulations are listed to provide a set of guidelines that will promote and encourage multiple use considerations of Public Lands, and mitigate the impacts of these treatments. These criteria are the result of environmental analysis work done in the Randolph ES.

Specific guidelines governing future allocations of forage created by land treatment practices are also listed. These guidelines set up a means of an orderly administration and allocation of increases in forage. A plan governing future allocations is necessary to provide stability and control for the implementation of the long term multiple use program.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Range Management RM-2.4
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT Range Management-2.4

This decision is the same as RM-1.3.

RATIONALE Range Management-2.4

Refer to RM-1.3 for rationale.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Range Management RM-3.1	
Overlay Reference		
Step 1		Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT Range Management-3.1

The following grazing trespass control measures will be implemented in Rich County.

1. The BLM will try to get the cooperation of the ranchers in each common allotment by offering Cooperative Grazing Allotment Agreements to control trespass. Cattle marking will not be required on those community allotments wherein all operators sign an agreement, similar to the attached example, indicating their willingness to cooperate in controlling livestock trespass. All operators in the community allotments will be held collectively responsible for livestock in excess of permitted numbers. These agreements will include livestock trespass before, during, and after the grazing season; trespass within an allotment, drift fence abuse and incorrect pasture within an allotment.

2. Paint branding will be required for the 1980 grazing season, on those community allotments where it is not possible to obtain unanimous acceptance by all operators in the allotment of a Cooperative Agreement as outlined above. Ear tagging will be required beginning with the 1981 grazing season for those allotments which have not entered into a cooperative agreement. Ear tagging will be required after a second trespass offense within an allotment during a given year. Trespass will include all items identified above.

The objective of this policy is to encourage responsible use by the public of the Public Lands. The primary responsibility for insuring responsible range use belongs to the users themselves. The users should work together and with BLM to reduce trespass. BLM will vigorously pursue the control of trespass and strictly enforce trespass regulations and apply penalties including fees and reductions as necessary.

RATIONALE Range Management-3.1

Trespass is one of the major factors contributing to range over use which in turn is a major contributory factor to range deterioration in Rich County. Numbered items below correspond directly to numbered items in decision above.

1. At present, it would be extremely difficult to determine if an operator is placing more livestock on the range than are permitted. A cooperative agreement, where in effect, will eliminate the need to determine actual ownership of any particular cattle. Periodic counts

will ascertain the total number on the allotment (also helping to determine actual use). This method is the least controversial method of trespass control and it encourages a program of self-policing and responsibility on the part of the range users, while accomplishing BLM management objectives.

The grazing regulations (43 CFR 4120.4(d)) give the District Manager discretionary authority to require ear tagging and other marking of livestock in order to abate trespass and promote orderly protection of the range. Paint branding will be used for the 1980 grazing season because of the long lead time required to realistically work ear tagging into the livestock operations. The requirement for ear tagging will encourage the operators to enter into cooperative agreements and work to see that they are maintained.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
Range Management RM-3.2	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT Range Management-3.2

Rewrite cooperative agreements in accordance with the District maintenance policy for range improvements. Any cooperative agreements written or rewritten will include all users in a community allotment, and not some individuals in a community allotment excluding others. Add stipulations to the grazing permits to make them contingent upon the proper maintenance and operation of the necessary range improvements 10 days prior to turn-out and throughout the grazing season. Compliance with the above stipulations would be a condition for turn-out. Included under these agreements are water developments, fences, and cattleguards not on county roads.

Once accepted and put into effect the above stipulations will become part of the operators' ten year permits.

RATIONALE Range Management-3.2

Proper operation of necessary range improvements is vital to the success of any grazing program and protection of vegetative resources. The Bureau in the past hasn't received sufficient funding to properly maintain these improvements, and cannot expect to receive sufficient funding in the future. If the improvements are going to be maintained to a standard that will insure proper grazing management, the range user will have to assume a larger share of the maintenance responsibility. The stipulations will help insure that the maintenance is done in a timely manner. The entering into any future agreements with all the users in an allotment rather than individuals or a group will help insure that the maintenance and use of an improvement is fair.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
Range Management RM-3.3	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 U2-PP-14

DECISION STATEMENT Range Management 3.3

Maintain or insure access on all existing roads crossing Public Land in Rich County to facilitate movement of livestock and maintenance of range improvements and other facilities in accordance with the access policy as stated in Decision Support 2.1. Maintain and/or reconstruct BLM roads as necessary to permit passage by vehicles and in such a manner as to reduce sedimentation and other environmental problems caused by those roads to an acceptable level.

RATIONALE Range Management 3.3

Existing BLM roads in Rich County are an important part of the overall range management program for the area. These roads are used by livestock to reach otherwise inaccessible areas and they are useful to livestock operators in moving livestock as well as for maintaining range improvements. Many of these roads are also essential to efficient, sound range administration by BLM personnel.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
Range Management RM-3.4	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT RANGE MANAGEMENT - 3.4

Dispose of 2,625 acres of public land to facilitate grazing management and administration as specified below. Priority for disposal of this land will be (1) state or private exchange under the provisions of Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 or (2) public sale under the provisions of Section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

1. Dispose of 867 acres outside of existing grazing allotments in T. 13 N., R. 6 E.; T. 13 N., R. 7 E.; and T. 14 N., R. 6 E., SLM according to the following priority:

(Refer to Decisions WL-1.6 & L-10.1)

2. Dispose of 637 acres in or near the Middle Ridge, Sessions and Big Creek Grazing Allotments in T. 8 N., R. 5 E.; T. 8 N., R. 8 E.; and T. 9 N., R. 5 E., SLM.

(Refer to Decision L-10.1)

3. Dispose of all Public Land in the Middle Ridge Grazing Allotment - T. 9 N., Rs. 5 & 6 E., SLM.

(Refer to Decision L-10.1 Restrictions on disposals will be the same as in that decision).

Exchange is the preferred method for disposal of these lands unless otherwise indicated. Exchange of lands with the State of Utah or private parties will generally result in no loss of Public Land in the county and will allow both BLM and the other party to the exchange to block their land ownership for better management. Should the BLM receive no viable exchange offers, the lands identified in this decision will, as a final resort, be sold at a public sale to the highest bidder.

RATIONAL RANGE MANAGEMENT 3.4

The lands identified in this decision are for the most part isolated parcels of Public Land and/or are difficult to manage with little or no public value to justify their retention.

(The item numbers below refer to corresponding numbers above.)

1. These isolated parcels of Public Land are not within a grazing allotment and have no significant public value to justify their

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

retention considering the expense and difficulty in managing them and lack of legal access to them.

2. These lands are isolated and difficult to manage and are of low multiple use value. The expense and difficulty in managing them far exceeds their value for retention.
3. The Public Land identified in this section makes up less than 15% of the Middle Ridge Allotment. This allotment would be better managed under private ownership considering the isolated-minority nature of the Public Land involved therein.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Range Management RM-3.5
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT: Range Management 3.5

Eliminate the "drift" in the Laketown, Big Creek, New Canyon, Duck Creek and Sage Creek Grazing Allotments. In place of this trailing use, the permitted livestock will be licensed at the full number for the full season. The season of use for these allotments is specified in RM 1.2.

RATIONALE: Range Management 3.5

The allotments listed presently have grazing licensed for the last one-half to one month of the grazing season, only the grazing AUMs charged against the operators active AUM qualifications are done so at only 10% the normal rate.

This leads to overstocking of the range and deters range recovery. By licensing the permitted livestock for the entire season, the range manager can be assured that no overgrazing is taking place.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Randolph

Activity

Range Management RM-3.6

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT Range Management 3.6

Adjust existing and future Exchange-of-Use grazing agreements to grazing capacity, concurrent with adjustments in grazing preference, so that the grazing capacity corresponds with the range survey capacity for the land in Exchange-of-Use. Season of use must correspond with the season of use established in the grazing permit for the allotment.

RATIONALE Range Management 3.6

Proper season of use and grazing capacity determinations are made in the Randolph MFP for the Public Lands in Rich County. Based upon present resource conditions and field studies, allowing an improper season of use or exceeding the grazing capacity on lands under Exchange-of-Use will result in adverse impacts to the federal range.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Randolph

Activity

Range Management RM-3.7

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT: Range Management 3.7

Block-up the Public Lands in the following grazing allotments to facilitate Range Management.

A. Eastman Allotment

Block-up all Public Lands in this allotment.

B. South Woodruff Allotment

Block-up all Public Lands in this allotment.

C. Deseret Allotment

Block-up all Public Lands in this allotment where feasible, except that the land under Neponset Reservoir (Section 24, T. 8 N., R. 7 E.) would not be traded or disposed of in any case.

The criteria for disposal of lands stated in L-10.1 and for acquisition of lands as stated in L-12.1 will apply these lands as well.

RATIONALE: Range Management 3.7

All three allotments have a "checkerboard" land ownership pattern. The BLM is a minority landowner in these allotments making management difficult. Blocking-up these Public Lands would permit managing the Public Lands without disrupting the private landowners' use of his lands.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Range Management RM-3.
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT: Range Management 3.8

Accurate actual use information must be submitted by every livestock permittee within 15 days after completing their annual grazing use. Failure to submit actual use information will constitute cause to cancel the grazing permit as under 43 CFR 4170.1-1 for violation of 43 CFR 4120.2-2 (Other Terms and Conditions). The actual use information will be submitted on a letter which includes a signed certification of the accuracy of the actual use figures. The letter will also include a statement as to the understanding for the need for an orderly range administration and the possibility that grazing privileges may be reduced if actual use information isn't provided, and the reasons. Submission of actual use information will be a condition of the grazing permit.

RATIONALE: Range Management 3.8

Actual use information is very necessary information in the study and monitoring of the general range "health". Actual use data is necessary to make utilization and trend studies functional and used in combination with those studies, actual use provides a means for monitoring the range program in progress. (Refer to Decision RM 3.9) 43 CFR 4120.2-2(d) provides that the authorized may require actual use information within 15 days after the completion of the grazing season.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Range Management RM-3.9
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT RANGE MANAGEMENT - 3.9

Grazing administration including use supervision, trespass control, and monitoring utilization and trend studies will receive top priority for funding within the Range Management program. If full funding is not available for these activities, funds will be diverted from other range activities, e.g., SVIM inventory, etc.

RATIONALE RANGE MANAGEMENT - 3.9

A major cause, if not the main cause, of range deterioration in the past has been inadequate administration by BLM, including trespass control. It does not do any good to force ranchers to take reductions if a lack of proper administration allows the condition of Public Land to continue to decline. In addition, some of the other Range Management Decisions depend on studies, which will have to be continued into the future.

APPENDIX B

Range Decision Documentation

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Page</u>
Bear Lake Allotment	B-11
Rabbit Creek Allotment	B-3
Dry Basin Allotment	B-6
Duck Creek Allotment	B-9
Laketown Allotment	B-12
Sage Creek Allotment	B-15
Kearl Allotment	B-19
New Canyon Allotment	B-21
Big Creek Allotment	B-25
Stuart Allotment	B-29
Woodruff Pastures Allotment	B-32
Twin Peaks Allotment	B-36
East Woodruff Allotment	B-38
Meachum Allotment	B-40
Eastman Allotment	B-42
South Woodruff Allotment	B-46
Deseret Allotment	B-49
Middle Ridge Allotment	B-52
Sessions Allotment	B-54

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

BEAR LAKE ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 1,198

B. Previous Adjudication

The allotment was reduced by 50% in 1961.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Falula Farms	374	C 187	187	C 5/15 - 9/15

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	99
Priority 2 - Sheep	0
Priority 3 - Deer	427

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	59	41	0
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

Utilization

59 %

Actual Use

85 %

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

42 %

Actual Use

65 %

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

217 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. If the operator agrees to an Allotment Management Plan by February 28, 1980, takes voluntary non-use of 50% for two grazing seasons to rest treated areas, and treatments are completed as programmed, then a decision on stocking will be deferred for two years. If the above conditions are not met, or if treatments result in less than 88 AUMs of additional forage, a reduction of 88 AUMs will be made over a three-year period.
2. If the operator agrees to an AMP by February 28, 1980, season of use will be set to meet physiological needs of key forage plants as specified in the AMP. If not, season of use will begin May 25 and end September 15.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 217 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 200 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The operator has tentatively agreed to an Allotment Management Plan which will create a two-pasture system. Also, a series of land treatments (sagebrush spraying) has been programmed for this year on both private and public lands in one of the pastures. The operator will provide rest on the treated area for two seasons by taking non-use. The predictable result of this program (as judged in consultation with SCS) will be an increase in available forage. It is logical to wait until the treatments are completed and evaluate results prior to forcing a reduction. If, for some reason, the treatments fail or are not carried out, a reduction will be the only alternative.
- B. With rest or deferment, plants can be grazed earlier than with continuous grazing. If an AMP is implemented, the season of use will be based on the needs of key plants. If not, it will be necessary to delay turn-out to protect soil and vegetative resources.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

RABBIT CREEK ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres: 3,257

B. Previous Adjudication

A 50 percent reduction was made from 1961 to 63.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u> <u>Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Keith Johnson	968	^C 486	482	c-5/10-10/10

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	358
Priority 2 - Sheep	0
Priority 3 - Deer	1218

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	1	99	0
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

Utilization

37%

Actual Use

Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

Moderate

Actual Use

70%

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

395 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Spring turnout will be delayed until May 25. If the possibility of a grazing system which will meet the needs of key plants is determined to exist, then an earlier turnout date may also be possible.
2. Make a reduction in the authorized level of use over a three year period to the range survey level of 358 AUMs. Continue utilization and actual use studies to verify this level of use. If future studies show inconsistencies with the range survey, stop reductions until the problem is resolved. This level of use will allow grazing by about the same number of yearlings as have been grazed in the past.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 395 AUM.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 823 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. There is little apparent possibility that an effective grazing system can be developed that includes rest or deferment of grazing on key plants. Most of the allotment is in higher elevation area. These factors indicate the need for a later turnout date. All the possibilities for a grazing system such as rotation of use with private land have not been investigated. Other avenues should be looked into, in an attempt to develop a more effective system and perhaps restore the earlier turnout date.
- B. The use of this allotment, at least last year, was made by yearlings. According to the Society for Range Management and SCS, a yearling's forage consumption is equivalent to about .7 AUMs.

When utilization/actual use information is interpreted in this light, the past year's data supports the range survey level of stocking. In other words, even though the operator turned out his full numbers the forage consumed was about 70% of his authorized level of use. If cow/calf units had been turned out, utilization would have been probably been in the heavy category. It appears that a reduction in authorized AUMs should be made, however, if the operator continues to run yearlings his head count will not be affected. If future studies contradict this interpretation a halt in the reduction should be made, until the situation is resolved.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

DRY BASIN ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres: 2,781

B. Previous Adjudication

In 1961, a 50 percent reduction was made. The reduction was taken over a three year period.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

A change in class of livestock, from sheep to cattle, was made prior to the 1976 grazing season. Four years of cattle use has been made in the allotment.

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Dallas Johnson	338	170	168	c-5/10-7/9
Larry Johnson	338	170	168	
Robert Johnson	<u>338</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>168</u>	
Total	1014	510	504	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	318
Priority 2 - Sheep	278
Priority 3 - Deer	1176

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	0	100	0
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

Utilization

Actual Use

26 %

Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

Actual Use

44 %

70 %

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

564 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Retain the present level of stocking. A three year study of utilization and actual use will be made to verify that the level of use is appropriate.
2. Develop an allotment management plan by July 31, 1980.
3. Establish season of use in the allotment management plan. The season of use will be based on the physiological needs of key forage plants under the specific grazing system established by the plan. If the allotment management plan is not implemented, establish the turnout date at May 25.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 564 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 609 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. Although the range survey indicates that a reduction in use is needed, utilization and actual use studies thus far have not supported the range survey. An allotment management plan has been tentatively agreed to and a spraying project and water system expansion will be implemented this year. A longer term study program is needed to determine the actual situation in the allotment, especially considering that a rest program for the spray treatment will be included during the studies.

B. The grazing system in the allotment will consider the needs of key forage species. The turnout date should be set in accordance with these needs. If a plan cannot be implemented before the next season that the allotment is grazed, turnout will be set at May 25. This turnout date will continue until the evaluation studies are completed.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

DUCK CREEK ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 13,410

B. Previous Adjudication

The allotment was reduced by 50% in 1961-63.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u>			<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
		<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>H</u>		
Feller, Fred Allen	326		163		163	
Groll, Mrs. Ben	480	50	182	8	240	
Hansen, Beatrice N.	72		36		36	
Forty-Six Co., Inc.	84		42		42	
Kennedy, William D.	459		217	13	229	
Kennedy, Reed	459		230		229	C 5/10 - 9/30
Lamborn, Grant	385		193		192	H 5/10 - 9/30
Peart, Roger	452		218	8	226	S 5/10 - 7/16
Willis, Claude	472		236		236	S 10/1 - 12/9
Willis, Elijah	869	430	5		434	
Total	4,058	480	1,522	29	2,027	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

*Total Active
2,031*

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	1231
Priority 2 - Sheep	1324
Priority 3 - Deer	2512

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	2	90	8
Sheep	91	9	0
Deer	91	9	0

Utilization

66%

Actual Use

Not known

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

Moderate

Actual Use

95%

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

678 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. No reduction in the level of use will be made at this time. Utilization and actual use will be monitored for 2 more years on key management areas (areas of historical moderate and heavy use). If utilization exceeds the proper level (50%) appropriate reductions will be made. Studies will continue on a permanent basis.
2. Turnout in the spring will be May 16 if an allotment management plan is accepted by July 31, 1980 and implemented by May 16, 1985.* When the plan is implemented, turnout will be based on the physiological needs of key forage plants. This could be May 16 or earlier depending on the particular grazing system. If an AMP is not accepted and implemented by the above dates, turnout will be May 25.
3. The "drift" condition in permits will be eliminated. The ending date will be decided by a majority of the users in the allotment. The users will inform the area manager of their choice by February 28, 1980. Cattle on the allotment after that date will be in trespass. The fall sheep season will not be changed.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 678 AUMs
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 1834 AUMS

VII. RATIONALE

- A. This year's utilization and actual use information does not support a reduction of the magnitude expressed by the range survey. There is evidence that a trespass situation generated last year's higher utilization figure. Portions of the allotment which are in good condition, may not have been fully documented and considered in the range survey, due to their inaccessibility and the short time frame in which the survey was conducted. A cautious approach is warranted in this allotment. Further studies should be conducted prior to making any adjustments.

- B. An earlier turnout date is possible with rest and deferment in the grazing system. These factors prevent damage to key plants which can occur under continuous early grazing. If reasonable progress is being made toward a system which includes rest and deferment, an interim turnout date of May 16 is acceptable. This date is intended to provide a degree of protection to key plants and also to reduce economic impacts to operators. After an effective system is in operation, the turnout date can be set at May 16 or earlier, depending on the particular system. If such a system cannot be implemented, the later date of May 25 is necessary to insure long term protection to soil and vegetative resources.
- C. The "drift" situation which is currently authorized is impossible to administer. The only effective way to supervise late season use is to establish a firm ending date. This date can be set to meet the needs of the operators since there are no evident conflicts with the end-of-season cattle use.

* Accepted means voluntarily agreed to by at least two-thirds of the livestock operators in the allotment.

Implemented means that the grazing system has been put into operation at a level which will meet the objectives of the AMP. It does not mean that all proposed improvements must be completed.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

LAKETOWN ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 3,241

B. Previous Adjudication

The allotment was adjudicated in 1961, when a 50 percent reduction was made.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Price, Mrs. Ruth		<u>C</u>		
Early	18	9	9	C - 5/10 - 9/30
Esterholdt, Raymond	309	155	154	
Lamborn, Howard	16	8	8	
Price, Kenneth J.	48	24	24	
Price, Glen	121	61	60	
Pugmire, Dean R.	78	39	39	
Total	<u>590</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>294</u>	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	327
Priority 2 - Sheep	0
Priority 3 - Deer	902

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	52	46	2
Sheep	98	0	2
Deer	98	0	2

Utilization

45 %

Actual Use

Not known

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

<u>Utilization</u>		<u>Actual Use</u>
East Half	35 %	Not Known
West Half	58 %	
Average	47 %	

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

372 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Retain the present level of stocking. Conduct a three-year utilization/actual use study and re-evaluate and make changes as needed as studies are completed and as riparian protection projects are completed.
2. Retain the present season of use if an Allotment Management Plan is accepted by July 31, 1981 and implemented by May 15, 1985. If the AMP is not accepted and implemented by the above dates, spring turn-out would be established at May 25. *
3. The drift conditions in the grazing permits will be eliminated. The season of use will end no later than September 1.
4. As part of the Allotment Management Plan, Exchange-of-Use problems and other problems of use of private lands in the allotment will be resolved.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 372 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 552 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The present level of allowable use is less than the range survey determination of carrying capacity; however, a riparian fencing project is scheduled on Laketown Creek which will likely mean a deduction of available forage. The riparian enclosure will probably be about equal to the excess in available forage and will probably negate an increase. The level of stocking should remain the same until riparian protection work is completed and studies verify the amount of forage available.
- B. If satisfactory progress is being made toward implementation of an Allotment Management Plan which includes rest or deferment to

protect key forage plants during the spring growth period, the turn-out date can remain the same until the plan is implemented. Spring turn-out after the plan is implemented would be based on the physiological needs of key forage plants under the actual grazing system set out in the plan. This date could be May 16 or earlier. This action is intended to reduce economic impacts to the users. If progress is not made toward an effective grazing system, the turn-out date must be delayed until May 25 in order to prevent long-term damage to soil and vegetative resources.

- C. The "drift" provision in the permits is impossible to administer. The only effective way to monitor and control late season use is to establish one ending date. This allotment has a large amount of critical deer winter range. To prevent direct competition with deer, the cattle ending date should be no later than September 1.
- D. Discussions with private land owners and users of the allotment have identified problems relating to the definition of the allotment boundary in relation to private lands and the situation concerning Exchange-of-Use Agreements. These problems should be resolved as soon as possible, but prior to completion of the AMP to insure an effective permanent grazing program.

* Accepted means voluntarily agreed to by at least two-thirds of the livestock operators in the allotment.

Implemented means that the grazing system has been put into operation at a level which will meet the objectives of the AMP. It does not mean that all proposed improvements must be completed.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

SAGE CREEK ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres: 10,153

B. Previous Adjudication

A 50 percent reduction was made in 1961-63.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None.

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u>		<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
		<u>Active</u>			
		<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>		
Peart, Roger	163	82		81	
Morrell Weston and	793		397	396	
Argyle Ranch Inc.	200		100	100	c-5/10-9/30
Rex, Charles W.	243		122	121	s-5/10-6/29
Rex, Robert R.	398		199	199	
Hatch, Roger J.	<u>296</u>		<u>148</u>	<u>148</u>	
Total	2,093	82	966	1,045	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	905
Priority 2 - Sheep	1383
Priority 3 - Deer	2815

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	12	88	0
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0
	<u>Utilization</u>		<u>Actual Use</u>
	51%		Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

<u>Utilization</u>	<u>Actual Use</u>
Moderate	90%

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

1254 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. A reduction in livestock will not be made at this time. the allotment will be monitored for two more years. Utilization will be observed on key areas. If utilization exceeds 50%, then a a reduction to the appropriate level will be made. Trend studies as well as utilization and actual use will be permanently continued to monitor changes in range condition and verify needs for adjustments in livestock use.
2. Season of use will begin May 16, if an AMP is accepted by July 31, 1981 and implemented by May 16, 1985.* If an AMP is not accepted and implemented by the above dates turnout will be set at May 25. After implementation of the AMP, the turnout date may be May 16 or earlier depending on the particular grazing system which is designed for the allotment.

3. The season of fall sheep use will remain the same.
4. The fall drift condition in grazing permits will be eliminated. The ending date for cattle use, will be the choice of a majority of the operators. The operators will inform the area manager by February 28, 1980 of their choice.
5. Trailing through the allotment will require a permit which, specifies the route and time allowed for crossing.

B. Other

1. Allocated to Deer - 1254 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 1019 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The range survey indicates a very small forage deficit exists (less than 1 percent). This is probably well within the margin of error for a survey process. Utilization actual use studies support the survey, which indicates that the allotment is stocked properly.
- B. The date of spring turnout can be earlier under a grazing system which includes rest or deferment than under continuous grazing. If satisfactory progress is being made toward an effective grazing system, turnout can remain May 16. This is a compromise, to reduce economic impacts to the operators. If an effective grazing system cannot be worked out, it will be necessary to delay the turnout date, in order to protect soil and vegetative resources from damage which can be caused from grazing under the present system.
- C. Fall sheep use appears to be working well. No conflicts with wildlife are evident. There is no reason to alter this season.
- D. The "drift" provision in the present permits are impossible to administer. The only sure way of controlling date season use is to establish a firm ending date. This date can be selected by the operators to fit their needs. Once it is selected it will be strictly monitored and enforced.

* Accepted means voluntarily agreed to by at least two-thirds of the livestock operators in the allotment.

Implemented means that the grazing system has been put into operation at a level which will meet the objectives of the AMP. It does not mean that all proposed improvements must be completed.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

KEARL ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 1,183⁵

B. Previous Adjudication

The allotment was reduced in 1962 as a result of a Section 8b Transfer and Adjudicated in 1964. A 25% reduction was made in 1964.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

The allotment has been used by Stuart Wamsley under an agreement with the permittees.

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u> <u>Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Paul or Mona Kearl	351	C - 263	88	C - 5/10 - 9/30
Morton J. Kearl, Estate	322	C - 240	82	
Total	673	503	170	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	176
Priority 2 - Sheep	--
Priority 3 - Deer	425

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	47	53	0
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

Utilization

54%

Actual Use

Unknown

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

52 %

Actual Use

100 % + a significant amount of trespass occurred by cattle from another allotment.

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

235 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Make a reduction to the level of 176 AUMs indicated by the range survey by May 25, 1980. Encourage the operator to enter into Exchange-of-Use Agreement for private land in the allotment.
2. Set spring turn-out at May 25. Terminate use in the fall at a date selected by the operator providing he informs the Area Manager of the date by February 28, 1980.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 253 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 172 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The carrying capacity of public and private land in the allotment is approximately what the BLM permit now authorizes. The level of use would remain about the same if the operator chooses to enter into Exchange-of-Use Agreements. The same level of use can be made as previously, at a lower grazing fee cost.
- B. This allotment is at a high elevation and is too small for other than a system of continuous grazing. A later turn-out is needed to protect key forage plants from damage which could be caused from the present system. The ending date can be selected to meet the operators' needs.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

NEW CANYON ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 30,665

B. Previous Adjudication

The allotment was formed in 1965 when it was separated from the Big Creek Allotment. A reduction was made in 1961-63 of 40 per cent.

C. Relevant Transfers, leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u>			<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
		<u>Active</u>				
		<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>H</u>		
Neilson, Wm. M.	865	16	495	8	346	C- 5/16-9/30
Lamborn, Grant	808		485		323	S- 5/10-6/19
Lamborn, Howard	393		236		157	H- 10/23-11/18
Argyle Ranch, Inc.	1,300	267	513		520	
Gray, Billy M.	495		297		198	
Hatch, Kenneth	Exchange of Use					
Jackson Land &	60			36	24	
Jackson, Loran	25		15		10	
Lamborn, David G.	870		522		348	
Muir, Ira B.	130		78		52	
Norris, Blen S.	108		65		43	
Rex, Charles W.	280		168		112	
Rex, Robert R.	805		538		267	
Thomson, H. LeRoy	46		28		18	
Thomson, Glenn and	316		189		127	
Thornock, A. Kay	205		123		82	
Hoffman, Harold	186		112		74	
Hoffman, Kenneth	468		281		187	
Hoffman, Merrill V.	336		201		135	
Hoffman, Roy	187		112		75	
Hoffman, Verl L.	357		214		143	
Total	8,240	283	4,672	44	3,241	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

	<u>Range Survey AUMs *</u>	
Priority 1 - Cattle	4,708	} 8,104 508 4206
Priority 2 - Sheep	3,396	
Priority 3 - Deer	4,719	

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	65	34	1
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

<u>Utilization</u>	<u>Actual Use</u>
59%	Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

<u>Utilization</u>	<u>Actual Use</u>
55 - 60 %	95 %

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

1,254 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. A reduction in livestock will not be made at this time. The allotment will be monitored for two more years. Utilization will be observed on key areas. If utilization exceeds 50%, then a reduction to the appropriate level will be made. Trend studies as well as utilization and actual use will be permanently continued to monitor changes in range condition and verify needs for adjustments in livestock use.
2. Spring turn-out will continue to be May 16. This date will continue if an AMP is accepted by July 31, 1980 and implemented by May 16, 1983. If an AMP is not accepted and implemented by the above dates, turn-out will be May 25. After implementation of the AMP, the turn-out will be based on physiological needs of key forage plants under rest or deferment. This can be May 16 or earlier.
3. Until an Allotment Management Plan is in effect, use above the drift fence will begin upon approval of the Area Manager. All livestock must be moved above the fence in ten days. Once the cattle have been moved above the drift fence, they will not be allowed below it. Livestock must be driven home at the end of the season. Livestock below the drift fence which are not under the direct control of the permittee or his employees will be in trespass.

4. The "drift" condition of permits will be eliminated. The ending date will be decided by a majority of the users of the allotment. The users will inform the Area Manager by February 28, 1980. Any livestock on the allotment after the specified ending date will be in trespass.
5. Livestock trailing to and from Forest Service lands must have a trailing permit while on BLM land. Routes will be specified and time allocated for crossing. These will be stated in the permit.
6. The fall sheep season will remain the same. Sheep use will be rotated between the two Hawk Spring seedings to maintain a desirable balance in vegetation.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 1254 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 5952 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The reduction which was identified by the range survey is very small (4 percent). This adjustment is probably smaller than the margin of error in the survey procedure. Utilization was in the high-moderate range in both 1978 and 1979. Actual use was near permitted level in 1979 and probably was in 1978 also. The best approach is to monitor the situation with more intensive studies prior to making any adjustments. A better grazing system and range improvements are probably more important in improving this allotment than a reduction of this magnitude.
- B. The date of spring turn-out can be earlier under a grazing system which includes rest or deferment than under continuous grazing. If satisfactory progress is being made toward an effective grazing system, turn-out can remain at May 16. This is a compromise to reduce economic impacts to the operators. If an effective grazing system cannot be worked out, it will be necessary to delay the turn-out date in order to protect soil and vegetative resources from damage which can be caused from grazing under the present system.
- C. The lower portion of the allotment, with the exception of seedings, is in much worse condition than the higher area. This is probably due to early grazing which is continued through the season and to late use where cattle drift to the lower areas and stay until they are removed from the allotment. This system puts heavy pressure on the lower range. The restrictions placed on grazing the area below the drift fence are needed to reduce pressure and, hopefully, improve the condition of the area by lightening the load which has been placed there.

- D. The "drift" provision in the permits is impossible to administer. This year an aerial count determined that a significant number of cattle remained on the range over and above the number allowed in the permits. The only effective way to control late season trespass is to establish one ending date. This date can be selected by the operators to fit their operation. Once it is selected, it will be strictly monitored and enforced.
- E. Trailing cattle to and from Forest Service lands, has contributed to unauthorized use on this allotment, particularly in the fall when gates are opened on the Forest boundary and cattle permitted to "drift home" across BLM land. This use is not considered in the capacity for grazing the allotment and cannot be allowed. The procedure for administering trailing is specified in the grazing regulations and it will be followed.
- F. The season of sheep use can remain the same with the exception of a slight delay in spring turn-out. Sheep use can help to maintain a desired vegetative composition and will be rotated between seedings in order to help maintain quality of forage. The AMP can modify this system if necessary.

- * Accepted means voluntarily agreed to by at least two-thirds of the livestock operators in the allotment.

Implemented means that the grazing system has been put into operation at a level which will meet the objectives of the AMP. It does not mean that all proposed improvements must be completed.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

BIG CREEK ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 20,346

B. Previous Adjudication

A 40 percent reduction was made in 1961-63. The allotment was separated from the New Canyon Allotment (Randolph Unit) in 1965.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class Of Livestock</u>		<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
		<u>Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>		
		<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>		
Argyle, Ross	93		55	38	
Argyle, Von	571		342	229	C - 5/10-9/15
Brown, Kenneth R.	557		334	223	S - 6/1-7/15
Call, Norman	110		66	44	9/1-9/15
Cornia, Hazen	1,444	478	690	574	10/1-11/30
Frazier, Francis	101	61		40	
Frazier, George	245		147	98	
Jacobsen, Mynard	128		77	51	
Kennedy, Fern	285		171	114	
McKinnon, Gale	388		233	155	
McKinnon, Glenn	680		408	272	
McKinnon, Lynn	266		160	106	
Morrell Weston and Argyle Ranch, Inc.	1,874		1,121	753	
Eastman, Arlo	Exchange of Use				
Total	6,742	539	3,804	2,697	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	2,809
Priority 2 - Sheep	2,753
Priority 3 - Deer	4,402

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	35	64	1
Sheep	73	27	0
Deer	73	27	0

Utilization

65%

Actual Use

Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

Heavy below drift fence
Moderate above drift fence

Actual Use

75%

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

1923 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Reduce the level of cattle use to the range survey carrying capacity of 2,809 AUMs over a three-year period. Retain the current level of sheep use. Continue to monitor utilization, actual use and trend in the allotment. If future studies are not consistent with this action the reduction will be stopped until the inconsistencies are resolved.
2. Establish May 16 as the date for spring turn-out. This date will continue if an AMP is accepted by July 31, 1980 and implemented by May 16, 1983.* If an AMP is not accepted and implemented by the above dates, turnout will be established at May 25. After implementation of the AMP, the turn-out will be based on physiological needs of key forage plants under rest or deferment. This can be May 16 or earlier.
3. Until an AMP is in effect, use above the drift fence will begin upon approval of the Area Manager. All livestock must be moved above the drift fence in ten days. Use will not be allowed below the drift fence after that date. Livestock must be driven home at the end of the season. After once moving above it, livestock below the drift fence which are not under the direct control of the permittee or his employees will be in trespass.

4. The drift condition of the current permits will be eliminated. The ending date will be decided by a majority of the users. Any livestock on the allotment after the specified date will be in trespass.
5. Livestock trailing to and from Forest Service lands must have a trailing permit while on BLM land. Routes and time allowed for crossing will be specified in the permit.
6. The fall sheep season will remain the same. No sheep use will be allowed below the drift fence after the date specified for movement above the drift fence as stated above.

B. Other

1. Allocation to deer - 1923 AUMs.
2. Allocation to other wildlife and watershed - 4,920 AUMs.

VI. RATIONALE

- A. Utilization and actual use data support the need for a reduction as stated in the range survey. Problems in over-use below the drift fence are evident, especially on the Limestone seedings. Although it appears that a reduction in use is necessary, this could be modified by continuing studies. If these studies contradict existing data, a halt should be made in reductions until inconsistencies are resolved.
- B. The date of spring turn-out can be earlier under a grazing system which includes rest or deferment than under continuous grazing. If satisfactory progress is being made toward an effective grazing system, turn-out can remain at May 16. This is a compromise to reduce economic impacts to the operators. If an effective grazing system cannot be worked out, it will be necessary to delay the turn-out date, in order to protect soil and vegetative resources from damage which can be caused from grazing under the present system.
- C. The lower portion of the allotment, with the exception of seedings, is in much worse condition than the higher area. This is probably due to early grazing which is continued through the season and to late use where cattle drift to the lower areas and stay until they are removed from the allotment. This system puts heavy pressure on the lower range. The restrictions placed on grazing the area below the drift fence are needed and grazing twice each year and, hopefully, improve the condition of the area by lightening the load which has been placed there.

- D. The drift provision in the permit is impossible to administer. This year an aerial count determined that a significant number of cattle remained on the range over and above the number allowed in the permits. The only effective way to control late season trespass is to establish one ending date. This date can be selected by the operators to fit their operation. Once it is selected, it will be strictly monitored and enforced.
- E. Trailing cattle to and from Forest Service lands has contributed to unauthorized use on this allotment, particularly in the fall when gates are opened on the Forest boundary and cattle permitted to "drift home" across BLM land. This use is not considered in the capacity for grazing the allotment and cannot be allowed. The procedure for administering trailing is specified in the grazing regulations and it will be followed.
- F. The season of sheep use can remain the same with the exception of a slight delay in spring turn-out. Sheep use can help to maintain a desired vegetative composition. Sheep will not be allowed to use the lower area in fall and winter to prevent direct conflict with deer.

* Accepted means voluntarily agreed to by at least two-thirds of the livestock operators in the allotment.

Implemented means that the grazing system has been put into operation at a level which will meet the objectives of the AMP. It does not mean that all proposed improvements must be completed.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

STUART ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 1,042

B. Previous Adjudication

In 1935, Earl Stuart obtained 423 AUMs by application. In 1961, 102 AUMs were adjudicated to Stuart Allotment, 298 in Woodruff Pastures, and 23 in Middle Ridge. No reduction has been made and the preference does not include suspended non-use.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

The use has been leased to Morrell Weston and Sons. The lease expires January 31, 1981.

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Morrell Weston & Sons	102	C - 102	--	5/16 - 6/19

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	60
Priority 2 - Sheep	--
Priority 3 - Deer	293

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	28	37	35
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

Utilization

55 %

Actual Use

Not Known

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

42 %

Actual Use

100 %

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

255 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. If the operator agrees to non-use which is sufficient to protect key forage plants in the area which is scheduled for spraying, and the treatment is completed as programmed, then a decision on a reduction in the level of use will be delayed for two years. If the above conditions are not met or if treatments result in less than 42 AUMs of additional forage, then a reduction of 42 AUMs will be made over a three-year period.
2. Turn-out will remain at May 16 if an Allotment Management Plan has been accepted by July 31, 1980 and implemented by May 16, 1981. If not, turn-out will be delayed until May 25. After implementation of the AMP, turn-out may be May 16 or earlier, depending on the needs of key forage plants on the allotment.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 255 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 38 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. A sagebrush spraying project has been planned and programmed for this year. If the operator will take non-use for two growing seasons to rest the treated area, the predicted results will be an increase in available forage. It is logical to wait until the treatment is completed and rested to evaluate results, rather than to force a reduction now. If the treatment fails or is not carried out, a reduction must be made.
- B. With rest or deferment, plants can be grazed earlier than with continuous grazing. If an AMP is implemented, season of use can be more flexible than under the present system. If satisfactory progress is being made toward an effective grazing system, the

turn-out date can be retained. If progress is not being made toward implementation of an AMP, it will be necessary to delay turn-out to protect soil, vegetative, and watershed resources, and the investment of public money in the land treatment.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

WOODRUFF PASTURES ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 21,875

B. Previous Adjudication

The Woodruff Pastures Allotment was officially formed in 1965 when the Woodruff Grazing Unit was fenced forming the Stuarts and Woodruff Pastures Allotments. In 1961, during the range adjudication period, the Woodruff unit was scheduled for a 52% reduction. This reduction was not implemented as scheduled. An intensive effort was made to upgrade the productivity of the area by land treatments instead of implementing the reduction.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u>		<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
		<u>Active</u>	<u>S - C</u>		
Cornia, Orson	894	380	514		
Stuart, Louis M.	263		263		
Cornia, Hazen	298	298			
Frazier, Francis	30	30			
Frazier, George O.	284	284			
McKinnon, Gale	266		266		
Putnam, Mrs. Elden	199		132	67	
Putnam, Keith L.	428		313	115	
Cornia, William Dee	118		118		
Schulthess, Wallace	27		27		
Bryson, Catherine	15		15		
Buck, Max	433		433		
Cornia, Peter C.	176		176		ALL OPERATORS C 5/16 - 9/15 S 5/16 - 5/31 S 11/1 - 1/13
Cornia, Keith	213		213		
Cox, Raymond B.	90		90		
Cox, W. Emerson	261		261		
Dean, Grant W.	100		100		
Eastman, Arlo	93		93		
Putnam, E. Deverl &	176		145	31	
Putnam, Keith &	90		90		
Longhurst, Clyde	20		20		
Rex, Benjamin R.	128		128		
Rufi, William D.	273		273		
Tingey, Wesley	163		163		
Total	5,038	992	3,833	213	

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	3,360
Priority 2 - Sheep	2,844
Priority 3 - Deer	2,644

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	48	37	15
Sheep	81	19	0
Deer	81	19	0

Utilization

60%

Actual Use

Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

Low-Moderate

Actual Use

75%

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

3990 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. The present level of stocking for both cattle and sheep will be retained, however, the level of use in any pasture will not exceed 50% of current growth. No more than 5 days will be allowed for movement to the next pasture. Livestock remaining after 5 days will be in trespass.

Although a reduction in level of use is not part of this decision, the utilization limit may result in actual use which is less than licensed use, especially in poor forage production years. Billings will be based on actual use.

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

2. The season of use will remain the same, however, sheep use will not be allowed in Dry Basin and Longhill Pastures after July 31. This is an interim restriction. Final establishment of the season and pattern of sheep use will be resolved in cooperation with users in the development of a wildlife habitat plan. This will be coordinated with the present allotment management plan. In the long term, a combination of sheep and cattle grazing will be used to achieve the desired vegetative composition.
3. Utilization, actual use, and trend studies will be established on a permanent basis. Special emphasis will be placed on critical deer areas.
4. The grazing system as stated in the AMP will be strictly followed and enforced. No exceptions will be made without District Manager's approval. Exceptions will not be granted except where severe drought or other extreme or unusual situations occur.
5. Trailing cattle from upper pastures in the fall will take no more than one day, with 3 days allowed in the Tin Can Pasture for reuniting cows and calves. No trailing permits will be issued for livestock not permitted in the allotment.
6. Consolidation of the Putnam Allotment will be completed as soon as funding allows. Until then, the Putnam Allotment will be managed separately.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 3990 AUM's.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 2026 AUM's.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The range survey is very close to the present permitted use for cattle and shows an excess of forage available for sheep. A problem exists, however, in that some pastures have been used heavily while others have been used lightly. The 50% utilization criteria and the requirement for movement from pasture to pasture has been imposed to spread use more evenly through the allotment. In poor years, this may result in lower than permitted use but will prevent overuse of the forage resource. Actual use billings will be initiated to insure that operators pay for only that forage which was actually taken.

- B. Dry Basin and Longhill pastures are extremely critical for wintering deer. Sheep will be restricted from winter use, in the interim, in these pastures to prevent direct conflict and hopefully, to reduce the pressure of deer on private lands on Woodruff Creek. In the long term, grazing by both classes of livestock will be used to maintain a desirable mix of grasses, forbs, and shrubs under criteria specified in the habitat management plan to be written in FY 80 and coordinated with the current AMP. In the long term, the presence of both classes of livestock can be used to the advantage of both deer and livestock grazing.
- C. Range studies are essential to know what vegetative changes are occurring under existing conditions of use. They must be established and read regularly in order to properly manipulate grazing to achieve objectives of the HMP and AMP.
- D. The grazing system must be strictly followed in order to attain management objectives, or to learn where changes are needed to improve conditions in the allotment.
- E. The constraints on trailing are needed to prevent excess pressure on the lower pastures. These are where most resource problems and conflicts occur. Utilization of these pastures should be lighter and strict measures are needed to insure lighter use.
- F. Certain improvements are needed to consolidate the Putnam Allotment into the operating grazing system. Until then, separate management is needed to prevent management problems.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

TWIN PEAKS ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 2,292

B. Previous Adjudication

The allotment was formerly part of the Rich Unit. In 1962 it was adjudicated. A 50% reduction was made at that time.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
William F. Goring	546	<u>S</u> 273	273	S - 5/22 - 6/30 9/20 - 10/20

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	--
Priority 2 - Sheep	773
Priority 3 - Deer	686

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	--	--	--
Sheep	100 %	--	--
Deer	100%	--	--

Utilization

35%

Actual Use

Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

29%

Actual Use

80 %

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

461 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Restore suspended non-use over a five year period. The increase will be non-renewable until studies show that the additional forage is available and that the increase is compatible with other resource values.
2. Implement an intensive program of studies (utilization, actual use and trend), and trespass control of cattle from adjacent allotments.
3. Retain the present season of use. Develop a formal Allotment Management Plan in cooperation with the operator.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 461 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 267 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. According to the range survey and other data, the opportunity exists to restore the operator's suspended non-use. This should be done carefully to insure that the increase is appropriate. This is the reason that the increase is to be spaced over five years.
- B. A good study program is needed to validate the existing data and verify the increase. It is evident that cattle from other allotments are making significant use of the allotment and preventing the riparian area from reaching a better condition. Trespass should be eliminated.
- C. The present grazing system appears to be working well; however, an Allotment Management Plan is a goal which should be reached in the near future to document or improve the present system and to identify improvement projects or other needs.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

EAST WOODRUFF ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 2,167

B. Previous Adjudication

This allotment was adjudicated in 1964. A reduction of 39 percent was made, from 266 AUMs to 162 AUMs.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Lawrence Brown	266	C - 162	104	C - 5/10 - 6/15 12/1 - 1/7

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	179
Priority 2 - Sheep	--
Priority 3 - Deer	352

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	36	64	0
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

Utilization

19 %

Actual Use

Not Known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

28 %

Actual Use

31% Cattle
72% Sheep (Exchange of use)

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old Single class of livestock method.

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

349 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Cattle use will be increased to the range survey level of 179 AUMs. This will be a non-renewable, temporary increase until a three-year utilization/actual use study insures that this amount of forage is available.
2. Develop an Allotment Management Plan which incorporates the present season of use and grazing system. Consider a consolidated AMP with Meachum Allotment.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 349 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 3 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The data which is available supports an increased level of use. A judicious approach is needed to verify current data and insure that the increase can be permanently allowed. Further studies will confirm or deny the data, as an increase in use is made on a temporary basis.
- B. The present grazing system seems to be working well. A complete AMP should be developed to complement this system. The operator is the same as in the Meachum Allotment and coordinates the use of the two. A consolidated AMP may be the best way to guide management for the two allotments.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

MEACHUM ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 1,951

B. Previous Adjudication

No adjudication has been made in this allotment

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u> <u>Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Lawrence Brown	286	S 286		S - 6/16 - 6/30 10/1 - 11/30

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	0
Priority 2 - Sheep	293
Priority 3 - Deer	463

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	20	80	0
Sheep	88	12	0
Deer	88	12	0

Utilization

14%

Actual Use

Light

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

17%

Actual Use

18%

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

253 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Retain the level of stocking at 286 AUMs. Conduct a three year study to verify that additional forage is available.
2. Evaluate the present grazing system. Consider consolidation of an allotment management plan with East Woodruff Allotment. Insure that wildlife and watershed needs are met in the AMP.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 253 AUMs
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 225 AUMs

VII. RATIONALE

- A. Utilization has been light in the allotment, but actual use has also been light. The operator is not convinced that the allotment will support the increase that is shown by the survey. A careful approach is needed in judging this allotment. Further studies should be made prior to allowing an increase.
- B. The present grazing system seems to be working. It should be evaluated in conjunction with studies discussed above, to determine whether an increase in use is appropriate. A consolidated AMP with East Woodruff should be considered, since the operator is the same and use of the two allotments is coordinated. The AMP should insure that wildlife needs are being met, since the area includes critical deer winter range.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

EASTMAN ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 3,405

B. Previous Adjudication

This allotment has never been adjudicated. The 1965 range survey determined that 381 AUMs were available. Land status changes increased AUMs available to 494. No reduction was made from historical level of use.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u>		<u>Season</u>
		<u>Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	
Delmore Eastman	255	255	--	5/1 - 10/15
Wm. B. & Arlo Eastman	441	441		
	<u>696</u>	<u>696</u>		

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

	<u>Range Survey AUMs</u> *
Priority 1 - Cattle	288
Priority 2 - Sheep	0
Priority 3 - Deer	1,389

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	4	55	41
Sheep	76	24	0
Deer	76	24	0

Utilization

55%

Actual Use

Not known

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

34 %

Actual Use

96 %

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

480 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Reduce cattle stocking in the allotment to 288 AUMs over a five year period. This would include reductions of 81 AUMs per year over four years and 83 AUMs the fifth year. Continue to monitor the allotment using utilization and actual use and trend studies. If future studies show results that are inconsistent with range survey information, reductions will be stopped until information is available which is sufficient to resolve the level of use that is appropriate.
2. If the operators desire to convert a portion of their permits to sheep use, this could be allowed. A maximum of 379 AUMs is available to sheep, along with 288 AUMs for cattle. An increase in sheep use would be initially permitted on a temporary, non-renewable basis until future studies verify that the use is consistent with available forage and good resource conditions.
3. Spring turn-out will be May 16 in 1980.

If the operators will enter into Exchange-of-Use Agreements and cooperatively develop an Allotment Management Plan by July, 1981, spring turn-out will remain at May 16. If not, turn-out would be set at May 25.

If an AMP is implemented by May 16, 1984, spring turn-out would be set according to the needs of key plants under the grazing system specified in the AMP. This date can be May 16 or earlier depending on the specific criteria identified in the AMP. If the AMP is not implemented by May 16, 1985, turn-out will be May 25.

4. Land exchange to block up Federal lands in the allotment is very desirable and is a priority. If effective management (either through consolidation of public lands and/or an effective Exchange-of-Use/AMP situation) is not accomplished in a reasonable time, then disposal of public land will be considered.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 480 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other Wildlife and Watershed - 917 AUMS.

VII. RATIONALE

A. In 1965 a range survey showed that a reduction was needed in this allotment. This reduction was never carried out. The 1978 range survey indicated that a reduction in cattle use is still needed. The 1978 range condition evaluation supports the survey in that it portrays most of the allotment in fair or poor condition. Utilization was moderate in 1978, but actual use for 1978 is unknown. Utilization in 1979 was light and actual use was only slightly less than the maximum allowable use. This contradicts the other data. The preponderance of available information indicates that a reduction in cattle stocking is needed; however, the latest utilization/actual use data indicates that caution is advisable. For this reason, the reduction is to be made over five years with the provision that reductions could be halted if future information so indicates.

B. The "overlap" procedure used in computing the range survey shows that 288 AUMs for cattle and 379 AUMs for sheep are available.

If the operators can make use of the sheep AUMs, the economic impact of the cattle reduction may be offset.

Although the range survey indicates that forage is available for sheep use, the increase should be non-renewable until studies can be conducted for sufficient time to insure that the increase is consistent with improvement in resource conditions in the allotment.

C. A later spring turnout is needed to protect forage plants during the early growth period as long as continuous grazing is in effect. A grazing system which includes rest or deferment allows earlier grazing than continuous grazing. If satisfactory progress is made toward a system which includes rest or deferment, spring turn-out can be May 16. This is an interim date and has been set as a compromise between the needs of the vegetative resource and the needs of the users.

If an AMP is developed, spring turn-out can be set based on the needs of key plants under deferred grazing or rest. This date can be May 16 or earlier, depending on the specific plans. A grazing system cannot be established which includes rest or deferment, then a turn-out date must be set which will provide protection for soil and vegetative resources from damage by early and continuous grazing. This date has been set at May 25.

4. The present pattern of land ownership creates a number of significant management problems. This problem may be possible to overcome by an exchange program to block up lands or a cooperative grazing program with private land owners. If these alternatives prove to be not feasible, then the alternative of land disposal must be considered.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

SOUTH WOODRUFF ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

- A. BLM Acres - 4,251
- B. Previous Adjudication

This allotment has never been adjudicated and no reductions in grazing have been made. It has been established by an administrative law judge that Orson Cornia has the right to 80 AUMs in the allotment.

- C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

Stephen Huffaker is the operator and manager on behalf of Wynn C. Huffaker and Mrs. Lynn Huffaker.

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>		<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
		<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>		
Mrs. Lynn Huffaker	195	175	20		C - 5/1 - 9/30 S - 5/1 - 6/30 S - 10/1 - 12/31
Mr. Wynn C. Huffaker	130		130		
Orson Cornia	80		80		
Total	405	175	230		

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

	<u>Range Survey AUMs</u> *
Priority 1 - Cattle	230
Priority 2 - Sheep	234
Priority 3 - Deer	748

	<u>Livestock Forage Condition</u>		
	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	2	66	32
Sheep	27	69	4
Deer	27	69	4

<u>Utilization</u>	<u>Actual Use</u>
74%	Not Known

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

38 %

Actual Use

Not Known

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

1,060 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Retain cattle use at the present level of 230 AUMs and retain sheep at the present level of 175 AUMs.
2. Establish the spring turn-out date at May 16. If an exchange has not been initiated which will allow consolidation of BLM land by July 1, 1980, the turn-out date will be changed to May 25. If an exchange has not been completed within three years, turn-out will be May 25. If an exchange is completed an allotment management plan will be developed in cooperation with users and proper carrying capacity and season of use will be established in the AMP.
3. No investment will be made in the allotment until an exchange is complete.
4. The late season use for sheep will remain as it is presently if the operator will initiate a land exchange by July 1, 1980. If not, the season will end at September 30. If an exchange is not completed within three years, the sheep season will end on September 30.
5. The first priority for exchange is to consolidate public lands within the allotment, if this is not accomplished in a reasonable time, exchange of the public lands in the allotment for lands outside the allotment will become the priority.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 803 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - None.

VII. RATIONALE

- ##### A. Present stocking is within the limits for dual use established by the range survey.

A later spring turn-out is needed in order to protect forage plants during the critical early growing period. The later turn-out should be maintained as long as the practice of continuous season-long grazing is in effect.

- B. Consolidation of public land in this allotment is needed in order to develop a grazing system or program which includes rest or deferment. A grazing system which includes rest or deferment allows earlier grazing than continuous grazing. If satisfactory progress is made toward a system which includes rest or deferment, spring turn-out can be May 16. This is an interim date and has been set as a compromise between the needs of the vegetative resource and the needs of the users. If a program is developed that includes deferment or rest, spring turn-out can be based on the needs of key plants. This date could be May 16 or earlier, depending on the specific plan. If a grazing program cannot be established which includes rest or deferment, then a turn-out date must be set which provides protection for soil and vegetative resources from damage by early and continuous grazing. This date has been set at May 25.
- C. It would not be proper to invest money in range improvements in a situation where effective management of the improvements cannot be insured, and the investment of public money cannot be protected. There are several other cases in Rich County where improper management has resulted in the loss of previous investments.
- D. Late season sheep use is a direct conflict with deer on critical winter range. An effective exchange program to consolidate public land is the first step needed to eliminate this conflict on public land. If an exchange can be made in a reasonable amount of time, the late season use could be retained to prevent economic stress to the operator. However, the present situation will not be acceptable over the long-run and if a satisfactory exchange cannot be worked out, the season must be shortened in order to resolve the problem.
- E. The present pattern of land ownership creates significant barriers to good management. If the problem cannot be resolved by an exchange program within the allotment, then the option of improving management elsewhere, by exchange of the lands may be possible.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

DESERET ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 15,557

B. Previous Adjudication

The allotment has never been adjudicated

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u>		<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
		<u>Active</u>			
Deseret Livestock	3100	S	C		C - 5/10 - 11/15 S - 5/20 - 10/31
		278	2822		

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	2288
Priority 2 - Sheep	1305
Priority 3 - Deer	2161

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	49	51	0
Sheep	77	23	0
Deer	77	23	0

Utilization

23%

Actual Use

Not known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

34%

Actual Use

Not known

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

68 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Retain the present total stocking level, however, change class of livestock to conform to range survey and other data. This would be 1305 AUMs of sheep use and 1795 AUMs of cattle use. Deductions will be made for the land sold to Deseret under the Unintentional Trespass Act, when the sale is final. Continue to monitor the allotment to determine if additional cattle use (to survey level) is acceptable.
2. Update and revise the Allotment Management Plan to include the rotation grazing system that has been adopted by Deseret. Initiate an actual use billing system.
3. Negotiate an exchange to consolidate public land in the allotment.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 68 AUMs
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 1953 AUMs

VII. RATIONALE

- A. Range conditions in the allotment are good. The range survey indicates that a change of part of the current preference to cattle is acceptable. Utilization has been light. No resource conflicts with the change in class of livestock are known. The actual operation of the allotment has included cattle, under temporary authorizations, in the past. The exact actual use numbers in the last two years are not known, however, it is known that use has been lighter than the preference. Changing a portion of the permit to cattle is appropriate, but an increase to the full survey level of cattle use should be delayed until utilization and more accurate actual use studies insure that the increase forage is available. Trend studies will also help to verify that an increase is warranted. These should be established as soon as possible.
- B. The Deseret Company has implemented a rest rotation grazing system. The Allotment Management Plan should be updated to include this system which appears to be well designed. Spring turnout should be established based on the requirements of the

grazing system. Actual use billings should be initiated to encourage better collection of actual use data and to provide a more convenient system to the operator.

- C. Consolidation of public land in the allotment would provide more control of the lands and hopefully create a more cost effective situation for access and management.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

MIDDLE RIDGE ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 1,286 of a total of 6,800 acres are public land, the remainder are private.

B. Previous Adjudication

There has been no adjudication in the allotment. The allotment has been separate from the Woodruff Unit for at least 20 years.

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Orson Cornia	80	<u>S</u> 80		S - 6/11 - 7/10 11/10 - 11/2
Louis M. Stuart	9	9		
Earl Stuart	23	23		
	<u>112</u>	<u>112</u>		

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	0
Priority 2 - Sheep	202
Priority 3 - Deer	405

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	0	77	23
Sheep	100	0	0
Deer	100	0	0

Utilization

12 %

Actual Use

Not Known

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

43 %

Actual Use

Not Known

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

251 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Increase the level of use to the range survey carrying capacity of 202 AUMs. This will be done over a three-year period. Thirty AUMs will be added to each year's authorized use. The increases will be authorized on a temporary non-renewable basis until further studies show that the increased forage is permanently available.
2. Maintain the present season of use.
3. Dispose of public land in the allotment. Exchange is the priority method for disposal. Lands adjacent to Woodruff Reservoir and Woodruff Creek should be retained.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 251 AUMs.
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 154 AUMs.

VII. RATIONALE

- A. The condition of livestock forage in the allotment is very good and the range survey indicates that additional forage is available. No known resource conflicts with increased grazing exist. The increases should be made to make use of the additional forage. They should be made cautiously, on a temporary basis, while studies are conducted to insure that the increase in use is acceptable.
- B. The present season of use seems to be very effective, it should be retained.
- C. The public land comprises a small percentage of this allotment and is isolated from other public lands. Effective management is dependent on the cooperation of the users and surrounding landowners. Disposal by exchange may help to consolidate public land in another area where management can be improved. Land adjacent to Woodruff Reservoir and Woodruff Creek is valuable for recreation and wildlife habitat and should be retained in public ownership.

RANGE DECISION DOCUMENTATION

SESSIONS ALLOTMENT

I. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. BLM Acres - 238

B. Previous Adjudication

This allotment has never been adjudicated

C. Relevant Transfers, Leases, etc.

None

II. PRESENT OPERATORS AND PREFERENCES

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Preference</u>	<u>Class of Livestock</u> <u>Active</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Season</u>
Sessions	40	^C 40	-	C - 5/16 - 9/15

III. 1978 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Range Survey AUMs *

Priority 1 - Cattle	20
Priority 2 - Sheep	-
Priority 3 - Deer	98

Livestock Forage Condition

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Cattle	0	100	0
Sheep	-	-	-
Deer	100	0	0

Utilization

50%

Actual Use

Not known

IV. 1979 RANGE STUDY INFORMATION

Utilization

32%

Actual Use

100%

* Computed by "overlap" method. This method is not the same as the old single class of livestock method.

V. CURRENT DEER DEMAND

60 AUMs

VI. DECISION

A. Livestock

1. Retain the present level of stocking for 2 more years while utilization and actual use studies are continued.
2. Dispose of public land in the allotment, preferably by exchange. If exchange is not possible, public sale should be used to dispose of the land.

B. Other

1. Allocated to deer - 60 AUMs
2. Allocated to other wildlife and watershed - 38 AUMs

VII. RATIONALE

- A. At full actual use, utilization was light in 1979. Last year utilization was proper, but actual use was not obtained. Additional utilization and actual use studies are needed prior to an adjustment since this year's data seems to contradict the range survey.
- B. The public land in the allotment is too small and too isolated for efficient management. It should be removed from public ownership, preferably by exchange, to obtain more manageable land. If it cannot be exchanged, it should be sold.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/P)	Randolph
Activity	Support-Comms. SU-1.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT Support 1.1

The existing radio communication system in Rich County will be upgraded as follows:

1. Priority will be given to acquiring a permanent base station radio for the Randolph field camp.
2. If it is found feasible to incorporate the existing Salt Lake District radio system into a microwave system, top priority should be given to including Rich County coverage within that system.

RATIONALE Support 1.1

Adequate radio coverage for Rich County is essential to good on-the-ground management and to the safety of field personnel who are charged with carrying out that management. A field base camp radio will provide for better coordination of field work, thereby improving efficiency, and will improve safety for personnel in the field by providing after hours radio service.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Support-ATROW SU-2.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3 U2-PP-14

DECISION STATEMENT Support 2.1

The policy for legal access to Public Land in Rich County is as follows:

1. Resource activity planning will be the primary tool used to identify legal access needs for Public Land. This activity planning will identify important areas where legal access is in the public interest and necessary for resource management. Certain areas where access is not desirable or certain roads which should be closed for resource protection may also be identified through this process.
2. "Legal Public Access" will only be obtained where there is a sufficiently large block of Public Land to insure that said public access is clearly in the public interest and will not unnecessarily jeopardize the interests of adjacent land owners. Exchange of land (refer to Decision Lands 12.1) will be an important tool used to consolidate Public Land into manageable blocks thereby solving many access problems due to intermingled land ownership.
3. A lesser form of legal access, e.g. administrative access, non-exclusive access, etc., will be obtained into areas where the federal government is a minority land owner. This would include access to isolated parcels of Public Land and Public Land in checker board ownership with adjacent state and private lands.
4. "Legal Public Access" will not be obtained to Neponset Reservoir under any circumstances. Legal access to this area will be limited to access for administrative purposes only. (Refer to Decision Wildlife 3.2).

Develop and implement a transportation management plan that will:

1. Incorporate the road inventory information as developed in the Randolph URA.
2. Provide a priority acquisition schedule for important areas of the Public Lands as identified in activity plans for each resource activity consistent with the access policy as stated above in this decision.
3. Specify the maximum type legal access to be obtained for each area identified in the preceding item.
4. Provide a road maintenance program to meet resource, administrative and other needs. This maintenance program will incorporate cooperative agreements with other federal agencies and Rich County to insure the most efficient, cost effective use of manpower and equipment.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

5. Identify and provide for correction of all safety hazards on BLM roads, including the placement of necessary warning, directional and regulatory signs, to insure public safety and resource protection.

The specific elements of this transportation plan should be completed by FY 1981 and implemented as spelled out in the plan.

RATIONALE Support 2.1?..1

Policy -

1. Legal access to the Public Lands is a necessary tool for BLM to carry out the resource management program contained in the Randolph MFP. Activity planning is the best means to identify specific access needs in terms of areas or individual roads and to establish a priority acquisition list for the most important areas.
2. "Legal Public Access", which would include a right of access for the general public, should only be obtained to large, contiguous blocks of Public Land wherein the public benefits will be sufficient to justify the expense and effort necessary to acquire such access rights.
3. In those case where some form of legal access is deemed necessary for proper management of an area, but public ownership is not the majority ownership, it is more appropriate to obtain a lesser form of legal access which does not include a right for the general public. This may help reduce the complexities and expense of obtaining legal access and should alleviate the problem of trespass and vandalism on adjacent private lands.
4. Neponset Reservoir is an important waterfowl habitat area within northern Utah. The Public Land in the reservoir vicinity is in a checker board ownership pattern with adjacent private land. Public access into this area could have a deleterious impact on the waterfowl habitat as well as creating trespass problems on adjacent private land.

Transportation Plan -

A transportation management plan will provide needed documentation of legal access needs in Rich County and a priority order for their acquisition. It will also help insure regular maintenance of all BLM roads in a safe, passable condition and proper signing of those roads for public safety and resource protection.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Support-fire SU-3.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 U2-PP-10

DECISION STATEMENT Support 3.1

No immediate change will be made in the current wild fire prevention or suppression plans for Public Land in Rich County. The Wasatch National Forest will continue to have initial attack responsibilities for Public Land in Rich County. A new Suppression Action Modification Plan will be prepared for Rich County after the plans for other important areas in the Salt Lake District are completed - approximately FY 1981.

RATIONALE Support 3.1

Wildfire occurrence in Rich County has historically been low. No significant problems have been noted with the present system for handling wildfires and the procedures are adequate to control any occurrences. A new Suppression Action Modification Plan should be prepared based upon information gathered during the Randolph planning process; however, this is a low priority in the overall District fire management program.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
ACEC	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-R-2

DECISION STATEMENT - AREA OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN

Designate 7,592 acres of Public Land and an additional 3,425 acres of Federal mineral estate underlying private surface within the Laketown Canyon watershed as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).

The objectives for management of the ACEC will be:

- The production of high quality water.
- To maintain or improve fish and wildlife habitat to a very good condition.
- To provide the public with a recreation opportunity, primarily of the back country or dispersed type.
- To protect scenic quality.

Other uses, such as grazing and oil and gas development, may take place, but they shall take place in a manner that does not detract from meeting the management objectives as stated above.

Overall land ownership within the Laketown Canyon Watershed is as follows:
(Also please refer to the attached page for legal description)

	<u>Surface Ownership (Acres)</u>	<u>Subsurface Ownership (Acres)</u>
BLM	7,592	10,805
USFS	910	910
Private	6,638	3,425
State	20	20
TOTAL	<u>15,160</u>	<u>15,160</u>

A management plan will be developed for the ACEC in 1981 to protect unusually valuable water, scenic, fish, wildlife, and recreation resources and the unique combination of these values. Public participation will be an integral part of plan development with special emphasis on coordination with other land owners in the watershed area, and other concerned government agencies.

RATIONALE ACEC

Nowhere else on Public Land in the Randolph Planning Unit do so many ACEC characteristics come together. The unique combination of these resource values makes Laketown Canyon one of the most significant total natural systems in the Salt Lake District.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Cold water trout fishery development in Laketown Creek has excellent potential. Instream habitat exhibiting excellent average annual flows, spawning gravels, and deep pools for over-wintering make the stream capable of supporting a high fish population.

The creek probably affects the main culinary water supply for the growing community of Laketown, Utah, and is an important source for irrigation in the nearby Round Valley. Water quality within the Laketown Watershed is good in the upper reaches but deteriorates downstream. Since this is the municipal watershed for Laketown, protection of the general watershed and especially riparian zones will result in better water quality.

Laketown Canyon contains a number of environmental resources such as critical deer, elk, and moose winter range, bobcat habitat, golden eagle eyeries, accipiter nesting habitat and an extremely valuable aquatic resource. The canyon also contains excellent scenic values which are generally lacking throughout most of the rest of the planning unit.

ACEC status in Laketown Canyon will both compliment and contrast the present recreational values found in both the nearby National Forest and the development adjacent to Bear Lake. The location of a Laketown Canyon ACEC would possess regional significance because of its proximity to Idaho and Wyoming as well as high local significance to the residents of Rich County and Utah.


LAKETWON CANYON WATERSHED

ACERAGE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION	TOTAL	SURFACE OWNERSHIP				SUBSURFACE OWNERSHIP				
		BLM	FS	PVT	STATE	BLM	FS	PVT	STATE	
T. 11 N., R. 5 E.										
Sec. 1, Lot 5	8.45	8.45				8.45				
Sec. 2, Lots 2 - 6 inclusive	105.08	105.08						105.08		
Sec. 3, Lots 1 - 8 and 12	234.48	194.48				234.48				
Sec. 4, Lots 1,2,7 - 12, SW $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	518.22	109.02		40.00	409.20	438.22		80.00		
Sec. 5, Lot 9, SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, NE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	220.00		140.00	80.00		40.00	140.00	40.00		
Sec. 7, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	60.00		40.00	20.00		20.00	40.00			
Sec. 8, All	640.00		320.00	320.00		280.00	320.00	40.00		
Sec. 9, N $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	440.00	360.00		80.00		360.00		80.00		
Sec. 16, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$	20.00				20.00					20.00
Sec. 17, N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, NW $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	430.00		60.00	370.00		330.00	60.00	40.00		
Sec. 18, E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$, SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, NE $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	220.00		90.00	130.00		130.00	90.00			
Sec. 19, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	140.00		140.00				140.00			
Sec. 20, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$	120.00		120.00				120.00			
T. 12 N., R. 5 E.										
Sec. 12, S $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot 3, Lot 4, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	119.99	99.95		20.04		99.95		20.04		
Sec. 13, Lots 1 - 8 inclusive, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$	624.80	321.46		303.34		580.18		44.62		
Sec. 14, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	160.00	160.00				160.00				
Sec. 23, E $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$	480.00	480.00				480.00				
Sec. 24, All	693.52	426.34		267.18		426.34		267.18		
Sec. 25, Lots 1 - 6, W $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot 8, Lots 9 & 10, W $\frac{1}{2}$	609.12	340.00		269.12		340.00		269.12		
Sec. 26, E $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$	540.00	360.00		180.00		360.00		180.00		
Sec. 27, SE $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	120.00			120.00				120.00		
Sec. 33, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{2}$	160.00	160.00				160.00				
Sec. 34, All	640.00	480.00		160.00		480.00		160.00		
Sec. 35, All	640.00	640.00				640.00				
Sec. 36, W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{2}$	240.00	240.00				240.00				

LAKETOWN CANYON WATERSHED

LEGAL DESCRIPTION	ACERAGE									
	TOTAL	SURFACE OWNERSHIP				SUBSURFACE OWNERSHIP				
		BLM	FS	PVT	STATE	BLM	FS	PVT	STATE	
T. 12 N., R. 6 E.										
Sec. 4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	240.00			240.00		200.00		40.00		
Sec. 5, Lots 2 - 4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$	591.71	40.00		551.71		551.71		40.00		
Sec. 6, Lots 1,2,8,11,12, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	354.65	130.15		224.50		130.15		224.50		
Sec. 7, Lots 2 - 8, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	638.08	422.42		215.66		598.08		40.00		
Sec. 8, A11	628.73	348.73		280.00		348.73		280.00		
Sec. 9, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	480.00			480.00		160.00		320.00		
Sec. 16, A11	640.00			640.00				640.00		
Sec. 17, A11	640.00	600.00		40.00		600.00		40.00		
Sec. 18, A11	653.50	290.40		363.10		613.50		40.00		
Sec. 19, A11	632.42	355.14		277.28		555.14		77.28		
Sec. 20, A11	640.00	320.00		320.00		640.00				
Sec. 21, N $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	520.00	520.00				520.00				
Sec. 29, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	80.00	80.00				80.00				
Sec. 30, Lot 1, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	236.75			236.75				236.75		
Totals	15,159.50	7,591.62	910.00	6,637.88	20.00	10,804.93	910.00	3,424.57	20.00	



LAND STATUS LEGEND

- Public Lands (Administered By Bureau of Land Management)
- Oregon & California Lands (O&C Lands) Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) NONE
- National Forest
- Patented Lands
- State Lands

MINERALS OWNED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

- | Mineral Rights | Symbol |
|---|--|
| All minerals | |
| Coal only | |
| Oil and Gas only | |
| Oil, Gas, and Coal only | NONE |
| Other | |
| No symbol indicates no Federal minerals | |

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Forestry F-1.1	
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT Forestry 1.1

Manage the forested areas on Public Land in Rich County as protection areas, issuing permits for post, poles and firewood to meet local needs only. Each permit issued for wood cutting purposes will contain stipulations appropriate to the existing conditions in order to protect other resource values in the County. Specifically, no wood cutting will be allowed near known or potential raptor nesting sites between March 1 and July 15 each year and no wood cutting will be allowed with the Laketown Canyon ACEC.

RATIONALE Forestry 1.1

The forest inventory conducted in 1976 by the Utah Division of Forestry and Fire Control indicated that the forest type found on Public Land in Rich County does not have the potential for intensive forest management on a sustained yeild basis. Commercial woodland products are currently being supplied Rich County form the adjoining National Forests. Under present conditions the forested areas on Public Land in the County have a higher value for wildlife habitat, recreation and watershed protection. Implementing a permit system to meet local demand for wood products from the Public Land will allow BLM to help satisfy this important need while protecting other important resource values by attaching special stipulations to each permit as appropriate.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Recreation R-1.1	
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3 M3-WL-3

DECISION STATEMENT Recreation-1.1

This decision and rationale are the same as Wildlife Decision 1.1.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Recreation	R-1.2
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3 M3-R-1

DECISION STATEMENT RECREATION 1.2

Establish the Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes shown on overlay M3-R-1. VRM management classes will apply to all Public Land in the planning unit as well as the Federal mineral estate underlying private surface ownership which is also administered by the BLM.

RATIONALE RECREATION - 1.2

This decision is consistent with the Bureau of Land Management mandate to manage the Public Lands in a manner which will protect the quality of scenic values as stated in Section 102 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. Acceptance of the modified Visual Resource Management Classification will insure adequate protection for visual and other resources on public lands in Rich County consistent with the VRM Classes. This form of protection was selected over more restrictive forms of protection such as withdrawal or ACEC designation because it is adequate for the quality of the resource involved and it is less time-consuming and more economically feasible than other forms of protection.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Recreation	R-1.3
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	Step 3	M1-R-2

DECISION STATEMENT RECREATION-1.3

Rehabilitate the most significant scenic intrusions identified in the planning unit. The number of intrusions rehabilitated is dependent upon the available funding and manpower.

RATIONALE RECREATION -1.3

Numerous scenic intrusions dot the landscape throughout the Randolph Planning Unit. As consistent with the Bureau's long-term objectives and policy as stated in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, removal and/or rehabilitation of intrusions will do much to further the scenic quality and public safety of the Public Lands in the unit.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Recreation R-1.4
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT Recreation - 1.4

Enhance recreation use and enjoyment of Public Lands within Rich County by obtaining legal public access into those specific areas identified through activity and site planning for the various resource activities. Legal public access to Public Land will only be obtained in accordance with the access policy stated in Support Decision 2.1.

Legal public access to Public Land in Rich County will be identified by the installation of roadside directional signs and will be described in a recreational interpretive guide brochure to be completed for Rich County.

RATIONALE Recreation - 1.4

Legal public access to Public Land in Rich County is not a major problem. There are isolated problems, because of the intermingled Public-private land ownership pattern, which are of some concern to hunters using Public Land in the County. Specific access needs will be identified through intensive activity planning and prioritized in the Transportation Plan required by Decision Support .1. Legal public access will enhance the management of Public Land in Rich County as well as making them more accessible to the visiting public as appropriate.

(Refer to the Decision Statement and Rationale for Support-2.1 for more detail on the access acquisition policy for Rich County.)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Recreation R-1.5
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3 M1-R-1

DECISION STATEMENT Recreation 1.5

Expand and improve camping facilities at both Birch Creek and Little Creek Reservoirs. Site designs and management plans will be prepared before any development takes place to include functional and aesthetic facility design, ORV closure of the sites, regular use supervision patrol of the sites, closure by fence of the sites to livestock and adequate maintenance. Birch Creek is a high priority and funding for design and construction should be obtained starting in FY 81. Little Creek is a lower priority.

The existing Classification and Multiple Use Act classifications -- Birch Creek 162 acres and Little Creek 120 acres -- should be retained to protect the developed facilities and recreational values at each site. (Refer to Decision ReCréation 2.3).

RATIONALE Recreation 1.5

Upper Birch Creek Reservoir provides the most consistent good fishing in Rich County. As stated in the Unit Resource Analysis, the reservoir experiences use from people throughout northern Utah and is the most heavily used recreation area in the planning unit. The existing site development is totally inadequate. The site is deteriorating as a result. User safety, site deterioration, and BLM image mandate proper site development be accomplished.

Little Creek Reservoir usually provides good fishing for planted rainbow trout which grow rapidly there. This is a favorite fishing spot for many of the local fishermen as well as out-of-towners. There presently exists a twenty year cooperative agreement between the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and the Little Creek water users assuring fishing rights for the entire fishing season each year.

As additional facilities are constructed at both sites, visitor use is expected to increase proportionately, thereby increasing opportunities for public recreation. This will help alleviate the demand for increased fishing opportunities in the county.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Recreation R-1.6
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

DECISION STATEMENT Recreation 1.6

This decision is the same as the ACEC Decision. Refer to that decision for Decision Statement and Rationale.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Recreation R-2.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-R-2

DECISION STATEMENT Recreation-2.1

Maintain and protect the integrity of existing cultural resources on Public Lands in the Randolph Planning unit, giving special attention to the western front of the Crawford Mountains and selected natural water ways. This will generally be accomplished by conducting Class III Cultural Resource (site specific) Inventories prior to and in conjunction with surface disturbing activities within the planning unit. Management will retain the option to forego a Class III Inventory for certain surface disturbing activities based upon existing data and the professional judgement of the District archaeologist, in situations such as heavy snow accumulation on the ground or in areas where recent Class II or Class III inventories have been conducted.

RATIONALE Recreation-2.1

During 1977, BLM completed a Class II 1-percent random sample survey and report on archaeological and historical resources on Public Lands in Rich County. These data, in addition to previously located archaeological and historical site information, indicate that archaeological sites are typically thinly scattered across Public Lands and are not generally considered highly important from a scientific or recreational standpoint. The county has potential for further cultural research both survey and excavation.

Conducting Class III Inventories for specific surface disturbing activities will allow BLM to fulfill its mandate to identify, evaluate and protect cultural resources as stated in Executive Order 11593 and the Antiquities Act of 1906 in a practical, cost efficient manner. Foregoing Class III surveys for certain projects based upon existing data and professional judgement will allow projects to proceed without unnecessary delays and reduce duplication of efforts.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Recreation R-2.2	
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	Step 3	M3-R-2

DECISION STATEMENT - Recreation-2.2

Designate Public Lands as "open" to all vehicle use, or "closed" to all vehicle use, or "limited" to certain roads, trails, season of use, types of vehicles, etc. as outlined in the Draft Off-Road Vehicle Implementation Plan for the Randolph Planning Unit.

RATIONALE - Recreation-2.2

The designation of Off-Road Vehicle areas is required by Executive Order 11644. The final rules and regulation announcement 43 CFR Part 8340 was released on June 15, 1979. Off-road vehicle (ORV) use is recognized by the BLM as a legitimate form of recreation use on Public Lands. There are no areas in the Randolph Planning Unit that meet the minimum requirements under the Recreation Inventory System for evaluation. Nearly all of the ORV use in the unit is done in connection with hunting. Four-wheel drive vehicles provide access to the high country along the established roads. Snowmobiling opportunities exist for improving trailheads leading to the Monte Cristo state-groomed trail complex near Woodruff, Randolph, and Meadowville areas.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Recreation R-2.3
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-R-1

DECISION STATEMENT Recreation 2.3

Take the following actions regarding the eight recreation sites included in the Rich County Classification and Multiple Use Act classification (Refer to the attached description):

1. Retain the existing C&MU classification for all Public Land in the Little Creek Recreation Site - 120 acres. (Refer to Decision Recreation 1.5).
2. Retain the existing C&MU classification for 162 acres of Public Land north of Highway 39 in the Birch Creek Recreation Site (Refer to Decision Recreation 1.5). Change the existing C&MU classification to a disposal classification for approximately 15 acres of Public Land south of Highway 39 in Lot 12, Sec. 19, T. 9 N., R. 6 E. (Refer to Decision Range Management 3.4).
3. Retain the existing C&MU classification for the $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, Sec. 17, T. 13 N., R. 6 E., 80 acres, within the Bear Lake Recreation Site (Refer to Decision Lands 1.1). Reevaluate the remaining 1,120 acres of Public Land included under the Bear Lake Recreation Site as to whether it should be retained in whole or in part under the existing C&MU classification, reclassified for another specific use or reopened to operation of the public land laws.
4. Retain all Public Land, 640 acres, in the Lake Neponset Waterfowl Habitat Site under the existing C&MU classification. (Refer to Decision Wildlife 2.1).
5. Necessary action relative to the C&MU classification for 1,517 acres of Public Land in the Laketown Canyon Recreation Site will be determined in developing the management plan for the Laketown Canyon ACEC. All Public Land listed in the classification for the Laketown Canyon site is within the proposed ACEC area. (Refer to the ACEC Decision).
6. Reevaluate all Public Land within the Otter Creek, Big Canyon and Woodruff Creek Recreation Sites, _____ acres, as to whether they should be retained in whole or in part, reclassified for another specific use or reopened to the operation of the public land laws.

RATIONALE Recreation 2.3

Generally the significance of the existing C&MU classification for the eight recreation sites listed in the attached description was overlooked in the planning process and particularly the "No Surface Occupancy" provision for mineral leasing.

The lands identified for retention under the C&MU classification in items 1 - 4 above were identified in the planning for retention in public ownership and for some form of protection. It has been determined that retaining the existing classification would be the most efficient, effective and flexible means of achieving this protection.

The 15 acres in item 2 were identified for some form of disposal in the range management portion of the planning.

It is necessary that the classification for the Laketown Canyon Site be evaluated as part of the overall plan for the management of the ACEC.

The remaining sites under this C&MU classification will all be reevaluated under the standard BLM withdrawal review procedures.

There are eight recreation sites listed in the Classification and Multiple Use Classification document embracing 4,123.07 acres in this planning unit. These sites were segregated against all forms of appropriation, entry, location and selection under the public land laws, including the general mining laws and from surface use and occupancy under the mineral leasing laws. These sites are described as follows:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN, UTAH

Laketown Canyon Recreation Site:

T. 12 N., R. 5 E.

Section 13: Lot 1, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	241.46 ac.
Section 14: SE $\frac{1}{4}$	160.00 ac.
Section 23: E $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$	480.00 ac.
Section 26: NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	120.00 ac.

T. 12 N., R. 6 E.

Section 16: Lots 8, 11, and 12	130.15 ac.
Section 17: Lots 5, 6, 7, and 8, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	294.59 ac.
Section 18: Lots 1 and 2	<u>90.40 ac.</u>

Containing 1,516.60 ac.

Otter Creek Recreation Site:

T. 11 N., R. 5 E.

Section 1: Lots 14 and 15	<u>80.00 ac.</u>
---------------------------	------------------

Containing 80.00 ac.

Little Creek Reservoir Recreation Site:

T. 11 N., R. 6 E.

Section 23: SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	<u>120.00 ac.</u>
--	-------------------

Containing 120.00 ac.

Big Canyon Recreation Site:

T. 10 N., R. 6 E.

Section 19: E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ 120.00 ac.

Containing 120.00 ac.

Birch Creek Reservoir Recreation Site:

T. 9 N., R. 5 E.

Section 24: Lots 1 and 2 44.17 ac.

T. 9 N., R. 6 E.

Section 19: Lots 5, 6, and 12 132.76 ac.

Containing 176.93 ac.

Woodruff Creek Recreation Site:

T. 8 N., R. 5 E.

Section 1: Lots 2 - 9 inclusive, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ 242.52 ac.

T. 9 N., R. 6 E.

Section 31: Lots 7 and 8 27.02 ac.

Containing 269.54 ac.

Lake Neponset Waterfowl Habitat Site:

T. 8 N., R. 7 E.

Section 34: All 640.00 ac.

Containing 640.00 ac.

Bear Lake Recreation Site:

T. 13 N., R. 6 E.

Section 16: W $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ 360.00 ac.

Section 17: E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ 240.00 ac.

Section 20: E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ 160.00 ac.

Section 21: W $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, and NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ 440.00 ac.

Containing 1,200.00 ac.

The areas described above aggregate 4,123.07 acres.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Recreation	R-3.1
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	Step 3	MI-R.2

DECISION STATEMENT RECREATION - 3.1

Develop and implement a visitor use management program on the Crawford Mountains which would explore the possibilities for enhancing hang-gliding activities, providing a scenic overlook with interpretive program, and acquiring a right-of-way easement to lands which may be identified for hang-gliding landing sites along the western front of the Crawford Mountains.

RATIONALE RECREATION - 3.1

The Crawford Mountains provide an excellent vista over the Bear River Valley with the Wasatch Mountains on the horizon. Development of a scenic overlook and interpretive facilities will promote enjoyment of this recreational opportunity. It will also offer an opportunity to interpret past phosphate mining and its economic importance to the area.

Hang-gliding activities are presently occurring on the mountain, but are unregulated and haphazard. It is felt that enhancing these activities by developing facilities to increase the safe use in the area should be investigated further for a possible management option for the site.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Recreation	R-3.2
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	Step 3	None

DECISION STATEMENT RECREATION - 3.2

Plan and develop camping facilities at the Woodruff Creek Reservoir. Attempts to acquire selected private and State lands to facilitate said development should begin in fiscal year 1980.

RATIONALE RECREATION - 3.2

Woodruff Creek Reservoir receives approximately 1,800 visits per year. The area is in need of a camping and picnicing site. There is Public Land adjacent to the reservoir, but there is no Public Land suitable for facilities. An ideal section of State-owned land, if acquired could provide an excellent camping site development opportunity.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (AFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Water	W-1.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 None	Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT WATER 1.1

Maintain existing water quality in the Randolph Planning Unit by implementing a program to monitor water quality:

- (1) As site specific water quality monitoring needs are identified for activities which may affect water quality,
- (2) Where cooperation with state and local agencies is needed, and
- (3) By sampling BLM's present water information network every five years to monitor water quality.

RATIONALE WATER 1.1

Basic water quality data has been obtained under the present system which established a sampling network that has been sampled for the last three years. Water quality data needs and funding dictate that future sampling be done on the network every five years or as specific problems and coordination needs arise.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Water W-1.2
Overlay Reference	Step 1 M3-WL-1 Step 3 M3-WL-1

DECISION STATEMENT WATER 1.2

Restore water quality in the Randolph Planning Unit by limiting live-stock use along selected waterways by implementing the practices outlined in Wildlife Decision 1.1. This decision is the same as WL-1.1.

RATIONALE WATER 1.2

Water quality has been fully considered in Wildlife Decision 1.1. Refer to rationale for WL-1.1.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Water W-1.3
Overlay Reference	Step 1 None Step 3 M1-R-2

DECISION STATEMENT Water-1.3

Provide the necessary watershed and streambank protection to insure the physical, chemical and biological parameters required for the Laketown municipal water supply in Laketown Canyon Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) by 1981.

Refer also to Wildlife Decision 1.1 and ACEC Decision.

Some practices that might insure water quality protection when fully implemented include:

- 1) Delineating a corridor along drainage bottom that restricts livestock use (would require fencing).
- 2) Promote watershed stabilization practices with agencies managing adjoining lands.
- 3) Restore riparian vegetation.
- 4) Restrict other land-uses having adverse impacts upon water quality.

Specific actions will be identified in the Laketown Canyon ACEC management plan.

RATIONALE Water-1.3

Presently, the Laketown water supply is piped approximately five miles down Laketown Canyon and stored in a newly constructed 95,000 gallon storage facility. This facility was designed to serve 56 families and irrigate approximately 1,000 acres of hay and cropland.

The BLM is required by law to prohibit activities which may have an adverse effect on municipal water supplies. This decision is consistent with Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972; the Water Quality Management Planning regulations as contained at 43 CFR, Parts 130 and 131; Executive Order 11752; and Title 73 of the Water Laws of Utah - Section 73-14-1, Pollution of Waters.

The Laketown Canyon ACEC is the watershed area for Laketown Creek. The ACEC plan will consider water quality needs and establish management procedures for improving and protecting water quality.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Air A-1.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1 None Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT Air-1.1

Require applicants for projects or actions on Public Lands, which may change air quality, to establish an air quality monitoring program. Air quality should be monitored for one year prior to project initiation and during project operation by the applicants at their expense.

RATIONALE Air-1.1

Monitoring of air resource values is consistent with Sections 165(a)(7) and 165 D(e)(2) of the Clean Air Act as amended and Section 201(a) of the Federal Land Policy Act of 1976. The authority to establish national air quality standards is the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970.

The data provided under this monitoring program would enable BLM to enforce the anti-degradation regulations as found at 40 CFR 52.00 or 39 F.R. 42510, December 5, 1974.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph			
Activity	Soil	S-1.1		
Overlay Reference	Step 1	None	Step 3	None

DECISION STATEMENT SOIL 1.1

Maximize watershed stabilization and productivity by carrying out land treatment practices in accordance with the specifications contained in Range Management Decision 2.3. An additional priority to those identified in RM-2.3 for land treatment funding would be areas in critical erosion condition or downward watershed trend where conditions are conducive to reseeding.

RATIONALE SOIL 1.1

Refer to rationale at Range Management Decision 2.3. Land treatments should be designed to improve areas of critical erosion and downward trend through reseeding. This can only be accomplished where soils, slope, and other factors are conducive to reseeding.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Soil	S-1.2
Overlay Reference	Step 1 None	Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT SOIL 1.2

Minimize the erosive effect of surface disturbing activities in the planning unit by considering surface disturbances on a site by site basis. Stipulations will be developed for each case through the Environmental Analysis/Decision making process.

Off-road vehicle use will be managed in accordance with the draft ORV Implementation Plan for the Randolph Planning Unit as stated in Recreation Decision 2.2.

Problems with erosion from roads will be corrected on a case by case basis. Road maintenance will be done in such a way as to reduce erosion, e.g., water barring, installing culverts as necessary, etc. Refer to Range Management Decision 3.3.

RATIONALE SOIL 1.2

Surface disturbing activities can best be considered on a case by case basis where individual site characteristics and needs can be considered and stipulations or mitigating measures can be developed to best protect soil and watershed values for that site.

Refer to Rationale for Decision R-2.2.

Refer to Rationale for Decision RM-3.3.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Soil	S-1.3
Overlay Reference	Step 1	None Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT SOIL-1.3

Increase the density of herbaceous vegetation on public lands in Rich County by implementing the range management practices described in Range Management Decisions 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2.

RATIONALE SOIL 1.3

Watershed values have been fully considered in developing the range management program as stated at Range Management Decisions 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2. Refer to the rationale for those decisions.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Randolph

Activity
Wildlife WL-1.1

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3 M3-WL-1

DECISION STATEMENT Wildlife-1.1

Improve quality of aquatic-riparian stream habitat on 20.0 miles of Public Land. Accomplish this goal over the short term by fencing 7.4 miles of stream riparian zone to exclude livestock on Laketown Creek, Spring Creek, Big Creek, Randolph Creek and the Middle Fork of Otter Creek. Specific water actions are categorized and listed below:

-Exclude Livestock Grazing-

1. Laketown Creek will be fenced across both sides of the bottom of the canyon. Fence design is to be of a "let-down" type to accomodate wildlife movements. The "V" fence will prevent cattle access to the Laketown Creek riparian zone in the Laketown Allotment because of the extremely steep canyon sides (see overlay M3-WL-1). Stream excluded to cows = 1.7 miles.
2. Spring Creek will be fenced for the entire length of publicly owned land (see overlay M3-WL-1). Stream excluded to livestock = 0.75 miles.
3. Big Creek will be fenced for the entire length of publicly owned land located on Big Creek above the existing enclosure and road crossing (see overlay M3-WL-1). Stream excluded to livestock 0.75 miles.
4. Randolph Creek will be fenced on all three sections of Public Land (13, 14 and 18), and adequate distance will be left to ensure cattle watering access on Public Lands (see overlay M3-WL-1). Stream excluded to livestock 2.9 miles.
5. Middle Fork Otter Creek will be fenced in two sections (3 and 4) on Public Land. On the upper portion fencing will be installed in a triangular shape to produce a mini-watershed for hydrologic investigation of water requirements of re-juvenating vegetation (see overlay M3-WL-1). Stream excluded to livestock = 1.3 miles.

-Spring Fencing-

North Fork Otter Creek will be fenced at three spring sources. Progressing from higher to lower in the watershed, springs located in Sections 2, 1 and 33 will be fenced with forest poles (see overlay M3-WL-1).

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

-Cattle Trespass-

The Salt Lake District fence maintenance policy shall be strictly enforced in the Laketown Creek area. Both Twin Peaks and Laketown Allotments shall be closely monitored to prevent any trespass cattle from damaging the riparian zone. Close adherence to the RM-3.1 decision is imperative.

-Further Study-

Further study will be conducted on the following streams: North Fork of Otter Creek (the uppermost meadow), North Fork of Otter Creek (the lowest spring to be considered for possible reservoir development), lower Laketown Creek, Little Creek, South Branch of the Middle Fork of Otter Creek, and the South Fork of Otter Creek. This constitutes an additional 4.8 stream miles which may have potential for fisheries development. Various supplementary riparian portions will be investigated to obtain use either by cooperative agreement, purchase or land exchange. These include spring sources for Laketown Creek, Spring Creek, and other areas such as Randolph Creek which would produce larger contiguous stream mileage.

-Improvement of Remaining Aquatic-Riparian Areas-

Improvement of other areas to be accomplished by designing livestock management systems which rotate, defer, or limit livestock access to riparian zones during the critical period of May 1 to August 30, and by non-riparian location of range improvements to draw livestock away from stream bottoms.

RATIONALE Wildlife-1.1

Streams and aquatic-riparian habitats have been identified in the URA as areas of critical environmental concern, crucial habitat, and conflict areas with livestock grazing. Habitat and fisheries currently exist in poor condition on all streams. These conditions are in direct conflict with BLM and legislative/executive policies such as outlined in Public Law 92-500, Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, which require improvement of riparian habitat and associated fauna.

Watershed quality in all riparian areas is fair to poor. Water quality is being adversely affected by livestock induced soil erosion and elevated

bacterial counts. Protection of watershed vegetation by developing grazing systems utilizing non-riparian watering and promoting better vegetative cover will enhance water quality.

Recreation use has increased in the planning unit, and the PAA indicates a probable increase in demand for wildlife based recreational opportunities. Fishing is currently the most heavily engaged recreational activity with exception of hunting. Improvement of fisheries would provide for an increase in the aesthetic and associated recreational on-site experiences and satisfaction.

The Big Creek administrative study has shown that elimination of livestock from riparian zones will improve aquatic-riparian habitat from poor to good condition and increase the stream fishery. Planned livestock exclosures would be expected to similarly affect presently degraded fisheries.

Spring fencing on the North Fork of Otter Creek will allow reestablishment of groundwater levels by reducing cattle induced soil compaction, and so possibly produce regeneration of the presently decimated stream flow.

Improvement of habitat and fisheries would enhance public recreational opportunities unit-wide as well as increase the operational efficiency of DWR's stocking program and catch per unit effort by angling publics.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife WL-1.2
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL-1

DECISION STATEMENT Wildlife-1.2

Improve habitat quality for wildlife on 12,704 acres of crested wheat-grass stands in the planning unit by using livestock as the principal management tool. Grazing management will be aimed at grazing these seedings in a manner which will stimulate natural plant succession towards a mix of desired shrub and forb species. Those seedings located in critical deer winter range will be managed to obtain a composition of 30 to 40 percent shrubs, 10 percent forbs, and 50 to 60 percent grass. Seasonal deer ranges containing crested wheatgrass seedings will be managed to obtain 20-30 percent shrubs, 10 percent forbs, and 60-70 percent grasses.

Interseeding may be used to obtain the needed mix of preferred species. These seedings will be initiated on an experimental basis to determine costs, and success rate of various plant species. The priority areas for any project which involves experimental interseeding will be Dry Basin and Longhill Pastures, located in the Woodruff Pastures Allotment.

RATIONALE Wildlife-1.2

A significant amount of range improvement can be obtained through proper management of livestock grazing in existing crested wheatgrass seedings in the planning unit. In almost all cases sagebrush is reinvading seedings throughout the planning unit. By manipulating livestock numbers and season of use, the existing values for mule deer as well as several other game and nongame species can be achieved. The overall management goal should be aimed at providing a good diversity on crested wheatgrass seedings. In some cases mechanical treatments may be required to either retard or speedup natural succession in the plant community. In addition, experimental planting of preferred browse and forb species on a small scale will allow management an opportunity to properly evaluate the ecological and economical feasibility of interseeding as a management tool. This will minimize impacts to the local economy and the environment if such a treatment fails. However, if it is determined to be feasible on selected sites it will result in a positive impact to big game animals, upland birds and nongame animals.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife WL-1.3
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT: Wildlife-1.3

Use prescribed fire as a habitat management tool to produce optimum benefits for wildlife. The use of fire will be coordinated with all other resource activities in order to minimize disruption of ongoing or planned activities.

RATIONALE: Wildlife-1.3

The use of prescribed fire is just one of many management techniques available to produce optimum range conditions for wildlife and livestock. In many areas of the planning unit the use of prescribed fire can be coordinated with other activity plans such as grazing allotment plans to achieve a desired mixture of plant species. Statistics provided in the PAA show a continuous demand for wildlife based recreation. There are additional demands for red meat production, therefore, it is essential that management tools such as prescribed fire be used in a manner that will yield mutual benefits to wildlife and livestock.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife-WL-1.4
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL-1

DECISION STATEMENT: Wildlife-1.4

Thin sagebrush stands and seed with a mix of grasses, forbs, and browse in order to enhance habitat quality for deer, antelope, elk, sage grouse, and a variety of nongame species. Treatments will be located in priority areas outlined in decision Range Management 2.3. These will be as follows:

- 1) Allotments with signed allotment management plans.
- 2) Allotments where forage for wildlife and livestock is either lacking, in short supply, or is of poor quality to meet present demands.
- 3) Only those range sites with the greatest potential for maximum productivity and diversity will be treated.

In addition, treatments will be designed to meet wildlife habitat requirements on critical and seasonal deer ranges and important sagegrouse habitat. The ultimate composition over breed areas will be 30-40 percent shrubs, 10 percent forbs, and 50-60 percent grasses on critical deer ranges, and 20-30 percent shrubs, 10 percent forbs, and 60-70 percent grasses on seasonal deer ranges. Any projects will be coordinated with other resource activities to minimize conflicts and impacts.

The wildlife program will initiate the sagegrouse monitoring study to identify important sagegrouse habitats. All wildlife initiated projects will be coordinated in order to minimize conflict between resources.

The wildlife program will identify and provide plant species to be included in seeding projects initiated by other programs. Only plant species adapted to a specific range site will be used in treatment projects.

RATIONALE: Wildlife 1.4

There are several large tracts of big sagebrush community scattered throughout the planning unit which could be treated in such a way as to significantly enhance both quantity and quality of forage for wildlife as well as increase habitat diversity. The ultimate goal of any treatment project should be to achieve a vegetative type which meets desired compositions without significantly impacting other resources. By coordinating the project design and implementation schedules as well as the desired target compositions both range and wildlife objectives can be mutually achieved without significantly impacting either resource activity.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Randolph	
Activity	
Wildlife WL-1.5	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL-1

DECISION STATEMENT: Wildlife-1.5

Provide water for wildlife at all wells, developed springs, catchments, and along pipelines during the period May 1-to October 1, or year-round where practical. In addition, improve water quality and enhance wildlife food and cover around all existing springs on Public Land by constructing exclosures sufficient in size to protect the spring source and associated vegetation. The spring protection devices will be constructed so no loss of livestock water is incurred.

RATIONALE: Wildlife-1.5

Water and the habitat associated with it are critical elements to all wild--- life species. Provision for watering wildlife at BLM developed water sources as well as directives requiring improved water quality are BLM Policy that need to be implemented in the Randolph Planning Unit. By implementing this decision we will be significantly improving both quantity and quality of wild- life habitat which will help meet future wildlife based recreational demands, as well as insuring a continued source of good quality water. Protecting springs will insure that the spring is not damaged and water will continue to be available for all uses.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife WL-1.6
Overlay Reference	Step 1 Step 3 M3-WL-1

DECISION STATEMENT WILDLIFE - 1.6

This decision is the same as Lands 10.1. Refer to L-10.1 for Decision and Rationale.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Wildlife	WL-1.7
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	Step 3	None

DECISION STATEMENT WILDLIFE - 1.7

Construct diagonal fence enclosures at selected corners away from gates or watering facilities within all grazing allotments in the planning unit. Each enclosure will be constructed so as not to exceed one acre in size - total area enclosed will be about ten acres in thirty separate pastures.

RATIONALE WILDLIFE - 1.7

These enclosures will have a direct positive impact on eight species of ground and shrub nesting passerine bird species as well as sage grouse, marsh hawks, short-eared owls, rabbits, and a large number of non-game mammals and reptiles. In addition, these enclosure areas would result, in time, with several small and scattered parcels of protected vegetation which will be useful as small study sites for photo plots, trend studies, utilization comparison areas, and production plots which will add greatly to our knowledge of succession in a variety of vegetation types on different soils. This will increase the technical knowledge needed concerning the relationship of plant and animal relationships in north-eastern Utah.

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
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife WL-2.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL-2

DECISION STATEMENT WILDLIFE - 2.1

Maintain or increase waterfowl, waterbird, and shorebird nesting and feeding habitat on publicly-owned islands in Neponset Reservoir by maintaining existing water levels, or by allowing an increase in water levels only if it results in the maintenance or an increase in nesting and feeding habitat in the reservoir. In the event an increase in water level is allowed, measures will be provided that will result in the same amount of island habitat in the reservoir. This will require the BLM to retain in public ownership the three sections of Public Land surrounding the existing reservoir site.

RATIONALE WILDLIFE - 2.1

Water users have proposed increasing the water level in the reservoir in order to provide more irrigation water during summer months. Allowing even a small increase in water depth would inundate several small islands thus effectively destroying much of the value of Neponset Reservoir for waterfowl, waterbird, and shorebird habitat. Because the reservoir and its adjacent shoreline have been identified as critical habitat requiring special management, the BLM will not allow an increase in water levels unless it can be shown that an equal or greater amount of island habitat can be created on adjacent BLM lands. By doing so, the BLM is carrying out its mandates as stated in Executive Orders 11988, and 11990, and Public Law 92-500, all of which dictate management protection and enhancement of riparian-aquatic wetland areas. In addition, this decision will continue to benefit wildlife which are highly dependent on this reservoir and will help to fulfill an increasing demand for wildlife based recreational activity.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Randolph

Activity

Wildlife WL-2.2

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3 M1-WL-2

DECISION STATEMENT Wildlife 2.2

Protect important wildlife habitat values on Public Lands as follows:

1. Restrict seismic work, well development, new road development and other surface disturbing activities in mule deer winter ranges between November 15 and April 30 unless specifically authorized by BLM.
2. Protect sage grouse strutting grounds from surface disturbing activities between April 1 and June 15 each year.
3. Restrict seismic work, well development, new road construction and other surface disturbing activities within 600 feet on either side of riparian zones, if that activity could significantly affect water quality and productivity of riparian habitats.

RATIONALE Wildlife 2.2

Implementation of the above measures will provide necessary protection of essential wildlife habitats in the planning unit. These measures should insure adequate protection of important breeding areas, watering and feeding areas for a variety of wildlife species as well as preventing unnecessary degradation of the environment.

Limiting activities in mule deer winter ranges between November 15 and April 30 will minimize disturbances to wintering mule deer and should aid survival.

Protection of sage grouse strutting grounds will maximize breeding opportunity which will aid in increasing annual productivity and survival.

Restricting activities within 600 feet of riparian habitats that would affect water quality and productivity will insure protection of these areas from such things as chemical pollution, sedimentation and excessive compaction.

These measures also comply with mandates as outlined in Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act (Sec 103).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife WL-2.3
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL-2

DECISION STATEMENT: Wildlife-2.3

Maintain the integrity of existing raptor nesting habitat on the west face of the Crawford Mountains with special emphasis on protecting this area as Peregrine falcon reintroduction site by prohibiting activities that will alter the physical character of the cliff sites. This includes such things as mining, prospecting, seismic shooting, etc., but would not exclude activities which do not alter the surface such as sightseeing, hang gliding and hiking. In addition, excessive human activity will be restricted within ½ mile of active raptor nests between 3/1 and 6/30 each year.

This decision will also allow for disposal of suitable agriculture lands along the base of the Crawford Mountains.

Specific guidelines for Off/Road Vehicle Management are provided in the Draft ORV Management Plan prepared by the Salt Lake District.

RATIONALE: Wildlife-2.3

Maintaining the raptor nesting habitat along the west face of the Crawford Mountains will fulfill the habitat requirements for nesting birds of prey in this area. Allowing activities which are quiet in nature and that do not alter the physical character of the cliffs will have only minor, if any, impacts on nesting raptors. Elimination of excess human activity between 3/1 and 6/30 will reduce the impacts of disturbance during the most critical period for nesting raptors. Disposal of the small tracts along the base of the Crawfords will have minimal impacts since this area is small, and because cultivated lands are generally more productive in terms of prey biomass produced than uncultivated lands. The Draft ORV Management Plan provides for the best uses of lands associated with the cliff faces while minimizing impacts to recreational users and traditional users such as livestockmen.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife WL-2.4
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL-2

DECISION STATEMENT WILDLIFE - 2.4

Eliminate significant competition for quality and quantity of forage between livestock and deer throughout grazing allotments and on the Crawford Mountains by the following measures:

1. Initiate livestock management programs which would include establishing proper stocking rates based on current range survey data, condition and trend data, and actual use surveys.
2. Increase quantity and quality of preferred deer forage in severe winter range areas through a series of land treatments when a forage demand has been identified (see Randolph Final Environmental Statement, Appendix 4).
3. Eliminate livestock grazing on the Crawford Mountains after September 1 each year. Long-term management will be aimed at developing a livestock management program which will improve winter range conditions and trend for mule deer habitat. In addition, in FY-81 a Comprehensive Habitat Management Plan will be developed for WHA-2 (Crawford Mountains). The HMP will include a list of specific monitoring programs to be used in evaluating the success of management objectives.
4. Make any additional livestock reductions on severe winter ranges if further conflicts are identified after the foregoing measures are taken.

RATIONALE WILDLIFE - 2.4

Several mule deer winter ranges described in the Unit Resource Analysis and in the Final Environmental Statement for the Randolph Planning Unit have had significant amounts of forage competition identified between mule deer and livestock. In order to insure adequate forage is available for mule deer it is essential that BLM implement and monitor these decisions.

Since the Crawford Mountains were not addressed in the Randolph E.S., it is necessary to explain the rationale for the decision in Item 3. This area supports, in a typical year, over 3000 deer for a five to six month period. At the present time, livestock grazing during the fall, after September 1, imposes a significant and direct conflict with these deer. It is for this reason that we are recommending elimination of livestock grazing after September each year. By doing this, in conjunction with establishing proper grazing capacities, the BLM can fulfill the forage needs for mule deer while impacting livestock grazing only slightly.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Randolph

Activity
Wildlife WL-2.5

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3 M1-WL-2

DECISION STATEMENT Wildlife-2.5

Provide necessary spatial requirements for mule deer utilizing severe mule deer winter ranges by limiting livestock use to the grazing seasons outlined Range Management Decisions RM-1.2, RM-2.1, and RM-2.2.

RATIONALE Wildlife-2.5

The decisions outlined in Range Management Decisions RM-1.2, RM-2.1, and RM-2.2 were based on a case by case evaluation of each allotment and the degree of competition between mule deer and livestock grazing. In the majority of cases the grazing seasons were altered in such a way as to minimize the amount of spatial conflict while still allowing limited grazing where conflicts were minimal or could be mitigated by management alternatives such as moving livestock away from critical conflict areas during the conflict period. While not totally eliminating the problem in all cases this decision provides the best multiple use approach on a limited resource. This decision should have an overall positive impact on mule deer while minimizing the economic hardships to livestock permittees.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Wildlife WL-3.1	
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL

DECISION STATEMENT Wildlife-3.1

Cooperate with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources in establishing antelope in the Randolph Planning Unit by providing necessary forage allocations and management actions on selected areas where sufficient forage and space is identified. The BLM will cooperate in developing management plans which identify those areas with the greatest opportunity for success while minimizing impacts to other resources and range users.

RATIONALE Wildlife-3.1

The Randolph Planning Unit has 148,000 acres of habitat which could be suitable for antelope introductions providing necessary management plans were developed which identified necessary land treatments, developments, and necessary fence modifications. At the present time; however, there are a number of other resource management problems which need to be solved before antelope could be introduced without resulting in over allocation of resources and creating conflicts with current land users. It is in the best interest of the public as well as the basic land resources, to implement grazing programs first, followed by land treatments and developments in order to insure that antelope introductions could be made with minimal impact. In addition, completing comprehensive management plans for wildlife habitat improvement will insure the proper areas and needs of antelope are met. This will insure a successful re-introduction program in the future.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph
Activity	Wildlife WL-3.2
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 M1-WL-3

DECISION STATEMENT Wildlife-3.2

Do not establish a warm water fishery in Neponset Reservoir. Do not provide public access to Neponset Reservoir.

RATIONALE Wildlife-3.2

Based on the BLM's knowledge of Neponset Reservoir it is doubtful this area could support a warm water fishery without a significant change in its current physical condition. In addition, the reservoir currently supports one of the major Canada goose nesting and moulting habitat in northern Utah. The red-head duck is also a common nesting bird at this reservoir. Development of a warm water fishery could result in considerable public fishing pressure on the reservoir. In lieu of this, and because of the unique quality of habitat this reservoir provides it is in the best interest of the resource to not allow any activity which would negatively impact waterfowl nesting and moulting, including public access to the reservoir vicinity.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Wildlife	WL-3.3
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3 M1-R-2

DECISION STATEMENT WILDLIFE - 3.3

This decision is the same as the ACEC decision. Refer to ACEC Decision for Decision Statement and Rationale.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Randolph	
Activity	Wildlife	WL-4.1
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3 None

DECISION STATEMENT WILDLIFE - 4.1

Develop comprehensive wildlife habitat management plans (HMPs) in the planning unit according to the following schedule:

- a. Public lands west of the Bear River (WHA-1) by 9/30/80.
- b. Public lands in the Crawford Mountains (WHA-2) by 9/30/81.

These HMPs will be developed along allotment boundaries and will be coordinated to the greatest possible degree with concurrent development of Allotment Management Plans.

RATIONALE WILDLIFE - 4.1

In order to solve the majority of problems identified for wildlife in the Randolph Planning Unit it is important to begin immediately setting down management objectives and beginning to implement projects which will yield positive benefits to all wildlife. In many instances those projects and treatments outlined in Habitat Management Plans designed to benefit wildlife also benefit other resources such as watershed, soil, and livestock forage. A special emphasis will be placed on improving forage conditions for mule deer and aquatic riparian habitat. Implementing these measures should yield positive benefits to wildlife throughout the planning unit and should help provide additional wildlife-based recreation activities throughout the planning unit.