

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill Activity Range Management Overlay Reference Step 1 no. 1 Step 3

Page 1 of 2

#### KINZIE BUTTE (0430)

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### RATIONALE

RM 2.1 1. Combine the Kinzie Butte and Lincoln Allotments.

A more effective grazing system can be implemented by combining allotments because of the larger area and increased number of treatments that can be used. Better utilization of the forage resource can be made with both sheep and cattle because of the time when the grazing use is made and the different forage requirements by the different class of livestock.

2. Adjust allotment boundaries to include that part of the North Shoshone Allotment east of Highway 93 with the combination of Kinzie Butte and Lincoln Allotments.

#### Multiple-Use Analysis

Combining Kinzie Butte and Lincoln Allotments, as proposed in this recommendation, and adjusting boundaries to include that part of the North Shoshone Allotment east of Highway 93 with the proposed combination would not adversely affect the local livestock operators within these allotments. The area east of the highway has traditionally been grazed by Campbell's sheep; therefore, the proposed adjustment to include this area with the Kinzie-Lincoln combination would not reduce the sheepmen's flexibility in the North Shoshone Allotment. The reduced acreage in North Shoshone resulting from this recommendation would be mitigated by allowing Campbell to continue his use east of the highway after the combination. Therefore, this recommendation should benefit management on all areas involved and would not create an adverse economic impact to the livestock operators. In fact, through better management and/or distribution of livestock, a potential positive economic gain could be received by the range users.

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendations.

The following recommendations which support grazing systems would also complement this proposal: Wildlife, WL 6.3, 12.2, 13.3; Watershed, W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2; Recreation, R 2.1, 3.2.



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill Activity Range Management Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 2 of 2

# Multiple Use Recommendation

#### Reason

Accept the recommendation as stated above.



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
	1
Activity	
Range Management	•.

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3 Page 1 of 2

Overlay Reference

#### KINZIE BUTTE ALLOTMENT (0430)

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### RATIONALE

succeeding years.

RM 2.2

1. Determine carrying capacity for National Resource Lands and private and State lands offered for exchange of use license and adjust stocking rates accordingly. The URA indicates that adequate forage is not available to satisfy the present Class I demand (see 1605.44A2c(5)(a)). Present policy provides that "Initial stocking rates...must not exceed the existing livestock grazing capacity...".. (WO Instruction Memo 75-407). Idaho's 5-year goals are to bring livestock use in line with existing grazing capacity for those areas in less than satisfactory condition as a result of excessive livestock use. It is anticipated that the present forage production capacities can be interpolated from Soil and Vegetative data to

be gathered during the summer of 1976 and

# Multiple-Use Analysis

URA indicated stocking rates may be in excess of the carrying capacity. This recommendation could result in reduction of grazing use and would, therefore, have an adverse economic impact on the livestock operations. With proper management and/or land treatment part of this impact may be mitigated over the long-term.

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendations.

Supporting recommendations include the following: Watershed, W 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, r.2; Wildlife, WL 12.1, 3.1; Recreation, R 2.1; Range Management, RM 1 & 2.3 (9430).

#### Multiple-Use Recommendation

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

#### Reasons

1. The stocking rates must be reasonably close to the carrying capacity to implement a rotation grazing system that will improve range condition.

2. Herbaceous vegetative cover left on site will reduce erosion and improve water quality.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)					
	Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hil]			
	Activity				
	Range Management				
	Overlay Reference				
	Step 1 No. 1 Step 3				

Page 2 of 2

# Multiple-Use Recommendations

# Reasons

3. Competition for forage with all wildlife species will be reduced and minimum cover requirements will be left for wildlife.



Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)



Bennett	Hil	lls-Timme	rman
Activity Range Ma	inag	gement	
Overlay Re	ferer	ıce	
Step 1 NO.	1	Step 3	

Hi1]

Name (MFP)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

#### KINZIE BUTTE ALLOTMENT (0430)

Page 1 of 3

# RECOMMENDATION

#### RATIONALE

RM 1 & 2.3

Implement an AMP for the combined 1. allotments with a rest-rotation grazing system that will provide for plant vigor, seed production, seed tramp, and seedling establishment of key native minimum acceptable grazing system.)

2. Include both sheep and cattle in the grazing system.

Supplemental guidance states that "AMPs will be made for all public lands which can reasonably be expected to remain in Federal ownership for multiple use management and on which livestock grazing is a significant use." forage species. (See URA Step 4 for the (1603.12G4c). The present grazing use does not provide for the physiological needs of native forage plants. Implementing a grazing system which provides for the plant's physiological needs will increase the density and vigor of the native forage species and thereby improve range condition and increase forage production to maximum potential. An estimated 480 additional AUMs can be produced annually within a 15-20 year period with proper management.

> The impact of grazing on the vegetation is the same regardless of class of grazing animal. Dual use, where sheep graze in early spring followed by late spring cattle use causes heavy utilization of the vegetation and results in deteriorated range conditions if not properly regulated.

# Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation would not have an adverse economic impact on the range users in the allotment. Since one allotment has strictly sheep use and the other has only cattle, some initial problems in handling of livestock would have to be resolved, but once an acceptable rest-rotation grazing system (AMP) has been implemented there should be economic benefits for the livestock operators. These potential forage increases from proper management and/or land treatments through implementation of an AMP for the combined allotments would help offset expected losses in allowable grazing use, resulting from adjustments recommended in range management, RM 2.2 (0430) which proposes to adjust stocking rates to carrying capacity.

This recommendation conflicts with the following activity recommendations: Vildlife, WL 9.1 identifies the need to exclude livestock grazing from waterfowl nesting areas which would reduce high quality livestock forage.

UNITED STATES	Name (MFP)
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	Activity
	Range Management
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN	Overlay Reference
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSLS-DECISION	Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 2 of 3

Wildlife, WL 12.1 and Watershed, W 1.3 identify the need to retain 40-50 percent of the annual growth of herbaceous vegetation in each pasture. This conflicts with the recommendation because use in some pastures would be greater than 60 percent.

Land, L 3.1A proposes disposal of several tracts of land within the allotment for agricultural purposes, should they meet appropriate classification criteria. Such an action would result in loss of important forage producing areas and would disrupt the proposed grazing system.

Minerals, M 1.2 proposes leasing the potential geothermal resources in the allotment with minimal restrictions. This could restrict livestock grazing and disrupt the proposed grazing system. If development occurred, approximately 1/3 of the lease area would be excluded from livestock grazing.

The following recommendations conflict to a minor degree with the proposed recommendation: Recreation, R 2.1; Lands L 6.2; and Lands L 6.4. These conflicts will be addressed prior to implementation of an AMP.

Supporting recommendations include the following: WL 6.3, 9.2, 12.2, 13.3; W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2; R 2.1, 3.2.

#### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

Modify the recommendation to include the following provisions in addition to those stated above:

1. Do not exceed 60 percent utilization of herbaceous vegetation in any pasture where grazing occurs. Adequate herbaceous vegetation should be left to provide adequate forage and cover for all wildlife, including deer, elk, and upland game birds, and to provide litter to protect the soil from the erosive forces of nature.

It is not anticipated that this restriction will seriously impact grazing since livestock gains normally begin to decline after 60 percent of the forage has been utilized.

Grazing livestock utilize and destroy riparian vegetation needed for waterfowl nesting habitat.

2. Fence canals where major critical waterfowl nesting areas are identified. Provide water gaps no farther than 1/2 while apart.

UNITED STATES	Name (MFP)
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill Activity
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION	Range Management Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

# Page 3 of 3

3. Allow disposal of lands within Class I and II irrigation potential classification.

to agriculture would provide greater economic stability to the locale than presently produced by the existing resource use.

> Restriction of livestock grazing by geothermal develo0ment is improbable, but if it occurs it should be allowed because of the greater value generated to the local and regional economy by mineral development.

Livestock grazing is the primary resource

affected with all other resources affected

to a minor degree. Conversion of this area

Support Needs: Accept the recommendations as stated above. Acquire easement on private lands.

4. Allow mineral leasing.





MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# KINZIE BUTTE ALLOTMENT (0430)

# Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill Activity Range Management Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 1 of 3

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### RATIONALE

RM 1 & 2.4 1. Remove competing cheatgrass and brush species on approximately 2,200 acres and remove brush and seed approximately 1100 acres of National Resource Land to release and establish desirable perennial forage species.

These treatments combined with management, are needed to meet the objectives within a reasonable time frame of 10-15 years. Approximately 375 additional AUMs will be produced annually from the treatment.

#### Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would result in an increase in forage production. The increase would partially offset expected losses in allowable grazing use resulting from the adjustments recommended in Range Management RM 2.1 (0430) (adjust stocking rate to grazing capacity). Thus a positive economic impact would occur. Where wildlife values are involved the Idaho Fish & Game Dept. will be consulted in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between that agency and the Bureau.

This recommendation is in conflict with the Recreation, R 4.1, 4.2, and 14.15, and Minerals, M 1.2 which would restrict or constrain layout and/or method of land treatment. The recreation recommendations deal primarily with visual impact of land treatments and the effect the recommended treatments might have on archaeological sites. The mineral's conflict involves the restriction on land treatments should development of potential geothermal resources take place.

The recommendation conflicts with Wildlife, WL 7.1 and Lands, L 3.1A which would prohibit any land treatment. The wildlife recommendations would prohibit brush control on sage grouse strutting grounds within the allotment as proposed. The lands recommendation proposes disposal of some lands which have been identified for land treatment.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: WL 9.2; L 6.2, 6.4; R 2.1. These conflicting proposals will be addressed prior to implementation of land treatments to insure resource values involved are adequately considered.

Supporting activity recommendations include the following: WL 6.1, 12.2, 13.3; W 1.4, 1.5, 5.2; R 13.1





MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

#### Multiple-Use Recommendations

# Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill Activity Range Management

Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 2 of 3

Reasons

Accept and modify the recommendation to subject brush removal and seeding proposals to the following constraints before projects are started.

1. Revise the allotment management plan and implement a sound and acceptable graz- success of revegetation projects and ing system.

Coordinate all land treatment proposals with wildlife, watershed, and regreation activities to assure all multiple-use conflicts are mitigated. Criteria to be used in mitigating conflicts are found in Appendix I (MFP Step II).

3. Allow selective brush control within a two mile radius of sage grouse strutting grounds.

4. Propose no land treatments on lands that have Class I and II irrigation potential pending outcome of classification.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Sound management is needed to assure to protect the investment made in the project.

Disruption of livestock use can be minimized by planning treatments within grazing pastures and in accord with the grazing sequence.

#### BLM policy

On-site information is not adequate to identify specific conflicts and resulting impacts at this time. This requires that no projects he started until on-site inspections can be made and impacts of the project on the multiple-use values are determined and mitigated.

Projects which alter the vegetation have long-term impacts and must be coordinated so as not to destroy other resource values.

The need to produce livestock forage to minimize the economic impact of the anticipated reduction in stocking rate (RM 2.1 (0416)) is considered to be as important as the need for increased sage grouse populations. Proposed brush treatments should be closely coordinated to allow only brush removal that is not critical to sage grouse nesting habitat.

Range improvement investment should not be made on lands that may be disposed of for agricultural purposes.



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name(MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hill
Activity Range Management	-
Overlay Reference	-
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3	_

Page 3 of 3

5. Allow leasing of minerals (geothermal resources) with no constraints on land treatment projects.

6. Prohibit land treatment projects on known archaeological sites. Present information is insufficient to determine impacts of geothermal development on land treatment. Any mineral development at this time appears to be improbable.

Bureau policy requires protection of cultural resources.



 $\bigcirc$