

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

KING HILL ALLOTMENT (0413)

Page 1 of 2

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 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 (applies to the Hog Creek Allotment also, assuming it would be combined with the King Hill Allotment).

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 & Vegetative data to be gathered during the summer of 1976 and succeeding years.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Since the URA indicates current 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 dependent on the allotment. With proper management and/or land treatment, part of this impact could be mitigated over the long-term.

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation.

Supporting recommendations include the following: Watershed, W 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 5.2; wildlife, WL 1.1, 2.1, 6.1, 6.3, 8.2, 8.3, 11.1, 12.1, 13.3; recreation, R 1.1, 2.1, 3.2, 9.1; range management, RM 1 & 2.2 (0413).

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

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)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
<u>Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil.</u>
Activity
<u>Range Management</u>
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 2 of 2

Reasons (continued)

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

KING HILL ALLOTMENT (0413)

Page 1 of 4

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.2

Combine the Hog Creek Allotment with the King Hill Allotment and adjust the AMP accordingly; maintain the present grazing system and AMP provisions.

The Hog Creek Allotment is too small to logically and feasibly divide and implement a rotation grazing system on that will provide for the physiological requirements of the perennial vegetation. The vegetation can be more effectively managed to reach Bureau range condition goals if allotments are combined because of the opportunity to implement a more effective grazing system. Administration and supervision costs will be reduced where one allotment is involved rather than two. The present AMP does not include the Hog Creek Allotment.

Approximately 710 additional AUMs of livestock forage could be produced annually within a 15- 20 year period with proper management. The present grazing system is designed to provide for the physiological requirements of the key native forage plants.

Adjust grazing use so that no more than 50 percent of the Class I demand and exchange of use are utilized during the critical spring growing season.

Presently, 2/3 of the Class I demand is used during the critical spring growing season which overloads the forage producing capacity of the vegetation during that time. Shifting some spring use to fall use would increase the opportunity for seed tromp requirements.

Support Needs:

Provide additional and improve existing access in allotment to facilitate use supervision and livestock movement.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would have an adverse economic impact on the current livestock operator in the Hog Creek Allotment because it would require him to move his livestock more often and over a greater distance. This would increase his operational costs. The combination would reduce the Hog Creek allottee's flexibility because

Note: Obtain 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)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Multiple-Use Analysis (continued)

Page 2 of 4

his livestock management would have to conform to the needs of the larger operations and to the AMP requirements.

Adjusting grazing to balance spring and post-seed ripe use would result in a shift from the present spring use of about 2/3 to 1/2 of the total demand. This adjustment would most likely result in reduced use in the allotment, and would, therefore, have an adverse economic impact on the range users. A long-term beneficial input would occur, however, because the recommendations favor increased forage production. This recommendation also conflicts with wildlife, WL 2.1 which identifies a need to utilize no more than 40 percent of the current growth on important shrubs on critical deer winter ranges because it shifts spring use to fall when utilization of browse by livestock is normally higher.

The combination of the two allotments does not conflict with any other resource activity recommendations: However, the existing grazing system conflicts with the wildlife, WL 1.1, 8.2, 12.1; and watershed, W 1.3, which 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.

The recommendation conflicts with recreation, R 9.1 which proposes reduction of livestock in the area proposed for Back Country designation.

Wildlife, WL 6.2, 9.1, 13.1, and watershed, W 3.3 identify the need to exclude livestock grazing from wet meadows, springs, and streams. This would reduce availability of high quality forage and restrict access to water which would contribute to livestock distribution problems. 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 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 grazing system. If development occurred, approximately 1/3 of the lease area would be excluded from livestock grazing.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: Wildlife, WL 1.4, 2.4, 8.1; recreation, R 1.1, 2.1; and lands, L 6.2, 6.4. These conflicting proposals should be addressed at the time the existing King Hill AMP is revised to insure all resource values are given proper consideration.

Supporting recommendations include the following: wildlife, WL 6.3, 8.3, 9.2, 12.2, 13.3; watershed, W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2; recreation, R 2.1, 3.2; range management, RM 2.1 (0413).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 3 of 4

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

Modify the recommendations as follows:

a. Combine the Hog Creek Allotment with the King Hill allotment when the least economic impact will occur to the allottee. Manage under custodial criteria in RM 1 & 2.1 (c.m.) pending combination.

Combining the allotment could have an overriding economic impact on the allottee at the present time because of the increased livestock handling and operation costs. Combining should be strongly considered if and when application is made to transfer or lease the grazing privileges or base property.

b. Do not allow adjustment of spring grazing use to fall grazing use.

This adjustment could cause economic hardship on the allottees and additional stress on the critical deer winter range by increasing use on important browse species utilized and depended on by deer.

Include the following provisions in the recommendations stated above:

a. 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.

b. Protect wet meadows, springs, streams and reservoirs from intensive livestock use which normally occurs as follows:

Springs: Coordinate protection with wildlife needs. Where significant wildlife values are identified, fence spring source area to exclude livestock and make water available to livestock outside the enclosure.

Livestock congregating on spring source areas denude vegetation essential to sage grouse broods and other wildlife species.

Wet Meadows: Fence wet meadows to exclude livestock only where it is demonstrated after one or two grazing cycles that significant wildlife habitat is being destroyed by livestock grazing.

It is anticipated that damage caused by livestock grazing will be mitigated by implementation of a proper grazing system.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

Page 4 of 4

Multiple-Use Recommendations (continued) Reasons (continued)

Streams & reservoirs: Fence streams and reservoirs where major critical waterfowl nesting areas and fisheries habitat are identified. Provide water gaps no farther than 1/2 mile apart, when possible.

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

d. Allow mineral leasing.

e. Continue with livestock use as identified in the present AMP unless adjustment is needed to reach carrying capacity of range.

Support Needs:

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

Grazing livestock utilize and destroy riparian vegetation needed for waterfowl nesting habitat, and tromp streambanks thoroughly eliminating overhanging banks and vegetation required for fish habitat in streams.

Livestock grazing is the primary resource affected with all other resources affected to a minor degree. Conversion of this area to agriculture would provide greater economic stability to the locale than presently produced by the existing resource use.

Restriction of livestock grazing by geothermal development 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.

It is anticipated that the present AMP will provide adequate protection to the vegetative resource if part of the allotment is designate as a Back Country (R 9.1).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

KING HILL ALLOTMENT (0413)

Page 1 of 2

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.3

Remove competing brush species on approximately 2,500 acres and remove brush and seed approximately 1,440 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 timeframe of 10- 15 years. Approximately 420 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 of allowable grazing use resulting from the adjustments recommended in range management (0413) RM 2.1 (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, ^{4.3,} 14.6, 14.15; and minerals, M ~~2.1~~, which would restrict or constrain layout and method of land treatments as recommended. The recreation conflicts involve the visual impacts of land treatment, and the effect the recommended treatments would have on archaeological sites. The minerals conflict involves the restriction on land treatments which would occur should development of geothermal resources take place.

Recreation, R 9.1 identifies the need to designate the area adjacent to King Hill Canyon as Back Country. This complements direction taken by the Boise District on the west side of the canyon. The recommendation is in conflict in that no development would be allowed that would change the present character of the terrain.

The recommendation conflicts with wildlife, WL 2.2, 7.1, which would prohibit any land treatment on critical deer and sage grouse wintering areas. This would reduce the potential livestock forage obtainable through implementation of the recommended treatments. Lands, L 3.1A could also prohibit any land treatment because it proposes disposal of land for agricultural purposes providing the classification criteria is met.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: wildlife, WL 2.8, 9.2, 11.1; and recreation, R 1.1, 2.1. These conflicting proposals will be addressed prior to implementation of land treatments to insure all resource values involved are adequately considered.

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

Page 2 of 2

Multiple-Use Analysis (continued)

Supporting activity recommendations include the following: wildlife, WL 1.2, 1.3, 6.1, 12.2, 13.3; watershed, W 1.4, 1.5, 5.2; recreation, R 2.1, 3.2, 13.1.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

Allow no brush treatment in the allotment.

Modified to provide for Back Country (R 9.1); critical deer winter range (WL 2.2) and sage grouse winter range (WL 7.1) values. This recommendation is further supported by the potential land disposal possibility (L 3.1A). The value of these combined resources is considered to be higher than the need for additional forage at the present time.

KING HILL ALLOTMENT

OPPORTUNITIES CONSIDERED

Allotment combination

Revise current AMP