WILDLIFE ACTIVITY SUMMARY

BENNETT HILLS-TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

All land treatment projects will be coordinated with wildlife to insure that the projects will not adversely affect wildlife.

Selectively reduce the sagebrush on deer and elk summer areas in order to increase the quality and quantity of summer forage.

Revegetation projects will include both forbs and grasses in order to increase the quality and quantity of summer forage for elk and deer.

No more than 1/3 of critical big game winter range will be grazed by livestock in the fall, and on those ranges that are grazed, livestock utilization of shrubs will not exceed 40 percent of the current annual growth.

There will be no brush control projects on any critical deer winter ranges.

Investigations will be made to identify opportunities to improve winter game ranges by planting palatable shrubs.

Critical game ranges will be closed to ORVs from December 15 through March 31 of each year.

No National Resource Land encompassing big game winter range will be disposed of, with the possible exception of the area north of Bliss, Idaho, adjacent to Bray Lake.

All new fences located on antelope range will be constructed in a manner such that it will not impede antelope. All existing fences that are shown to impede antelope will be modified.

Sagebrush control projects proposed in known sage grouse winter areas and within two miles of sage grouse strutting grounds will be designed such that adequate nesting and wintering habitat is maintained for present and future populations.

Small parcels of National Resource Land identified as having important upland game habitat and situated adjacent to private land will be retained in public ownership and managed for upland game.

Selectively exclude livestock grazing from portions of the important waterfowl producing reservoirs, streams, and canals. In addition, the sagebrush cover lying adjacent to the canals will be maintained to provide nesting cover for waterfowl.

In association with the Idaho Department of Fish & Game, goose nesting sites will be constructed on Mormon, Thorn Creek, Spring Creek, Pioneer, and Sonners Reservoirs.

The vegetative cover lying within a two-mile radius of raptor nests will be managed in a manner that will enhance the habitat for the birds principal prey species. Additionally, various activities that could lead to the disturbance of the nesting birds will be discouraged.

The fisheries habitat along King Hill, Dry, and Clover Creeks will be improved by fencing portions of the streams to exclude livestock from the riparian habitat and stream channel.

WILDLIFE

OBJECTIVE NO.	SUBJECT
1.	Mule Deer Summer Range
2.	Mule Deer Winter Range
3.	Elk Habitat
4.	Antelope Habitat Expansion
5.	Antelope Habitat
6.	Sage Grouse Summer Habitat
7.	Sage Grouse Winter Habitat
8.	Upland Game Habitat
9.	Waterfowl Habitat
10.	Goose Nesting Habitat
11.	Birds of Prey
12.	All Wildlife Habitat
13.	Fish Habitat

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	1

OBJECTIVE:

Manage 200,000 acres of mule deer summer range in the Bennett Hills Planning Unit such that there is adequate food, cover, and water for 1,000 animals by 1990.

RATIONALE:

Approximately half (200,000 acres) of the Bennett Hills Unit is identified as suitable deer summer range, yet the URA indicates that resident deer numbers are low. The PAA states that the public desires to see additional big game animals. Policy plans developed in 1975 by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game outline management programs to increase the number of resident deer by 30 and 100 percent in Fish and Game Management Units 45 and 52 respectively. Critical portions of both management units lie within the Bennett Hills Planning Unit. In addition to the facts that more deer are wanted and that there is adequate habitat to handle more deer, the predicted increase in hunters is expected to double statewide (Economic Supplement) by 1980, thus placing greater emphasis on the need for additional deer.

B.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER SUMMER (d_{su})

RECOMMENDATIONS

WL - 1.1

Intensify livestock grazing management sufficiently to ensure that no more than 60 percent of the herbaceous vegetation in any one pasture is utilized by domestic livestock.

RATIONALE

Food habit studies show that a sufficient portion of a mule deer's summer diet is com posed of herbaceous vegetation. In order to provide adequate habitat for the expecte increase in resident deer numbers additiona forage has to be made available.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The improvement and increased availability of herbaceous forage would prove beneficial to summering mule deer and enhance the potential for increased resident deer numbers. The hunting season has been closed in the Bennett Hills Planning Unit due primarily to a lack of resident deer. With a sufficient resident population the season could be reopened thus creating a beneficial economic impact on the small towns located within the unit.

This recommendation is complementary to all activity recommendations except for the intensive livestock management recommendation. The conflict with livestock grazing is not considered a major conflict.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

The multiple-use benefits outweigh the conflict with livestock grazing.

Decision

Modify the multiple use recommendation as follows:

Maximum allowable utilization by livestock in any pasture will be determined in the formulation of the AMP. The degree of utilization in any use pasture will not exceed the identified needs of wildlife (food and cover) and watershed protection.

Reasons

To allow more flexibility in development of specific grazing systems and AMPs commensurate with related on-site needs.

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

B.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills–Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER SUMMER (d_{su})

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 1.2

Throughout mule deer summer ranges, reduce the sagebrush canopy by 40 to 60 percent in those areas where the present sagebrush canopy cover exceeds 25 percent.

RATIONALE

To meet the expected increase in mule deer numbers additional forage is required. The reduction of sagebrush and correspondin increase in herbaceous vegetation (forbs and grasses) would help meet this demand.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to the watershed recommendation (W-1.4), recreation recommendations (R-4.1, 4.2 & 4.3), and the livestock grazing recommendations dealing with brush control. The improved herbaceous vegetation would have a beneficial economic impact on wildlife, recreation, and livestock. Proper layout and design of brush removal projects would mitigate any adverse environmental impacts associated with such a project.

This recommendation does conflict with wildlife recommendation WL-7.1 which deals with maintaining the existing brush on sage grouse nesting and wintering areas. Since the sage grouse nesting areas overlap the deer summer areas, poorly designed brush removal projects could adversely affect sage grouse nesting. However, in those areas where brush is not limited, it is felt that brush control could be beneficial for brooding grouse. Consequently, the recommendation concerning sage grouse nesting habitat will be modified to the extent that brush removal will be allowed so long as sufficient brush is maintained for present and future nesting populations.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER SUMMER (d_{su})

RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
WL - 1.3 All revegetation projects located in deer summer areas should include a variety of both forbs and grasses.	The introduction of a variety of herbaceous species would provide a greater variety of forage species for deer, and improve the opportunity to increase the quality as well as quantity of the summer range.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to watershed recommendation (W-1.5) and does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. Providing a variety of species would be beneficial to the environment by establishing a diversity of vegetation thus increasing the complexity of the community. Economically the initial cost of the seeding would be increased, but the long-term economic return to all resource activities would over-ride these costs.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER SUMMER (d_{su})

RECOMMENDATIONS	RATIONALE
WL - 1.4 Establish livestock grazing systems that will enhance the reproduction and forage availability of forbs and shrubs.	Livestock grazing systems offer us an opportunity by which we can improve mule deer summer range. However, the system, in order to enhance these species, must be based upon the physiological requirement of forbs and shrubs and not grasses alone.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to watershed activity recommendation W-1.2 and range management recommendations dealing with grazing systems. The initial costs of implementing a grazing system is higher than the implementation of a season long system. However, the increased benefits derived from an intensively managed system should prove to off-set the initial costs.

There are no resource activity recommendations that conflict with this recommendation.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills–Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER SUMMER (d_{su})

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 1.5

In cooperation with the Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game initiate studies that will: 1) identify what, if any, the specific habitat requirements are for fawning; 2) identify a census technique or method to determine how many resident deer inhabit the planning unit.

RATIONALE

No specific habitat requirements for fawnin have been identified; however, it is concei able that the animals are selecting areas that have a certain density of shrubs, etc. If this situation exists it then becomes a factor which must be considered prior to an brush control projects. Mule deer resident populations are known to be low. However, there are no census methods being used currently to identify the approximate numbe or trend. To identify whether or not the objective is being met a census method should be initiated.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other resource recommendation, nor does it create any adverse impact on the environment. If this information does not become available in the immediate future it could have serious social and economic impacts.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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 – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	2

OBJECTIVE:

Manage 122,500 acres of mule deer winter range in the Bennett Hills and Timmerman Hills Planning Units in order to provide adequate food and cover for 3500 animals by 1990.

RATIONALE:

It is presently unknown from where exactly the deer wintering in the two planning units come from. However, the majority are known to move from north of State Highway 68, and if these animals summering in Game Management Units 44, 48, 49, and perhaps even 43 are to be enhanced, the winter ranges in both planning units must be managed and improved. Of added importance to the winter ranges, specifically in Timmerman Hills, is the fact that the traditional winter ranges in Unit 48 (Sun Valley) are becoming unavailable to deer due to increased recreational activities and its associated development.

B.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills–Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL 2.1

Intensively manage livestock grazing sufficient to ensure that no more than 40 percent of the current annual growth on important shrubs is utilized by livestock on ranges identified as critical deer wintering areas. Important shrubs include bitterbrush, chokecherry, serviceberry, and sagebrush species.

RATIONALE

These shrubs comprise approximately 80 percent of a wintering deer's diet. Consequently if deer numbers are to be increased additional forage will have to be made available for the animals.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation could conflict with the range management recommendation to intensify livestock grazing. To date there is insufficient data to say if livestock are utilizing more than 40 percent of the current annual growth under the present grazing systems. If systems were implemented that introduced heavy grazing pressure on the critical winter ranges in the fall there could be a major conflict arising between livestock and wildlife. Such a system could seriously impact the environment. However, if a grazing system could not be designed that would reduce the browse utilization by livestock, there would be a significant economic impact on the livestock users if a reduction in numbers were the only alternative.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

It is felt that the mule deer resource wintering in these units are of critical importance and every effort should be made to enhance these herds.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation

Reason

The degree of use can be monitored through AMP and wildlife studies.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 2.2

No land treatment project that would reduce the existing shrub density should be proposed on the critical deer winter ranges.

RATIONALE

Sagebrush comprises an important component of the deer's winter diet and any reduction in quantity would adversely affect the capacity of the habitat to winter deer.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with the range management recommendation dealing with the reduction of sagebrush in order to increase livestock forage. In addition these critical deer ranges are also identified as sage grouse wintering areas, upland game bird areas, and raptor foraging areas. Since all this wildlife is either directly or indirectly depend upon sagebrush it is felt that at the present time any reduction in brush would adversely impact wildlife. Consequently, until there is sufficient data to show that the present and future wildlife populations will not be adversely affected by brush control the existing wildlife recommendation will be accepted as stated.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation

Reasons

(Refer to Appendix I and II of Range Management for supplemental coordination guides).

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 2.3

Investigate the opportunity to improve portions of the winter range by the introduction of palatable shrubs.

RATIONALE

Habitat studies have indicated that the winter range could be improved by increasin the variety and quantity of shrubs. However presently the feasibility of such a plantin is unknown. Experimental seedings and plantings should be undertaken on the winte ranges to determine seeding and/or planting rates, methods of such, and species.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other resource activity recommendation: The long-term environmental impacts would be beneficial by developing a diversity of species in areas and also improving both quality and quantity of winter forage for mule deer. The initial economic investment would be higher per acre than a normal seeding; however, when properly designed it will add a critical ingredient which cannot be judged from an economic viewpoint.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 2.4

Implement grazing systems that will assure that no more than 1/3 of the critical winter ranges are grazed in the fall (after August 15).

RATIONALE

To improve both quality and quantity of forage for wintering deer, 2/3 of the critical deer winter ranges should be closed to livestock grazing after 8/15. Normally the herbaceous vegetation begins to dry on or about this date causing the livestock to turn toward the more nutritious shrubs resulting in a reduction of available winte forage for deer.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The only activity recommendation which could conflict concerns range management. Presently the four critical winter range areas encompass five allotments. The proposal is to revise or implement AMPs on three of the critical areas. Consequently this recommendation, if considered when implementing the AMPs, should not create any major conflicts. The King Hill critical range encompasses two allotments and it is not felt that under the existing AMPs that this recommendation will create a significant conflict.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 2.5

Defer livestock grazing on the critical deer winter ranges west of Highway 46 until after April 15, and those critical ranges east of Highway 46 until after May 1.

RATIONALE

The food habits of livestock and deer are very similar during the spring period, and prior to April 15 there is only a limited amount of forage being produced. Consequently when both game and livestock are on an area prior to April 15, there is competition for the existing forage. Deer have been under stress for several months due to cold temperatures and lack of high quali forage, and if additional stress is employe due to a lack of spring forage it could seriously impact the population.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with the range management recommendation concerning opening dates. However, the recommended opening dates on critical areas lying west of Highay 46 coincides with the adjudicated opening date. The recommended opening date in areas lying east of Highway 46 does not complement the adjudicated opening da but does coincide with the overall feeling of the resource managers that May 1 would more aptly fit the physiological requirements of the vegetation.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Encourage the livestock users to defer grazing on the critical deer winter ranges until after April 15 on those areas west of Highway 46 and after April 30 on those areas east of Highway 46.

Reasons

Step 1 recommendation conflicted with the RM recommendation concerning opening dates; however, it was felt that from the multiple-use aspect the users should be encouraged to defer grazing for approximately two weeks.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

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

WL - 2.5 (Continued)

Decision

Modify the Step 2 multiple use recommendation as follows:

Establish opening dates for livestock grazing compatible with identified wildlife needs.

Reasons

As a rule, livestock grazing seasons (opening and closing dates) have been established by previous range adjudication. A fixed season of use is one of the basic criteria to provide stability to a year round livestock operation.

An allotment management plan is the vehicle which allows flexibility in seasons of use. The normal season of use and allowable flexibility should be established or adjusted in AMP formulation to best-fit the needs of livestock and wildlife in any given allotment.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H. T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL 2.6

Close the critical deer winter ranges to off-road vehicles from December 15 through March 31.

RATIONALE

Deer during the winter are under considerable stress due to deep snow, cold temperatures, and a lack of quality forage. Additional stress, such as harassment from humans or their machines could severely impair their ability to survive the winter.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with recreation recommendation R-8.2 which recommends that the entire unit remain open to ORVs. However, since the critical deer areas are restricted to a small percentage of the unit and ORVs are felt to cause undue stress on wintering animals, the recreation recommendation will be modified.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

The critical areas do not constitute a large portion of the unit nor do they involve areas which are excellent snowmobile areas. Consequently it is not felt that the closure will significantly impact existing ORV use.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. – T.H.
Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills–Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

WINTER DEER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL 2.7

If the ongoing telemetry study identifies that definite deer migration routes exist in the planning units, such routes should be managed to insure that no barriers are created that would prevent the animals from goinging access to their winter ranges.

RATIONALE

In order to increase deer numbers the migration routes to and from the winter ranges must remain open and available to the animals.

Multiple-Use Analysis

There are no significant conflicts created by this recommendation with other resource activities, and it is felt that the recommendation should remain unchanged.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale as stated above.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION

WL 2.8

Coordinate with the wildlife program any brush removal project that is located on deer winter range, to insure that adequate winter deer forage and cover are maintained.

RATIONALE

Sagebrush comprises an important component of the deer's winter diet and the indiscriminate removal of brush could seriously impact winter mule deer population.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation complements watershed recommendation W-1.4 and Recreation recommendations R-4.1, .2, .3, and constitutes a minor conflict with range management recommendations dealing with brush removal. However, the wildlife recommendation does not preclude brush removal, it only states that sufficient brush needs to be maintained to meet the habitat requirements of wintering deer. Since the public value will be best served by maintaining and/or improving the deer populations as well as providing additional forage for livestock the wildlife recommendation, as proposed, will remain the same.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. – T.H.
Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

DEER WINTER (d_{wt})

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 2.9 Propose no land disposal actions for any areas identified as deer winter range. Support: Initiate a land exchange to gain ownership of the private land identified as critical deer winter range on Picabo Hills.	In order to successfully winter the projecte increase in deer numbers the existing winte range areas must be retained in public ownership and managed accordingly.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation complements all activity recommendations except for lands. Lands recommendation L-3.1A recommends the disposal of a small portion of winter range located north of Bliss. This area lies on the fringes of the agricultural land and is felt to have more public value in its present native state as winter range than it would as agricultural land. By excluding this small area from the lands recommendation there would not be a significant impact on the overall disposal plan.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	The winter range area has greater public value in its present state than it would hav if sold to a private individual.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	3

OBJECTIVE:

Manage the existing 77,000 acres of summer habitat and 26,000 acres of winter habitat in the Bennett Hills Planning Unit in order to provide adequate food and cover for 400 elk by 1990.

RATIONALE:

The PAA has identified the resident elk herds in the Bennett Hills Planning Unit as having moderate significance to local interests and these individuals feel that the transplant that took place in 1965 has been good for the area. By improving the elk habitat there would be a resultant effect of increasing numbers, thus enhancing the recreational hunting opportunities in the unit. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game elk policy plans for units 45 and 52 recognize a potential to increase the population by 160 and 150 percent respectively.

B.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills–Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ELK RANGE (e)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 3.1 Intensively manage livestock grazing throughout elk summer and winter habitat in order to ensure that no more than 60 percent of the herbaceous vegetation and 40 percent of the current annual growth of shrubs are utilized by livestock on the summer and winter ranges respectively.	Food habit studies indicate that cattle and elk forage preference are very similar. Consequently, to provide additional forage for the expected increase in elk numbers, grazing management will need to be intensified in order to provide additional forage.

Multiple–Use Analysis

The recommendation is complementary to watershed recommendation W–1.3 and recreation recommendations R–4.1, 2 and 3. It could produce a minor conflict with the range management recommendation that deals with maximizing the grazing program. However, since the foraging habitat of both elk and cattle is similar the improvement practices and grazing systems used to enhance the vegetative resource for livestock should also prove beneficial for elk. It appears that the over-all public values, not only for wildlife but also watershed and recreation, will be enhanced by maintaining a residual cover of both herbaceous and browse vegetation throughout all pastures.

Multiple–Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple–Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision	Reasons
Modify the Step 2 multiple use recommendation as follows: Maximum allowable utilization by livestock in any pasture will be determined in the formulation of the AMP. The degree of utilization in any use pasture will not exceed the identified needs of wildlife (food and cover) and watershed protection.	To allow more flexibility in development of specific grazing systems and AMPs commensurate with related on-site needs.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

ELK RANGE (e)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 3.2 Reduce the sagebrush cover by 40 to 60 percent on elk summer ranges where the canopy cover exceeds 25 percent.	To meet the expected increase in elk number additional forage is required. The reduction in sagebrush and corresponding increases in herbaceous vegetation would help meet this increase.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation complements watershed recommendation W-1.4, recreation recommendations R-4.1, 2 and 3, and those range management recommendations dealing with brush removal. Although it is somewhat more restricted than the range management recommendations it is not considered as conflicting with them. Refer to the Multiple-Use Analysis in wildlife recommendations WL - 2.2 for additional detail concerning this recommendation's conflict with WL - 7.1.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendations as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

B.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ELK RANGE (e)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 3.3 Establish studies to determine if inter-specific competition between deer and elk exists on the elk winter ranges.	As the deer and elk populations increase, it is possible that competition for forage will occur. This study will be necessary in order to make logical recommendations on how to eliminate such competition.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with other resource activity recommendations, nor will it present any adverse economic or social impacts.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills–Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ELK RANGE (e)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 3.4 Determine the habitat requirements necessary for elk calving areas.	No information is presently available that adequately describes elk calving areas in the sagebrush–bunchgrass environment. A radio telemetry study is now underway which should give us this information. If sagebrush is a requirement for calving it could have an impact on the recommendation concerning the reduction of sagebrush.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with other resource activity recommendations, nor does it present any adverse economic or social impacts.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ELK RANGE (e)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 3.4 Determine the habitat requirements necessary for elk calving areas.	No information is presently available that adequately describes elk calving areas in the sagebrush-bunchgrass environment. A radio telemetry study is now underway which should give us this information. If sagebrush is a requirement for calving it could have an impact on the recommendation concerning the reduction of sagebrush.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with other resource activity recommendations, nor does it present any adverse economic or social impacts.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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): B.H. Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference: Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ELK RANGE (e)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 3.5 Close the elk winter ranges to off-road vehicles between December 15 and March 31.	Elk are under significant stress due to the winter conditions and low quality forage, and additional stress created by human disturbance could adversely impact the animals

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with recreation recommendation R-8.2 which recommends that the entire unit remain open to ORVs. However, this is not felt to constitute a major conflict since the critical elk winter range is restricted to only a small area which does not provide good snowmobile riding. Consequently, the recreation recommendation will be modified to exclude ORVs use on the elk winter range between December 15 and March 31.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	The ORV closure will not significantly affe ORV uses but will provide an added measure or seclusion to winter elk.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	4

OBJECTIVE:

Determine the feasibility of expanding the antelope habitat in both the Bennett and Timmerman Hills Planning Units in order to provide huntable population by 1980.

RATIONALE:

The PAA states that the public would like to see more antelope throughout the planning units. In addition the URA has made the assumption that additional animals could be maintained if habitat conditions are maintained and/or improved. However, the URA also identifies that information is lacking concerning both the habitat conditions and animal population characteristics. Consequently, before the Bureau can effectively manage antelope habitat, studies will have to be initiated.

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ANTELOPE (a)

RECOMMENDATION

WL 4.1

Cooperatively with the Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game initiate studies to determine: 1) the population characteristics of the antelope herds; 2) the limiting habitat factors, if any, that have prevented the animals from expanding their distribution; 3) the present antelope distribution throughout the year.

RATIONALE

The same rationale presented for objective No. 4 is applicable to this recommendation.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation will cause no adverse social, environmental, or economic impacts, nor does it conflict with other resource activity recommendations.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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 – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*
Activity: Wildlife
Objective Number: 5

OBJECTIVES:

Manage 59,000 acres of antelope habitat in the Timmerman and Bennett Hills Planning Units.

RATIONALE:

The rationale presented for objective 4 applies to this objective as well. In addition, in order to maintain the present base population of antelope the limited amount of habitat identified in the URA should be maintained and/or improved.

B.H. - T. H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ANTELOPE (a)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 5.1 Establish and maintain a vegetative composition such that succulent forbs comprise between 15- 20 percent of the vegetation on antelope ranges.	Food habit studies show that forbs comprise more than 60 percent of the antelope summer diet. Succulent summer forbs appear to be lacking throughout most of the antelope range. Consequently, the introduction or establishment of forbs could substantially improve the ranges for antelope.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with other resource activity recommendations, nor will it produce any adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendations as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ANTELOPE (a)

RECOMMENDATION

WL 5.2

Maintain randomly distributed sagebrush patches, 2- 4 acres in size (canopy cover > 20 percent, brush height > 40 cm) throughout the identified antelope habitat.

RATIONALE

Idaho studies indicate that antelope fawnin sites normally occur within sagebrush and that fawns will normally remain in such brush until two weeks old. Consequently, these patches are required in order to provide adequate fawn cover and fawning sites.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation could provide a minor conflict with the range management recommen ation dealing with sagebrush removal. However, the patches of brush maintained are extremely small and the preservation of these patches will not adversely impact a brush removal project of any size. The environmental affects will be enhanced by providing fawning site for antelope in addition to habitat for other wildlife.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. – T. H.
Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

ANTELOPE (a)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 5.3 All new fences constructed on antelope ranges should be constructed according to specifications presented in the 1737 Fencing Manual. Any existing fence that impedes or alters antelope movement should be modified to allow their passage.	Studies have shown that antelope normally prefer to go under or through fences rather than jump them. Consequently, when confronted with a fence which cannot be negotiated in this manner, their access is blocked. In order to maintain unimpaired movement of animals the fence specifications outlined in BLM Manual 1737 should be imployed.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Since this recommendation conforms with the 1737 Fencing Manual it is assumed that the social, economic, and environmental impacts were assessed prior to the manual release and found to be favorable in conjunction with the above recommendation.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reasons
Accept the recommendations as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	6

OBJECTIVE:

Improve 283,000 acres of sage grouse brood rearing habitat in the Bennett Hills and Timmerman Hills Planning Units in order to provide adequate food, cover, and water for a prehunting season population of 20,000 sage grouse by 1990.

RATIONALE:

Sage grouse are the most significant upland game bird throughout the two planning units and provide the greatest number of recreational bird hunting hours in the unit. An economic study conducted in 1972 indicated that approximately $65,000 is generated during the opening weekend of sage grouse season in the Timmerman and Bennett Hills Planning Units. The PAA indicates there is a public concern for sage grouse habitat by the fact that they feel livestock are competing with sage grouse for the available succulent forage. If the sage grouse populations are to be enhanced, the Bureau will have to intensively manage one of the most important segments of the sage grouse requirements, brood rearing habitat.

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills- Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

SAGE GROUSE SUMMER (Sgsu)

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 6.1

Selectively reduce sagebrush throughout the broodrearing habitat, in order to improve the vegetative forb composition.

RATIONALE

The reduction of sagebrush would reduce the competition for moisture, nutrients, and space, thus providing improved growing conditions for succulent forbs. The forbs would produce additional forage for the expected increase in sage grouse population: It must be noted that the broodrearing habitat is identical to the nesting habitat and in most cases winter habitat. Since sagebrush is a must for nesting and winteri sage grouse any brush removal proposals should be closely coordinated with sage grouse requirements for all periods of the year.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to watershed recommendation W-1.4 and recreation recommendations R-4.1, 2 & 3, and the range management recommendations dealing with brush removal. It conflicts with wildlife recommendations WL-2.2 and WL 7.1 which deal with maintaining the existing brush on critical deer winter range and sage grouse nesting and wintering areas. Since the broodrearing areas are some times synonomous with sage grouse nesting and wintering, as well as deer wintering, certain brush removal projects could cause adverse environmental impacts. Consequently, this recommendation will be modified to exclude critical deer winter ranges and identified sage grouse winter areas, and the recommendation concerning nesting areas will be modified to the extent that brush removal will be allowed so long as sufficient brush is maintained for present and future sage grouse nesting populations.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Selectively reduce sagebrush throughout those portions of sage grouse broodrearing habitat that does not encompass either critical deer winter range or winter sage grouse habitat.

Reason

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

WL - 6.1 (Continued)

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

SAGE GROUSE SUMMER (SGsu)

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 6.2

Exclude livestock and other non-compatible use from spring and wet-meadow areas as identified on the wildlife overlay.

RATIONALE

Livestock presently congregate along the water source areas reducing the existing vegetation that is essential to provide adequate forage for sage grouse broods.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to watershed recommendation W 4.2 but does conflict with range management recommendations dealing with the free movement of livestock. It is not felt that the conflict with range management is a major one. Small areas would not be available to domestic animals, but in no instance would water become unavailable. It is presently unknown what the vegetative responses on wet meadows will be to the implementation of rest-rotation grazing systems. Since grazing systems are proposed for the majority of the areas containing wet meadows it appears foolhardy to propose a fencing program when perhaps the meadows will respond to a grazing system.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Selectively fence spring areas, and monitor the response of wet meadows to the implemented grazing systems. Following one cycle of the systems examine the meadows and determine if the wildlife values have improved. If no improvement is shown begin a program to selectively fence the wet meadows.

Reasons

The wildlife recommendation concerning wet meadows has been modified at this time in order to study the vegetative response of a wet meadow under an intensively managed grazing system.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Reasons

Based on specific grazing system design and allotment location, trend or change may not become apparent until after more than one grazing cycle.

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

B. H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

SAGE GROUSE SUMMER (SGsu)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL - 6.3 Establish livestock grazing systems that will enhance the reproduction and forage availability of forbs.	Livestock grazing systems offer us one metho by which to improve sage grouse brood rearir habitat. However, the system in order to improve forbs must be based upon their physiological requirements.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other resource activity recommendation; however, it will place some constraints on the development and implementation of AMPs. Specific forbs, valuable to grouse, will need to be identified and their physiological requirements taken into consideration when developing the AMP.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reason
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	7

OBJECTIVE:

Manage the existing sagebrush on 283,000 acres of nesting habitat and 38,000 acres of winter habitat in order to provide the necessary nesting cover and winter forage and cover for a prehunting season population of 20,000 sage grouse in the two planning units.

RATIONALE:

In addition to the rationale presented in objective 6, sage grouse are almost solely dependent upon sagebrush for nesting cover and winter forage. Recent Idaho research has shown that 90 percent of the nesting hens nest within a two-mile radius of their breeding grounds. Guidelines for Habitat Protection in Sage Grouse Range states "the breeding complex (strutting grounds and nesting areas) will be considered as all lands within a two-mile radius of occupied strutting grounds. Vegetatal control will not be undertaken within two miles of strutting grounds or on nesting and other special use areas". (e.g. wintering areas.)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

B.H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

SAGE GROUSE WINTER (n)

RECOMMENDATION

WL 7-1

Maintain the existing sagebrush within a 2-mile radius of sage grouse strutting grounds and on all identified sage grouse wintering areas.

RATIONALE

Sage grouse are almost solely depending upo sagebrush for nesting, and recent Idaho research has shown that 90 percent of the nesting hens nest within two miles of the grounds. In addition, sagebrush makes up between 95 to 100 percent of the grouse's winter diet. Therefore, in order to provide adequate nesting habitat and winter forage for the expected increase in grouse numbers sufficient brush must be retained on the nesting and wintering areas.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with the wildlife recommendations WL-1.2, 3.2, 6.1, watershed recommendation W-1.4, and the range management recommendations dealing with the removal of sagebrush. In areas where critical deer winter range overlaps with sage grouse nesting and winter habitat, the above recommendation is complementary to wildlife recommendation WL-2.2.

The unrestrained removal of sagebrush adjacent to sage grouse strutting grounds could and would have a catastrophic impact on sage grouse populations. However, in instanc where brush is not limiting, a well designed and implemented sagebrush control project would not adversely impact nesting grouse, and in fact could prove beneficial in those areas where broodrearing and nesting habitat overlap. Sage grouse are solely dependent upon sagebrush during the winter months and it appears that any brush control on such concentrated wintering areas would adversely impact grouse.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Selectively control sagebrush within a 2-mile radius of strutting grounds in a manner that will not adversely impact present and future nesting sage grouse populations. No brush control projects will be proposed on sage grouse wintering areas.

Reasons

The recommendation was modified because it was felt that selective control would not adversely impact nesting grouse and would be beneficial for other resource activities

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H. - T. H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

WL 7-1 (Continued)

Decision

Adopt Step 2 multiple use recommendation with the following modification:

Selective brush control may be under taken on sage grouse wintering areas only after careful consideration that remaining sagebrush habitat will be adequate for projected sage grouse populations.

Reason

(See Appendix I and II of the Range Management section).

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	8

OBJECTIVE:

Manage the upland game bird habitat throughout the two planning units, and provide a diversity of vegetative species in order to provide a variety of habitats for the five species of upland game birds.

RATIONALE:

The upland game bird populations throughout both planning units are presently providing only marginal hunting opportunities for the recreationist. The URA assumes that the major cause for the low populations of birds is due to a lack of sufficient diversity of plant species. Four of the five species inhabit the nonirrigable native vegetation and by improving the vegetative conditions one could expect a significant increase in bird numbers. The fifth upland game bird (Ring-necked Pheasant) is dependent upon the agricultural lands for its food; however, with the increased emphasis being placed on overhead sprinkler systems and clean-farming practices, the sagebrush tracts adjacent to farms are becoming increasingly more important for winter and escape cover.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

B.H. – T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

PHEASANT COVER (P)

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 8.1

Retain in public ownership and exclude livestock from areas identified as pheasant escape and winter habitat, except when grazing is shown to be beneficial to wildlife.

RATIONALE

The sagebrush tracts adjacent to private land are becoming increasingly important to upland game, such as Hungarian partridge and pheasants, for winter and escape cover. The clean farming practices, combined with overhead sprinkler systems, have reduced the habitat suitable for these birds. Therefore the birds are becoming more dependent upon the sagebrush to provide their cover needs. The exclusion of livestock will increase the understory vegetation, thus providing sufficient cover to facilitate nesting.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with lands recommendation L-3.1, & 2 dealing with the disposal of National Resource Land and those range management recommendations dealing with intensive livestock grazing management. The lands identified for retention lie adjacent to private land and provide an integral habitat requirement to pheasants that is generally unavailable on private lands. They constitute only a very small percentage of the total National Resource Land in the unit, and the exclusion of grazing on this small an area would not produce a significant hardship on the livestock grazing users. The majority of the lands are marginal from the agricultural standpoint and retention in public ownership would prove more beneficial to the majority of the public. It appears that through a Sykes Act Cooperative Agreement with the Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game there is a possibility where these tracts could be partially farmed and still retain their wildlife habitat values.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

UPLAND GAME BIRDS

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 8.2

Intensively manage grazing livestock to insure that no more than 60 percent of the herbaceous vegetation is utilized by livestock in any pasture involving upland game bird habitat.

RATIONALE

Forbs and grasses are extremely important components in the life cycles of upland game birds. Their increased availability due to the reduced utilization by livestock will significantly enhance the birds habitat.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation complements watershed recommendation W-1.3, recreation recommendation R-4.1, 2 & 3, and wildlife recommendations WL-1.1, 3.1 & 12.1. It does conflict with the range management recommendations dealing with maximizing livestock grazing.

It appears that the over-all public values, not only for wildlife but also recreation and wildlife, would be enhanced by maintaining a residual cover of herbaceous vegetation throughout upland game bird habitat. There would be no adverse social or economic impacts to any user group of the National Resource Lands.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

Reason

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Modify the Step 2 multiple use recommendation as follows:

Maximum allowable utilization by livestock in any pasture will be determined in the formulation of the AMP. The degree of utilization in any use pasture will not exceed the identified needs of wildlife (food and Cover) and watershed protection.

Reasons

To allow more flexibility in development of specific grazing systems and AMPs commensurate with related on-site needs.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

UPLAND GAME BIRDS

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 8.3

Establish livestock grazing systems in order to establish a diverse vegetative composition (15- 20 percent shrubs, 20- 25 percent forbs, and 50- 65 percent grasses) throughout the upland game bird habitat.

RATIONALE

Managing these areas for a diversity of vegetation will provide excellent nesting and escape cover, as well as providing a range of forage species that will be available throughout the entire year.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to wildlife recommendations WL-5.1, 6.3 and 12.1 and doesn't conflict with any other resource activity recommendation. It will, however, constraint the type of AMP that is developed in upland game bird habitat, but this should not detract from the plan's primary object, which is to improve the over-all vegetative resource.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	9

OBJECTIVE:

Provide nesting cover for waterfowl and shorebirds along the entire 295 miles of streams and canals and around the 2,000 surface acres of reservoirs on National Resource Lands in the Timmerman and Bennett Hills Planning Units.

RATIONALE:

The URAs identify that nesting cover is the single most important factor limiting the waterfowl production throughout the planning units. If areas adjacent to streams, canals, and reservoirs, where managed to provide a dense understory of vegetative species, the resident waterfowl populations would be significantly enhanced. The increase in production would prove very beneficial to the early season duck hunters. The large influx (100,000 plus) of winter migrants which normally produce the majority of the duck hunting in Magic Valley, doesn't arrive until late November or early December. Consequently, when the resident production is low the duck hunting is poor for the first two months of the season.

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference: Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

WATERFOWL (d)

RECOMMENDATION

WL 9.1

Exclude livestock and other noncompatible uses from the areas identified for waterfowl nesting, except at times when it is deemed such uses would prove beneficial for wildlife.

RATIONALE

Livestock presently congregate along water source areas reducing the existing vegetation that provides critical escape and nesting cover for shorebirds and waterfowl.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation produces a major conflict with the range management recommendation to maximize livestock grazing. In specific areas where upland game bird habitat (pheasants) and waterfowl nesting habitat overlap the recommendation complements wildlife recommendation WL-8.1.

There is a considerable amount of National Resource Land that has the potential to provide waterfowl nesting habitat. However, any effort made to exclude livestock would create a major impact on the development of AMPs.

In addition, the exclusion of livestock and corresponding increase in vegetative cover would be detrimental to the irrigation companies that maintain the many miles of canals throughout the unit. However, by selectively excluding livestock along areas that are not maintained by canal companies (natural run-off areas), and major reservoirs and streams, the nesting potential can be significantly increased without creating a significant conflict with the range management activity.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Selectively exclude livestock from those reservoirs, streams, and canal reaches identified on the wildlife overlay except when such use is deemed beneficial for wildlife.

Reasons

This recommendation has been modified because in its present state it produces a major conflict with grazing management. As it is now written only on major nesting area will livestock be excluded and at no time will the project prevent livestock from access to adequate water.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

WATERFOWL (d)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL - 9.2 Establish vegetation such as tall wheatgrass, crested wheatgrass, alfalfa, etc., in conjunction with existing sagebrush along the water course areas and reservoirs.	The introduction of such spcies will increase both quality and quantity of wildlife cover, thus providing additional nesting areas and increased brood survival. In addition to improved waterfowl habitat these seedings would also have a similarly beneficial impact on shorebirds.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation complements watershed recommendation W-1.5 and wildlife recommendations WL-8.3 and 12.1 which deal with providing a diversity of vegetative species. It does not conflict with any resource activity recommendation. The initial cost of the seeding would be increased; however, the long-term effects of the project would prove significantly beneficial to all resource activities and the public in general.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendations as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	10

OBJECTIVES:

Increase the nesting goose populations on Thorn Creek, Spring Creek, and Mormon Reservoirs by eight to ten pair on Thorn Creek and Spring Creek, and by 25 percent on Mormon Reservoir.

RATIONALE:

Geese, in addition to their aesthetic qualities, are considered by many hunters to be a trophy species. The URA recognizes the potential to increase goose production on several reservoirs throughout the planning unit. If nesting sites were developed successfully the only adverse impacts that might arise would concern itself with fishing. During late springs it is possible that conflicts would occur between fisherman and incubating geese, thus causing certain portions of reservoirs to be closed to fishing for short periods of time.

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

GEESE (gee)

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 10.1

In conjunction with the Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game initiate the construction of goose nesting sites on Mormon, Thorn Creek, Spring Creek, Pioneer, and Sonners Reservoirs.

RATIONALE

Food, water, and resting areas are in adequate supply for nesting geese, but due to the lack of features such as islands, promotories, or isolated areas, good nesting sites are unavailable. The construction of nesting platforms and small islands would provide the necessary sites, thus increasing the number of geese produced on these reservoirs.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with no other resource activity recommendation and would prove beneficial both socially and economically.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reason
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

GEESE (gee)

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 10.2

Monitor the effects of public disturbance on nesting geese and other waterfowl. If such disturbance is identified as influencing the nesting behavior of these birds, steps should be undertaken to eliminate or reduce the disturbance.

RATIONALE

With the ever-increasing public use of thes reservoirs there is an increased possibilit that public use could adversely affect wate fowl and shorebird nesting success. The greatest potential impact involves nesting geese. Geese normally nest in the open and depend upon their size and senses to protec their nests while most other birds depend upon concealment, concealing their nests in dense vegetation. During most years it is felt that the breeding and incubation perio is over prior to the opening of the fishing season. However, during extremely late springs it is possible that geese and other waterfowl would still be nesting during the opening of the fishing season.

If it is determined that nesting continues into the fishing season more than just occasionally, it should then be determined what impacts the fishing public has on nesting birds, and how these impacts should be mitigated.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation to monitor the effects of public disturbance on nesting geese will have no impact on any resource recommendation. However, if it appears that disturbance is a factor limiting the productivity of these birds, depending upon what measures are taken to eliminate the disturbance, it could conflict with the recreation resource on certain reservoirs (refer to the rationale). At this point it is unknown if human disturbance is a factor and even if it were there have been no plans formulated to mitigate it. Consequently, it is felt that under the present conditions it is premature to identify a conflict and/or change the recommendation.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reason
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

WL - 10.2

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

B.H. – T.H.
Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman-Hill
Activity
Wildlife
Objective Number
11

OBJECTIVE:

Protect the 14 known eagle eyries in the Bennett Hills Planning Unit and manage the vegetative cover within a two-mile radius of the nest sites such that it provides adequate food and cover for the birds' major prey species.

RATIONALE:

Raptors and specifically golden eagles are an abundant and very important nongame species inhabitating the planning units. As the importance of these birds increase over time more and more emphasis will be placed on the management and improvement of their habitat. The URA has recognized that in order to maintain and/or increase the number of breeding birds, it will be necessary to: 1, manage the habitat in order to maximize the prey species; and 2, minimize the human disturbance of nesting birds.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

B.H. - T.H.

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2. Step 3

EAGLE EYRIES

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL - 11.1 Retain in public ownership and manage the vegetative cover within a two-mile radius of the known eagle eyries in order to maintain and/or enhance the birds prey species.	Studies indicate that jackrabbits and marmonts, when available, are the primary prey of golden eagles in this vicinity. If adequate food sources are to remain available for these birds, the undeveloped National Resource Lands should be maintained in a state which provides adequate habitat for such animals.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with the range management recommendations dealing with the control of sagebrush. It is complementary to watershed recommendation W-1.4, recreation recommendations R4.1, 2 & 3, and wildlife recommendations WL-8.2 and 12.1, and where eagle eyries are located on deer winter range 2.2 and 2.8.

Since this recommendation does not preclude the control of brush but only states that the vegetation should be managed such that the birds major prey are maintained and/or enhanced, it is not felt that this recommendation constitutes a major conflict with range management.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendations as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision	Reasons
Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation	(See Appendix I and II of Range Management for additional coordination criteria).

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

B.H. - T.H.

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Activity
Wildlife

Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

EAGLE EYRIES

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 11.2

Close the National Resource Lands within 1/2 mile of known eyries to off-road vehicles and discourage other human activities during the nesting season (Feb. - June).

RATIONALE

Eagles, when excessively disturbed by man, will abandon their nests. These birds are more vulnerable to man and his depredation during the nesting period, especially during incubation (Mar.-mid-April) and if disturbed they will abandon their nests.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with recreation recommendation R-8.2, which recommends that the entire unit remain open to ORVs. However, since it is felt that ORV use, specifically motorcycles, could cause harassment and nest abandonment, and that the areas as identified are only a small portion of the unit, the recreation recommendation will be modified.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

The ORV closure will not significantly affect ORV use, but will provide an added measure of seclusion to the nesting birds.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 None Step 3

BIRDS OF PREY

RECOMMENDATION

WL - 11.3

Initiate studies and inventories to determine the species, their population dynamics, and habitat requirements of the raptors inhabiting the planning unit.

RATIONALE

There are nine species of raptors and five species of owls which inhabit the planning unit. If we are going to adequately manage raptor habitat, these inventories and studies will have to be made.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation will cause no adverse social, environmental, or economic impacts, nor does it conflict with other resource activity recommendations.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	12

OBJECTIVE:

Manage for a maximum diversity of vegetative species in order to meet the habitat requirements for a variety of wildlife species.

RATIONALE:

To identify and discuss in the URAs the habitat requirements of all the wildlife species inhabitating the planning units would be impossible. Consequently, we must recognize that many species which have specific habitat requirements have not been identified in the URAs. Therefore, prior to the initiation of any project or activity that could adversely affect the animal or its habitat, impacts of the project or activity must be considered. Public attitudes have changed over the past several years and the wildlife management emphasis has gone from a concern primarily for game species to one of concern for both nongame as well as game animals. The Bureau's Supplemental Guidance (1603.12D3a) identifies this changing emphasis.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

B.H. – T.H.
Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hi
Activity

Wildlife
Overlay Reference

Step 1 None Step 3

ALL WILDLIFE

RECOMMENDATION

WL 12.1

Intensively manage grazing livestock to ensure that no more than 60 percent of the herbaceious vegetation is utilized by livestock in any pasture, and implement grazing systems to establish and maintain a diverse vegetative composition (20- 25 percent forbs, 55- 65 percent grasses, and 15- 20 percent shrubs) throughout both planning units.

RATIONALE

A good variety of vegetative species would provide succulent, highly nutritious forage for many small mammals and birds, and also provide them with excellent cover. Improve habitat conditions for small herbivorous mammals will both directly and indirectly improve carnivorous animal habitat.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation complements watershed recommendation W-1.3, recreation recommendations R-4.1, 2 & 3, and wildlife recommendations WL-1.1, 3.1, and 8.2. It does not conflict with other resource recommendations, but it does constrain the development and management of AMPs.

It is felt that over-all public values would be enhanced by maintaining the residual herbaceous vegetation and developing a diversity of vegetative species. The short-term cost of implementing such a grazing system would be higher, but over the long-term the social and economic benefits would outweigh the initial cost.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Modify the Step 2 multiple use recommendation as follows:

Maximum allowable utilization by livestock in any pasture will be determined in the formulation of the AMP. The degree of utilization in any use pasture will not

Reasons

To allow more flexibility in development of specific grazing systems and AMPs commensurate with related on-site needs.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

B.H - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 None Step 3

WL 12-1

Continuation - Decision

exceed the identified needs of wildlife (food and cover) and water shed protection.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 None Step 3

ALL WILDLIFE

RECOMMENDATION

WL 12.2

To insure that all wildlife habitat needs are met, any and all land treatment projects should be coordinated with the wildlife program. Considerations to keep in mind for such projects are: forage requirements, availability, quality, succulence, and cover and water availability.

RATIONALE

This is in accordance with 1603.12D3a, 12D4b, and 12D4c, Idaho Manual Supplement 6711.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with other resource activities, nor will it produce any adverse social or economic impacts.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name *(MFP)*	
Activity	Wildlife
Objective Number	13

OBJECTIVE:

Manage the 51 miles of streams and associated riparian habitat in order to maximize the fisheries potential in both the Bennett and Timmerman Hills Planning units.

RATIONALE:

The PAA and URAs identify that the fisheries resources throughout the planning units are important to both the local and surrounding communities. Noted fishery problems, to date, have been identified only for the larger more significant reservoirs or streams. The Bennett Hills URA indicates that perhaps there is an excellent potential to expand or enhance the fisheries in many small streams and reservoirs. However, before any firm recommendations can be made, certain studies should be undertaken to determine what the potential is for these waters.

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*: Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity: Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 3 Step 3

FISHERIES

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 13.1 Improve the riparian habitat and fisheries habitat by excluding livestock along the reaches of King Hill Creek, Dry Creek, and Clover Creek.	Improved riparian habitat along the streams will enhance the fisheries habitat by reducing the water temperatures, provide shad areas for fish, increase their food supplie and in instances increase the dissolved oxygen content of the water.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to watershed recommendation W-3.3 to improve water quality, and recreation recommendation R-1.1 to increase the fisheries throughou the unit. Although it will constrain the range management recommendations dealing with livestock grazing it is not considered as conflicting with these recommendations It appears that in addition to the enhancement of the fisheries habitat both the recreation and watershed values will be benefitted at little or no expense to other resource activities.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendations as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

B.H. - T.H.
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 None Step 3

FISHERIES

RECOMMENDATION

WL 13.2

Intensive surveys should be made to determine the fisheries potential within all the streams and reservoirs throughout the two planning units. Additionally, these surveys would gather water quality data, identify stream improvement measures, and potential beaver introduction areas.

RATIONALE

The Bureau is judged with the responsibilit to maintain and/or improve the water qualit in streams, etc., which arise or run throug National Resource Lands. Associated directly with water quality is the fisherie potential of any stream. Before recommendations or management programs can be developed certain basic data must be available This data is presently lacking throughout the planning units and must be gathered if we are to accept our management responsibilities.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other resource recommendation, nor does it create any adverse impact on the environment. If the information is not gathered it could have serious environmental as well as economic impacts.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reason

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

B.H. - T.H.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name *(MFP)*
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
Activity
Wildlife
Overlay Reference
Step 1 None Step 3

FISHERIES

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
WL 13.3 Improve the overall watershed conditions within both planning units.	By improving the watershed conditions the quality of water would be enhanced, and secondly, it would extend or prolong the run-off thus lengthening the time that streams would have water in them.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation complements watershed recommendation W-3.2, and range management recommendations dealing with the adjustment of stocking rates, and implementing grazing systems. It does not conflict with other resource activity recommendations, nor would there be any adverse economic or environmental impacts created.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendations as stated above.	Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)