

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

66
Name (MFP)

Activity

Range Management

Objective Number

1

OBJECTIVE:

Increase forage production from the present estimated 65,618 AUMs to the estimated potential production of 98,140 AUMs by 1990.

RATIONALE:

The Planning Area Analysis indicates increase in demand for forage in the Planning Area of over 50% by 1990. Approximately 22% of the total forage consumed in the Planning Area is produced on National Resource Lands. Forage produced on NRL generates \$283,762 of personal income in the Planning Area. The above figures indicate grazing on NRLs in the Planning Area is significant. Since the estimated potential production of live-stock forage is 98,140 AUMs while the P.A.A. projects a demand of 129,000 AUMs by 1990, the lesser figure was used (see 1608.31A1). Manual 1603.12G3b (Bureau long-term objectives for the range program) requires management which will "Provide forage to help meet the needs of the Nation, to help stabilize the economy of the livestock industry, individual users, and dependent communities!" Other pertinent guidance used to develop the objective is consistent with the above manual statement and includes the following: Basic Guidance - 1602 (1602.12, 1602.42c2a, b, 1602.42c3e) Supplemental Guidance - 1603 (1603.12G2a, b, 1603.12G3b, 1603.21a, b, 1603 - Appendix 1, Part II C 1); The Taylor Grazing Act (One of the purposes of the Act is "...to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range..."); and The Federal Grazing Regulations 43 CFR (4110.0-2, 4111.4-2).

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Timmerman-Bennett Hills
Activity	Range Management
Objective Number	2

OBJECTIVE:

Implement management practices on all grazing lands in the planning area to reach and maintain good range condition by 1996.

RATIONALE:

Step 3 of the URAs indicate a total of 153,608 acres are in Poor Condition, 315,191 acres are in Fair Condition, and only 154,529 acres are in Good Range Condition in the Planning Area. Step 3 and 4 of the URAs indicate present forage production is estimated to be only 67 percent of the potential. The full potential can be realized only if the range is in a good condition. Basic Guidance (1602.12) indicates the Bureau will "Protect the lands, resources, environment, and public values therein from avoidable destruction, abuse and deterioration, and correct past abuses to the extent feasible." Other pertinent guidance used to develop this objective is consistent with the above statement and includes the following: Basic Guidance (1602.11, .12, 113A, .42C2, 3, & 4); Supplemental Guidance (1603.12G3a); Federal Grazing Regulations (4110.0-2, 4111.2-1(a)). In addition, references listed in the rationale for Objective Number 1. apply to this objective.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Activity
Range Management

Objective Number
3

OBJECTIVE:

Provide for protection and conservation of ^{Threatened} endangered plants in the Planning Area.

RATIONALE:

Step II URA indicates four species ^{that are candidates for inclusion on the official list} of endangered plants have been found in the Planning Area. Section 7 of Public Law 93-205 places responsibility for conservation of endangered plants with the Bureau.

RANGE MANAGEMENT

<u>Allotment No.</u>	<u>Allotment Name</u>
0403	West Bliss
0404	Teceska
0405	101
0406	Pioneer
0413	King Hill
0414	Dempsey
0415	Indian
0416	Clover Creek
0417	Davis Mountain
0418	Black Canyon
0419	North Gooding
0420	Hash Spring
0421	Rattlesnake
0426	North Shoshone
0430	Kinze Butte
0431	Marsh Spring
0432	Macon Flat

Custodial

Appendix I

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

UNIT WIDE
Threatened & Endangered Plants

Page 1 of

RECOMMENDATIONS

RATIONALE

RM 3.1

1. Inventory threatened and endangered plants in the planning area.

The extent and locations of threatened and endangered plants are not known at the present time.

2. Consider the physiological requirements of threatened and endangered species when designing and implementing all grazing systems.

Management that is based on the physiological requirements of these plants will provide protection and encourage increased densities and propagation of these species.

3. Provide for adequate protection of threatened and endangered plant species where vegetation disturbing range improvement practices are proposed.

Range improvement practices that disturb the present vegetation composition could destroy threatened and endangered species.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation could have an adverse impact on livestock users in allotments where land treatments are proposed. If threatened and endangered plants are found to occupy proposed treatment areas, the acreage of treatable land would have to be reduced, thereby decreasing the potential increase in livestock forage production. The recommendation could restrict or prevent livestock grazing altogether if threatened and/or endangered plants are found which are susceptible to grazing.

The recommendation conflicts with wildlife, WL 1.2, 3.2, 6.1, 1.5; watershed, W 1.4, and range management, RM 1. & 2.2, which propose vegetation treatments which could destroy threatened and/or endangered plant species. Minerals, M 1.2 conflicts with the recommendation because development of the geothermal resource could destroy threatened and/or endangered plant species. Lands, 3.1A which calls for disposal of tracts of land for agriculture purposes, conflict with the requirement of protection and/or enhancement of threatened and/or endangered species.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following recommendations: WL 9.2; W 1.5; R 2.1; RM 1. & 2.5 (unit wide), and range management support recommendations for increased access in the form of roads and livestock trails. These conflicts should be addressed before any on the ground action is implemented to insure threatened and/or endangered plants are not disturbed.

The recommendation is supported by the following activity recommendations: WL 1.4, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 8.1, 8.3, 9.1, 12.1; W 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 3.3; RM 5.1, 6.1, 9.1, 14.6, 14.12, 14.15. Range management recommendations which propose improved

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 Hill	
Activity	Range Management	
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	No. 1	Step 3

Page 2 of

Multiple-Use Analysis (cont)

grazing management, and adjusting stocking rates to the proper carrying capacity, also support the recommendation.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept recommendations as stated above. Give overriding consideration to land disposal for agricultural purposes and to mineral leasing.

Reasons

Modified to allow for land disposal and mineral leasing because the impact to recommendation of these programs appears to be small at this time. This recommendation may be reconsidered as more information becomes available.

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 Hill
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No.1 Step 3

Page 1 of 2

UNIT WIDE
Noxious & Poisonous Plants

RECOMMENDATIONS

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.2

Map and inventory all noxious weeds and poisonous plants.

Adequate data is not available as to locations or concentrations of these plants. More information is needed so that preventative measures can be taken (i.e., spraying, rerouting livestock trailing, etc.).

Continue noxious and poisonous plant control program with counties.

The counties have taken the lead in the plant control program and are equipped to do the job where BLM is not. This program is partially funded by BLM.

Consider treatments for grazing systems in AMPs that work toward control or reduction of noxious and poisonous plants.

Grazing systems that are designed to work against the physiological needs of these plants will help to control and reduce them, thereby improve range condition and forage production.

Develop a noxious and poisonous plant control program with Elmore County.

No organized weed control program presently exists for that part of the planning unit within Elmore County.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would have no significant adverse economic impacts. However, a positive impact would occur where control on poisonous and noxious weeds reduce loss of livestock and infestation on private cropland.

The recommendation conflicts with wildlife, WL 2.2 and 7.1, which would prohibit treatments which would eliminate sagebrush in deer and sage grouse wintering areas. The recommendation conflicts with range management, RM 3.1 which calls for protection of threatened and/or endangered plant species. The herbicide application used in the weed control program could destroy some threatened and /or endangered plants.

The recommendation is in minor conflict with the following activity recommendations, WL 2.8, 5.1, 9.2, 11.1; R 2.1. These conflicts should be addressed prior to implementation of weed control practices on a site by site basis to insure adequate consideration of the resource values involved.

The recommendation does not support any other resource activity recommendations.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1500-21 (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

Page 2 of 2

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reason:

Accept the recommendation as stated above and include the following provision:

1. Coordinate noxious and poisonous plant control program with wildlife requirements so that no plants such as sagebrush that is critical to wildlife survival is destroyed.

2. Do not allow plant control where threatened and endangered plants are known to exist in significant densities.

Indiscriminate spraying could destroy vegetation necessary for wildlife survival or threaten or endangered species.

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

Page 1 of 2

UNIT WIDE
Exchange of Use

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 2.3

1. Adjust stocking rates where exchange of use licenses exceed the carrying capacity of the lands offered for exchange.

Current stocking rates appear to be in excess of the carrying capacity in many allotments. BLM Manual directs that exchange of use agreements "...may be issued...not to exceed the normal grazing capacity of such nonfederal land." (4115.21A6b.) Allowing stocking rates in excess of the carrying capacity of lands offered for exchange of use contributes to range deterioration.

2. Encourage exchange of use licenses in the allotment for land located only within the allotment boundaries.

Exchange of use agreements for lands outside the allotment have been allowed that do not work to the advantage of administration of the range and has resulted in over-obligation of the range resources. BLM Manual states that "Exchange of use agreements should benefit or work to the advantage of district administration by blocking up range areas...and establishing...operation advantageous to both range management and...the livestock industry." "Such agreements may be issued to applicants...of nonfederal lands that are interspersed and normally grazed in conjunction with a particular area of Federal range." (4115.21A6b).

The State Department of Public Lands has expressed a desire to have lessees exchange leases where possible so that allottees control leases within their allotments.

Multiple-Use Analysis

URA indicates stocking rates on much of the exchange of use lands may be in excess of the carrying capacity. Part I of this recommendation could result in reduction of grazing use authorized, and would, therefore, have an adverse economic impact on livestock operations involved. With proper management and/or land treatment, part of this impact could be mitigated over the long-run. Part 2 of this recommendation would have no significant economic impact on livestock operations involved.

The recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendations.

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 (cont)

Supporting recommendations include the following: WL 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 5.1, 8.2, 11.1, 12.1; W 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 5.2; R 1.1, 2.1, 3.2

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

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)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
Activity Range Management
Overlay Reference Step 1 NO.1 Step 3

UNIT WIDE
Range Improvements - Fences

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.4

1. Maintain, construct, and/or re-locate fences necessary for the implementation of allotment management plans.

Implementing proper management is the least costly and most advantageous method to improve range condition and increase forage production. Fencing is essential for implementation of grazing systems required for proper management. Proper maintenance of fencing will help control trespass.

2. Where possible relocate allotment boundary fences to include adjoining tracts of National Resource Lands that are not used (may have unauthorized use), or not allotted within respective allotments.

Including these "unused or unallotted" areas will increase the usable range within the allotment and provide more forage to supply the demand.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Part 1 of the recommendation would have a positive economic impact on livestock users because installation of fencing is necessary for proper range management and would help in improving livestock forage production. Part 2 would have a favorable economic impact on livestock operators in allotments where the proposed adjustments would take place because the added acreage would make more livestock forage available.

The recommendation conflicts with recreation, R 8.3 which recommends avoiding construction of fences or other obstacles which would conflict with ORV use. It is likely that many of the fences needed for implementation of AMPs would interfere with ORV use. The recommendation also conflicts with recreation, R 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 14.6, 14.12, and 14.15, which would restrict or constrain location and/or design of fencing to insure fences do not detract from the visual characteristics and to prevent disturbance of archaeological sites.

Lands, L 3.1A conflicts with the recommendation because it proposes disposal of Class I and II irrigable lands for agricultural purposes should they meet appropriate classification criteria. This would prohibit construction of management fences or at least forestall installation until classification action is completed. Minerals, M 1.2 conflicts with the recommendation because development of geothermal resources would take land out of the allotments, thus requiring removal and/or relocation of fencing.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: WL 2.7, 5.3, 12.2; R 2.1, 9.1. These conflicts should be addressed on a site

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 Hill
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Multiple-Use Analysis (cont)

Page 2 of 2

by site basis prior to installation of the proposed fences to insure all resource values are given adequate consideration.

The recommendation supports the following activity recommendations: WL 1.4, 2.4, 6.3 8.3; RM 2.2 (custodial management).

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

Accept the recommendations as stated above and include the following recommendations:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Install cattleguards or gates that can be easily opened on all roads, trails, at fence corners, and at least every mile. | The requirements for cattleguards and gates for fencing are specified in BLM Manual 1737. Gates and cattleguards properly spaced will allow for ORV and reduce maintenance costs. |
| 2. Coordinate fence location and construction so as not to detract or destroy the visual resources quality. | Fence construction or location could detract from scenic landscape qualities. |
| 3. Do not locate fences on known archaeological sites. | Soil disturbance such as cat lines and live-stock concentrations associated with fencing could destroy archaeological values. |
| 4. Allow construction of fences pending classification on lands potentially valuable for agriculture. | Fences could be relocated at the expense of the land applicant if the lands are disposed of which would allow intensive management to continue. |
| 5. Allow mineral leasing. | Fence relocation could be stipulated on the lease. |

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 Hill
Activity	Range Management
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	No. 1
Step 3	

UNIT WIDE
Range Improvement-Livestock Water

RECOMMENDATION

RM 1. & 2.5
Maintain and construct water facilities necessary for proper livestock distribution and implementation of allotment management plans.

RATIONALE

Implementing proper management is the least costly and most advantageous method to improve range condition and increase forage production. Adequate water facilities are essential to implementation of grazing systems and for proper livestock distribution required for proper management.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would have a positive economic impact on livestock users in the planning unit. Developing waters where needed would improve distribution and promote implementation of sound grazing systems, which in turn would result in increased production and availability of livestock forage.

The recommendation conflicts with Recreation, R 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 14.6, 14.12, and 14.15, which could restrict or prohibit construction of water developments. The proposals identify the need to preserve the natural characteristics of the landscape and protection of archaeological sites. Lands, L 3.1A, 6.2, 6.4, conflict with the recommendation because they propose disposal of tracts of land for agricultural purposes. Disposal would preclude expenditure of funds for water development on the identified tracts. Minerals, M 1.2 conflicts with the recommendation because it proposes leasing the geothermal resource. If development of geothermal resources occurred approximately 1/3 of the leased area could be excluded from livestock grazing. Thus, some water developments could be of no value. However, the likelihood of geothermal development seems remote at this time.

The recommendation supports all other activity recommendations which identify the need for improved range and watershed condition, and wildlife habitat.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

Accept the recommendations as stated above except where modified as follows:

1. Coordinate construction of water facilities with recreation so as to mitigate the impact on the visual resource quality.

Improperly constructed reservoirs, etc., could significantly detract from the scenic landscape quantities.

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 Hill
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

Reasons (cont)

Page 2 of 2

2. Coordinate development of water facilities to minimize adverse impacts to archaeological values. Development that would destroy significant archaeological sites should not be done.

BLM policy provides significant archaeological sites be protected.

3. Allow development of water facilities on geothermal leases.

Loss of water facilities due to geothermal leasing appears remote at this time.

4. Do not expend funds to develop water facilities on lands identified as potentially valuable for agriculture.

Disposal of land would result in loss of investment.

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

UNIT WIDE
Change in Class of Livestock

Page 1 of 2

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.6

Allow conversions in class of livestock only where;

a. The stocking rate is commensurate with the carrying capacity for the class of livestock being converted to.

b. A grazing system is implemented that will protect and propagate the key native forage species in the allotment.

The PAA indicates a trend in class conversion from sheep to cattle will continue. This will result in activation of nonuse previously held by sheep operators and will increase actual grazing use in the allotment. The increased grazing pressure will cause the range condition to decline. In some allotments, the recognized Class I demand appears to allow grazing use in excess of the carrying capacity of the range.

Grazing by cattle is generally more intense for a longer duration and later in the critical spring growing season than customarily made by sheep. This use is more detrimental to the forage resource and will result in deteriorated range condition and a decline in forage production.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

The recommendation would have an economic benefit to the cattle industry in terms of additional AUMs available for cattle grazing. Increased maintenance of management facilities would constitute a negative economic impact for allottees. Since most of the sheep operators in the allotments currently use only a portion of their authorized privileges, an economic benefit would occur with regard to the market for excess AUMs and the opportunity to activate privileges with cattle. It is anticipated that some of the sheep operators would be against allowing conversions because rotation grazing systems restrict their operations to small areas of use. This could reduce their opportunity to take only the initial vegetative growth on forage forage plants which these operators consider to be the best quality of sheep feed.

The recommendation conflicts with wildlife, WL 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 8.2, 12.1; and watershed, W 1.3 which identify the need to take no more than 50- 60 percent of the annual growth of herbaceous vegetation. It is likely that utilization in some pastures would exceed 60 percent under the grazing season and with conversion.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with recreation, R 2.1, 8.3, 9.1; WL, 6.2, 8.1, 9.1. These conflicts should be addressed prior to conversions to ensure adequate consideration of all resource values.

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 Hill
Activity
Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

page 2 of 2

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

The recommendation is not supported by any specific resource activity recommendations.

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Reason

Accept recommendation as stated above and include the following recommendation:

1. Do not exceed 60 percent utilization of herbaceous vegetation in any pasture where grazing occurs.

Adequate herbaceous vegetation should be left to provide adequate forage and cover for all wildlife, including deer, elk, and upland game birds and to provide litter to protect the soil from the erosive forces of nature.

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)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

UNIT WIDE
Season of Use

Page 1 of 2

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 2.7

1. Establish general seasons of use and adjust grazing use to the following suggested dates:

Present phenological data and observation by district staff indicate that adequate plant growth to sustain grazing pressure does not occur prior to the suggested dates. Grazing that begins earlier appears to induce close grazing most of the grazing season causing range deterioration. This impact is mitigated where grazing systems are in effect since part of the allotment is rested and the previous year's growth is available to partially supply forage demand until the plant has adequate time to make growth and supply forage to satisfy the demand.

Area A (allotments west of Bliss)

a. Allotments with acceptable grazing systems, grazing during any part of the year, providing base property requirements are met.

b. Allotments with custodial management only, 4/1 to 12/31.

Area B (allotments north of Bliss-King Hill to Davis Mountain)

a. Allotments with rest-rotation grazing systems, 4/1 to 12/31.

b. Allotments with custodial management, 4/16 to 12/31.

Area C (allotments north of Gooding and Shoshone-Black Canyon to Kinzie Butte)

a. Allotments with rest-rotation grazing systems, 4/16 to 12/31.

b. Allotments with custodial management, 5/1 to 12/31.

Area D (Macon Flat)

a. Allotments with rest-rotation grazing systems, 5/10 to 12/31.

b. Allotments with custodial management, 5/20 to 12/31.

Area E (Hash Spring and Marsh Spring)

a. Allotments with rest-rotation grazing systems, 5/15 to 12/31.

b. Allotments with custodial management, 6/1 to 12/31.

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 Hills

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 2 of 2

2. Establish grazing seasons of use that are the same within each allotment for both sheep and cattle.

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

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would have an adverse economic impact on operators in allotments where turnout is currently set at an earlier date. The impact would result from the cost of providing feed on the base property for a longer period in the spring. These costs could be partially offset by increased forage production on the spring ranges resulting from additional growing time prior to grazing. Part 2 of the recommendation would have no known economic impact on the operations in the allotments where both classes of livestock would have the same turnout date.

The recommendation conflicts with Wildlife, WL 2.5 which proposes deferring turnout in the critical deer winter range in King Hill and Dempsey Allotments until April 16, and in the Rattlesnake and Shoshone Cattle Allotments until May 1. Since rest-rotation grazing systems are proposed on all of the above allotments, recommended turnout dates would be two weeks earlier than those suggested to reduce competition between livestock and wintering deer herds.

The recommendation is not supported by any other resource activity recommendation.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above. Encourage establishment of grazing season that coincide with WL 2.5 on allotments that contain critical deer winter ranges.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)