

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

NORTH SHOSHONE ALLOTMENT (0426)

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.1

Adjust the Shoshone Cattle Allotment boundaries to include the following adjoining allotments:

a. Curtis Lake Allotment

This allotment would be located in the center of the proposed North Shoshone Allotment. Including it as part of the North Shoshone Allotment will facilitate implementation of the North Shoshone AMP and the vegetation can be as effectively managed to improve range condition and forage production. Contiguous tracts of federal land would be under similar management and administration. Cost to the government would be reduced. An economic hardship would not be worked on the ranch operations of the present allottee.

b. That part of the North Shoshone (sheep) Allotment which lays west of Highway 93.

Combining the allotment will (with management) allow better utilization of forage without adverse impacts on the vegetation because of the time of use by the two classes of livestock and will provide better quality forage for sheep. Conversion of class of livestock could be facilitated where a sound management system is in effect. Administration costs would be reduced where one allotment is involved rather than three. Combining allotments would not work an economic hardship on any of the allottees.

Adjust the Shoshone Cattle Allotment boundaries to exclude

a. the Fredericksen Lane or the southwest extended part of the allotment.

This tract of land cannot be feasibly and effectively managed with this allotment because of its size and location. It was originally set up to facilitate trail use and does not lend itself to pasture rotation in a grazing system. Including this tract in the Rattlesnake Allotment would facilitate implementation of a rotation system and administration of the range resources.

b. Lands lying east of Highway 93.

This is a long, narrow tract of land that cannot be feasibly managed with the allotment because of Highway 93. This tract can be better utilized and managed with the Kinzie Butte Allotment.

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 Analysis

Combining the Curtis Lake Allotment with the Shoshone Cattle and North Shoshone Allotments, as recommended, would have an adverse economic impact on the present Curtis Lake Allottee. The allottee would have to move his cattle over longer distances, and separate them from the other livestock prior to taking them off the Federal range. His Federal range use would have to conform to the grazing system for the combined allotment. His operation would have to be constrained by the bylaws of the grazing association with regard to bull standards and other requirements. He would lose the utility of his private lands which are presently fenced with National Resource Lands in the Curtis Lake Allotment.

Combining the North Shoshone and Shoshone Cattle Allotments would have positive economic impacts on the sheep and cattle operations which presently have base property qualifications in the two allotments. The combination would provide higher quality sheep forage thereby increasing lamb weights. This in turn would increase monetary returns to the operators. Conversions from sheep to cattle would be facilitated and could be more readily carried out with regard to needed facilities in the combined allotment than in the North Shoshone Allotment in its present state (no facilities for cattle). With regard to cattle operations, the combination would have a positive economic impact because additional forage would be immediately available to partially offset expected losses in grazing use resulting from adjustments recommended in range management (0426), RM 2.2 (adjust stocking rate to grazing capacity). Refer to RM 2.1 for Kinzie Butte Allotment (0430) for analysis of exclusion of the part of North Shoshone Allotment lying east of U.S. Highway 93.

Exclusion of the Federicksen Lane area, as recommended, would have no significant economic impact on the allottees. It would cause the inconvenience of trailing livestock along county roads to the allotment rather than across National Resource Lands. Distance of trailing would not be significantly different.

The recommendation does not conflict with any other resource activity recommendations.

It is supported by range management (0426), RM 1. & 2.3 and all other activity recommendations which propose improved vegetation management.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept recommendations as stated above.

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

NORTH SHOSHONE ALLOTMENT (0426)

RECOMMENDATION

RM 2.2
Determine carrying capacity for National Resource Lands and private and state lands offered for exchange of use license, and adjust stocking rates accordingly.

RATIONALE

The URA indicates that adequate forage is not available to satisfy the present Class I demand (see 1605.44A2c(5)(a)). Present policy provides that "Initial stocking rates...must not exceed the existing livestock grazing capacity...". (WO Instruction Memo 75-407).

Idaho's 5-year goals are to bring livestock use in line with existing grazing capacity for those areas in less than satisfactory condition as a result of excessive livestock use. It is anticipated that the present forage production capacities can be interpolated from soil and vegetative data to be gathered during the summer of 1976 and succeeding years.

Multiple-Use Analysis

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

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendations.

Supporting recommendations include the following: watershed, W 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 5.2; wildlife, WL 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 8.2, 12.1; recreation, R 1.1, 2.1, 3.2; ~~range management, RM 1 & 2.3 (0426)~~.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

1. The stocking rates must be reasonably close to the carrying capacity to implement a rotation grazing system that will improve range condition
2. Herbaceous vegetative cover left on site will reduce erosion and improve water quality.
3. Competition for forage with all wildlife species will be reduced and minimum cover requirements will be left for wildlife.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

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 4

NORTH SHOSHONE ALLOTMENT (0426)

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.3

Revise the present AMP as follows:
for the combined areas in RM 1.
and 2.1.

1. Adjust the grazing system to one that will provide for plant vigor, seed production, seed trome, and seedling establishment of the key native forage species.

The present grazing system is not designed to propagate or provide for the physiological need of the key native forage plant. A grazing system which provides for these treatments will increase the density and vigor of the native forage species and improve range conditions and increase forage production to maximum potential. Approximately 2700 additional AUMs can be produced annually within a 15- 20 year period with proper management.

2. Adjust grazing use so that not more than 50 percent of the Class I demand and exchange of use license is utilized during the critical spring growing season.

Grazing during the growing season is critical to the health and vigor of the forage producing plant. Excessive grazing during that period is detrimental to the vegetation and will result in deteriorated range conditions and loss of forage production.

3. Adjust license flexibility to meet manual requirements and specify as a minimum the normal operation, maximum numbers allowed to graze and season of use, flexibility not to exceed five days before and after the normal operation dates.

Flexibility allowed in the present AMP does not conform to manual requirement.

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

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.

Support Needs: Exchange for isolated private land in the allotment which will provide access to water, improve distribution, and block Federal lands which will facilitate management.

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 2 of 4

Multiple-Use Analysis

Revision of the present AMP, as recommended, would result in a slight adjustment of spring use to fall use and a reduction of grazing area because of rested pastures. ~~Therefore,~~ the economic impact to the operator would be slight. Fence adjustment resulting from adjustment in the grazing system could have a substantial impact ~~to~~ ^{his operation} the operator if he were required to participate. A long-term beneficial input would occur because the recommendations favor establishment of perennial grasses which will stabilize and increase forage production. ~~The recommendation would restrict the~~ ^{Sheep operators' individual flexibility because it would confine grazing to specific areas}

Wildlife, WL 1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 3.1, 8.2, 12.1; and watershed, W 1.3 identify the need to retain 40- 50 percent of the herbaceous vegetation. This conflicts with the recommendation because utilization in the heavy use pastures of the grazing system would likely be greater than 60 percent. Wildlife, WL 6.2, 9.1 identify the need to exclude livestock grazing on wet meadows, springs, streams, and canals. This would reduce availability of high quality forage and restrict access to water, which would contribute to the livestock distribution problems. Wildlife, WL 2.4 and 2.1 identify the need to assure that no more than 1/3 of the critical deer ranges are grazed by livestock in the fall and to retain 60 percent of the annual growth on important shrubs on critical deer winter ranges. This would restrict allowable grazing intensities in the fall and would require adjustment of the grazing system to provide protection for 1/3 of the critical deer winter range during the fall season.

Lands, L 31A proposes disposal of Class I and II lands found to be consistent with classification criteria. Such an action would result in loss of productive areas and important spring range in the allotment, and would disrupt the proposed grazing system. Minerals, M 1.2 proposes leasing, with minimal restrictions, the geothermal resource. This could restrict livestock grazing because development would prohibit use of up to 1/3 of the surface under lease.

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

Supporting recommendations include the following: WL 6.3, 8.3, 9.2, 12.2, 13.3; W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2; R 1.1, 2.1, 3.2, 13.1; RM 1. & 2.1, 2.5 (0426).

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

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

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

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

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 3 of 4

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont) Reasons (cont)

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

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

Wet Meadows: After revision of the grazing system fence wet meadows to exclude livestock only where it is demonstrated after one grazing cycle that significant wildlife habitat is being destroyed by livestock grazing.

Streams & canals: Fence streams and canals where major critical waterfowl nesting areas are identified. Provide water gaps no farther than 1/2 mile apart.

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

4. Allow mineral leasing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

Page 4 of 4

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

Reasons (cont)

5. Arrange pasture location and the grazing system so that not more than 1/2 and preferably only 1/3 of the critical deer winter ranges is situated in any pasture and grazed in the fall.

Modified to accept wildlife, WL 2.4 recommendation. Heavier grazing occurs on shrubs in the fall than in the spring or summer and results in removal of important food sources for wintering deer.

6. Remove livestock in the fall when utilization of the annual growth on the important shrubs exceed 40 percent on critical deer winter ranges.

Modified to accept wildlife, WL 2.1 recommendation fall grazing on critical winter ranges results in direct competition between livestock and deer on important shrub species.

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

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

NORTH SHOSHONE ALLOTMENT (0426)

Page 1 of 3

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.4

Remove competing brush species on approximately 33,340 acres and remove brush and seed approximately 7,980 acres of National Resource Land to release and establish desirable perennial forage species.

These treatments, combined with management, are needed to meet the objectives within a reasonable timeframe of 10- 15 years. Approximately 4300 additional AUMs will be produced annually from the treatment.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would result in an increase in forage production. The increase would partially offset expected losses in allowable grazing use resulting from the adjustments recommended in range management, RM 2.2 (0426) (adjust stocking rate to grazing capacity). Thus a positive economic impact would occur. Where wildlife values are involved the Idaho Fish & Game Dept. will be consulted in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between that agency and the Bureau.

This recommendation is in conflict with the recreation, R 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 14.6, and 14.15, and Minerals, 1.2 which would restrict or constrain layout and/or method of land treatment. The recreation recommendations deal primarily with visual impact of land treatments and the effect the recommended treatments might have on archaeological sites. The minerals conflict involves the restriction on land treatments should development of potential geothermal resources take place.

The recommendation conflicts with wildlife, WL 2.2, 7.1 and Lands, L 3.1A which would prohibit any land treatment. The wildlife recommendations would prohibit brush control on critical deer winter ranges and on sage grouse wintering areas, and within two miles of sage grouse strutting grounds. The lands recommendation proposes disposal of some lands which have been identified for land treatment.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: WL 2.8, 9.2 ; L 6.2, 6.4; R 1.1, 2.1. These conflicting proposals will be addressed prior to implementation of land treatments to insure resource values involved are adequately considered.

Supporting activity recommendations include the following: WL 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 6.1, 12.2, 13.3; W 1.4, 1.5, 5.2; R 3.2, ~~RM 2.2 (0426)~~.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

Accept and modify the recommendation to subject brush removal and

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 3

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

Reasons (cont)

seeding proposals to the following constraints before projects are started.

1. Revise the allotment management plan and implement a sound and acceptable grazing system.

Sound management is needed to assure success of revegetation projects and to protect the investment made in the project.

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

This is BLM policy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Present information is insufficient to determine impacts of geothermal development on land treatment. Any mineral development at this time appears to be improbable.

5. Prohibit land treatment projects on known archaeological sites.

Bureau policy requires protection of cultural resources.

6. Allow no brush treatment in the allotment on areas identified as critical deer winter range. (See no control area, Step II Overlay No. 2.)

Modified to provide for critical deer winter range, WL 2.2. This value is considered to be higher than the need for additional forage at the present time.

7. Allow coordinated land treatment on sage grouse winter range

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 3 of 3

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

and nesting grounds. Refer to criteria in Appendix I (MFP Step II).

Reasons (cont)

The need to produce livestock forage to minimize the economic impact of the anticipated reduction in stocking rate (FM 2.1 (0426)) is considered to be as important as the need for increased sage grouse populations. Proposed brush treatments should be closely coordinated to allow only brush removal that is not critical to sage grouse winter habitat and nesting.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)