BH - TH

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill.

Activity Watershed

Objective Number

W-1 (Acceptable Erosion Level

### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1

ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

#### OBJECTIVE

Page 1 of 2

Reduce the rate of erosion in the planning units according to the following schedule:

	sative gent	Present Erosion Class	Desired Erosion Class	MFP Overlay Reference No.	Acres	Target Date
1.	Wind	Critical (SSF 70)	to <u>Stable</u> or Low <u>Slight</u> (SSF 18-30)	W-1(A)	590	1981
2.	Water	Critical	to Moderate	W-1(B)	244,800	1985
		<u>Moderate</u>	to <u>Slight</u>			

Note: Within overlay reference No. W-1(B) further reduce erosion on lands having potential for  $\triangle$  SSF > 20 according to this schedule:

	Critical	to <u>Slight</u>			
	Moderate	to <u>Stable</u>			
3.	Wind & <u>Slight</u> Water	to Stable or	W-1(C)	297,200	1985

### RATIONALE

Bureau Manual 1602.12 and 1603.21A states: "...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."

Bureau Manual 1603, Appendix 1, Page 1, Program Outlook Guide, states: "An equally important BLM task is to provide a level of protection for basic resource values of all types - ranging from ...to critical watersheds, adequate to arrest a continued decline in conditions. The need for existing or increased levels of production from national resource lands (sic) will vary, based upon need and demand, but the need to maintain a stable base and its...production value is important. In many instances, this protection will require direct action to retard ongoing damage or prevent future damage from occurring, and cannot be accomplished as part of an ongoing use authorization..."

Idaho State Office Manual supplement 1603, Appendix 1, Page 14, E. <u>Watershed Management</u> states in part: "Watershed problems on BLM land in Idaho, for the most part, can be taken care of by the establishment of an adequate vegetal cover. This applies to both water and wind erosion..."

"Our objective is to stabilize all nongeologic erosion to the fullest extent practicable at an early date..."

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

BH - TH

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill.

Activity
Watershed

Objective Number
W-1 (Acceptable Erosion Leve.

### OBJECTIVE

Page 1 of 2

Reduce the rate of erosion in the planning units according to the following schedule:

	sative gent	Present Erosion Class	Desired Erosion Class	MFP Overlay Reference No.	Acres	Target Date
1.	Wind	Critical (SSF 70)	to <u>Stable</u> or Low <u>Slight</u> (SSF 18-30)	W-1(A)	590	1981
2.	Water	Critical	to <u>Moderate</u>	W-1(B)	244,800	1985
		<u>Moderate</u>	to <u>Slight</u>			

Note: Within overlay reference No. W-1(B) further reduce erosion on lands having potential for  $\triangle$  SSF > 20 according to this schedule:

	Critical	to <u>Slight</u>			
		or			
	Moderate	to <u>Stable</u>			
3.	Wind & <u>Slight</u> Water	to Stable or Low Slight (SSF < 25)	W-1(C)	297,200	1985

### RATIONALE

Bureau Manual 1602.12 and 1603.21A states: "...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."

Bureau Manual 1603, Appendix 1, Page 1, Program Outlook Guide, states: "An equally important BLM task is to provide a level of protection for basic resource values of all types - ranging from ...to critical watersheds, adequate to arrest a continued decline in conditions. The need for existing or increased levels of production from national resource lands (sic) will vary, based upon need and demand, but the need to maintain a stable base and its...production value is important. In many instances, this protection will require direct action to retard ongoing damage or prevent future damage from occurring, and cannot be accomplished as part of an ongoing use authorization..."

Idaho State Office Manual supplement 1603, Appendix 1, Page 14, E. Watershed Management states in part: "Watershed problems on BLM land in Idaho, for the most part, can be taken care of by the establishment of an adequate vegetal cover. This applies to both water and wind erosion..."

"Our objective is to stabilize all nongeologic erosion to the fullest extent practicable at an early date..."

#### BH--TH

### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1

ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)				
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hi			
Activity Watershed				
Objective Number W-1 (Acceptable Erosion				

Level)

RATIONALE (Continued)

Page 2 of 2

According to the Planning Area Analysis (Bureau Manual 1607, Illustration 13, Watershed) there is "Local concern about deteriorating watersheds."

The above objective is consistent with the intent of cooperative agreements with Blaine, Camas, Gooding, North Side, and Wood River S&WC Districts.

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

B.H.

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hi

Activity
Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3
Page I of 2

### ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

### RECOMMENDATION

#### W-1.1

Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the 590 acre seeding in stabilizing the effects of past severe wind erosion. Reseed those portions with scant vegetation. Close the area to livestock grazing except when the soil is moist. Leave at least 50 percent of the current years growth of herbaceous vegetation in place for protection from the wind.

W-1.1 (alternative)

As above, except fence the area and exclude grazing altogether.

Support needs

Develop fuel modification along
Union Pacific Railroad tracks.

### RATIONALE

This area was seeded to rehabilitate a wildfire burn. Extremely strong winds scoured the loose sandy soils before the seeding was established. Very close monitoring is neede to prevent a recurrence of this calamity. The loose soil is very subject to disturband by trampling. A regime of very late fall or winter grazing, in moderation, will only meet the minimum requirements for protection

This more nearly meets the needs of this fragile area for protection and rehabilitation.

### Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with 101 Allotment Recommendations RM 1.2 and 2.2 which calls for an adjusted grazing system which could not utilize the pasture only when the soil is moist (or frozen). In order to salvage the area and stabilize it, the Alternative recommendation is the only viable one to select.

### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reseed those portions of the 590-acre tract that presently have scanty vegetation. Fence the area to exclude grazing by domestic livestock until such time that the area is fully stabilized. Closely monitor unauthorized grazing use (trespass). Improve wildfire protection so the area will not be denuded of

### Reasons

The site must be stabilized as rapidly as possible. The most effective method involves complete rest from grazing when the soils are dry and readily disturbed, and improved protection from wildfire.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

### B.H.

W

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity
Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3
Page 2 of 2

Multiple-Use Recommendations (continued)

protective ground cover.

Support Needs:

Develop a fuel modification plan for the nearby Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way. Implement the plan as soon as possible.

### Decision

Reason

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

BH - TH Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil Activity Watershed Overlay Reference

Step 3

### ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

### RECOMMENDATION

W - 1.2

Meet the physiological needs of herbaceous vegetation so that it will prosper and increase to the greatest ground cover the soils are capable of supporting in the shortest possible time frame.

### RATIONALE

The greatest single contribution to deteriorated watersheds has been and continues to be excessive and ill-timed domestic livestock grazing. Conversely the greatest single opportunity to reduce erosion and pro vide a protective cover of vegetation is by manipulating the grazing animal.

Step 1 No.1

The recommendation is consistent with the intent of the NRDC agreement. See also the rationale for Objective W-1, Recommendation W-1.3, Recommendation W-1.5.

### Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other specific activity recommendation rather it complements several. Recommendations R-312, WL 12.1, and those Range Management recommendations which relate to adjustments in stocking rate, implementation of grazing systems, and adjustments in season of use deal directly or indirectly with the problem of meeting the growth requirements of forage species. See Rationale above and the Rationale for Objective W-1.

### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-1.2 was accepted in its entirety.

### Reasons

After analysis with other activity recommend tions no unresolvable conflicts are evident.

#### Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

#### Reason

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

в.н т.н.	
Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hil.
Activity	*
Watershed	
Overlay Reference Entire	_
Step 1 Area Step 3	_

Page 1 of 2

### ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

### RECOMMENDATION

W - 1.3

Remove no more than 50 percent of the current year's growth of herbaceous ground cover in any <u>allotment</u> during a grazing season.

### RATIONALE

The SCS ecological site classification system, based on soils and vegetation (clip and weigh yield determination), will, if combined with rational suitability determinations, provide present site production as well as potential site production. The Shoshone District will be able to determine the proper stocking rate to utilize 50 percent of available forage.

Utilization may be heavy in some pastures and absent in other pastures, but allotments as a whole should have one-half the forage left when the stock are removed.

Vegetative litter is very important for watershed protection; it breaks raindrop velocity above mineral soil and slows overland water flow thus allowing greater infiltration.

### Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation was more liberal than Recommendation WL-12.1 which calls for no more than 60 percent utilization of herbaceous vegetation by livestock in any pasture, including the heavy-use pasture in a rotation grazing system. The need for vegetative litter to protect the soil and unused vegetation to provide food and cover for wildlife can be realized by combining the recommendations. In addition, to the watershed and wildlife needs being met the intent of W.O. Instruction Memo 75-407 would be carried out.

#### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Remove no more than 60 percent of the current year's growth of herbaceous vegetation in the most heavily used pasture during a grazing season. In

#### Reasons

See <u>Rationale</u> above and that for Recommendation WL-12.1 and Objective W-1. The use by livestock of those pastures designated for rest would normally be by sheep. On occasion it may become necessary to utilize

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

### 1

# 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.
i	Activity	
	Watershed	
	Overlay Reference	
	Step 1 Entire Step 3	_

Page 2 of 2

### Multiple-Use Recommendations (continued) Reasons (continued)

addition, remove no more than 50 percent of the herbaceous vegetation in any other <u>pasture</u> used that same grazing season. Remove no more than 20 percent in the "rest pasture".

### 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 he AMP. The degree of utilization in any pasture will not exceed the identified needs of available food and cover and watershed protection.

some forage by cattle in the rest pastures but generally rest pastures should be rested completely. Very little, if any, supplemental use should ever be allowed in a rest pasture.

### Reason

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

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

B.H. - T.H.

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil.

Activity Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 Step 3

Listed under Recommendation

### ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

Page 1 of 3

### RECOMMENDATION

W - 1.4

Selectively control heavy stands of brush which are competing with, or have replaced, herbaceous vegetation desirable for watershed protection in the following delineated areas:

### P.U. Overlay Name/No. Treatment Delineation

ВН	URA-4, No. 3	"Chemical Brush Control"
ВН	URA-4, Natural & Artificial Potential (Range Manage- ment)	"Brush Removal only"
BH	URA-2, Land	(Any areas form-
æ	Treatments	erly treated, but reinvaded with brush)
TH	URA-4, No. 1 (Watershed)	"Chemical Brush Control"
- TH	URA-4, Range	"Potential Through
	Management	Land Treatment,
	Opportunities (Range Manage- ment)	Spraying, Chaining, or Burning"
TH	URA-2, Land	(Any areas formerly

<u>Support Needs</u>. Acquire legal access to any watershed improvement job on a case-by-case basis.

treated, but rein-

vaded with brush)

### RATIONALE

Heavy stands of brush with scant understory vegetation, especially on sloping land, provide inadequate protection from the scouring effect of overland water flow.

Selective control involves leaving part of the stand to meet the needs of wildlife but primarily to reduce the effect of strong winds which dry the soil surface, remove moisture (in the form of snow) and erode light soils. Control may occur in patches, strips, blocks, or other geometric patterns. Brush removal may occur by chaining, railing, beating prescribed burning, chemically killing, plowing, or other methods. The main thing to consider is the effect of the job layout and control method on the most basic of the resource components—the soil.

Generally, avoid dry south-facing slopes and areas of thin rocky soils (usually Low sage areas) unless an erosion class of high moderate or critical (SSF greater than 50 is encountered). Above that level the danger of losing the basic soil resource should override wildlife or other considerations.

Legal access may be a temporary easement or a permanent easement. The nature and size of the job will determine this as well as maintenance requirements.

Treatments &

Management Facilities

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

В.Н. – Т. Н.	
Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hi1
Activity	
Watershed	
Overlay Reference	

Step 3

Page 2 of 3

### Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to the following recommendations: WL-1.2, WL-3.2, WL-5.2, WL-6.1, WL-11.1, WL-12.2. It conflicts with the following: WL-2.2, WL-7.1, and those Range Management recommendations which call for large areas of brush removal. There is a possibility of conflict with R-4.3. The primary conflicts involve maintaining existing brush on critical deer winter range and maintaining existing brush within a two-mile radius of known sage grouse strutting grounds and on all identified sage grouse wintering areas. A minor conflict could occur with visual resources by not paying close attention to the effect of brush control layout on the natural character of the land.

### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-1.4 was accepted in its entirety with the following changes:

Drop: Nothing.

Add: Do not control brush on critical deer winter ranges or within a two-mile radius of known sage grouse strutting grounds or on identified sage grouse wintering areas except where a SSF of greater than 50 indicates a danger of losing the basic soil resource.

Lay out all brush control jobs in such a way that they will be harmonious with the landscape. The final product should reflect what could be a natural occurrence within the landscape.

### Reasons

These additional criteria were added to more effectively meet the needs of wildlife and the needs of visual resource management. The large areas of treatment recommended by the Range Management activity probably would have a deleterious effect on wildlife, possibly on watershed and assuredly on visual resources. Brush control for increased forage can be accomplished but it must be constrained by the needs of other resources.

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

-	
Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hi!
Activity Watershed	
Overlay Reference	
Ct == 1	

W - 1.4 (Continued)

Page 3 of 3

B.H. - T.H.

### Decision

Adopt the multiple use recommendation with the following modification:

Selective brush control may be undertaken within a two-mile radius of sage grouse strutting grounds, sage grouse wintering areas, and deer winter range, subject to a coordinated assessment by the Area Manager and Wildlife Biologist.

The restriction is retained on ritical deer winter range.

### Reason

The two-mile radius guide does not infer total restriction. Pockets and patches of brush exist adjacent to grouse strutting grounds that are unnecessary for sage grouse habitat. Selected areas within wintering areas can be altered without detriment to sage grouse or deer. (See supplemental guides under Appendix I and II Range Management.)

#### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

	R.H. T.H. Name (MFP)		
	Bennett Hills-Timmerman H	i	
	Activity		
Watershed			
	Overlay Reference		
	Step 1 Step 3		
•	Listed under Recommendatio	n	

### ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

sted under Recommendation
Page 1 of 2

### RECOMMENDATION

### RATIONALE

W - 1.5

Seed areas that do not have a sufficient residual stand of herbaceous vegetation (grasses and forbs) to adequately protect the basic soil resource from the erosive agents of wind and water in the following delineated areas:

P.U.	Overlay Name/No.	Treatment Delin-
		eation
ВН	URA-4, No. 3	"Mechanical Treat-
	(Watershed)	ment"
BH	URA-4, Natural	"Pretreatment &
	& Artificial	Seeding"
	Potential (Range	3
	Management)	
ВН	URA-2, Land	(any areas form-
	Treatments	erly seeded but
		without sufficient
		herbaceous cover
		for soil protec-
		tion)
TH	URA-4, No. 1	"Mechanical Treat-
TIT	(Watershed)	ment"
TH	URA-4, Range	"Potential Through
TIL	Management	Land Treatment,
	9	Seedings"
	Opportunities	Seedings
	(Range Manage-	
	ment)	( farmar1
TH	URA-2, Land	(any areas formerly
	Treatments &	seeded but without
	Management	sufficient herbaceous
	Facilities	cover for soil pro-

For areas of brush removal (Recommendation W-1.4) the rate of erosion increases rapidly unless residual plants rapidly occupy the site. Seeding may also be necessary in nontreatment areas having scanty herbaceous vegetation.

Generally, perennial vegetation is considered superior to annual vegetation for watershed protection. It is more dependable and is usually less flammable. Perennial grasses are especially desirable as their fibrous root systems create many tiny soil pores into which precipitation can infiltrate.

To "adequately protect the basic soil resource" is a judgmental thing. Generally if the SSF is 40 or higher and living herbaceous vegetation occupies less than eight percent of the ground surface a seeding should be considered.

Aerial seeding in areas to be used heavil by livestock (for seed trampling) is a viable alternative when drilling is impractical.

Support needs

Acquire legal access to any watershed improvement job on a case-by-case basis.

tection)

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

.н Т	•п•			
Name (MF)	?)			
Bennett	Hills-Timmerman	_Hil:		
Activity				
Watershed				
Overlay Reference				
Step 1	Step 3			

Listed under Recommendation Page 2 of 2

### Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is complementary to the following recommendations: WL-1.3, WL-9.2, WL-12.2, and those Range Management recommendations dealing with seedings. There is a possibility of conflict with R-4.3. A minor conflict could occur with visual resources by not paying close attention to the effect of seeding layout on the natural character of the land. See Rationale above and the Rationale for Objective W-1 for the available social, economic, and institutional data, and for Bureau Manual guidance.

### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-1.5 was accepted in its entirety with the following changes:

Drop: Nothing.

Add: Lay out all seeding jobs in such a way that they will be harmonious with the landscape. The final product should reflect what could be a natural occurrence within the landscape.

### Reasons

These additional criteria were added to meet the needs of visual resource management.

#### Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

#### Reasons

### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

]	в.н Т.н.	
	Name (MFP)	
B	ennett Hills-Timmerman	<u> H</u> ill
	Activity Watershed	
	Overlay Reference	

Page 1 of 2

### ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL (Roads & Trails)

### RECOMMENDATION(s)

### K < 1.6

Limit the number of "roads" and trails to those needed for proper administration of National Resource Land and intermixed state land, and for access to private land.

Place needed roads and trails on the District Transportation Plan for regularly scheduled maintenance.

"Put to bed" roads not deemed necessary by 1985.

Abandon the practice of Bureau Force Account crews "touching up" roads as they move tractors from one spot to another. Never flat blade a road.

Seed dirt roads with adapted herbaceous vegetation.

Support Needs
Upgrade District Transportation Plan.

### RATIONALE

The Shoshone District Transportation Plan is incomplete at the present time. Spur roads necessary for access usually are not shown. When the Existing Access Overlay is compared to the roads shown on the Base Map, hundreds of miles of low quality "tire track", "jeep trail" or "goat trail" type roads are apparent. These nonmaintained paths are an important cause of erosion.

Improper location, steep grades, lack of ditches, lack of crown, lack of water bars, and culverts make these "roads", which are usually lower than the surrounding land surface, an ideal collection area for water which flows unimpeded. The result is a gully

Bureau personnel trying to create a better "road" along one that has washed out very often create as bad an erosion problem as they were trying to solve. No road work should ever be done without a proper design and adequate supervision.

A plant cover on a road will provide protection from wind and water.

### Multiple-Use Analysis

A minor conflict occurred between this recommendation and those Range Management support recommendations calling for additional livestock trails to facilitate the movement of livestock from one use area to another. In addition, the recommendation to abandon Force Account crews "touching up" roads and/or flat blading roads was questioned. Certain parts of the recommendation can be altered to allow greater flexibility in road maintenance and still include those items important to reducing erosion.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Watershed MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN Overlay Reference Step 1 Area Step 3

### Reasons

There are occasions when a flat-bladed road is adequate but these are rare. The concept of road improvement by force account crews who can spot difficulties and remedy them is sound. However, careful supervision of personnel who are not trained in road and trail standards will be necessary

B.H. - T.H. Name (MFP)

Page 2 of 2

Activity

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-1.6 was accepted in its entirety with the following changes:

Drop: "Abandon the practice of Bureau Force Account crews "touching up" roads as they move tractors from one spot to another. Never flat blade a road."

Add: Maintain and/or construct roads and trails only after adequate design and/or with adequate supervision of the District Engineering staff.

### Support needs

Upgrade District Transportation Plan. Provide ongoing engineering staff support.

### Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Reason