Name	(MFP)
------	-------

Activity

Wildlife

Objective Number

# MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

### **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.

- The state of the

B.H.

B

Name (MFP) Sennett Hills-Timmerman	нч т
Activity Wildlife	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3	

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION ,

# 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. Cor sequently, to provide additional forage for the expected increase in elk numbers, grazir 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

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

#### 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

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

### Reasons

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

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# 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.

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis

B.H. - T.H.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Name (MFP)

Activity Wildlife

### 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.

Reasons

and Rationale.

# Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated \_ above.

### Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

# MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# ELK RANGE (e)

RECOMMENDATION

#### RATIONALE

WL 3.3

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

## 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

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

#### Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

# Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

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

- <u>- - -</u> - -

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use Analysis and Rationale.

how to eliminate such competition.

## MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

## 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

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)

1945 C.	ene e constanto. A	a .] / -	
B.H.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Name (MF)	P)		
Bennett	Hills-Ti	mmerman	Hil
Activity			
Wildlife	2		_
Overlay Re	eference		

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

## MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

## 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

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

### Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

#### Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

#### Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Reasons

Refer to the above Multiple-Use analysis and Rationale.

B.H. Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil Activity Wildlife Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

## MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

# 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

B.H. Name (MFP)

Step 1 NO. 1 Step 3

Activity Wildlife Overlay Reference

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

## 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

Accept the recommendation as stated above.

#### Reasons

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.