WATERSHED ACTIVITY SUMMARY

BENNETT HILLS-TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

In the <u>Acceptable Erosion Level</u> program category, several recommendations have been adopted which are designed to reduce the present rate of wind and water erosion. In a critical wind erosion area, practices such as additional seeding, fencing, and additional fire protection are expected to stabilize the area by 1981. Practices such as meeting the physiologic needs of range grasses and forbs, leaving some vegetation undisturbed by grazing, selective brush control, seeding areas without sufficient native seed source, and limiting the number of roads to those essential for management, are expected to significantly reduce erosion over the next 10 years.

Program category Water Quality planning decisions involve primarily inventory and data collection work. Several permanent water quality monitoring stations are planned for streams. An inventory of potential water control structure sites and surface waters, such as springs and seeps, are planned over the next two to four years.

The program category <u>Flood and Sediment Reduction</u> decisions include completion of an inventory of flood and sediment problem areas within the next two years.

Overall improvement in stream and other surface water quality and reduction in flood and sediment damage is expected to result from the practices identified under <u>Acceptable Erosion Level</u> above. But identification of corrective measures needed for specific sites will result from the planned inventories. Corrective work is planned over the next 10 years.

A need for selective channel fencing along certain reaches of three perennial streams was identified. Specific areas to be fenced will be carefully planned in conjunction with proposed AMP fences needed to implement grazing systems.

Ser aport

WATERSHED

OBJECTIVE NO.	SUBJECT
W-1	Acceptable Erosion Level
W- 2	Water Quality - Streams
W-3	Water Quality - Streams
W <u>- 1</u>	Water Quality - Surface
W- 5	Flood & Sediment Reduction
W-6	Water Yield

UNITED STATES		
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR		
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT		

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1

ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

BH - TH Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill.

Activity Watershed

Objective Number W-1 (Acceptable Erosion Leve)

-i (Acceptable Elosion Lev

OBJECTIVE

Page 1 of 2

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

r

	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> or	W-1(B)	244,800	1985
		Moderate	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 <u>Stable</u> or Low <u>Slight</u> (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. <u>Watershed Manage-</u> <u>ment</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..."

ВН - ТН

Name(MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill.

W-1 (Acceptable Erosion Leve)

Activity Watershed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE

Page 1 of 2

Objective Number

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

Causative	Present Erosion Class	Desired Erosion Class	MFP Overlay <u>Reference No</u> .	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> or	W-1(B)	244,800	1985
	Moderate	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 <u>Stable</u> or Low <u>Slight</u> (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. <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..."

B	H	TH	
U.	11		

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

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

RATIONALE (Continued)

3

Page 2 of 2

According to the Planning Area Analysis (Bureau Manual 1607, Illustration 13, <u>Watershed</u>) 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

ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

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. 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 of 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 rehabilita-tion.

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 <u>Alternative</u> 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.

Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

Activity Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1_{Step 3} Page 1 of 2

B.H.

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil Activity

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

Page 2 of 2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

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.

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 provide a protective cover of vegetation is by manipulating the grazing animal.

BH - TH

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.

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

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other <u>specific</u> 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 <u>Rationale</u> above and the Rationale for Objective W-1.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-1.2 was accepted in its entirety.

Decision

Reason

Reasons

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

A start

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

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W - 1.3

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

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

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Reasons

See Rationale 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

B.H. - T.H. Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Activity Watershed Overlay Reference Entire Step 1 Area Step 3

Page 1 of 2

Name (MFP)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	38.1
B.H. T. H. Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hil.
Activity	
Watershed	·
Overlay Reference	
Step 1 Arca Step 3	

汕

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". 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 & rest pasture.

Reason

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

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.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil.

Activity Watershed

Overlav	Reference

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

-	
Step 1	Step 3
Listed	under Recommendation

ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

Page 1 of 3

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 BH URA-4, No. 3 "Chemical Brush Control"

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

Management vaded with brush) Facilities

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

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

Page 2 of 3

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 Analysis

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 visua resources. Brush control for increased forage can be accomplished but it must be constrained by the needs of other resources.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

A THE PROFESSION SEC.

B.H. - T.H.

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

_{Activity} Watershed

Overlay Reference Step 1 Step 3

Page 3 of 3

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

W - 1.4 (Continued)

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.)

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

R.H T.H. Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hil	ls-Timmerman
Activity	
Watershed	
Overlay Reference	ce
Step 1	Step 3

Hi:

Listed under Recommendation

Page 1 of 2

ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL

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:

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

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.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

د المحمد المانية (10 مارية مارية الحربي 10 مارية الحربية (1996 مارية (1996 مارية (1996 مارية (1996 مارية	
в.н. – т. ^н .	
Name (MFP)	
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 <u>Rationale</u> above and the <u>Rationale</u> 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.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Reasons

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

Reasons

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Page 1 of 2

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

> Activity Watershed Overlay Reference Entire

Step 1

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Area Step 3

ACCEPTABLE EROSION LEVEL (Roads & Trails)

RECOMMENDATION(s)

RATIONALE

W = 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.

<u>Support Needs</u> Upgrade District Transportation Plan. The Shoshone District Transportation Plan is incomplete at the present time. Spur roads necessary for access usually are not shown. When the <u>Existing Access Overlay</u> 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 <u>Range Management</u> 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

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

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

Reason

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil Activity Watershed Overlay Reference Step 1 Area Step 3 Page 2 of 2

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)

BH

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Name(MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hill
Activity Watershed	_
Objective Number W-2 (Water Ouality-Strea	ams.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

No. 1) Page 1 of 2

OBJECTIVE:

Gather water quality baseline data for measuring the effectiveness of Bureau management programs by the fall of 1978. Maintain these for a minimum of ten years (1988).

Rationale:

Data are not presently available. In order to make intelligent land management decisions we must obtain some basic information on water quality. Field observations indicate that over large areas the quality of surface waters is only fair to very poor. The primary cause appears to be excessive and ill-time livestock grazing Clean water flowing in lush streambeds has wide appeal among all types of people. There is much support for a quality environment in our basic and supplemental guidance documents.

Bureau Manual 1602.13A states, "The Bureau, in deciding among alternative uses of available resources and among management alternatives, will utilize both physical and social data in evaluating the immediate and long-range impact of proposed actions on environmental quality and ecological balance and will strive to maintain and enhance environmental quality."

Bureau Manual 1602.33A states, in part, "Environmental characteristics of public landwill become increasingly important. Public land-use decision-making will focus sharply on characteristics which promote public health and well-being, and prevent or counter environmental degradation...The need for attention to environmental
factors, including sociological and psychological values, in addition to economic or resource management principles, will increasingly govern public land-use..."

Bureau Manual 1602.42C3a,b,c, state in part, "All land-use and resource management program decisions must be consistent with Federal or State air and water quality standards..."

"In all land-use and program decisions, the capacity of ecosystems to sustain themselves and the condition and requirements of all species within these ecosystems will be fully considered."

"In all land-use and program decisions, protection of natural and man-made elements in the environment which have aesthetic values of natural beauty...will be fully considered."

Bureau Manual 1603.12El states, The Watershed Program activity includes vegetative manipulation through mechanical, chemical, and biological methods, and water development and control structures. These are directed toward stabilization of soil resources, maintenance or restoration of soil productivity, protection and enhancement of water yield and quality, and reduction of flood and sediment damage, both on and offsite.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

BH
Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hills
Activity
Watershed
Objective Number
 W-2 (Water Quality-Streams)
 Page 2 of 2

Rationale (Continued):

Bureau Manual 1603.12E3b states that one long-term objective of the Water Resource Program Activity is to: "Restore, maintain, and improve surface and ground water quality and yield for both on-and off-site use."

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

WATER OUALITY - STREAMS

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W - 2.1

Establish 16 water quality monitoring stations in the locations shown on the overlay.

The locations were selected to give the greatest amount of information with the leas number of stations. Road access was an important consideration. Some walking may t necessary but it has been kept to a minimum.

After analysis with other activity recommend

tions no conflicts are evident.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. See <u>Rationale</u> above and the <u>Rationale</u> for Objective W-2 for available social, economic and institutional data and for Bureau Manual guidance. The recommendation is complementary to Recommendation WL-13.2 (Fisheries) which calls for surveying fisheries potential, gathering water quality data, and inventorying other water related items.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-2.1 was 'accepted in its entirety.

Decision

Reason

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Watershed Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

B.H. Name (MFP)

Activity

Reasons

QĮ

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

BH -(TH) 1/

Name(MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hills

Activity Watershed

Objective Number W-3 (Water Quality-Streams,

No. 2)

OBJECTIVE

Improve the quality of water in the main stream channels shown on Overlay No. 2 by 1985. Objective targets are compliance with Idaho State and Federal water quality standards. Quantification of a starting point for water quality is not possible because of scanty water quality baseline data (see also Objective W-2).

RATIONALE

3

See rationale for Objective W-2 and rationale for recommendations under this objectiv (W-3).

1/ Only Recommendation W-3.1 applies to the Timmerman Hills Planning Unit.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

WATER QUALITY STREAMS

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W-3.1

Complete a "site specific" inventory of potential dam sites, gabion sites, and detention structure sites on the main stream channels (and their primary and secondary tributaries) shown on the overlay by the end of the field season, 1978. 2/

2/ No overlay was prepared for the Timmerman Hills Planning Unit. Inventory the steep Timmerman and Picabo Hill drainageways.

<u>Support needs</u>: Assistance will be needed from the District Engineer and/or his staff in selecting feasible sites on the ground. There is no current inventory of feasible construction sites in the Shoshone District. Construction of water catchments has been on a piecemeal basis with the single objective (in nearly all cases) of providing additiona livestock water. A carefully prepared inventory with photos would assist in making management decisions concerning the feasibil ity of construction projects in relation to land treatment jobs. Watershed construction jobs will always be considered a complement to vegetal manipulation and proper livestock management rather than a replacement for these needed practices.

This inventory recommendation represents no

conflict with any present or future activity

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. See <u>Rationale</u> above and the <u>Rationale</u> for Objective W-2 for the available social, economic, and institutional data and for Bureau Manual guidance.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-3.1 was accepted in its entirety.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Reason

program of the Bureau.

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)



Activity Watershed Overlay Reference

B.H. - T.H.

Name (MFP)

Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

WATER QUALITY - STREAMS

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W-3.2

Improve water quality in the main stream channels shown on the overlay according to the following schedule:

Change in SSF on surrounding uplands	Target Date	Designation on BH URA Step 4, <u>Watershed</u> , Over- Lay No. 5
10-20 + points 5-9 points	1985 1985	Opportunity Area WQ-1 Opportunity Area WQ-2

While not quantifiable, there is a relationship between SSF and sediment load in drainages. Reduction of SSF should also bring about a reduction in turbidity that can increase water quality.

By implementing recommendations W-1.2, W-1.3 W-1.4, W-1.5 significant reductions in SSF can be accomplished by 1985.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation, rather it complements several. Recommendations W-1.2, W-1.3, W-1.4, W-1.5, R-3.2, WL 13.3, and those Range Management recommendations which relate to adjustments in stocking rate and implementation of grazing systems deal directly or indirectly with the problem of erosion and/or stream load of sediment. See <u>Rationale</u> above and the Rationale for Objective W-2.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-3.2 was accepted in its entirety.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Nore: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Reasons

If erosion reduction can be accomplished on upper watersheds, improved water quality in main stream channels is expected to follow naturally.

Reason

Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil: Activity Watershed

B.H.

Overlay Reference

Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

B.H. Name (MFP)

Activity Watershed

Page 1 of 2

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

WATER QUALITY - STREAMS

W - 3.3

Improve water quality in the stream reaches designated on the overlay by selective channel fencing to exclude domestic livestock by 1980. Leave sufficient water gaps to meet the needs of grazing animals. These stream bottoms have a history of very heavy livestock concentration which annually denudes most herbaceous riparian vegetation. The stream bottom is a separate and distinct ecosystem from the surrounding uplands. It is a fragile environment, easily disturbed. Excluding livestock from the stream bottom will decrease bacterial counts and bank sloughing. Increasing lush riparian vegetation will help to shade the water surface. A decrease in water temperature is expected to occur.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with the free movement of domestic livestock and with providing the maximum amount of forage, but is not in direct conflict with any <u>specific</u> Range Management recommendation. It is complementary to recommendations R-1.1 (Fishing Improvement) and WL-13.1 (excluding livestock along King Hill, Dry, and Clover Creeks). The needs of domestic stock have been considered in that water gaps are proposed. However, initial and maintenance costs will be high and certain stream reaches may be healed through implementation of a grazing management system. On these reaches the least cost alternative of implementing intensive livestock management should be explored. Other reaches are in such condition that total protection is critical.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-3.3 was accepted in its entirety for those stream reaches designated <u>Channel</u> Fencing on the overlay.

Improve water quality, in the stream reaches designated <u>Channel Fencing</u> <u>only after AMP Failure to Heal</u> on the overlay, by selective channel fencing to exclude domestic livestock only after at least one cycle in a rest rotation-type grazing system. If healing is not apparent fence stock Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Reasons

These stream reaches are considered critical for the recreation and wildlife activities.

These stream reaches are important, but less critical than those above.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

B.H.

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill Activity Watershed Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

Page 2 of 2

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

away from the stream bottom. Leave sufficient water gaps to meet the needs of grazing animals.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

B.H T. H.	
Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hil
Activity	
Watershed	
Objective Number	
W-4 (Water Quality-Surfa	ace

白斑

Waters Other than Streams) Page 1 of 1

OBJECTIVE:

Improve the quality of water in Bureau water developments (except wells and pipelines), undeveloped springs and water seeps on National Resource Land by 1985. At present, this is a nonquantifiable objective.

RATIONALE:

Field observation indicates that areas around springs and seeps accessible to domestic livestock (especially cattle) are very often converted from a natural oasis supporting many forms of life to an ugly "mud wallow". The resultant decrease in water quality is apparent, even to the casual observer. In addition, livestock very often wade into developed waterholes and reservoirs creating a quagmire of mud and fecal material very inhospitable to many forms of life.

Bureau Basic and Supplemental guidance emphasizes the need for a quality environment.

Bureau Manual 160 2.12 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 in part, "An equally important BLM task is to provide a level of protection for basic resource values of all types... 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..."

See also Bureau Manual 1602.42C3a,b,c and 1603.12E3b shown in rationale for Objective W-2.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

	1 Barris	
.H.		

AA M.

Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hi

Activity Watershed

H.H. ~]

Overlay Reference Step 1 See fogtep 3 note reference 3/

WATER QUALITY - SURFACE WATERS OTHER THAN STREAMS

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W-4.1 (entire planning unit)

Complete an inventory of all existing Bureau water developments (except pipelines and wells), undeveloped springs, and water seeps on National Resource Land to determine the need for "site specific" water quality improvement measures by the end of the field season 1980.

3/ See the following overlays for locations of existing water developments and some undeveloped waters. See also base map for some other undeveloped waters.

BH URA Step 2 - <u>Water Resources</u> No. 2. TH URA Step 2 - <u>Water Resources</u> No. 1.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. See <u>Rationale</u> above and the <u>Rationale</u> for Objective W-4 for the available social, economic, and institutional data, and for Bureau Manual guidance.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity mecommendation W-4.1 was accepted in its entirety.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Reasons

This inventory recommendation represents no conflict with any, present or future activity program of the Bureau.

The Bureau has an inventory of water developments; it is, however, noticeably lacking inwater quality information. There is no inventory of undeveloped natural waters.

An inventory, with photos, emphasizing water quality, is important to decide which surface waters have highest priority for improment measures and what practices are needed

Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

D • .	α	1.11.		
Nan	ae (MF	P)		
Ben	nett	Hills-Timr	nerman	Hil:
	^{ivity} tersl	ned		
Ove	rlay R	eference	1	

Overlay Reference Step 1 See Step 3 Footnote Reference 4/

WATER QUALITY - SURFACE WATERS OTHER THAN STREAMS

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W-4.2 (entire planning unit)

Implement water quality improvement measures on those surface waters requiring corrective work by 1985. Continue maintenance on a regular basis from then on.

4/ See footnote under Recommendation W-4.1. The water quality inventory recommended (W-4.1) will identify corrective work required to restore surface waters to an acceptable level. Some corrective actions are:

 Fence the areas with fences strong enough to handle the greatest expected problem,
 e.g., railroad tie posts with 6" rails in areas frequented by bulls.

2. Pipe water away from the water source to troughs below or to a reservoir below.

3. Plant adapted species in and around areas denuded by overgrazing, e.g., establish willows, quaking aspen, etc., in what is now a pure stand of Kentucky bluegrass.

Support needs: Job feasibility determination will need to be made on a
case-by-case basis the year prior to inclusion in the AWP by the District Engineer and/or his staff.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Improving water quality will affect some present uses, e.g., free movement of livestock, but the effects are considered worth the trade-offs and dollar cost. The recommendation is consistent with the intent of Recommendation WL-6.3 (excluding livestock from spring and wet meadow areas which are important summer habitat for sage grouse). Any corrective improvement work should be done in such a way that it harmonizes with the landscape and does not represent a visual intrusion (Recommendation R-4.3).

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Reasons

W-4.2 (entire planning unit) Implement water quality improvement measures on those surface waters requiring corrective work by 1985. Construct any improvements in such a way that they harmonize with, rather than detract from, the natural occurrence of aquatic life and the surrounding drier vegetation. Continue maintenance on a regular basis indefinitely.

Support needs: The same support needs apply to the modified recommendation as applied to the original recommendation.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Recommendation W-4.2 was modified to reflectivisual resource needs. Surface waters in a semi-desert area support many life forms (plant & animal). These life forms should predominate, not the man-made improvements.

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

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil Activity Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 See Step 3 Footnote Reference 4/

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

			1/4	
В.	$H_{\bullet} = T$.H.	e construction of the second se	
Nam	e(MFP)		•	
Benr	ett Hi	115	s/Timmerman	Hill
Activ	vity		*** · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Wat	ershed			
Obje	ctive Num	ber		
W-5	(Flood	&	Sediment R	educ-

tion) Page 1 of 2

OBJECTIVE:

Reduce flood and sediment damage to an acceptable level by 1985. At present, this is a nonquantifiable objective.

RATIONALE:

Some flooding and sedimentation are occurring because the watershed conditions are conducive to rapid runoff. Overgrazed and nearly denuded lands do not provide a sufficient mantle of protective herbaceous vegetation to allow infiltration of moisture into the soil. The Corps of Engineers observed, "Some flood problems have been noted along the lower reaches of both Thorn and Dry Creeks. The estimated annual flood damages in both of these reaches are small, which limits the amount of flood protective work that could be economically justified. The effort to find feasible solutions to these problems has been frustrated by conflicti reports on the problems and their causes." 1/

While the Corps is primarily concerned with structural improvements in the main stream channels on flood plains, the Bureau must be concerned with the vegetative mantle on the upper watershed areas.

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 1602.42a states in part, "All land use and resource management program decisions must be consistent with Federal or State air and water quality standards..."

Bureau Manual 1603.12E3c states that one long-term objective of the Water Resources Program Activity is to: "Reduce and control flood and sediment damage, both on and off the public lands."

Bureau Manual 1603.124a states that one major principle and standard we are to comply with is, "As a minimum, meet State and Federal air and water quality standards."

Idaho State Office Manual supplement 1603, Appendix 1, Page 14, E., <u>Watershed</u> <u>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...'

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 - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

B.H T.H.	
Name(MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hill
Activity Watershed	
Objective Number W-5(Flood & Sediment Re	- educ-

tion) Page 2 of 2

Rationale (continued)

1/ Data Source: Big Wood River & Tributaries, Public Workshop Brochure No. 2. 1972. U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, Walla Walla, Washington.

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION В.Н. – Т.Н.

Name (MFP)

Sennett Hills-Timmerman Hil Activity Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1 See Footep 3

note Reference 5/

FLOOD & SEDIMENT REDUCTION

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W - 5.1 (Entire planning unit)

Establish studies to collect baseline data on present flood and sediment damage. Develop an inventory of problem areas and the source of the problem by the end of the field season, 1978.

5/. See BH URA, Step 3, Watershed Overlay No. 3 for areas designated "Flood Prone". No overlay was prepared for the Timmerman Hills Unit. At the present time the scope and magnitude of flood and sediment damage is not known. In fact, there are conflicting reports on the problems and causes (see <u>Rationale</u> for Objective W-5),

An inventory of trouble spots is a first step in rational solution of the problems.

Some possible study methods are siltation transects on selected reservoirs, siltation and/or erosion transects on selected stream reaches, interviews and/or field trips with knowledgeable local persons, etc.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation. See <u>Rationale</u> above and the <u>Rationale</u> for Objective W-5 for the available social, economic, and institutional data and for Bureau Manual guidance.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-5.1 was accepted in its entirety.

Reasons

This inventory recommendation represents no conflict with any present or future activity program of the Bureau.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

FLOOD & SEDIMENT REDUCTION

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

W- 5.2

Reduce offsite (downstream) flood and sediment damage by reducing the rate of erosion and improving herbaceous vegetative cover on the upper watershed by 1985.

Offsite damage as determined under Recommend ation W-5.1 can largely be alleviated by proper care and management of the source of the flood water and sediment, the upper watershed areas. If Recommendations W-1.2, W-1.4, W-1.4, W-1.5, W-3.2, and W-3.3 are accepted and implemented, damage along streams issuing from the planning unit will be reduced. Damage along streams having their source outside the unit will, of course, continue until their watershed areas are improved (Big Wood & Little Wood Rivers and Camas Creek).

See also rationale for Objectives W-1, and W-2.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation, rather - it complements several. Recommendations W-1.2, W-1.3, W-1.4, W-1.5, W-1.6, W-3.2, W-3.3, R-3.2, WL 13.1, WL 13.2, WL 13.3, all deal with watershed and or stream channel quality. See Rationale above and the Rationale for Objective W-5 for social, economic, and institutional data, and for Bureau Manual guidance.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Activity Recommendation W-5.2 was accepted in its entirety.

Decision

Adopt the Step 2 multiple use recommendation.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Reasons

This naturally will follow with the acceptance of watershed improvement practices on the upper watersheds.

B.H. - T.H.

Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Activity Watershed

Overlav Reference

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

в.н. – Т.н.	
Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hill
Activity	
Watershed	
Objective Number	
W-6 (Water Vield)	

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1 ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE:

Bureau Manual 1608.36A4 states, "Establish objectives only to quantify the amount needed for human needs within the watershed activity."

No objectives have been developed as no future water requirements have been identified for the watershed activity.

This statement was included in the Watershed objectives only to account for the Water Yield program category.

RATIONALE:

No rationale was developed.