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

RATTLESNAKE ALLOTMENT (0421)

RECOMMENDATION

RM 1. & 2.1
Adjust the allotment boundaries to include the following areas:

1. That part of the adjoining North Gooding Allotment east of Highway 46 from the settlement to the Gwin Ranch.

2. All of the Turkey Butte Allotment.

3. The southwest extension of the North Shoshone Allotment known as the Federicksen Lane.

4. Unallotted or unused areas in the following described areas:

Sec. 30, T. 4 S., R. 16 E.
Secs. 25,35, T. 4 S., R. 15 E.
Secs. 2,3, T. 5 S., R. 15 E.

5. All of the Highway 46 Allotment.

RATIONALE

These areas are too small to be logically and feasibly divided and implement a rotation grazing system that will provide for the physiological requirement of the native forage plants. Combining these areas with the Rattlesnake Allotment will provide an area large enough to justify pasture division fences and water developments required to implement a grazing system. Water developments and miles of fence needed to implement a grazing system will be reduced over the present situation. Inclusion of that part of the North Gooding Allotment east of the highway will allow for implementation of a more effective grazing system for the area.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation to combine that part of the North Gooding Allotment east of Highway 46 and the southwest extension of the Shoshone Cattle Allotment known as Fredericksen Lane with the Rattlesnake Allotment would result in the loss of important spring range to the operators in these two allotments. However, these losses would be mitigated by shifting some grazing use into the allotment benefiting from the adjustment from those losing acreage. There would be no adverse economic impact to livestock operators involved.

Combining the "46" allotment with the Rattlesnake Allotment would have an adverse economic impact on the current livestock operator because it would require him to move his livestock more often and over a greater distance, resulting in increased operational costs. It would also seriously reduce his present flexibility in going from an individual allotment bordering his property to a larger group allotment with AMP requirements.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

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

Multiple-Use Analysis (cont)

Combining Turkey Butte Allotment and the unallotted areas mentioned above with the Rattlesnake Allotment would have no adverse economic impact to the range users in the allotments involved. In fact a beneficial impact would occur in that more range would be available to grazing than under the present situation because of the unallotted areas.

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendations.

The following recommendations which support grazing systems would also complement this proposal: Wildlife, WL 5.1, 6.3, 8.3, 9.2, 12.2, 13.3; watershed, W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2; recreation, R 2.1.

Multiple-Use Recommendation	Reason
Accept recommendations as stated above.	

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION–ANALYSIS–DECISION

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

RATTLESNAKE ALLOTMENT (0421)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
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.	The URA indicates the stocking rate appears to be in excess of the carrying capacity of the allotment. Present policy provides that "Initial stocking rates...must not exceed the existing livestock grazing capacity...". (W.O. Inst. Memo 75-407). Idaho's five-year goal is 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 vegetation data to be gathered during the summer of 1976 and succeeding years.

Multiple-Use Analysis

Since the current Class I active demand appears to be in excess of the carrying capacity, this recommendation would result in reduction of grazing use, and, therefore would have an adverse economic impact on the livestock operations dependent upon the allotment. With proper management and land treatment part of the impact could be mitigated over the long-term.

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendation.

Supporting recommendations include the following: watershed, W 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 5.2; wildlife, WL 2.1, 2.4, 3.1, 5.1, 6.3, 8.2, 8.3, 12.1, 13.3; recreation, R 2.1, 3.2; range management, RM 1. & 2.3 (0421).

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept the recommendation as stated above.	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)

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

RATTLESNAKE ALLOTMENT (0421)

RECOMMENDATION

RM 1. & 2.3
Revise the present AMP as follows for the combined areas in RM 1. & 2.1 (0421).

1. Adjust the grazing system to one that will provide for plant vigor, seed production, seed tromp, and seedling establishment of the key native forage species. (See URA Step 4 for minimum grazing treatment opportunity.)

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

3. Adjust license flexibility to meet manual requirements and specify as a minimum the normal operation, maximum numbers allowed, flexibility not to exceed 5 days before and after the normal operation dates.

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

Support Needs:
1. Improve and provide additional access in the allotment to facilitate use supervision and livestock movement.

2. Acquire by exchange the isolated private lands in the allotment which will provide access to water, improve distribution and block Federal lands to facilitate management of the Federal range.

RATIONALE

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 960 additional AUMs can be produced annually within a 15- 20 year period with proper management.

Presently most of the Class I demand is used during the critical spring growing season which overloads the forage producing capacity of the vegetation during that time. Adjusting more spring use to fall use will increase the opportunity for seed tromp requirements. Flexibility allowed in the present AMP does not conform to manual requirement.

The impact of grazing on the vegetation is the same regardless of class of grazing animal. Dual use, where sheep grazing 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.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Multiple-Use Analysis

Revision of the present AMP, as recommended, would result in adjustment of spring use allowed from over 2/3 of the qualified demand to 1/2 of the qualified demand, and possibly a reduction of grazing area during the spring season. This adjustment would most likely result in reduced use in the allotment and would, therefore, have an adverse economic impact on the range users. In addition, less flexibility in the grazing license would occur which could restrict the grazing operation. A long-term beneficial input would occur because the recommendations favor establishment of perennial grasses which will stabilize and increase forage production.

Wildlife, WL 3.1, 8.2; 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; and watershed, W 3.3 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, 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 3.1A proposes disposal of Class I and II lands found to be consistent with classification criteria. Such an action would result in loss of most productive area 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 could prohibit use of up to 1/3 of the land surface under lease.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with R 2.1, 8.1; 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 5.1, 6.3, 8.3, 9.2, 12.2, 13.3; W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2; R 2.1;

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Modify the recommendation to include the following provisions in addition to those stated above:	
1. Do not exceed 60 percent utiliza-	

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)	Reasons (cont)
tion of herbaceous vegetation in any pasture where grazing occurs.	Adequate herbaceous vegetation should be left to provide adequate forage and cover for all wildlife, including deer, elk, and upland game birds, and to provide litter to protect the soil from the erosive forces of nature. 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.
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 exclosure.	Livestock congregating on spring source areas denude vegetation essential to sage grouse broods and other wildlife species.
Wet Meadows: After revision of the grazing system fence wet meadows to exclude livestock only where it is demonstrated after one or two grazing cycles that significant wildlife habitat is being destroyed by livestock grazing.	It is anticipated that damage caused by livestock grazing will be mitigated by implementation of a proper grazing system.
Streams & canals: Fence streams and canals where major critical waterfowl nesting areas are identified. Provide water gaps no farther than 1/2 mile apart.	Grazing livestock utilize and destroy riparian vegetation needed for waterfowl nesting habitat.
3. Allow disposal of lands within Class I and II irrigation potential classification.	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.
4. Allow mineral leasing.	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

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 range 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 range 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.

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

RATTLESNAKE ALLOTMENT (0421)

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
RM 1. & 2.4 Remove competing cheatgrass and brush species and seed approximately 3320 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 480 additional AUMs will be produced annually from the treatments.

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 (0421)(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, 14.12, and 14.15; and minerals, M 2.1 which would restrict or constrain [illegible] 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 7.1, and lands, L 3.1A which would prohibit any land treatment. The wildlife recommendations would prohibit brush control on sage grouse wintering areas and strutting grounds within the allotment as proposed. 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, 5.2, 9.2; L 6.2, 6.4; R 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 6.1, 12.2, 13.3; W 1.4, 1.5, 5.2; R 2.1.

Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons
Accept and modify the recommendation to subject brush removal and seeding proposals to the following	

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)	Reasons (cont)
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 impacts 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. Allow coordinated land treatment on sage grouse winter range and nesting areas. (See criteria in Appendix I (MFP Step II).	The need to produce livestock forage to minimize the economic impact of the anticipated reduction in stocking rate (RM 2.1 (0416)) 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 and nesting habitat.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. Prohibit land treatment projects on known archaeological sites.	Bureau policy requires protection of cultural resources.