

# MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Activity

Range Management

Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

## MARSH SPRINGS ALLOTMENT (0431)

### RECOMMENDATION

RM 2.1

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

### RATIONALE

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

Idaho's 5-year goals are to bring livestock use in line with existing grazing capacity for those areas in less than satisfactory condition as a result of excessive livestock use.

It is anticipated that the present forage production capacities can be interpolated from Soil & Vegetative data to be gathered during the summer of 1976 and succeeding years.

## Multiple-Use Analysis

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

This recommendation does not conflict with any other activity recommendations.

Supporting recommendations include the following: Watershed, W 1.2, 1.3, 5.2; Wildlife, WL 1.1, 3.1, 12.1; Fecreation, R 1.1, 2.1; range management, RM-1. & 2.2 (0431).

#### Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

### Reasons

- 1. The stocking rates must be reasonably clos to the carrying capacity to implement a rotation grazing system that will improve range condition.
- Herbaceous vegetative cover left on site will reduce erosion and improve water quality
   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



### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hill
Activity	
Range Management	_
Overlay Reference	=

MARSH SPRING ALLOTMENT (0431)

Page 1 of 2

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3

### RECOMMENDATION

RM 1. & 2.2

Implement an AMP with a rest-rotation grazing system that will provide for plant vigor, seed production, seed tromp, and seedling establishment of native key forage species. (See URA Step 4 for the minimum acceptable grazing system.)

## RATIONALE

Supplemental guidance states that "AMPs will be made for all public lands which can reasonably be expected to remain in Federal ownership for multiple-use management and on which livestock grazing is a significant use." (1603.12G4c).

The present grazing does not provide for the physiological need of native forage plants. Implementing a grazing system which provides for the plant's physiological needs will increase the density and vigor of the native forage species and thereby improve range conditions and increase forage production to maximum potential. An estimated 165 additional AUMs can be produced annually within a 15-20 year period with proper management

## Multiple-Use Analysis

Implementing the recommendation would not cause a significant adverse economic impact on the allottee. Increased fencing (if necessary) would result in some additional costs for maintenance. However, the improved management would increase livestock forage production. This would likely offset increased maintenance costs and partly mitigate expected reduction in allowable grazing use resulting from the adjustments recommended in range management, RM 2.1 (0431).

Wildlife, WL 1.1, 3.1, 12.1, and watershed, W 1.3 identify the need to retain 40 percent to 50 percent of the herbaceous vegetation. This conflicts with the recommendation because utilization in the heavy use pastures of the grazing system would likely be greater than 60 percent. Wildlife, WL 6.2, 9.1 identify the need to exclude livestock grazing on wet meadows and springs. This would reduce availability of high quality forage and restrict access to water, which would contribute to the livestock distribution problems. Minerals, M 1.2 proposes leasing, with minimal restrictions, the geothermal resource. This could restrict livestock grazing because development would prohibit use of up to 1/3 of the land surface under lease.

Unstructions on reverse)

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: WL 1.4, and R 1.1, 2.1. 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.

Nore: a Supporting: recommendations include the following: WL 6.3, 12.12; W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2;

#### MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

Reasons

Page 2 of 2

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

Multiple-Use Recommendations

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

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

5. 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.

## Support needs:

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

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

# MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Bennett Hills-Timmerman H	11
Activity	
Range Management	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3	

## MARSH SPRING ALLOTMENT (0431)

Page 1 of

er og grande skalende skalend

## RECOMMENDATION

RM 1. & 2.3

Remove competing brush species on approximately 3500 acres of National Resource Land to release and establish desirable perennial forage species.

## RATIONALE

These treatments combined with management, are needed to meet the objectives within a reasonable timeframe of 10- 15 years. Approximately 780 additional AUMs will be produced annually from the treatment.

## Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would result in an increase in forage production. The increase would partially offset expected losses in allowable grazing use resulting from the adjustments recommended in range management, RM 2.1 (0416)(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, 4.3, and 14.15; and minerals, M 1.2 which would restrict or constrain layout and/or mothod 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 which would prohibit brush control on sage grouse strutting grounds and within the allotment as proposed.

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

Supporting activity recommendations include the following: WL 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 6.1, 12.2; W 1.4, 1.5, 3.2, 5.2; R 13.1,  $\frac{RM}{R}$  1. & 2.2(0431).

### Multiple-Use Recommendations

### Reasons



Accept and modify the recommendation to subject brush removal and seeding proposals to the following constraints before projects are started.

Nore: Attach additional sheets, if needed

## MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman	Hill
Activity Range Management	<del>-</del>
Overlay Reference	_
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3	

Page 2 of

## Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

1. Implement a sound and acceptable grazing system.

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).

- 3. Allow coordinated land treatment within a 2-mile radius of sage grouse strutting grounds. See criteria referred to in 2. above.
- 4. Allow leasing of minerals (geo-thermal resources) with no constraints on land-treatment projects.
- 5. Prohibit land treatment projects on known archaeological sites.

## Reasons (cont)

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.

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 longterm impacts and must be coordinated so as not to destroy other resource values.

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 nesting habitat.

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

Bureau policy requires protection of cultural resources.



Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

# MARSH SPRING ALLOTEMENT

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Combing allotments