MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

DAVIS MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENT (0417)

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

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. Information is needed to substantiate URA estimates and establish baseline data. 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/or 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, 3.2, 5.2; wildlife, WL 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 6.3, 8.2, 8.3, 12.1; recreation, R 2.1; range management RM $1 \& 2.2 \pmod{0416}$.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendations as stated above.

Reasons

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)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

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



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

DAVIS MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENT (0417)

Step 1 No. 1 Step 3 Page 1 of 4

Range Management

Overlay Reference

Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill

Name (MFP)

Activity

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.2 Revise the present AMP as follows:

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 no more than 50 percent of the Class I demand 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 to graze and season of use, flexibility not to exceed five days before and after the normal operation dates.

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

Support Needs:

Improve and provide additional access in the allotment to facilitate use supervision and livestock movement. Exchange National Resource Lands in the Long Gulch area for scattered

Note: Att ch additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse)

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 1140 additional AUMs can be produced annually within a 15- 20 year period with proper management.

Grazing during the growing season is critical to the health and vigor of the forage producing plant. Excessive grazing during that period is detrimental to the vegetation and will result in deteriorated range conditions and loss of forage production.

Flexibility allowed in the present AMP does not conform to manul requirements.

The impact of grazing on the vegetation is the same regardless of class of grazing animal. Dual use, where sheep graze in early spring, followed by late spring cattle use causes heavy utilization of the vegetation and results in detrimental range conditions if not properly regulated.

S

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

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

Page 2 of₄

1.000.000000000

<u>Support Needs</u>: (cont) private lands in the main part of the allotment.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would result in adjustment of spring use allowed from 2/3 of the qualified demand to 1/2 of the qualified demand, and a reduction in 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 livestock movements could restrict the grazing operation. Long-term benefits in terms of increased forage production from improved management would partially offset the reduction in use resulting from the adjustment to carrying capacity, as proposed in Range Management (0415) RM, 2.1.

Wildlife, WL 1.3, 3.1, 8.2, 12.1, and watershed, W 1.3 identifies the need to retain 40- 50 percent of the herbaceous vegetation produced each year on each pasture. This conflicts with the recommended grazing system because utilization on some pastures would likely exceed 60 percent. Wildlife, WL 6.2, 9.1, 12.1, and watershed W 3.3 identify the need to exclude livestock grazing on wet meadows, springs, streams, and canals in the allotment. This would reduce the availability of high quality forage and restrict access to water which would increase the existing livestock distribution problems. Lands, L 3.1A proposes disposal of Class I and II irrigable lands in the allotment if they meet the appropriate classification requirements for agricultural use. Such action would result in loss of a large amount of the important spring range in the allotment. Disposal of the land would disrupt the recommended grazing system. Minerals, M 1.2 proposes to lease the potential geothermal resources in the allotment. Should an economic source of geothermal energy be found and developed, livestock grazing would be restricted because development would require about 1/3 of the leased area.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: Wildlife, WL 1.4, 2.1, 2.8; recreation, R 1.1, 2.1. These conflicting proposals should be addressed at the time the AMP is implemented to insure all resource values are given proper consideration.

Supporting recommendations include the following: Wildlife, WL 6.3, 8.3, 9.2, 12.2; watershed, W 1.2, 3.2, 5.2; recreation, R 1.1, 2.1, 13.1.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Reasons

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

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES	Name (MFP)
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	Bennett Hills-
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	Activity
	Range Managem
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN	Overlay Reference
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION	Step 1 No. 1 Ste

Name (MPP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
Activity
 Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3
Page 3 of 4

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

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

Reasons (cont)

Addituate 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. Protest wet meadows, springs, streams, and canals from intensive livestock use which normally occurs as follows:

<u>Springs</u>: 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.

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.

Streams & canals: Fence streams and canals where major critical waterfowl nesting areas and fisheries potentials are identified. Provide water gaps no farther than 1/2 mile apart.

3. Allow disposal of lands within Class I and II irrigation potential classification. Livestock congregating on spring source area: denude vegetation essential to sage grouse broods and other wildlife species.

It is anticipated that damage caused by livestock grazing will be mitigated by implementation of a proper grazing system.

Grazing livestock utilize and destroy riparian vegetation needed for waterfowl nesting and fisheries habitat.

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 economical stability to the locale than presently produced by the existing resource use.



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill Activity
Range Management
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3
 Page 4 of 4

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

4. Allow mineral leasing.

Reasons (cont)

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	Hi 1 1
	Activity	
	Range Management	
	Overlay Reference	-
1	Step 1No 1 Step 3	

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Page 1 of 2

DAVIS MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENT (0417)

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 1. & 2.3

Remove competing brush species on approximately 1300 acres and remove brush and seed approximately 3900 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 418 additional AUMs will be preduced annually from the treatment.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would result in an increase in forage production. The increase would partially offset expected losses of allowable grazing use resulting from the adjustments recommended in range management (0415), RM 1.1 (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, 14.6, 14.15, and minerals, M 1.2 which would restrict or constrain layout and method of land treatment as recommended. The recommendations deal primarily with visual impact of land treatment and the effect the recommended treatments would have on archaeological sites. The minerals proposal deals with the restriction on land treatments which would occur should development of geothermal resources take place.

The recommendation conflicts with wildlife, WL 7.1, which would prohibit any land treatment on sage grouse wintering areas. This would reduce the potential livestock forage obtainable through implementation of the recommended treatments. Lands, L 3.1A would also prohibit any land treatment because it proposes disposal of land for agricultural purposes.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with the following activity recommendations: wildlife, WL 2.8, 5.2, 9.2, 11.1; and recreation, R 2.1. These conflicting proposals will be addressed prior to implementation of land treatments . to insure all resource values involved are adequately considered.

Supporting activity recommendations include the following: wildlife, WL 1.2, 1.3, 6.1, 12.2, 13.3; watershed, W 1.4, 1.5, 5.2; recreation, R 2.1.

•		Multiple-Use Recommendations	Reasons	
•		Accept and modify the recommendation to subject brush removal and seeding pro-		
		ttach additional sheets, if needed		
	Instruct	ions on reverse)		Eorm 1600-21 (April 1075)



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

<u>Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill</u>
Activity Range Management
Overlay Reference
Step 1 No. 1 Step 3
 Page 2 of 2

Downoth IId 11

Name (MFP)

Multiple-Use Recommendations (cont)

Reasons (cont)

posals to the following constraints before projects are started.

1. Revise the allotment management plan and 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 on sage grouse winter range. (See Appendix I, MFP Step II.)

4. Propose no land treatments on lands that have Class I and II irrigation potential pending outcome of classification.

5. Allow leasing of minerals (geothermal resources) with no constrains on land treatment projects.

6. Prohibit land treatment projects Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed 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 inspection: can be made and impacts of the project on th 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.

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 habitat.

Range improvement investment should not be made on lands that may be disposed of for agricultural purposes.

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.

(Instructions on reverse)

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

DAVIS MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENT (0417)

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 2.4 Establish administrative stock trails, not to exceed 1/4 mile in width, as follows:

1. From Bray Lake east (Sec. 25, T. 4 S., R. 12 E.), open to grazing year-long.

2. Southwest from Crist Cabin (Sec. 15, T. 4 S., R. 12 E.), open to grazing from 5/15 to 12/31.

This is the main route for sheep herds trailing from the Bruneau desert to the North Gooding and Macon Flat Allotments, and points north.

This trail is used under the same circumstances as 1. above. Trail should be closed 1/1 to 5/15 because of late forage growing conditions in higher ranges in the North Gooding Allotment.

Establishment of stock driveways will give better administrative control over trailing livestock and will reduce unauthorized trailing and abuse of the forage resource. This will result in a decrease of forage utilization in the allotment and improvement of range conditions.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation would have negligible economic impact on the users in the allotment. A small adjustment would have to be made to make up for the forage excluded from use by the stock driveway. Possibly the adjustment would be mitigated by the increase in forage resulting from elimination of indiscriminate trailing outside the established driveway.

The recommendation is in conflict with lands, L 3.1A which proposes disposal of a tract of land which would be crossed by the lower trail (provided those lands meet appropriate classification criteria). Establishment of the trail would preclude disposal of part of the area.

The recommendation conflicts to a minor degree with watershed, W 1.2, 1.3, 5.2, and range management, RM 1. & 2.2 which process establishment and maintenance of a good herbaceous vegetative cover on the area. Although the same conflicts occur in the Clover Creek Allotment, they are considered to be minor in this case because the trails would have much less use and are not open for year-round trailing. Adverse impacts would be further mitigated by the late opening date of the upper

Name (MFP) Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hil Activity Range Management Overlay Reference Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

Page 1 of 2



.



MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

	Name (MFP)
•	Bennett Hills-Timmerman Hill
	Activity
	Range Management
	Overlay Reference
	Step 1 No. 2 Step 3

Page 2 of 2

Multiple-Use Analysis (cont)

trail. It also conflicts to a minor degree with wildlife, WL 1.1, 5.1, 12.1. These conflicts will be addressed at the time the driveways are established to insure they will be given adequate consideration.

The recommendation is supported by range management (0417), RM 1. & 2.1, and all other activity recommendations which propose improved vegetation management. The recommendation would facilitate management of trailing, thereby reducing impacts from improper trail use outside the designated route.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Accept the recommendation as stated above and modify to include the following:

1. Allow disposal of lands with Class I and II irrigation potential classification without reservation for the stock driveway. Reserve public access to remaining National Resource Lands to facilitate need for a stock driveway.

Reason

Generally benefits to administrative benefit are considered to be as important as the moderate damage to the vegetative resource anticipated as a result of the livestock trail.

Access to National Resource Lands for trailing livestock can be provided by public access reservations if lands are disposed of

(Instructions on reverse)

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

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

DAVIS MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENT (0417)

RECOMMENDATION

RATIONALE

RM 2.5 Establish an individual allotment in the Long Gulch **D**rainage.

This area is an extension of National Resource Land that is surrounded by private land. This area cannot be feasibly included in the Davis Mountain AMP because of its location.

Refar to rationale for RM 2.1.

Provide custodial management of the area. Refer to Custodial Management Recommendation, RM 2.1.

Multiple-Use Analysis

The recommendation would have a slight positive economic impact on the allottee to whom the individual allotment would be licensed. The positive impact would result from the increased utility to the allottee with regard to use of private rangelands he owns, which are adjacent to the National Resource Lands within the proposed allotment. Within constraints of proper management, the operator would be able to use the allotment in a manner best adopted to the use of his adjacent private rangelands.

The recommendation does not conflict with any other resource activity proposals.

To the extent that the recommendation would facilitate range management on the area and on the rest of the present Davis Mountain Allotment, the recommendation is supported by the following activity recommendations: range management (0417), RM 1. & 2.1; wildlife, WL 6.3, 8.3; watershed, W 1.2, 5.2; recreation, R 3.2.

Accept recommendations as stated Same as Rationale above.
above.
1. A

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

DAVIS MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENT

Alternatives Considered

Allotment Boundary Changes

Forage Inventory

.

a²
a²

.

.

. • •