TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1
Key Findings ES-2
Vegetative Resource ES-2
Ecological Condition ES-2
Productivity ES-3
Elk and Cattle Use ES-4
Elk/Cattle Overlap ES-4
Recommendations ES-5
Conclusion ES-5

INTRODUCTION I-1
Data Collection and Analysis I-1
Plant Nomenclature I-2
Document Organization I-2

1. VEGETATION EVALUATION 1-1
1.1 Long-Term Plant Data Trends 1-1
1.1.1 Plot C-6 1-2
1.1.2 Plot C-29 1-6
1.1.3 Plot C-51 1-9
1.1.3 Plot C-56 1-11
1.1.4 Plot C-74 1-11
1.2 Ecological Condition of Rangeland Habitats 1-12
1.3 Productivity of Rangeland Habitats 1-24
1.4 Initial Stocking Rates 1-30

2. RANGE CONDITION AND GRAZING 2-1
2.1 Current Range Condition 2-1
2.1.1 North Crow Elk Herd Unit 2-4
2.1.2 Kimber Elk Herd Unit 2-5
2.2 Historic Range Condition 2-6

3. SAMPLING AND UTILIZATION 3-1
3.1 Methods 3-2
3.1.1 Sampling Process 3-4
3.1.2 Calculations 3-4
3.1.3 Statistics 3-4
3.2 Utilization History for Kimber and North Crow Elk Herd Units 3-6
3.3 Utilization Sites 3-8
3.3.1 Beaver/Pole Utilization Site 3-11
3.3.2 Cold Springs Utilization Site 3-13
3.3.3 Dry Gulch Utilization Site 3-16
3.3.4 Eagle Basin Utilization Site 3-19

3.3.5 Elkhorn Springs Utilization Site 3-22
3.3.6 Eureka Creek Utilization Site 3-25
3.3.7 Horsethief Park Utilization Site 3-27
3.3.8 Kelly Gulch Utilization Site 3-30
3.3.9 Kimber Ridge Private Utilization Site 3-33
3.3.10 Longfellow Utilization Site 3-36
3.3.11 Shep's Gulch Utilization Site 3-38
3.3.12 Staubach Utilization Site 3-41
3.3.13 Tizer Basin Utilization Site 3-43
3.3.14 Upper Eagle Utilization Site 3-45
3.3.15 Vosburg Mine Utilization Site 3-47
3.3.16 Utilization Data Summary For All Sites 3-49

4. ELK AND LIVESTOCK GRAZING OVERLAP 4-1
4.1 Elk Distribution 4-1
4.1.1 North Crow EHU 4-4
4.1.2 Kimber Elk Distribution 4-6
4.2 Cattle Distribution 4-8
4.2.1 Allotment Management Systems 4-11
4.2.2 Season of Use 4-12
4.2.3 Actual Use Background for Cattle Allotments Inside the WMU 4-12
4.2.4 Cattle Suitability Determination 4-13
4.3 Areas of Elk/Cattle Overlap 4-16

5. COMPARISON WITH OTHER FINDINGS AND MODELS 5-1
5.1 Comparisons with Similar Studies 5-1
5.2 Conifer Encroachment 5-4
5.2.1 Barrett (2005) Encroachment Exercise 5-5
5.3 Elk Security Analysis 5-8
5.4 Hiding Cover Analysis 5-9
5.5 State and Transition Model 5-9
5.6 Landscape Modeling 5-11
5.6.1 Modeling in the Elkhorns 5-13
5.6.2 SIMPPLLE Results 5-14

6. VARIABLE IDENTIFICATION FOR MONITORING 6-1

7. MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS 7-1
7.1 Vegetation Resource 7-1
7.1.1 Weed Control Recommendations 7-1
7.1.2 Conifer Encroachment Recommendations 7-3
7.1.3 Elk Security 7-5
7.1.4 Forage Projections 7-9
7.1.5 Upland Utilization Standards 7-10
7.2 Conflict Minimization 7-11

7.2.1 Modify/Change Season of Use 7-12
7.2.2 Cattle Distribution 7-12
7.2.3 Conflicts on Winter Ranges 7-15
7.3 Conditions to Trigger Changes 7-16
7.3.1 Annual Precipitation 7-16
7.3.2 Continue Cooperative Approach to Management of the Elkhorns 7-17
7.3.3 Value of Working Landscapes 7-17
7.3.4 Promote Working Landscapes adjacent to the Elkhorns 7-17

8. MONITORING RECOMMENDATIONS 8-1
8.1 Future Monitoring Recommendations 8-1
8.1.1 Upland Monitoring 8-2
8.1.2 Riparian Monitoring 8-3
8.2 Updating USFS Rangeland Habitats Data Set 8-5
8.3 Parker 3-Step Plots 8-6
8.4 State and Transition Modeling 8-7

9. REFERENCES 9-1

APPENDIX A: LIST OF PREPARERS

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure ES-1 Production comparison ES-3
Figure ES-2 Pounds of forage used by elk and cattle within the Part B study area ES-4

Figure I-1 Kimber and North Crow EHUs I-1

Figure 1.1.1-1 HNF staff reading Transect #1 at C-6 in 2005 1-2
Figure 1.1.1-2 Hits by species for Plot C-6 Transect 1 1-3
Figure 1.1.1-3 Plot C-6 summary of Transect 1 1-3
Figure 1.1.1-4 Hits by Species for Plot C-6 Transect 2 1-3
Figure 1.1.1-5 Plot C-6 summary of Transect 2 1-4
Figure 1.1.1-6a Parker 3-Step C-6 T-1 in 1957 1-5
Figure 1.1.1-6b Parker 3-Step C-6 T-1 in 1966 1-5
Figure 1.1.1-6c Parker 3-Step C-6 T-1 in 2005 1-5
Figure 1.1.1-7a Parker 3-Step C-6 T-2 in 1957 1-5
Figure 1.1.1-7b Parker 3-Step C-6 T-2 in 1974 1-5
Figure 1.1.1-7c Parker 3-Step C-6 T-2 in 2005 1-5
Figure 1.1.2-1 Hits by species for Plot C-29 Transect 1 1-6
Figure 1.1.2-2 Hits by species for Plot C-29 Transect 2 1-6
Figure 1.1.2-3 Plot C-29 summary of both transects 1-6
Figure 1.1.2-4 Remeasurement of Plot C-29 Transect 1 1-7
Figure 1.1.2-5 Transect 1 at Plot C-29 in 1959 1-8
Figure 1.1.2-6 Transect 1 at Plot C-29 in 2004 1-8
Figure 1.1.2-7 Transect 2 at Plot C-29 in 1959 1-8

Figure 1.1.2-8 Transect 2 at Plot C-29 in 2004 1-8
Figure 1.1.3-1 Hits by species for C-51 Transect 1 1-9
Figure 1.1.3-2 Hits by species for C-51 Transect 2 1-9
Figure 1.1.3-3 C-51 summary of both transects 1-9
Figure 1.1.2-4 Transect 1 at Plot C-51 in 1967 1-9
Figure 1.1.2-5 Transect 1 at Plot C-51 in 2004 1-9
Figure 1.1.2-6 Transect 2 at Plot C-51 in 1967 1-9
Figure 1.1.2-7 Transect 2 at Plot C-51 in 2004 1-9
Figure 1.1.3-1 Plot C-56 summary of both transects 1-11
Figure 1.1.4-1 Plot C-74 summary of both transects 1-11

Figure 1.2-1 Example Worksheet Number 1 1-13
Figure 1.2-2 Example Worksheet Number 2 1-15
Figure 1.2-3 Example of an Ecological Condition Worksheet 1-19
Figure 1.2-4 Ecological Condition Map 1-21
Figure 1.2-5 Stand Stage Ratings for the North Crow EHU 1-22
Figure 1.2-6 Stand Stage Ratings for the Kimber EHU 1-23
Figure 1.2-7 USFS and ERG Comparison of Ecological Condition of Rangeland Habitats within the WMU for Kimber and North Crow EHUs 1-23

Figure 1.3-1 Double sampling locations 1-25
Figure 1.3-2 Total production for Kimber and North Crow EHUs 1-29

Figure 2.1-1 Ecological condition with elk locations 2-3
Figure 2.2-1 Cold Springs Pasture of the North Crow Allotment in 1939 2-6
Figure 2.2-2 North Crow EHU cattle grazing history for allotments inside the WMU 2-6
Figure 2.2-3 Kimber EHU cattle grazing history for allotments inside the WMU 2-7

Figure 3-1 Forage consumed by elk and cattle within the WMU for the Kimber EHU 3-1
Figure 3-2 Forage consumed by elk and cattle within the WMU for the North Crow EHU 3-1

Figure 3.3-1 Utilization site location map 3-9
Figure 3.3-2 Percent utilization map 3-10
Figure 3.3.1-1 Beaver/Pole utilization site location 3-11
Figure 3.3.1-2 View towards the west from the Beaver/Pole site 3-12
Figure 3.3.2-1 Cold Springs utilization site location 3-13
Figure 3.3.2-2 Cold Springs utilization site view towards the southwest 3-14
Figure 3.3.3-1 Dry Gulch utilization site location 3-16
Figure 3.3.3-2 Control cage at Dry Gulch utilization site 3-17
Figure 3.3.3-3 Heavy use at the Dry Gulch utilization site 3-18
Figure 3.3.4-1 Eagle Basin site location 3-19
Figure 3.3.3-2 View towards the northwest at the Eagle Basin utilization site 3-20
Figure 3.3.5-1 Elkhorn Springs site location 3-22
Figure 3.3.5-2 Locating paired plot at the Elkhorn Springs utilization site 3-23
Figure 3.3.6-1 Eureka Creek utilization site location 3-25

Figure 3.3.6-2 Control cage at the Eureka Creek utilization site 3-26
Figure 3.3.7-1 Horsethief Park utilization site location 3-27
Figure 3.3.7-2 Cage #3 at the Horsethief Park utilization site 3-28
Figure 3.3.8-1 Kelly Gulch site location 3-30
Figure 3.3.8-2 Elk among the cages at the Kelly Gulch utilization site 3-31
Figure 3.3.9-1 Kimber Ridge Private utilization site location 3-33
Figure 3.3.9-2 View towards the south from the Kimber Ridge Private utilization site 3-33
Figure 3.3.9-3 Elk at the Kimber Ridge site 3-35
Figure 3.3.10-1 Longfellow utilization site location 3-35
Figure 3.3.11-1 Shep's Gulch utilization site location 3-38
Figure 3.3.11-2 View towards the south from the Shep's Gulch utilization site 3-39
Figure 3.3.12-1 Staubach utilization site location 3-41
Figure 3.3.12-2 View of the Staubach Site on August 9, 2005 3-42
Figure 3.3.13-1 Tizer Basin utilization site location 3-43
Figure 3.3.13-2 Elk sedge and Idaho fescue dominating the species mix at the Tizer Basin utilization site 3-43
Figure 3.3.14-1 Upper Eagle utilization site location 3-45
Figure 3.3.14-2 View of Eagle Basin looking north 3-46
Figure 3.3.15-1 Vosburg Mine utilization site location 3-47
Figure 3.3.15-2 Permittees, USFS, and ERG personnel on site selection trip 3-48

Figure 4.1-1 Elk Winter Trend (1961-2004) for Kimber and North Crow Elk Herd Units 4-1
Figure 4.1.1-1 North Crow EHU Winter Elk Densities 4-4
Figure 4.1.1-2 North Crow EHU Spring Elk Densities 4-4
Figure 4.1.1-3 North Crow EHU Summer Elk Densities 4-4
Figure 4.1.1-4 North Crow EHU Fall Elk Densities 4-4
Figure 4.1.2-4 Kimber EHU Fall Elk Densities 4-6
Figure 4.1.2-1 Kimber EHU Winter Elk Densities 4-6
Figure 4.1.2-2 Kimber EHU Spring Elk Densities 4-6
Figure 4.1.2-3 Kimber EHU Summer Elk Densities 4-6
Figure 4.2-1 Cattle Allotments in Kimber and North Crow Elk Herd Units 4-8
Figure 4.2.3-1 Cattle Grazing History (1921-2005) for USFS Allotments in the North Crow Elk Herd Unit 4-12
Figure 4.2.3-2 Cattle Grazing History (1940-2005) for USFS Allotments in the Kimber Elk Herd . . 4-12
Figure 4.2.4-1 Cattle Grazing Suitability Map 4-15
Figure 4.3-1 Stakeholder Comments Map 4-17
Figure 4.3-2 North Crow EHU Elk-Cattle Overlap (Dual Use Areas) 4-19

Figure 5.2-1 Forty year aerial photo-set of Crow Creek in the vicinity of Power Gulch 5-4
Figure 5.2.1-1 Barrett's BpS clipped to the Phase II project area 5-5
Figure 5.2.1-2 2005 Timber overlayed on Barrett's BpS 5-6
Figure 5.2.1-3 Areas of encroachment 5-6
Figure 5.6.1-1 Area modeled with SIMPPLLE 5-12

Figure 6-1 Annual Precipitation as Percentages of Annual Averages 6-2

Figure 6-2 Boulder Monthly Precipitation and 56-year Average for 2001–2005 6-6
Figure 6-3 Helena Monthly Precipitation and 112-year Average for 2001–2005 6-7
Figure 6-4 Tizer Basin Monthly Precipitation and 17-year Average for 2001–2005 6-8
Figure 6-5 Townsend Monthly Precipitation and 56-year Average for 2001–2005 6-9

Figure 7.1.1-1 Dalmatian toadflax locations 7-1
Figure 7.1.1-2 Spotted knapweed locations 7-2
Figure 7.1.1-3 Musk thistle locations 7-2
Figure 7.1.3-1 Present timber cover with roads 7-5
Figure 7.1.3-2 Open roads buffered by one half mile 7-5
Figure 7.1.3-3 Elk security for the Kimber and North Crow EHUs 7-5
Figure 7.1.3-4 Hiding cover and conifer encroachment 7-5
Figure 7.2.2-1 Evidence of dual use along Kimber Ridge 7-12
Figure 7.2.2-2 Existing pasture realignment for the Whitehorse Allotment 7-13
Figure 7.2.2-3 Potential pasture realignment for the Whitehorse Allotment 7-13

Figure 8.3-1 USFS pasture polygons 8-6
Figure 8.3-2 ERG's final vegetation polygons 8-6

LIST OF TABLES

Table ES-1 Ecological Condition Comparison ES-3

Table 1.2-1 Comparison of Range Site Descriptions 1-16
Table 1.2-2 Range Site Description Comparison from *Technical Range Site Descriptions* Publication 1-17
Table 1.2-3 Ecological Condition of the Rangeland in the North Crow Allotment 1-20
Table 1.2-4 Ecological Condition of the Rangeland on Allotments in the Kimber EHU 1-20
Table 1.2-5 Stand Stage of the Rangeland in the North Crow EHU 1-22
Table 1.2-6 Stand Stage of the Rangeland in the Kimber EHU (Acres and Percentages) 1-23
Table 1.3-1 Double Sampling and Stand Stage Production Comparison 1-26
Table 1.3-2 Double Sampling Production Comparison by Site 1-27
Table 1.4-1 Stocking Rate Comparison for USFS Allotments within the WMU 1-30
Table 1.4-2 Initial Stocking Rates by Pasture for USFS Allotments within the WMU 1-31

Table 2.2-1 1923/2005 Total Forage Consumed Comparison 2-7

Table 3.1.3-1 Statistics Summary 3-5
Table 3.3-1 Utilization Site Comparison 3-8
Table 3.3.1-1 Beaver/Pole Utilization Site 2004 Utilization Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-11
Table 3.3.1-2 Beaver/Pole Utilization by Species 3-12
Table 3.3.1-3 Beaver/Pole Utilization by Life Form 3-12
Table 3.3.2-1 Cold Springs Utilization Site 2004 Utilization Summary 3-14
Table 3.3.2-2 Cold Springs Utilization by Species 3-15
Table 3.3.2-3 Cold Springs Utilization by Life Form 3-15

Table 3.3.3-2 Dry Gulch Utilization by Species 3-18
Table 3.3.3-3 Dry Gulch Utilization by Life Form 3-18
Table 3.3.4-1 Eagle Basin Utilization Site 2004 Utilization Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-19
Table 3.3.4-2 Eagle Basin Utilization by Species 3-20
Table 3.3.4-3 Eagle Basin Utilization by Life Form 3-21
Table 3.3.5-1 Elkhorn Spring Utilization Site 2004 Utilization Summary 3-22
Table 3.3.5-2 Elkhorn Springs Utilization by Species 3-24
Table 3.3.5-3 Elkhorn Springs Utilization by Life Form 3-24
Table 3.3.6-1 Eureka Creek Utilization Site 2004 Utilization Summary 3-26
Table 3.3.6-2 Eureka Creek 2004 Utilization by Species 3-26
Table 3.3.6-3 Eureka Creek 2004 Utilization by Life Form 3-27
Table 3.3.7-1 Horsethief Park Utilization Site 2004 Utilization Summary 3-28
Table 3.3.7-2 Horsethief Park Utilization by Species 3-29
Table 3.3.7-3 Horsethief Park Utilization by Life Form 3-29
Table 3.3.8-1 Kelly Gulch Utilization Site 2005 Utilization Summary 3-31
Table 3.3.8-2 Kelly Gulch 2005 Utilization by Species 3-31
Table 3.3.8-3 Kelly Gulch 2005 Utilization by Life Form 3-31
Table 3.3.9-1 Kimber Ridge Private Utilization Site 2004–2005 Utilization Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-34
Table 3.3.9-2 Kimber Ridge Utilization by Species 3-35
Table 3.3.9-3 Kimber Ridge Utilization by Life Form 3-35
Table 3.3.10-1 Longfellow Utilization Site 2005 Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-37
Table 3.3.10-2 Longfellow 2005 Utilization by Species 3-37
Table 3.3.10-3 Longfellow Utilization by Life Form 3-37
Table 3.3.11-1 Shep's Gulch Utilization Site 2004-2005 Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-39
Table 3.3.11-2 Shep's Gulch Utilization by Species 3-40
Table 3.3.11-3 Shep's Gulch Utilization by Life Form 3-40
Table 3.3.12-1 Staubach Utilization Site 2005 Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-41
Table 3.3.12-2 Staubach 2005 Utilization by Species 3-42
Table 3.3.12-3 Staubach 2005 Utilization by Life Form 3-42
Table 3.3.13-1 Tizer Basin Utilization Site 2004 Utilization Summary 3-44
Table 3.3.13-2 Tizer Basin Utilization by Species 3-44
Table 3.3.13-3 Tizer Basin Utilization by Life Form 3-44
Table 3.3.14-1 Upper Eagle Utilization Site 2005 Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-45
Table 3.3.14-2 Upper Eagle 2005 Utilization by Species 3-46
Table 3.3.14-3 Upper Eagle 2005 Utilization by Life Form 3-46
Table 3.3.15-1 Vosburg Utilization Site 2005 Summary (Dual Use Site) 3-47
Table 3.3.15-2 Vosburg 2005 Utilization by Species 3-48
Table 3.3.15-3 Vosburg 2005 Utilization by Life Form 3-48
Table 3.3.16-1 Utilization Summary Data 2004 3-49
Table 3.3.16-2 Utilization Summary Data 2005 3-50
Table 3.3.16-3 Utilization Summary Data 2004–2005 3-50

Table 4.1-1 2003–2005 Elk Winter Trend Comparison 4-2
Table 4.1-2 Expected Uniform Density of Elk Relocations Per Season 4-3

Table 4.1.1-3 Winter Trend Counts for the North Crow EHU 4-5
Table 4.1.2-3 Winter Trend Counts for the Kimber EHU 4-7
Table 4.2-1 Stocking Rate Comparison for Allotments within the WMU 4-8
Table 4.2-2 Actual Use Summary for 2004 and 2005 for Allotments within the WMU 4-10
Table 4.2.4-2 Cover Class Catagories from SILC3 Coverage 4-13
Table 4.2.4-3 Methodology for Determining Cattle Suitability from Slope and Canopy Cover 4-13
Table 4.3-1 Rangeland Comparison Between Kimber and North Crow EHUs 4-18

Table 5.2.1-1 Encroachment Analysis Results 5-8
Table 5.3-1 Elk Security Analysis for Kimber and North Crow EHUs 5-9
Table 5.6.1-1 Fire Return Interval Comparison Between Differing SIMPPLLE Logic 5-14
Table 5.6.2-1 Forest Size/Structure/Density Comparison for Forested Portions of the Phase II Project Area 5-15

Table 6-1 Percent of Normal Production Comparison 6-4

Table 7.1.3-1 Elk Security and Hiding Cover Results 7-7
Table 7.1.3-2 Security and Hiding Cover Encroachment Analysis 7-8
Table 7.1.5-1 Upland Utilization Standards for USFS Allotments 7-10

LIST OF KEY MAPS

Figure 1.2-4 Ecological Condition Map (page 1-21). This map presents similarity index site locations with the ecological condition measurement displayed. Points were interpolated using the Inverse Distance Weighted function to create a grid that extrapolates the data across the entire Phase II study area. This data does not apply to closed canopy areas. Further explanation of the methods used to create this map can be found in Chapter 1.

Figure 1.3-2 Total Production by Air Dry Weight Map (page 1-29). This map presents similarity index site locations with the total production measurement displayed. Points were interpolated using the Inverse Distance Weighted function to create a grid that extrapolates the data across the entire Phase II study area. This data does not apply to closed canopy areas. Further explanation of the methods used to create this map can be found in Chapter 1.

Figure 2.1-1 Ecological Condition Map with Elk Locations (page 2-3). This map is the same as the Ecological Condition map with elk locations displayed from the DeSimone stud (1982-1989). A discussion of this map can be found in Chapter 2 with methods described in Chapter 1.

Figure 3.3-2 Percent Utilization Map (page 3-10). This map presents similarity index site locations with the percent utilization measurement displayed. Points were interpolated using the Inverse Distance Weighted function to create a grid that extrapolates the data across the Phase II study area. This data does not apply to closed canopy areas. Further explanation of the methods used to create this map can be found in Chapter 3.

Figure 4.2.4-1 Cattle Allotments with Grazing Suitability Rating (page 4-15). This map shows both BLM and USFS cattle allotments clipped to the North Crow and Kimber Elk Herd Units. Land was rated for grazing suitability based on slope and canopy cover, assuming the greater the slope and canopy, the less suitable the area is. Further explanation of the methods used to create this map can be found in Chapter 4.

Figure 4.3-1 Stakeholder Comments Map (page 4-17). Based on conversations with area stakeholders, this map characterizes comments verbally described or drawn onto ERG field maps, particularly related to elk-cattle dual use areas.

Figure 4.3-2 Elk-Cattle Overlap (Dual Use Areas) (page 4-19). This map depicts areas of significant dual use by both elk and cattle. For cattle, areas of significant use are inside cattle allotments with the exception of steep sloped and heavily forested areas. Significant use by elk is based on the density of relocations from DeSimone's study 1982-1989; elk use areas are presented where density of relocations is greater than a uniform distribution. The overlap area is then broken into zones of low, medium, and high utilization based on interpolated data from the 2004 and 2005 similarity index sites. Further explanation of the methods used to create this map can be found in Chapter 4.