



# United States Department of the Interior

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**  
**CARSON CITY DISTRICT OFFICE**  
1535 Hot Springs Rd., Ste. 300  
Carson City, Nevada 89701

G 10/4/89  
IN REPLY REFER TO:

4700  
(NV-03480)

**OCT 04 1989**

Commission for the Preservation of Wild Horses  
Stewart Facility  
Capitol Complex  
Carson City, NV 89710

Dear Ms. Jay:

Thank you for your comments concerning the Draft Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan. We have made a few minor changes in the Final Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan. The most significant change is that we recalculated the area of the Herd Area using the original Unit Resource Analysis map which depicted the first and only delineation of this Herd Area. This resulted in a slightly larger Herd Area than was used in the Draft Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan. After careful consideration of the comments and a review of our land use planning objectives, our decision is to implement the proposed action contained in the final documents.

Before responding to your comments concerning the Draft Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan I would like to lay to rest any suspicions on your part concerning the monitoring information, and individuals responsible for gathering this information. Carson City has a very professional and dedicated staff and is recognized as such by other agencies and individuals both inside and outside of the BLM, I can assure you that any information used as a basis for any document originating from this office is indeed factual and accurate.

Each of your comments will be addressed as they appear in your letter dated August 14, 1989.

My response to your comments is as follows:

Paragraph 4: The number of wild horses that the Herd Management Area (HMA) is capable of supporting was based on actual monitoring data collected in the fall of 1987 and 1988. Interested members of the public were invited to participate in the collection of this data but declined to do so.

Paragraph 5: As stated above all adjustments (livestock and wild horses) are based strictly on monitoring data.

Paragraph 6: A statement was made in 1976 by a wildlife biologist new to the district that the HMA receives little wildlife use. However, this statement was incorrect. In fact this HMA receives considerable use by

Mule deer (winter and yearlong), pronghorn, sage grouse, valley quail, chukar, doves and numerous non-game birds including raptors. The planned bighorn sheep release is in an adjoining allotment, however, the HMA contains suitable bighorn habitat and it is likely that bighorn sheep may move into the HMA. The sole reason for the proposed reduction is to restore the range to a thriving natural ecological balance and prevent further deterioration of the range threatened by an over population of wild horses in and around the Flanigan HMA. No forage has been allocated for bighorn sheep within the HMA.

Paragraphs 7-14: The allotment management plan (AMP) refers to a pasture called Juniper Basin and the Draft Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan refers to a area of the HMA as Juniper Basin. The Juniper Basin area of the HMA is only a portion of the Juniper Basin pasture in the Allotment. The grazing season for the Juniper Basin portion of the HMA, has been changed from spring-summer to winter. As with all of the winter use allotments the actual season of use will be 12/1 - 4/15. The actual pressure from domestic livestock will be considerably lower than in past years. Based on our monitoring information which indicates that wild horses are inflicting more resource damage than domestic livestock it is felt that with the reduction of wild horses and domestic livestock and the change in season of use the HMA will receive proper use and over time will improve ecologically, without a closure to domestic livestock. Also the HMA is not fenced, therefore, it cannot be closed to livestock.

Paragraph 17: You are correct, these documents do describe the area used by wild horses at the time that these documents were written. However, as Tim Reuwsaat and John Axtell have explained to you many documents have used the term herd use area to describe the current distribution of wild horses. In many cases (including the Flanigan HMA) the distribution was larger than the Herd Area (appendix B of the final removal plan), since these areas were delineated for analysis purposes only and did not reflect the true delineation of the Herd Area. Those maps which you refer to were not labeled Herd Areas or HMAs, instead they delineated areas of horse use at the time that those documents were written. They used terms such as "herd use area" and "herd boundary" which were larger than the herd area because of population increases which lead to population expansions to areas outside of the HMA (appendix B of the Final Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan). The Fort Sage HMA may have also been confused with part of the Flanigan HMA.

Paragraph 19: The 1976 Herd Management Area Plan which you refer to stated that horses were found in these other areas in 1955. These horse were not found in these areas prior to the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro act (1971) nor were they found in these areas after the passage of the above act. Therefore, these areas could not be designated as herd areas (see appendix B of the Final Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan).

Paragraph 22: The reduction of wild horses is based strictly on monitoring data with the goal of restoring the range to a thriving natural ecological balance and prevent further deterioration of the range threatened by an over population of wild horses in and around the Flanigan HMA.

Paragraph 23: Please refer to the response to paragraph 19.

Paragraph 24: It is our intent to improve the habitat within the Flanigan HMA so that the remaining 104 wild horses will utilize the Flanigan HMA. However, if some of the horses continue to inhabit areas outside the HMA then we will have to remove those horses.

Paragraph 25: The contractor cannot be fined for the injury or death of horses, however, it is the Bureau's responsibility to ensure that this does not occur.

Paragraph 26: Please refer to the response to paragraph 19.

Paragraph 27: Very few cattle from the Pyramid Reservation cross into the Flanigan Allotment. However, when they do the permittee will push them back onto the reservation. Wild horses are better able to cross into the reservation and appear to do so much more frequently than do cattle. The Wild Horse and Burro Specialist for the Lahontan Resource Area monitors the horses during regularly scheduled monitoring flights.

Paragraph 28: Of the 30 wild horses seen during the month of April 1989 none possessed foals or radio collars (indicating that the studs were vasectomized). It is true that there are 9 vasectomized horses that have lost their radio collars, however, out of 507 wild horses it is unlikely that they were the cause of the lack of foals. As stated in the Draft Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan, the most likely explanation for the low foal rate was the extremely poor condition of the mares during the winter which resulted from a lack of forage. We feel that the horse population was expanding and has now slowed to a very low rate of increase. Unfortunately the trade off for a low rate of increase is starving horses in the winter, heavy and severe utilization of the vegetation and many horses outside of the HMA.

Paragraph 29: Bob Garrott is a graduate student who is presently working on a doctorate degree in the Fisheries and Wildlife Department at the University of Minnesota on a study recommended by the National Academy of Sciences. His expertise is in the field of Population Ecology. Garrott stated to John Axtell during a telephone conversation that out of the 5 herd areas that they studied, the Flanigan wild horses had the lowest pregnancy rate. Based on data obtained from the 1985 gather of horses in the Flanigan area a 9% mortality rate for adult horses was calculated and a 13% rate of increase was also calculated.

Paragraph 30: The 3/1 turnout date for livestock is for billing purposes only and reflects use in the winter portion of the allotment.

Paragraph 31: We have enclosed a copy of the Flanigan Allotment Management Plan. As you may recall, during your participation in the development of this plan you suggested managing for a range of wild horse between 75 - 125, thus avoiding unnecessary stress to the horses by gathering them every year. However, based on the comments we received on this capture plan we have decided to postpone implementing this approach. We will reduce the population to 104, which is the maximum level that our monitoring data

indicates the HMA can support. However, we still plan to propose this management strategy in the future during development and implementation of the Herd Management Area Plan.

Paragraph 32: Please refer to my response to paragraph 6.

Paragraph 34: Garrott is working on a study recommended by the National Academy of Sciences dealing with population increases in wild horses. We are not using the 7 - 15% rate of increase recommended by the National Academy of Sciences because newer research provided by Mr. Garrott indicates that wild horses on good range will have a rate of increase between 15 - 24%. If the habitat is managed properly (i.e. a thriving natural ecological balance, which we hope the wild horse and livestock adjustments will bring about) the wild horses should have a rate of increase approaching 24%; however, we chose to use the more conservative figure.

It appears that most of your concerns are based on a misinterpretation or lack of clarification of the Allotment Management Plan, Draft Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan and purpose of maps delineating herd use areas. I hope that this discussion will clarify the issue and that we will have your support. It is our intent to comply fully with the regulations governing the management of wild free-roaming horses and burros and recent IBLA rulings. If you have any further questions regarding this matter please contact John Axtell (Wild Horse and Burro Specialist) of my staff.

Sincerely yours,

*Norman L Murray*  
James W. Elliott *acting*  
District Manager

3 Enclosures:

1. Final Flanigan Wild Horse Removal Plan. 8pp.
2. Environmental Assessment. 39pp.
3. Flanigan Allotment Management Plan. 30pp.

~~8/1/89~~ ~~10/1/89~~

## FLANIGAN WILD HORSE REMOVAL PLAN

### I. Purpose

The proposed action is to restore the range to a thriving natural ecological balance and prevent further deterioration of the range threatened by an over population of wild horses in and around the Flanigan Herd Management Area (HMA). The proposed action will bring the population of wild horses to a level in balance with available forage within the Flanigan HMA. The population adjustment is based solely on analysis of monitoring data. Helicopters will be used to capture the wild horses.

### II. Area of Concern

The area of concern is the Flanigan HMA. The location of the area is shown on the attached map 1.

### III. Numbers of Wild Horses

The most recent complete census conducted in the Flanigan HMA (which lies entirely within the Flanigan Allotment) and surrounding area in 1989, resulted in an actual count of 507 head. The planned removal is 403 head (see analysis in the accompanying Environmental Assessment). The removal of 403 wild horses is based on a 1989 census. The number may be adjusted in order to leave approximately 104 wild horses within the HMA. Because utilization data cannot be collected until the end of livestock scheduled use (September) an average of census and monitoring flights was used through February 1989 in utilization calculations.

### IV. Methods for Removal and Safety

The methods employed during this capture operation will be herding horses with a helicopter to a trap built with portable panels. The Bureau of Land Management will contract with a private party for this operation. Two or more Bureau employees will be supervising the contractor at all times during the gathering operation. The following stipulations and procedures will be followed during the contract to ensure that wild horses are removed from proper areas and to ensure the welfare, safety and humane treatment of the wild horses.

A. Roundup Procedures within Contract Area:

The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) will determine specific roundup areas and numbers of animals within general contract areas as animal concentration, terrain, physical barriers and weather conditions dictate. Upon determination of the specific roundup areas, the COR will select the general location of trap sites in which to herd the animals, animal concentration, terrain, physical barriers and weather conditions will all be considered when selecting trap sites. All wild horses will be removed from areas outside of the HMA.

B. Motorized Equipment

1. All motorized equipment employed in the transportation of captured animals shall be in compliance with appropriate State and Federal laws and regulations applicable to the humane transportation of animals.

2. Vehicles shall be in good repair, of adequate rated capacity, and operated so as to insure that captured animals are transported without undue risk of injury.

3. Only stocktrailers shall be allowed for transporting animals from traps to temporary holding facilities. Only Bobtail trucks, stocktrailers, or single deck trucks shall be used to transport animals from temporary holding facilities to final destination. Sides of stocktrucks of transporting vehicles shall be a minimum height of 6 feet 6 inches from vehicle floor. Single deck trucks with trailers 40 feet or longer shall have two partition gates to separate animals. Trailers less than 40 feet shall have at least one partition gate to separate the animals. Each partition shall be a minimum of six feet high and shall have a minimum 5 foot wide swinging gate. The use of double deck trailers is unacceptable and shall not be allowed.

4. All vehicles used to transport animals to final destination shall be equipped with at least one door at the rear end of the vehicle which is capable of sliding either horizontally or vertically.

5. Floors of vehicles and loading chute shall be covered and maintained with a non-skid surface such as sand, mineral soil or wood shavings, to prevent the animals from slipping. This will be confirmed by a BLM employee prior to loading (every load).

6. Animals to be loaded and transported in any vehicle shall be as directed by the COR and may include limitations on numbers according to age, size, sex, temperament and animal condition. A minimum of 1.4 linear foot per adult animal and .75 linear foot per foal shall be allowed per standard eight foot wide stocktrailer/truck.

The BLM employee supervising the loading of the wild horses to be transported from the trap to the temporary holding corral will require separation of small foals and/or weak horses from the rest should

he/she feel that they may be injured during the trip. He/she will consider the distance and condition of the road and animals in making this determination. Horses shipped from the temporary holding corral to the BLM facility will normally be separated by studs, mares and foals (including small yearlings). However, if the numbers of these classes of animals are too few in one compartment and too many in another, animals may be shifted between compartments to properly distribute the animals in the trailer. This may include placing a younger, lighter stud with the mares or a weak mare with the foals. Further separation may be required should condition of the animals warrant.

The BLM employee supervising the loading will exercise his/her authority to off-load animals should he/she feel there are too many horses on the trailer/truck.

7. The COR shall consider the condition of the animals, weather conditions, type of vehicles, distance to be transported, and other factors when planning for the movement of captured animals. The COR shall provide for any brand inspection or other inspection services required for the captured animals.

It is currently planned to ship all horses to the Palomino Valley facility. Communication lines have been established with the Palomino Valley personnel involved in off-loading the horses, to receive feedback on the condition of shipped horses. Should problems arise, shipping methods and/or separation of the horses will be changed in an attempt to alleviate the problems.

8. If the COR determines that dust conditions are such that the animals could be endangered during transportation, the contractor will be instructed to adjust speed. The maximum distance over which animals may have to be transported on dirt road is approximately 30 miles per load.

Periodic checks by BLM employees will be made as the horses are transported along dirt roads. If speed restrictions are placed in effect, then BLM employees will, at times, follow and/or time trips to ensure compliance.

C. Trapping and Care

1. All capture attempts of wild horses shall be accomplished by the utilization of a helicopter. A minimum of one saddle horse shall be immediately available at the trap site to accomplish roping if necessary. Under no circumstances shall animals be tied down for more than one hour.

Roping will be allowed only to capture an orphaned foal or a suspected wet mare within the Flanigan HMA. However, since all wild horses have to be removed from the Winnemucca, Big Canyon Allotments and other areas outside of the HMA roping will be allowed if certain individual

horses continue to elude helicopter herding operations.

2. The helicopter shall be used in such a manner that bands of horses will remain together. Foals shall not be left behind.

The Carson City District will use an observation helicopter as the primary means in which to supervise the use of the project helicopter. In the absence of an observation helicopter, the project helicopter or saddle horses may be used to place a BLM observer on a point overlooking the area of the helicopter herding operations.

3. The rate of movement and distance the animals travel shall not exceed limitations set by the COR who will consider terrain, physical barriers, weather, condition of the animals and other factors.

BLM will not allow horses to be herded more than 10 miles nor faster than 20 miles per hour. The COR may decrease the rate of travel or distance moved should the route to the trap site pose a danger or cause avoidable stress (steep and/or rocky). Animal condition will also be considered in making distance and speed restrictions.

Temperature limitations are 10 degrees F. as a minimum and 95 degrees F. as a maximum. Special attention will be given to avoiding physical hazards such as fences. Map 2 shows locations of fences and any other potential hazards.

4. It is estimated that five trap locations will be required to accomplish the work. All trap locations and holding facilities must be approved by the COR prior to construction. The contractor may also be required to change or move trap locations as determined by the COR. All traps and holding facilities not located on public land must have prior written approval of the landowner.

If tentative trap sites (Map 2) are not located near enough to the concentrations of horses, then the trap site will not be approved. The COR will move the general location of the trap closer to the horses. Trap sites will not be approved where barbed-wire fences are used as wings, wing extensions, or to turn the horses, during herding, toward the trap.

5. All traps, wings and holding facilities shall be constructed, maintained and operated to handle the animals in a safe and humane manner and be in accordance with the following:

a. Traps and holding facilities shall be constructed of portable panels, the top of which shall not be less than 72 inches high, the bottom rail of which shall not be more than 12 inches from the ground level. All traps and holding facilities shall be oval or round in design.



b. All loading chute sides shall be fully covered with plywood or like material. The loading chute shall also be a minimum of 6 feet high.

c. All runways shall be a minimum of 20 feet long and a minimum of 6 feet high and shall be covered with plywood or like material a minimum of 1 foot to 5 feet above ground level.

d. Wings shall not be constructed out of barbed-wire or other materials injurious to animals and must be approved by the COR.

e. All crowding pens including the gates leading to the runways shall be covered with material which prevents the animals from seeing out (plywood, burlap, etc.) and shall be covered a minimum of 1 foot to 5 feet above ground level. Eight linear feet of this material shall be capable of being removed or let down to provide a viewing window.

f. All pens and runways used for the movement and handling of animals shall be connected with hinged self-locking gates.

6. No fence modification will be made without authorization from the COR. The contractor shall be responsible for restoration of any fence modification which he has made.

If the route the contractor wishes to herd horses passes through a fence, the contractor will be required to roll up the fencing material and pull up the posts to provide at least one-eighth mile of gap. The standing fence on each side of the gap will be well-flagged for a distance of 300 yards from the gap on each side.

7. When dust conditions occur within or adjacent to the trap or holding facility, the contractor shall be required to wet down the ground with water.

8. Alternate pens, within the holding facility shall be furnished by the contractor to separate mares with small foals, sick and injured animals, and estray animals from the other horses. Animals shall be sorted as to age, number, size, temperament, sex, and condition when in the holding facility so as to minimize (to the extent possible) injury due to fighting and trampling.

As a minimum, studs will be separated from the mares and foals when the animals are held overnight.

9. Animals shall be transported to final destination from temporary holding facilities within 24 hours after capture unless prior approval is granted by the COR for unusual circumstances. Animals shall not be held in traps and/or temporary holding facilities on days when there is no work being conducted except as specified by the COR. The contractor shall schedule shipments of animals to arrive at final

destination between 6:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. No shipments shall be scheduled to arrive at final destination on Sunday.

10. The contractor shall provide animals held for 5 hours or more in the traps and/or holding facilities with a continuous supply of fresh clean water at a minimum of 10 gallons per animal per day. Animals held for 10 hours or more in the traps or holding facilities shall be provided good quality hay at the rate of not less than two pounds of hay per 100 pounds of estimated body weight per day.

11. It is the responsibility of the contractor to provide security to prevent loss, injury or death of captured animals until delivery to final destination.

12. The contractor shall restrain sick or injured animals if treatment by the government is necessary. The COR will determine if injured animals must be destroyed and provide for destruction of such animals. The contractor may be required to dispose of the carcasses as directed by the COR.

13. When refueling, the helicopter shall remain a distance of at least 1,000 feet or more from animals, vehicles (other than fuel truck), and personnel not involved in refueling.

V. Disposition of Removed Animals

The wild horses and burros will be sent to Palomino Valley Wild Horse and Burro Placement Center to be processed for adoption.

Impounded, privately-owned animals will be processed as outlined in the Bureau of Land Management, Nevada State Office Instruction Memoranda NV-84-116 and NV-85-416.

VII. Responsibility

The District Manager is responsible for maintaining and protecting the health and welfare of the wild horses. To ensure the contractor's compliance with the contract stipulations, the COR and Project Inspectors, (PI) all from the Carson City District, will be on site. However, the Lahontan Area Manager and the Carson City District Manager are very involved with guidance and input into this removal plan and with contract monitoring. The health and welfare of the animals is the overriding concern of the District Manager, Area Manager, COR and PIs.

The COR and/or PI will constantly, through observation, evaluate the contractor's ability to perform the required work in accordance with the contract stipulations. Compliance with the contract stipulations will be through issuance of written instructions to the contractor, stop work orders and default procedures should the contractor not perform work according to the stipulations.

Prior to issuance of the "Notice to Proceed" to the contractor, the COR and PIs will inspect the equipment to be used during the contract, to insure the equipment meets or exceeds the standards contained in the contract stipulations.

Prior (less than 20 days) to the start of the contract and constantly during the course of the contract the COR and/or PIs will evaluate the conditions which may cause undue stress to the animals. The factors considered will include animal condition, prevailing temperatures, drought conditions, soil conditions, topography, animal distribution, distance animals travel to water, quantity of available water and condition of roads that animals are to be transported over. These factors will be evaluated to determine if additional constraints other than those already discussed above, need be initiated in order to safely capture and transport the animals (i.e. veterinarian present, or delay of capture operations). This is of special concern during this year of possible drought which may intensify the impact of removal operations on the animals and the roads.

VIII. Signatures

Prepared by:

John Axtell  
John Axtell  
Wild Horse and Burro Specialist  
Lahontan Resource Area

18 sep 89  
Date

Concurred by:

Norman L Murray  
Norman L. Murray  
Assistant District Manager, Resources

9-22-89  
Date

James M. Phillips  
James M. Phillips  
Area Manager  
Lahontan Resource Area

9-22-89  
Date

James W. Elliott  
James W. Elliott  
District Manager

9/26/89  
Date

Approved by:

Edward F. Spang  
Edward F. Spang  
State Director, Nevada

10/2/89  
Date

For


Capture Area Boundary

Fences

Hazards

Traps

Boundary and Hazards



ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Flanigan Wild Horse Removal

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposal is to restore the range to a thriving natural ecological balance and multiple use relationship and prevent further deterioration of the vegetation community threatened by an overpopulation of wild horses in the Flanigan Herd Management Area (HMA), and remove wild horses that have moved to areas outside of the HMA and are also contributing to the over utilization of the key forage species. This proposal is in conformance with the Lahontan Resource Management Plan (RMP). The proposed action involves removals in order to correct resource degradation identified from analysis of rangeland monitoring data from the Flanigan HMA and surrounding area. Wild horses will also be removed from areas outside of the HMA to reduce resource damage and as directed by 43 CFR part 4710.4; Wild, Free Roaming Horse and Burro Regulations.

Relationship to Other Environmental Documents

This EA is tiered to the Reno Grazing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which analyzed the general ecological impacts of managing rangelands in the Reno area under a program of monitoring and adjustment of wild horses and livestock. This EA is a project specific refinement of the EIS focused on the removal of excess wild horses in the Flanigan area. The decisions regarding overall rangeland management analyzed in the Reno EIS will not be changed by the Flanigan Removal Plan. Both documents are available for public review at the Carson City District Office.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

- A. The proposed action is to remove excess wild horses in the above mentioned HMA and surrounding area through the use of a helicopter and other motorized equipment. The wild horses would be herded by a helicopter into traps constructed of portable steel panels. The Bureau of Land Management would contract with a private party for the removal operation. The contractor would be supervised at all times by at least two Bureau employees. A total of 403 excess wild

horses are proposed for removal from the HMA and surrounding area leaving 104 wild horses within the HMA.

- B. Alternative No. 1 is to conduct the removal operations through the use of water traps. Traps consisting of portable panels would be constructed around water sources and the horses caught when coming into water.
- C. Alternative No. 2 is to conduct the removal by herding the wild horses from horseback. Riders would herd horses into traps built of portable steel panels.
- D. The no action alternative is to not conduct the wild horse removals.

### III. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

#### A. Wild Horses

The Flanigan HMA is located approximately 50 miles north of Reno, Nevada. Flanigan HMA lies within the Carson City District of the Bureau of Land Management. The most recent complete census conducted in the Flanigan HMA was in July 1989 and resulted in an actual count of 507 wild horses in the Flanigan Allotment, Flanigan HMA and Winnemucca Allotment. Ground observations conducted in May 1989 showed 3 wild horses in the Big Canyon Allotment.

The HMA location is shown on the attached map as well as the capture area boundaries (maps 1 & 2).

#### Population

At the present time, the wild horses have virtually unrestricted movement within the HMA and the majority of the allotment. A majority of the wild horses are using areas outside of the HMA, as all or part of their home range. This is due to a population increase beyond the HMA's capacity to produce sufficient forage (vegetation section) and supply adequate space. The limited area of the HMA results in increased intraspecific interactions which at current population levels lead to many of the wild horses moving to areas outside of the HMA.

A census in February 1989 (not complete; HMA was completely censused, however, fog prevented censusing some areas outside of the HMA) was conducted and documented that at a minimum 89% of the wild horses have moved out of the HMA. In September of 1987 a census documented that 74% of all the wild horses counted were located outside of the HMA. A census conducted in September 1985 documented that 71% of all wild horses counted were located outside of the HMA. Flights conducted in conjunction with the University of Minnesota (UOM) fertility study documented that even during the spring green-up a minimum of 54% of the wild horse population remained outside of the HMA. UOM flights are not complete censuses, and may underestimate the number of wild

horse outside of the HMA. Wild horses have also expanded into areas of the Winnemucca Ranch and Big Canyon Allotments. Wild horses gained entry into the Winnemucca Ranch and Big Canyon Allotments when snows, wild horses or cattle knocked down the fences, or when gates were left open.

Many of the horses currently spend all or part of the year outside of the HMA and at times on land which is not administered by the BLM. In this situation, these wild horses may intermingle with privately owned and Indian horses, thereby, making them difficult or impossible to identify. This contributes to enforcement and protection problems. Once a wild horse crosses into the Indian reservation it can no longer be identified as a wild horse and therefore, may be subject to capture and sale.

During the February 1989 census approximately 80% of the wild horses both within and outside of the HMA were in very poor physical condition, due to lack of forage. Their ribs, pelvic bones and vertebrae were clearly evident. This was particularly evident in breeding age mares. The poor condition of the horses has resulted from lack of adequate forage within the HMA and surrounding area. Just prior to the 1985 removal there were almost twice as many wild horses, however, the habitat has continued to deteriorate from over grazing. Recent utilization data shows a continued increase of heavy and severe use within the HMA caused by both wild horses and cattle.

A total of 30 different adult wild horses were observed during the month of April 1989, however, no foals were observed within the HMA. During the same time period many foals have been observed in all other HMAs within the Resource Area. The cause of this is most likely due to poor condition of the mares which can result in reabsorption and abortion of fetuses and low birth weight of foals which decreases their ability to survive. Of the 30 wild horses observed none possessed radio collars, therefore, lack of foals was most likely caused by poor condition rather than vasectomized stallions. The UOM also analyzed blood samples from 5 HMAs and concluded that wild horses in the Flanigan HMA had the lowest pregnancy rate of the 5 HMAs (Garrott, pers. comm.)

All complete censuses of the wild horse population inside and outside of the HMA indicate a consistent increase in numbers. Since the passage of the WH&B Act the population has increased from 96 wild horses in 1972 to 507 in 1989. During this time period three removals have been conducted from the HMA and surrounding area, which resulted in the removal of 451 wild horses. However, 20 wild horses were introduced into the HMA within the above time span due to a law suit and study.

Data from the 1985 removal indicates a sex ratio of 82 males to 100 females. Demographic data indicates a increasing population. However, a bias exists with data derived from gathers, since gathers are more representative of stable bands within a population and not the population as a whole (BLM W.O. Information Memorandum NV-83-



104). This will bias the results towards females and foals and underestimate the number of stallions. In a growing population, time-specific data underestimates the true survival rate (Information Memorandum NV-83-104). The Flanigan population was increasing at the time of the last removal, as analyzed per Nevada State Office supplement 4730.

#### Habitat Evaluation

A formal habitat evaluation was completed in 1988 on the Flanigan HMA following the guidelines in the draft Wild Horse and Burro Habitat Evaluation Procedures Users Guide. It was determined that forage quantity was the factor most limiting the wild horse population within the HMA. Currently water and escape cover are not limiting the population of wild horses.

#### B. Livestock Use

The HMA lies within the Flanigan Allotment. Historical grazing preference for the Flanigan Allotment, (HMA comprising 18% of the total allotment), has been 7368 AUMs of which 5015 AUMs are active use and 2306 AUMs have been held in Suspended-Non-Use since 1965. An additional 47 AUMs were lost when the federal acreage was reduced following approval of several Desert Land Entries (August 1984). Fish Springs Ranch Ltd. is the current livestock operator, and is permitted all of the livestock preference within the Flanigan Allotment.

Prior to 1988 livestock grazing occurred allotment-wide 11 months a year. However, due to a lack of forage in the Juniper Basin area, livestock have not used this portion of the allotment for at least the last 5 years.

During development of the AMP, the permittee agreed to an additional 1200 AUM (24%) reduction and changes in season of use. These AUMs will be placed in suspended preference until such time that monitoring indicates additional forage is permanently available. In which case a formal decision will have to be issued.

Use in the summer area (69% of the HMA) will be deferred until 6/15 with all cattle going to private property on the base ranch by the end of September and remaining there until 12/1. Livestock will graze the Juniper Basin Area, which makes up the remainder of the HMA, during the winter (12/1 through 2/28). Between 2/28 and 6/15, 10/1 and 12/1 no cattle will be within the HMA.

Livestock adjustments may be made in March of 1992 based on continued monitoring data with an objective of achieving 55% utilization on key grass species and 45% utilization on browse species.

#### C. Soils and Vegetation

The soils in the Flanigan HMA exhibit wide ranges in depth, drainage

K

class, percent Surficial and sub-surface rock fragments, pH, and other diagnostic soil properties. For more detailed, site specific descriptions, see Progress Field Review, Washoe County, NV, Central Part, Sept. 1985.

Accelerated erosion is occurring in the Upper Juniper Basin area. This is due primarily to a lack of cover, such as grass and litter. Decline of condition in this area can be attributed primarily to wild horses which have been the primary herbivore utilizing this area for at least the last 5 years. This is documented through distribution data collected during censuses and field observations.

Cottonwood, Anderson and Rock Springs Canyons also have relatively small percentages of basal cover, however, these areas are not at present experiencing accelerated erosion on a large scale, due to high percentages of surficial rock fragments (Watershed Analysis, Flanigan Allotment 1984).

Two major range sites (023, 026) comprise 89% of the HMA and are described below:

Loamy 10-12" pz. (023 x 020N)

1. Associated species: bluebunch wheatgrass (Agropyron spicatum), Thurber needlegrass (Stipa thurberiana), bottlebrush squirreltail (Sitanion hystrix), Wyoming big sagebrush, antelope bitterbrush and Douglas rabbitbrush (Chrysothamnus viscidiflorus).
2. Occurs on rolling uplands and alluvial fans at elevations of 5500 ft. to 6500 ft.
3. Soils are moderately deep and are well drained with 10-12" pz.
4. Annual production in normal years is 800 lb./acre.

Steep North Slope 14-20 (026 x 007)

1. Associated species: Thurber needlegrass, bottlebrush squirreltail, bluebunch wheatgrass, Sandberg bluegrass (Poa secunda), Idaho fescue (Festuca idahoensis ;dominant), mountain big sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata vaseyana), antelope bitterbrush, Douglas rabbitbrush, snowberry (Symphoricarpos).
2. Occurs on steep and mountain shoulders, north slopes at elevations of 5000 ft. to 8000 ft.
3. Soils are moderately deep and well drained with 14-20" pz.
4. Annual production in normal years is 800 lbs./acre.

The ecological status of the HMA (in acres) is as follows:

<u>Low Seral</u>	<u>Mid Seral</u>	<u>High Seral</u>	<u>Potential Natural Community</u>
4804	9072	1798	0

Utilization studies and use pattern mapping of the vegetation completed over the last 2 years (1986-87 and 1987-88) show that 95% of the HMA is currently receiving heavy and severe use. Of the acreage in heavy and severe utilization classes (within the HMA) 69% can be attributed to wild horses with the remaining 31% to cattle (map 3 & 4). Studies conducted prior to turnout of domestic livestock, June 15, showed that the overall vegetation utilization by wild horses alone (both inside and outside HMA) was 44%. This figure reflects 3-3 1/2 months grazing use. Percentages of wild horse and cattle use as stated are based on actual use data, field observations and distribution analysis of where the grazing use by individual species occurred and reflect that portion of the area used by each species. At current population levels the ecological status of the HMA and surrounding area will continue to deteriorate.

Juniper Basin presents a unique problem. This area has not been grazed by livestock since 1982. However, there are no key forage species outside of exclosures, due to continued severe over-utilization from wild horses.

Excess use by wild horses not only occurs within the HMA but is also occurring outside of the HMA with 17% of the over utilized area being grazed exclusively by wild horses outside of the HMA. During this time period (1986-88) AUMs utilized by domestic livestock have decreased by 285 AUMs while wild horse AUMs have increased by 852 AUMs. The Permittee is taking an additional reduction of 915 AUMs to bring the total reduction to 1200 cattle AUMs Allotment wide.

There is only one key area within in the HMA. It was established in August 1984 (map 5). The frequency transect on this key area will be read again in 1990 and read every 5 years thereafter.

One additional key area (key area #2) will be established in the summer of 1989, in the Juniper Basin area (map 5). Determination of key areas and establishment of frequency transects was done and will continue, following the format established in the Nevada Range Monitoring Procedures and BLM Handbook TR 4400-4 p. 29.

The key area summarized as follows:

Key Area No. 1

Location

T. 25 N., R. 19 E., Section 10, SE1/4 West side Cottonwood Canyon.

6

14

Access

Via U.S. 395 North, Honey Lake Valley Road and the Cottonwood Stock Trail.

Site Description

Dominant shrubs - Mountain big sagebrush  
Snowberry  
Rabbitbrush

Dominant grasses - Idaho fescue  
Bottlebrush squirreltail  
Bluebunch wheatgrass

Key Species

Idaho fescue  
Bluebunch wheatgrass  
Antelope bitterbrush

Use Periods and Types of Animals

Cattle - 6/15 to 9/30  
Wild horse - Year long  
Deer - Year long

All utilization studies were conducted using the Key Forage Plant Method. Proper use is 55% on perennial grasses (key species) and 45% on shrubs as recommended in the Nevada Rangeland Monitoring Handbook.

D. Water and Riparian

Springs located in the Virginia Mountain Range show heavy use by wild horses and cattle. Their associated riparian vegetation has disappeared, the spring sources are experiencing heavy trampling which leads to reduced spring flow and fouled water.

Riparian areas in this HMA (total approximately 25 acres) have historically received severe (80% to 100%) use from wild horses and cattle. This in turn is affecting sage grouse chick survival. Sage grouse chicks, for the first few months of life require green leaves and insects which forbs and grasses provide (Leopold et al, 1981). Erosion and loss of riparian species is taking place on many meadows and was the reason for the following springs being protected:

<u>Name</u>	<u>JDR#</u>	<u>Size</u>
Juniper Spring	#6017	15.0 acres
Lower Adobe Spring	#5019	.2 acres Includes check dams

7

#### E. Cultural Resources

Cultural resources in the form of arrow heads and fragments exist within the gather area.

#### F. Wildlife Use

The Dogskin-Virginia Mountain Habitat Management Plan (HMP) did incorporate a maximum of 100 wild horses as the maximum number of wild horses for the Flanigan HMA. Therefore, wildlife management plans were based on the anticipated use from 100 wild horses.

The HMA includes habitat for mule deer (winter and yearlong), pronghorn (yearlong), sage grouse, chukar partridge, valley quail (Callipepla californicus), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura) and many nongame species.

The HMA has both a resident and wintering migratory mule deer herd (Doyle Deer Herd, a part of the Lassen Washoe Interstate Deer Herd) utilizing the area. Mountainous portions of the allotment, specifically Fort Sage and Virginia Mountains, are considered to be critical deer winter range. The habitat conditions in the higher elevations of these mountainous areas are generally good due to the rugged terrain and lack of water which restricts livestock use.

The California Department of Fish and Game has completed the Doyle Deer Herd Plan (1984), of which the HMA is a part. An identified problem in this plan is that winter ranges appear to be undergoing long-term deterioration; preferred browse (antelope bitterbrush; Purshia tridentata) is old and failing to reproduce. It is possible that wild horses may also be utilizing bitterbrush and other browse species (Waring 1979). The Doyle Deer Herd plan also documented that grasses and forbs increase in importance for deer as winter progress. Wagner (1978) stated that food habits of feral equids (wild horses) overlap with those of mule deer. It is also possible that the wild horses are utilizing a sufficient amount of forage to cause cattle to utilize browse species to a greater degree than they ordinarily would.

The Honey Lake and northern Virginia Mountains of the allotment are yearlong range for pronghorn. Severe utilization (BLM utilization records) by wild horses and livestock is occurring in this area.

Habitat for valley quail in the HMA is limited due to the typically small amount of riparian vegetation. Chukar partridge populations are moderate (16 to 29 birds/sq. mi.; Nevada Department of Wildlife; NDOW).

Bighorn sheep are not present in the HMA, however, the HMA is historical range for this species. The Dogskin-Virginia Mountain Wildlife Habitat Area, HMP identified the Flanigan Allotment summer range which includes the HMA as part of a bighorn sheep introduction area. The introduction of bighorn sheep is scheduled for FY 89 or 90.

The HMP also stated that sage grouse and pronghorn populations are declining in the HMA due to meadow deterioration caused by livestock

and/or wild horses.

G. Threatened and Endangered Species

Flanigan HMA and surrounding area contain no known threatened and endangered plant or animal species.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/MITIGATION MEASURES

A. Proposed Action

Reducing the wild horse population to a level that the vegetation within the HMA can support would benefit both the wild horses and wildlife within the HMA and at the same time meet the management objectives of the Land Use Plans (improve ecological condition). By improving the vegetation all species of wildlife will benefit including pronghorn, mule deer, bighorn sheep (when transplanted) and many non-game species. Under current conditions the habitat within the HMA cannot support a reasonable number of mule deer, pronghorn or bighorn sheep. It is anticipated that after the reduction the utilization will decrease from 75% to 55% on key species and from 75% to 40% on interim species. It is also anticipated that the condition of the wild horses will improve from poor to fair or excellent, that the mares will be able to produce a sufficient number of foals to ensure long term survival of the population and that the wild horses will stay within the HMA.

It is anticipated that by reducing the number of wild horses the rate of soil erosion should decrease and the basal cover should increase.

Riparian area condition within the HMA should improve after wild horse numbers are adjusted. However, to adequately protect critical areas and spring sources, exclosures will still be needed.

Unavoidable impacts in the form of injuries to the horses may occur as a result of the removal process. Death loss is not expected to exceed 2% of the horses captured at the trap site. Potential injuries and fatalities can be limited through strict enforcement of contract specifications for safety and humane treatment of animals. BLM representatives would be monitoring the contractor's activities at all times during removal to ensure compliance with specifications and humane treatment of animals.

Some stress to the horses would be associated with the helicopter herding operations, however, after adoption, the horses would become accustomed to captivity and most would receive proper care.

There are currently a maximum of 19 vasectomized stallions in the Flanigan allotment left over from a University of Minnesota study. However, due to the loss of collars only 10 of them can be identified. If all 19 vasectomized stallions were left within the HMA after a herd reduction, they could adversely impact the population dynamics, and greatly decrease the heterozygosity of the population.

9

Removal operations may disrupt band structure either temporarily or permanently and cause some stress to individuals. A certain degree of heterozygosity will be lost from a small population as a result of removals. However, removals may disrupt the band structure of remaining wild horses which would facilitate recombination of adult horses which may lead to an increase in average heterozygosity. If removals are selective in any way, this loss of heterozygosity will be greatly increased (Franklin, 1980).

From analysis of data it was determined that 104 wild horses is the maximum that the HMA can support (appendix A) while maintaining an ecological balance between vegetation, wild horses, wildlife and livestock.

Small localized areas within the vicinity of trap sites and holding facilities would receive trampling and the subsequent loss of vegetation. However, overall the vegetative resource would improve due to the reduction in grazing pressure. Forage availability should increase and utilization levels decrease.

No impacts would occur to cultural resources, as the trap sites would be cleared prior to construction.

Removal of wild horses will prevent further deterioration of the range due to the wild horse overpopulation. By removing the excess wild horses the remaining population will allow for a thriving ecological balance between wild horses, wildlife, livestock and vegetation.

#### B. Water Trapping

General impacts from a reduction in wild horse numbers would be identical to those outlined for the proposed action. This method of capturing wild horses is probably the least stressful to the animals. However, once captured, the handling and transportation of the animals would be the same as the proposed action. As most injuries to wild horses occur during handling and transportation, the injury and fatality rate would remain approximately the same. Once prepared for adoption, the animals become accustomed to captivity and most would receive proper care.

Small localized areas within the vicinity of trap sites and holding facilities would receive trampling and subsequent loss of vegetation. Overall, the vegetation resource would improve due to the reduction in grazing pressure. Forage availability should increase and utilization levels decrease. This would occur in both the short and long term.

No impacts would occur to cultural resources, as the trap sites would be cleared prior to construction.

Due to the time necessary for construction of complex water traps and the prolonged period it would take for the animals to become accustomed to using the traps, it would take more manpower to implement this alternative. Therefore, it would be significantly more expensive than the proposed action. In addition, the number of springs and length of

streams in the entire removal area would make the water trapping method of capture unfeasible, due to the amount of fencing material required.

#### C. Horseback Trapping

General impacts from a reduction in wild horse numbers would be identical to those outlined for the proposed action. Using riders on horseback to herd horses to traps, results in less stress to the animals during capture than the proposed action. However, once captured, the handling and transportation of the animals would be the same as the proposed action. As most injuries to wild horses occur during handling and transportation, the injury and fatality rate would remain approximately the same. Once prepared for adoption, the animals become accustomed to captivity and most would receive proper care. Except for the method of capture and the removal of vasectomized stallions all other impacts on the HMA and wild horses would remain the same as the proposed action

Some localized areas within the vicinity of trap sites and holding facilities would receive trampling and subsequent loss of vegetation. Overall, the vegetation resource would improve due to the reduction in grazing pressure. Forage availability should increase and utilization levels decrease. This impact would have both short and long term effects.

No impacts would occur to cultural resources as the trap sites would be cleared prior to construction.

Bands of horses are not controlled effectively with horseback herding, therefore, many bands are spilled or individual horses separated from the band. This results in increased social structure disruption and/or orphaned foals, which requires attempts to capture these separated animals. The number of animals captured per day versus the proposed actions is significantly fewer, therefore, it is very time consuming resulting in very high capture costs.

This method of capture is very tiring for the saddle horses which results in injuries to both the saddle horses and personnel involved.

#### D. No Action

The no action alternative would result in no wild horses being removed. The animals would not undergo stress, injuries, nor fatalities related to capture, handling and transportation. However, in the long term, the population would increase to a point where excessive utilization would eliminate nearly all the forage plant species. The animals would suffer stress searching for food and may be subject to starvation. Attainment of Land-Use-Planning objectives would not be met.

The population would continue to expand both within and outside of the HMA, further impacting the vegetation and wildlife. This would lead to the loss of many species of wildlife through starvation or dispersal to areas outside of the HMA.. The physical condition of the wild horses would continue to deteriorate.



Habitat improvement would not be realized with this alternative. The frequency of key species would decline further. The animals would continue to search for food and further degrade their habitat, thereby reducing the carrying capacity of the area which would eventually lead to starvation and possible extinction of the population. However, before the wild horses disappear the deer, pronghorn and many other species of wildlife would have died. The HMA would be "home" to just a few wild horses, reducing the chances for the public to observe wild horses. The few wild horses left would be in poor condition, thus, viewing of these wild horses would be a negative experience for most people.

Accelerated erosion would continue and basal cover would continue to increase from excess utilization.

Riparian areas would continue to be over utilized further deteriorating the wildlife habitat.

All vasectomized stallions would remain further decreasing the average heterozygosity of the population.

Further deterioration of the range would occur and the area will not be in a state of thriving natural ecological balance between wild horses, wildlife, vegetation and livestock.

#### V. Public Involvement

This environmental assessment and capture plan is being sent to the following persons, groups and government agencies for review and comment. This review and comment is considered as the consultation and coordination as required in the Lahontan Resource Management Plan.

American Bashkir Curley Register  
American Horse Protection Association  
American Humane Association  
American Wild Mustang & Burro Foundation  
Animal Protection Institute  
Big Canyon Ranch  
Commission for the Preservation of Wild Horses  
Craig C. Downer  
Craig London  
Debra Allard  
Fish Springs Ranch Ltd.  
Fund for Animals  
International Society for the Protection of Wild Horses and Burros  
Kathy McCovey  
National Mustang Association  
National Wild Horse Association  
Nevada Cattlemen's Association  
Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Nevada Federation of Animal Protection Organization  
Nevada Humane Society  
Nevada State Clearinghouse  
Nevada State Division of Agriculture

Rebecca Kunow  
Save the Mustangs  
Sierra Club  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
U.S. Humane Society  
United States Wild Horse and Burro Foundation  
Washoe County Board of Commissioners  
Wild Horse Organized Assistance  
Winnemucca Ranch

VI. List of Preparers

Prepared by:

John Axtell

18 SEP 89

John Axtell  
Wild Horse and Burro Specialist  
Lahontan Resource Area

Reviewed by:

David Loomis

9-18-89

David Loomis  
Environmental Coordinator  
Carson City District

Date


FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/DECISION OF RECORD  
Flanigan Wild Horse Removal

Impacts associated with implementation of the proposed action are not of a significant nature, therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

This plan is in the public interest because the proposed action will restore the range to a thriving natural ecological balance and prevent further deterioration of the range threatened by an over population of wild horses in and around the Flanigan Herd Management Area.


The proposed plan is in accordance with the Lahontan Resource Management Plan and is in the public interest, therefore, it is approved.

Approved:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James M. Phillips  
Area Manager  
Lahontan Resource Area

9-22-89  
Date

Concurred:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James W. Elliott  
District Manager

9/26/89  
Date

### Literature Cited

Franklin, I.R. 1980. Evolutionary Change in Small Population, In Conservation Biology, M.S. Soule and B.A. Wilcox (Eds) pp 135 - 149



Garrott, B. 1989. Univ. of Minn., Personal Communication.

Leopold, A.S., J. Gutierrez, M.T. Bronson. 1981. North American Game Birds and Mammals, Charles Scribner's Sons New York. 198 pp.

Wagner, F.H. 1978. Livestock Grazing and the Livestock Industry. In Wildlife and America. H.P. Brokaw, ed. U.S. Council on Environmental Quality, Washington, D.C. 532 pp.

Waring, G.H. 1979. Behavioral adaptation as a Factor in the Management of Feral Equids in Symposium on the Ecology and Behavior of Wild and Feral Equids, Univ. of Wyoming Laramie pp. 85-92.

MAP 1  
Location of HMA



BOUNDARY AND STATIONS

--- Sure Area Boundary

--- Fences

--- Hazards

--- Traps


X X X




# MAP # 3

'1986-87


## UTILIZATION CLASS



## TYPE USE



## HERD MANAGEMENT AREA





# MAP # 4

1987-88

## UTILIZATION CLASS


SEVERE  
(81-100%)




HEAVY  
(61-80%)




MODERATE  
(41-60%)



LIGHT  
(21-40%)



SLIGHT  
(0-20%)




## TYPE USE


HORSE



CATTLE




DUAL



HERD MANAGEMENT AREA — — — — —



MAP 5  
Key Areas  
(key area 2 has not been established)



## APPENDIX A

In order to meet both the HMA and allotment management plan objectives, adjustments in wild horses and cattle both inside and outside of the HMA area are required. Current vegetation monitoring indicates that the HMA will support approximately 1248 AUMs of wild horse use taken yearlong. Therefore, to properly manage the vegetative resource the wild horses will be adjusted to an average population of 104. Further monitoring data will be collected and analyzed, after the population is adjusted, to determine if this adjusted population level will be established as a new Appropriate Management Level (AML) for the HMA.

Based on the Flanigan AMP, livestock will take a 24% or 1200 AUM reduction (monitoring justifies only a reduction of 991 AUMs) and will defer use in the summer portion of the HMA until boot stage of bluebunch wheatgrass, approximately June 15. Fish Springs Ranch, Inc. agreed to a reduction above which is supported by monitoring information, because they realize that the vegetation will improve faster if additional AUMs are reduced.

Juniper Basin will be utilized by domestic livestock only in the winter thus ensuring non-competitive use of this area by wild horses from spring through the fall.

Determination of wild horse and livestock numbers to be in balance with the habitat limitations:

The Flanigan HMA contains 17,101 acres of both public and private land. However, an allotment boundary fence was constructed in 1952 Prior to the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971. This results in 627 acres that are unavailable to wild horses. Of the 16,474 acres available to wild horses 920 acres within in the HMA are private.

From utilization records the average utilization within the HMA from 1986 - 1988 is 75%.

Within the Flanigan allotment cattle use can be broken down into sections. From actual use data and habitat utilization studies it is estimated that 2692 AUM's of cattle used 34900 acres of land, of which the HMA is incorporated.

Of the 16,474 available acres within the HMA 4,583 acres are not used by cattle because the permittee did not place his cattle in this area due to severe over utilization by wild horses. This leaves 11,891 acres of the HMA which is used by both cattle and wild horses. Thus 11891 acres comprises 34% of the 34900 acres used by cattle within this portion of the allotment. This results in 915 AUMs (average for 86-88) of cattle use within the HMA. Cattle have not used the area north of Telephone Canyon (4,583 acres) for at least the past 5 years.

An average or 62% of the wild horses are outside of the HMA. Thus, of the 399 (1987 census) total population 152 wild horses are inside the HMA. From census and population data it has been determined that 25% of these wild horses use the area north of Telephone Pole Canyon. Therefore 38 wild horses are north of Telephone Pole Canyon within the HMA and 114 wild horses are south of Telephone Pole Canyon within the HMA.

Using the accepted formula for making animal adjustments it is determined that

18 wild horses need to be removed from the area north of Telephone Pole Canyon.

<u>Actual use (AUMs)</u> Average/Weighted Average Utilization	-	<u>Potential Actual Use (AUMs)</u> Desired Average Utilization
$\frac{456}{75\%}$	-	$\frac{x}{40\%*}$
		- 243 AUMs north of Telephone Pole Canyon. Thus 213 AUMs of horses need to be removed, $213/12 = 18$ horses removed north of Telephone Pole Canyon.

\* 40% was used here instead of 55% because there are no key species in this area due to severe over utilization by wild horses, 40% is the recommended utilization level for interim species.

The 114 wild horses south of Telephone Pole Canyon (within the HMA) = 1368 AUMs of wild horses. There are also 915 AUMs of cattle use in this area. Thus the total demand for AUMs south of Telephone Pole Canyon (within the HMA) is 2283.

Using the above formula results in a need to reduce 609 AUMs south of Telephone Pole Canyon. Wild horse use comprises 60% of the AUMs south of Telephone Pole Canyon. Therefore 365 AUMs (30 wild horses) of wild horse use need to be removed. Also 244 AUMs of cattle need to be removed.

Allotment wide cattle use has been reduced by 1200 AUMs which results in an estimated 216 AUM reduction of cattle use within the HMA, which very closely coincides with the 244 AUM reduction stated above.

IN REPLY REFER TO:



## United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
CARSON CITY DISTRICT OFFICE  
1535 Hot Springs Rd., Ste. 300  
Carson City, Nevada 89701

4700  
(NV-03480)

AUG 25 1989

The purpose of this document is to review all available documentation of each herd area (HA) within the resource area and to explain its origin and establishment in accordance with 43 CFR 4700.0-5(d) and 4710.4.

The regulations governing the management of Wild, Free-Roaming Horses and Burros, 43 CFR 4700.0-5 defines "Herd Area" as "the Geographic area identified as having been used by a herd as its habitat in 1971". CFR 4710.3-1 Defines Herd Management Areas (HMAs) as follows: "Herd management areas shall be established for the maintenance of wild horse and burro herds. In delineating each herd management area, the authorized officer shall consider the appropriate management level for the herd, the habitat requirements of the animals, the relationships with other uses of the public and adjacent private lands, and the constraints contained in 4710.4." 4710.4 Constraints on management states: "Management of wild horses and burros shall be undertaken with the objective of limiting the animals' distribution to herd areas."

The Dogskin Mountain, Flanigan, Carson City portion of Fort Sage, Granite Peak, Pah Rah and Tule Ridge HAs were first delineated in the Pyramid-Long Valley Unit Resource Analysis (URA) completed in February 1973. The aerial reconnaissance flights which were used in making these delineations were conducted in 1972-73. Overlays were constructed from data gathered during these flights. These overlays were incorporated into the Pyramid-Long Valley URA, and are stored at the Carson City District Office. Map 2 is a photocopy of the original URA overlays showing the earliest and only delineation of the HAs. In the draft Reno EIS a map depicting "wild horse use areas" is used for analysis purposes only so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map shows the area that the horses were using in 1982, which represents a population increase above the 1972-73 levels which lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the HAs.

The Horse Mountain, Horse Springs and Lahontan HAs were first delineated in the Fort Churchill URA. The aerial reconnaissance flights which were used in making these delineations were conducted in 1975. Overlays were constructed from data gathered during these flights. These overlays were incorporated into the Fort Churchill URA, and are stored at the Carson City District Office. Maps 3 and 4 are photocopies of the original URA overlays showing the earliest and only delineation of the HAs. In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used for analysis purposes only so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map shows the areas that the horses were using in 1984, which represents a population increase above the 1975 levels which lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the HAs.

The Clan Alpine, South Stillwater and the Carson City portions of the Augusta Mountain, Desatoya, New Pass and North Stillwater HAs were first delineated in the Clan Alpine URA. The aerial reconnaissance flights which were used in making these delineations were conducted in 1975. Overlays were constructed from data gathered during these flights. These overlays were incorporated into the Clan Alpine URA, and are stored at the Carson City District Office. Map 5 is a photocopy of the original URA overlays showing the earliest and only delineation of the HAs. In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used for analysis purposes only so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map shows the areas that the horses were using in 1984, which represents a population increase above the 1975 levels which lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the HAs.

In some documents, Herd Use Areas (HUAs), Herd Units and other terms were used to describe areas that wild horses were using at the time these documents were written, however, these areas were not necessarily the recognized official HAs or HMAs and in most cases are larger than the earliest delineation of the 1971 HAs because of population increases which lead to expansions into areas outside of the HAs. A map depicting all of the HUAs state wide (Aug. 1983) shows HUAs within the Lahontan Resource Area much larger than the earliest delineation of the 1971 HAs because it shows the approximate areas that horses/burros used at that time. The areas that were identified in the URAs mentioned above are the official HAs as of 1971 and management of wild horses is restricted to these areas. CFR 43 4710.4 states that "management of wild horses and burros shall be undertaken with the objective of limiting the animals distribution to Herd Areas".

The approximate acreage and estimated 1971 population level of wild horses within the Lahontan Resource Area, Carson City District are summarized below:

HA	Approximate acres from original URA overlays	Estimated 1971 population	Date of Count***
Augusta Mt.	90,374*	17**	1975
Clan Alpine	314,986	513	1975
Dogskin Mt.	6,895	6	1972-73
Desatoya	23,110*	42**	1975
Flanigan	17,101	96	1972-73
Fort Sage	2,043*	14**	1972-73
Granite Peak	3,886	6	1972-73
Horse Mt.	52,422	27	1975
Horse Spring	30,540	27	1975
Lahontan	11,029	4	1975
New Pass	24,669*	121**	1975
N. Stillwater	45,773*	34**	1975
S. Stillwater	9,940	10	1975
Tule Ridge	4,009	7	1972-73
Pah Rah	23,045	101	1972-73

\* Includes only the acreage within the Lahontan Resource Area.

\*\* Includes only the number of wild horses within the Lahontan Resource Area.

\*\*\* Aerial reconnaissance flights.

Acreage stated above may include private lands and other lands not administered by the BLM.

#### AUGUSTA MOUNTAINS HA:

The Augusta Mt. HA (maps 1 & 5) lies within 3 districts, (Carson City, Battle Mountain and Winnemucca) the Carson City portion was first delineated in 1975. This HA contains approximately 90,374 acres of both public and private lands within the Carson City portion. Map 5 delineates the Carson City portion of the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975 and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map was for analysis purposes only during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

#### CLAN ALPINE HA:

The Clan Alpine HA (maps 1 & 5) was first delineated in 1975 and contains approximately 314,986 acres of both public and private land. Map 5 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In several documents including the Environmental Assessment for the Clan Alpine Wild Horse Interim Herd Management Area Plan and December 1979 and 1980 removal plans a map was included which delineated an area called a Herd Unit. A Herd Unit in this context was the area that horses occupied when these and later documents were written and not the official Herd Area. This area was larger than the HA because the wild horse population had increased and expanded since 1975. In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. This map was constructed for analysis purposes only. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

#### DOGSKIN MOUNTAINS HA:

The Dogskin Mt. HA (maps 1 & 2) was first delineated in 1973 and contains approximately 6,895 acres of public lands. Map 2 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1972-73, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Reno EIS a map depicting "wild horse use areas" is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed during the development of the Management Framework Plan (MFP) which was published in 1982. This map was constructed for analysis purposes only. Population increases since 1972-73 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

DESATOYA HA:

The Desatoyas HA (map 5) lies within 2 districts (Carson City & Battle Mountain) and the Carson City portion was first delineated in 1975. This HA contains approximately 23,110 acres of both public and private land within the Carson City portion. Map 5 delineates the Carson City portion of the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). The map of the Lahontan Resource Area HAS and HMAs found in the Lahontan Management Decisions summery 1987 update (map 1) is only approximate and not meant to represent an accurate boundary of the Desatoya HA. During production the shaded area delineating the HA was inadvertently shifted over to the left and was not corrected. The actual HA is as shown in map 5 which was derived directly from the 1975 URA overlays which delineated the HAS. In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. This map was constructed for analysis purposes only. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

FLANIGAN HA:

The Flanigan HA (maps 1 & 2) was first delineated in 1973 and contains approximately 17,101 acres of both public and private lands. However, approximately 627 acres lie east of the Red Light fence which is an allotment boundary fence constructed in 1952. Apparently during the 1972-73 HA reconnaissance flights 2 horses were seen on the east side of the fence or the fence was not recognized from the air. Map 2 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1973, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the 1976 Herd Management Area Plan (which was never fully implemented) several herd boundaries were depicted, these boundaries were larger than the official HA because of population increases which caused some horses to move to areas outside of areas identified in 1972-73. These herd use boundaries were depicted in order to show the expansion of the horses and the approximate area that they were currently using. There is no record of how these unofficial herd boundaries were delineated, however, they are not the official HA as delineated in February 1973 and therefore, do not reflect the area used by horses during the 1972-73 reconnaissance flights used in establishing the official HAS. In the 1985 removal plan for the Fort Sage/ Flanigan HAS a HUA boundary delineated a larger area than the HA because of population increases since 1972-73. This map was made to show the approximate area that the horses were using at that time. In the draft Reno EIS a map depicting "wild horse use areas" is also used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map was constructed for analysis purposes only during the development of the MFP which was published in 1982. Population increases since 1972-73 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

4



FORT SAGE HA:

The Fort Sage HA (maps 1 & 2) lies within 2 districts (Carson City & Susanville) and the Carson City portion was first delineated in 1973. This HA contains approximately 2,043 acres of both public and private lands within the Carson City portion. Map 2 delineates the Carson City portion of the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1973, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the 1985 removal plan for the Fort Sage/ Flanigan HAs a HUA boundary delineated a larger area than the HA because of population increased since 1972-73. This map was made to show the approximate area that the horses were using at that time. In the draft Reno EIS a map depicting "wild horse use areas" is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map was constructed for analysis purposes only during the development of the MFP which was published in 1982. Population increases since 1972-73 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

GRANITE PEAK HA:

The Granite Peak HA (maps 1 & 2) was first delineated in 1973 and contains approximately 3,886 acres of public and private land. Map 2 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1973, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Reno EIS a map depicting "wild horse use areas" is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map was constructed for analysis purposes only during the development of the MFP which was published in 1982. Population increases since 1972-73 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

HORSE MOUNTAIN HA:

The Horse Mountain HA (maps 1 & 4) was first delineated in 1975 and contains approximately 52,422 acres of public land. Map 4 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed. This map was constructed for analysis purposes only during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

#### HORSE SPRINGS HA:

The Horse Springs HA (maps 1 & 4) was first delineated in 1975 and contains approximately 30,540 acres of public and private land. Map 4 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). Because of the proximity to 2 main highways, the checker board land pattern, requests from private property owners and the Nevada Highway Patrol all wild horses were removed from this HA in 1983 (appendix A). For these reasons this HA was not designated as a HMA during the land use planing process (Lahontan RMP). In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting the Horse Springs horse area is used since horses had been removed and the area declared free of wild horses. This map shows the areas that the horses were using prior to their removal in 1983, which represents a population increase above the 1975 levels. This population increase lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

#### LAHONTAN HA:

The Lahontan HA (maps 1 & 4) was first delineated in 1975 and contains approximately 11,029 acres of public land. Map 4 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed for analysis purposes only to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

#### NEW PASS HA:

The New Pass HA (maps 1 & 5) lies within 2 districts, (Carson City & Battle Mountain) the Carson City portion was first delineated in 1975. This HA contains approximately 24,669 acres of both public and private lands within the Carson City portion. Map 5 delineates the Carson City portion of the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed to show the areas that wild horses were using during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA. The New Pass use area was not separated from the Clan Alpine use area in the Draft Lahontan RMP/EIS because of the interchange between the Clan Alpine herd and the New Pass herd.

SHERMAN PEAK:

In the Draft Lahontan Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (1984) a map of the Wild Horse Herd Use Areas was made. In this map a Wild Horse Herd Use Area is depicted for Sherman Peak. However, BLM never identified any horses in this area. This area was depicted using data from other agencies which was later found to be inaccurate.

NORTH STILLWATER HA:

The North Stillwater HA (maps 1 & 5) lies within 2 districts, (Carson City & Winnemucca) the Carson City portion was first delineated in 1975. This HA contains approximately 45,773 acres of both public and private lands within the Carson City portion. Map 5 delineates the Carson City portion of the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed for analysis purposes only to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

SOUTH STILLWATER HA:

The South Stillwater HA (maps 1 & 5) was first delineated in 1975 and contains approximately 9,940 acres of public land. Map 5 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1975, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). In the draft Lahontan RMP and EIS a map depicting horse use areas is used. This map was developed for analysis purposes only to show the areas that wild horses were using so the impacts to other resources could be identified and discussed during the development of the RMP which was published in 1984. Population increases since 1975 lead to an expansion of the population to areas outside of the official HA.

TULE RIDGE HA:

The Tule Ridge HA (maps 1 & 2) was first delineated in 1973 and contains approximately 4,009 acres of public and private land. Map 2 delineates the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1973, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). During the 1972-73 census 7 horses were seen in this HA. These horses have not been seen since.

PAH RAH HA:

The Pah Rah HA (maps 1 & 2) was first delineated in 1973 and contains approximately 23,045 acres of public and private land. Map 2 delineates

✓

the HA and was derived directly from the original URA overlays made in 1973, and is the first and only delineation of this HA. The area that was identified in the URA mentioned above is the official HA and management of wild horses is restricted to this area (CFR 43 4710.4). Because of the checker board land pattern and requests from private property owners all wild horses were removed from this HA in 1985 (appendix B). This HA was not designated as a HMA, during the land use planing process (Reno MFP).

Pinenut Mountains:

In the Draft Lahontan Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (1984) a map of the Wild Horse Herd Use Areas was made. In this map a Wild Horse Herd Use Area is depicted for Pinenut Mountains. This area represents an expansion of the Pinenut Mountains horse population into the Lahontan Resource Area, The official Pinenut Mountains HA does not cross the Carson River nor extend into the Lahontan Resource Area.

Summary of acres in HAs and acres to be managed as HMAs:

HA	Approximate acres from original URA overlays (HAs)	Estimated 1971 population	Approximate acres managed as a HMA
Augusta Mt.	90,374*	17**	90,374*
Clan Alpine	314,986	513	314,986
Dogskin Mt.	6,895	6	6,895
Desatoya	23,110*	42**	23,110*
Flanigan	17,101	96	17,101
Fort Sage	2,043*	14**	2,043
Granite Peak	3,886	6	3,886
Horse Mt.	52,422	27	52,422
Horse Spring	30,540	27	0
Lahontan	11,029	4	11,029
New Pass	24,669*	121**	24,669
N. Stillwater	45,773*	34**	45,773
S. Stillwater	9,940	10	9,940
Tule Ridge	4,009	7	4,009
Pah Rah	23,045	101	0

\* Includes only the acreage within the Lahontan Resource Area.

\*\* Includes only the number of wild horses within the Lahontan Resource Area.

Acreage stated above may include private lands and other lands not administered by the BLM.

The above discussion and chronology of events were derived from all available official Bureau documentation and land use plan inventory data collected between 1972 and 1975. Therefore, it is recommended that the original Unit Resource Analysis maps referenced in (and certified copies attached to) this memorandum be used for all future actions involving the management of wild horses in the Lahontan Resource Area.

John Astell 25 Aug 89  
Lahontan Wild Horse and Burro Specialist

Reviewed by: Timothy B. Remond 8-25-89  
District Wild Horse and Burro Specialist


Concurred by: Samuel M. Phillips 8/29/89  
Lahontan Resource Area Manager

7 Enclosures:

- 1 - 5 Maps of the original URA delineations of the Herd Areas.
- 6 Appendix A Public Notice dated 1/19/83
- 7 Appendix B Memo regarding Pah Rah dated 8/23/85



WILD HORSE HERD MANAGEMENT AREA



WILD HORSE HERD AREA


Inhabited by wild horses in 1971, but has since been declared free of wild horses.

- |                      |                       |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 2. LAHONTAN          | 9. DESATOYA MOUNTAINS |
| 3. HORSE MOUNTAIN    | 10. DOGSKIN MOUNTAIN  |
| 4. NORTH STILLWATER  | 11. FLANIGAN          |
| 5. SOUTH STILLWATER  | 13. GRANITE PEAK      |
| 6. PINENUT MOUNTAINS | 14. New Pass          |
| 7. CLAN ALPINE       |                       |
| 8. AUGUSTA MOUNTAINS |                       |

- |                              |
|------------------------------|
| 1. HORSE SPRINGS             |
| 12. TULE RIDGE/MAHOGANY FLAT |
| 14. PAH RAH                  |

Lahontan Resource Area Herd Areas and Herd Management Areas.

Source: Lahontan Management Decisions Summary 1987 update.



**WILD HORSE HERD MANAGEMENT AND HERD AREAS**

LAHONTAN RESOURCE AREA  
 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
 CARSON CITY DISTRICT OFFICE  
 CARSON CITY, NEVADA

Desatoya Mountains HMA was shifted over during production, see map 8 for Carson City portion of HMA


STUDY AREA

11

MAP 2

- 1- Fort Sage HA, 2- Flanigan HA,
- 3- Tule Ridge HA, 4- Dogskin Mt. HA,
- 5- Granite Pk. HA, 6- Pah Rah HA.


R 16 E R 19 E R 20 E R 21 E R 22 E



CARSON CITY DISTRICT  
 LAHONTAN RESOURCE AREA  
 PYRAMID-LONG VALLEY  
 PLANNING UNIT  
 0306 - 0321

I certify that this  
 is a accurate reproduction  
 of the original  
 UKA overlay delineating  
 the first & only delineation  
 of the Herd Areas.  
 Lahn Axtell 24 Aug 89  
 Wild Horse & Burro  
 Specialist.

Horse Mountain Herd Area



I certify that this is a accurate reproduction  
of the original URA overlay delineating the  
first & only delineation of the Herd Areas.

John Atwell 24 Aug 89.  
Wild Horse & Burro Specialist




Horse Springs  
&  
Lahontan Herd Areas

T 20 N

I certify that this is a accurate  
reproduction of the original URA overlay  
delineating the first & only delineation of  
the first & only delineation of the Herd Areas.

John Antall ZHAWY BR  
Wild Horse & Burro Specialist



HORSE SPGS-STOCKTON FLAT

8144

VIRGINIA

RANGE

LYON CO  
CHURCHILL CO

CHURCHILL VALLEY

CHURCHILL

LYON DEAC

CAMEL

LAHONTAN  
RESERVOIR

LAHONTAN


1/8

R 24 E

R 25 E

R 26 E

Augusta Mt., Clan Alpine, Desatoya Mt.  
New Pass, North Stillwater, South Stillwater Herd Areas.



I certify that this is a accurate reproduction of the original UK overlay delineating the first delineation of the Herd Areas  
 John Akell 24 Aug 88  
 Wild Horse & Burro specialist

MS



# United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
District Office  
1050 E. Williams, Suite 335  
Carson City, Nevada 89701

IN REPLY  
REFER TO:  
4740  
(N-033)

## PUBLIC NOTICE

### HORSE SPRINGS WILD HORSE HERD USE AREA

This notice is to inform interested persons that the implementation of the Horse Springs Wild Horse Removal Plan has been completed. Any persons who believe they may own one or more of the captured animals shall have five days from the posting of this notice to present evidence of ownership to the District Manager, Carson City District, Bureau of Land Management, 1050 E. Williams Street, Suite 335, Carson City, Nevada 89701. The following types of evidence will be considered in making the determination of ownership: Bills of Sale, Horse Registry Certificates, and Brand Inspections. Any of the subject horses determined to be privately owned will be considered to have been in trespass and will not be released until the trespass is settled.

This notice is also to inform interested persons that the Horse Springs Wild Horse Herd Use Area is now declared to be free of Wild, Free-Roaming Horses. Any horses found hereafter within this area will be considered privately owned and will be subject to trespass provisions of Title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, 4150. The area will continue to be considered a Wild Horse Use Area because of the presence of wild horses at the time of passage of the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act. This area could be considered in future land use planning for possible relocation of wild horses should circumstances change.

Thomas J. Owen  
District Manager  
Carson City District Office

*signed  
1/19/83*

Posted: \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_  
title \_\_\_\_\_

*... 1/19/83*

# Memorandum

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

*Reb*

IN REPLY REFER TO:

4700  
(NV-033)

*8/22*

Date: *AUG 22 1985*

TO : District Manager, Carson City  
 Through: ADM, Resources; and AM, Lahontan Resource Area

FROM : Wild Horse and Burro Specialist

SUBJECT : Pah Rah Wild Horse Removal

On February 14, 1985, a census of the Pah Rah Wild Horse Herd Area was conducted which resulted in 107 wild horses being counted. This 107 figure was used as an estimated quantity in the contract bid schedule. However, the contract specifications required all wild horses to be removed from this area.

On August 15, 1985, the contractor, Dave Cattoor, began capture operations. These operations were concluded on August 20, 1985, after 174 head of wild horses were removed. This complete removal was in accordance with the Reno Management Framework Plan. Therefore, I recommend that the Pah Rah Herd Area be declared free of wild horses.

*Thomas J. Owen*

Concurred:

The Pah Rah Wild Horse Herd Area is declared free of wild horses.

*Thomas J. Owen*  
 Thomas J. Owen  
 District Manager

*8-23-85*  
 Date

TReuwaat:bb - 8/22/85