Wild Horses

Table of Contents

Schell URA NO. 3

Wild Horse Program

On December 15, 1971, the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act became law. The Act proclaimed that wild free-roaming horses and burros are living symbols of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West; that they contribute to the diversity of life forms within the nation and enrich the lives of the American people; and that these horses and burros are fast disappearing from the American scene. It is the policy of Congress that wild free-roaming horses and burros shall be protected from capture, branding, harrassment, or death; and to accomplish this they are to be considered in the area where presently found, as an integral part of the natural system of the public lands.

With the passage of this act, the Wild Horse and Burro Program was initiated. Authority to manage the wild horses and burros was assigned to the Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service. These agencies are required to provide written reports on administrative procedures, management methods, expenses incurred, and any legislative recommendations to aid in the management of wild horse and burro populations.

The responsibility of the BLM and USFS is to guard and maintain healthy herds of wild horses and burros while implementing proper multiple-use of public rangelands. Populations must be controlled to preserve and maintain a thriving ecological balance and multiple-use relationship. Wild horse and burro populations have increased steadily since the Act was passed almost a decade ago. Annual increases have been successfully controlled, however, the existing numbers must be reduced further to achieve the proper manageable balance.

Those animals removed from the range that are healthy, can now be adopted by qualified individuals under the Adopt-A-Horse program. It is through this program that the public can play an important role in preserving and improving wild horses and burros.

Several topics must be discussed to accurately analyze the wild horse population inhabiting the Schell Resource Area.

A record of the history of wild horse and burro populations is a valuable tool in determining origin, territories, and habitat requirements of the animals.

A study of seasonal use areas provides information on utilization and migratory patterns needed to develop management plans.

The physical characteristics of wild horses aid in identifying specific herd qualities such as colors, size, and conformation.

Investigation of habitat and/or land use problems will reveal problems resulting from various external influences affecting wild horses.

The reproductive capacity and herd condition of wild horse herds determines the viability and health of wild horses and furnishes knowledge useful in adjusting numbers in line with proper management levels (see: Nelson, Kurt J., "On the Question of Male-Limited Population Growth in Feral Horses," Central Files under Wild Horses).

Lastly, the protection of wild horses by enactment of new legislation and continued enforcement of existing law needs to be discussed. Public attitudes and problems associated with activities occurring within the wild horse herd domain need to be identified.

Wild Horse Herd Classification

The Schell Resource Area presently contains ten herd areas (see Overlay WH-3). These herds are the Schell Creek Herd, Goshute Herd, Moriah Herd, Dry Herd, Cave Valley Herd, Seaman Herd, Golden Gate Herd, White River Herd, Fortification Herd, and Patterson-Eagle Herd.

In the past, the Patterson-Eagle Herd has been divided into two herd areas and referred to as two separate herd units or as one consolidated herd. For the purpose of this Unit Resource Analysis, this herd will be referred to as the Patterson-Eagle Herd and will be considered as a combined herd unit.

Population History

Data is not available to indicate the location of wild horses within each herd area as of December 15, 1971, when the Wild Horse and Burro Protection Act was passed. Inventories conducted in all of the herd areas by both ground and aerial methods from February 1973, to the present indicate that the horses have been in the areas they presently occupy since that time and in some regions they have expanded their use areas. (See Table 1) Herds that appear to have expanded their use areas are the Schell Creek Herd, Fortification Herd, Seaman Herd, and Golden Gate Herd.

Five herd areas found on lands administered by the Ely District extend into adjacent districts, i.e., the Schell Creek and Goshute Herds extend into the Elko District with the Goshute Herd drifting into the Salt Lake District, Utah, as well. The Patterson-Eagle and Dry Herds extend into the Las Vegas District. The Patterson-Eagle Herd also moves into portions of the Cedar City District, Utah. The Schell Creek and White River Herds often migrate into the Egan Resource Area of the Ely District. The Moriah Herd has used lands administered by Mount Moriah Division of the Humboldt National Forest. An interview with Jack Wilcox, District Ranger for the Ely and White Pine Ranger Districts, on April 25, 1980, indicates that horses have not been observed on the Mount Moriah Division since 1974. The Forest Service is currently making plans to drop this area used by horses if substantial numbers are not accounted for during the next inventory.

Coordination with the Forest Service and with adjacent BLM Districts where herd areas overlap will be important for proper management now and in the future.

TABLE NO. 1

WILD HORSE NUMBERS BY HERD OBTAINED DURING AERIAL INVENTORIES

HERD	INVENTORY YEAR	TOTAL	ADULTS	YEARLINGS	CURRENT YEARS FOAL CROP
GOSHUTE	1975	64 (+78 Elko)			
	1980	52 (+78 Elko)	122	7	1
SCHELL	1975	174 (+5 Elko)			
	1980	115 (+7 Elko)	109	7	6
MORIAH	1975	5			
	1979	1	1	0	0
CAVE VALLEY	1975	13			
	1979	9	8	0	1
SEAMAN	1975	102			
	1979	15	11	3	1
WHITE RIVER	1975	27			
	1979	0	0	0	0
GOLDEN GATE	1975	16			
	1979	5	4	1	0
DRY LAKE	1973	86 (+27 Las Vegas)			
	1979	50 (+4 Las Vegas)	49	4	1
PATTERSON-EAGLE	1973	42 (+5 Utah) (+42 Las Vegas)			
	1979	6 (+9 Utah) (+3 Las Vegas)	17	1	0
FORTIFICATION	1973	62			
	1979	112	100	8	4

Herd areas within the Schell Resource Area were established based on past historical horse use areas and inventory data gathered from 1973 to the present.

History of wild horses in the Schell Resource Area before 1971 is sketchy and not very well documented. At one time, wild horses in the Schell Resource Area, were domesticated or their ancestors were released on rangelands or escaped and returned to the wild state.

In several cases, old homesteaders, ranchers, and miners would turn horses out on the range during the winter when weather prevented them from using horses for their occupational needs. In the spring, they would round-up, sort out, and keep those that were fit for work. Remaining horses would be turned out or sent to processing plants. Under this system, there were always some horses left on the range.

When the Army Remount Service was in operation during the early 1900's through 1940, remount stallions of various breeds were released on the range to upgrade the existing herds. These stallions were mainly thoroughbreds or Morgans, but a few draft bloodlines were introduced to develop a hardier strain for pulling supply wagons and heavy artillery. Native stallions were often shot to allow breeding dominance by the remount stallions.

Schell Creek Herd/Goshute Herd

Information concerning the history of wild horses in the Schell Creek Herd and Goshute Herd is minimal but the origin of the herd is probably closely related to that of the Moriah Herd and general knowledge concerning the history of horses in the entire resource area. Approximately 100 head of horses resided in the Becky Peak area. Others were known to exist in Chin Creek and Dolly Varden (Elko District). These animals were trapped near Becky Springs in Horse Canyon.

Seasonal Use Areas

The Schell Creek horses primarily graze in Spring Valley during the winter and early spring; some also graze in Steptoe Valley on the west side of the Schell Creek Range and in Antelope Valley on the east side of the Antelope Range. Horses in this herd area will stay in the Pinyon-juniper zone on the lower benches during the day and graze in the valley bottoms in the evening. During open winter when there is little snow on the Schell Creek Range and the Antelope Range, the horses will stay high on the open slopes and will not move down into the valleys. It is possible to see a few horses in this herd area at all different elevations during any time of the year, but the majority of the bands will follow a migrational pattern based on climatic and seasonal conditions. There is also movement of horses from the north end of Becky Peak and the north end of the Antelope Range into the Elko District. This movement is based on seasonal and climatic conditions when snow levels on these mountains force horses down into the lower elevations in the Elko District.

Physical Characteristics

Wild horses in the Schell Resource Area posess a variety of colors and conformations. The assortment includes: sorrels, bays, browns, blacks, whites, palominos, chestnuts, red roans, strawberry roans, blue roans, duns, buckskins, grullos, grays, and a few pintos. A large percentage of the horses that are bay or brown have lighter tones around the eyes, on the muzzle, and in the region of the gaskin. Common facial markings are: stars, strips, snips, blazes, and bald faces. Leg markings included are socks, stockings, posterns, and half posterns.

On the average, adult horses weigh between 500 and 800 pounds, and stand approximately 14.0 hands to 15.3 hands (1 hand = 4") at the withers.

Habitat or Land Use Problems

The major external influence on this herd unit is livestock grazing. The main problem has been competition for available forage between wild horses and domestic livestock. Livestock grazing has been voluntarily reduced in this area the last few years, and competition has decreased.

There are a few fences in this area that hinder the north-south movement of horses but their ability to survive has not been seriously affected. (See Overlay WH-5.)

Goshute Herd

Seasonal Use Areas

The Goshute Herd generally grazes in the low, rolling mountains on a yearlong basis, and horses on the west and southwest sides of the Goshute Mountains move into Antelope Valley and graze there. During the summer months, horses in the Ferber Flat area in the Elko District move down into the Ely District closer to water. During the winter, when snow is available, they will move back into the Ferber Flat area. Horses occupying the Goshute Mountains move freely back and forth between the Ely and Elko Districts, and into Utah.

Habitat and Land Use Problems

This herd unit is externally influenced by livestock grazing and fences.

Competition for existing forage in the past has been extreme, but in recent years voluntary reductions by livestock permittees has reduced this competition between horses and domestic livestock.

Fences along the Goshute Indian Reservation boundary has forced horses to concentrate on public lands. Some fences in this herd unit hinder horse movement by forcing horses to run along the fence for four to five miles before they can get around it.

Moriah Herd

Population History

A long-time resident who was raised and ranched in the area stated that the Mount Moriah region used to have a quite a few horses. Their range extended from White Cloud Mountain south towards the summit of Mount Moriah. Their seasonal migration pattern originated at White Cloud Mountain, terminating near the summit of the Mount Moriah during spring green-up. They would remain until late summer when the sheep moved into the area at which time they trekked north towards White Cloud for the winter.

From the early 1900's into the 1950's, horse trapping occurred on a regular basis. Ranchers used five wing traps to gather wild horses since water trapping was an unsuccessful method due to the availability of water in the region. The traps were strategically located in the vicinity of Big Canyon, Six Mile Peak, Mud Peak above Mud Spring, Eight Mile, and at the end of Smith Creek. They were built on trails regularly used by wild horses traveling to water. Initially, the wings were left open so that the horses could become accustomed to them after which time they were closed and the horses trapped by men on horseback. A man named Bill Meecham built most of these traps in the early 1900's. Once the horses were trapped, they were kept in a natural rock pasture at the end of Thunder Mountain until there were 100-150 head gathered. the horses were then trailed to the vicinity of Deseret, Utah, where the best were sold for saddlehorses and the rest sold for chicken feed. Some sources say they were also shipped to Missouri where they were used in the fields by cotton farmers. While trailing horses to auctions, their nostrils were partially sewn shut to reduce air take and thus prevent escape. In the 1940's, the horses became valuable for leather and were shot for their hides which were worth $10 each. In the late 1950's, 200 horses were gathered on Mount Moriah using portable traps. The wings were made of cables with rags tied on them, while the adjoining corrals, 8 feet high, were made of hog wire. When trapping occurred, the horses would run into the corrals until they struck the wire. Instead of turning back towards the gate they continued to attempt escape through the wire, giving the riders enough time to close the bar gates. After capturing the animals, the riders herded them to nearby ranches, controlling movement by tying a foreleg to the tail. The horses were loaded and shipped after arriving at the ranch. An estimated 150 horses remained in the area after gathering ceased in the late 1950's.

Noted "mustangers" in the Moriah and Spring Valley areas were Bill Meecham, Jack Rice, and George Eldridge, but almost all ranchers in the vicinity trapped horses when they had time.

Since the County Commissioners were responsible for issuing permits to gather wild horses in Nevada, prior to the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Protection Act in December 1971, the White Pine County Clerk's office was contacted to obtain information from the Commissoners' records on how many permits were issued. The records indicated that no permits had ever been issued.

Seasonal Use Areas

Information on the Moriah Herd is very limited. During the March 1975 inventory only one band of five horses was counted north of Spring Valley Wash in Snake Valley, and in the March 1979 inventory only one horse was sighted on the Kern Mountains. However, that summer a band of three adults and one colt was observed in the same general area. A range conservationist for the Schell Resource Area reported he had seen 11 horses in the Devils Gate Allotment in 1978. The Forest Service has had no confirmed sightings of horses on lands administered by them since 1974. These lands originally made up the southern portion of the Moriah Herd Unit. The Forest Service is currently planning to drop their lands from the Moriah Herd Unit.

Habitat or Land Use Problems

The two major external influences on horses in this area are livestock grazing and fences.

Competition for available forage is not as severe in this herd area as in the Goshute Herd. This is due to the small number of horses presently in this area. However, existing forage in this area is not overly abundant and at certain times of the year livestock make heavy demands on the forage.

Fences in this area completely block or severely hinder horse movement and may be a factor for the low number of horses in this unit.

→ **Fortification Herd**

Population History

Horses in the southern portion of the Schell Resource Area fall into seven herd areas. They are the Patterson-Eagle Herd, Fortification Herd, Dry Herd, Cave Valley Herd, Seaman Herd, Golden Gate Herd, and White River Herd. Their history is similar to the account already given. The best record is that of the Fortification Herd and it is felt that this account either directly or indirectly has had influence on the historical background of the other herds.

The history of the Fortification Herd was provided by Bob Steward, a long-time resident of the area. The following is a synopsis of his account.

The present wild horse population inhabiting the Fortification Range originates from domestic equines once employed in livestock, mining, hunting, trapping, and military affairs. These horses were released on the range and thus became wild in nature.

Before the Wild Horse and Burro Act was passed in December 1971, the state was responsible for the regulation of these animals. Permits were issued allowing individuals to capture or kill those horses declared as a nuisance. However, in the 1920's, no real attempt was made by government agencies to reduce the growing horse population in the vicinity of

Fortification Range, so, the local ranchers assumed the responsibility. During the depression of the late 20's and 30's trapping wild horses and coyotes became a main occupation and/or sporting event. Cowboys were paid five dollars a head for horses dead or alive! In 1934, the Taylor Grazing Act was passed, imposing limitations on grazing lands issued to ranchers. Unwilling to share the available forage needed for livestock, the ranchers reduced the horse population further.

Before fences were constructed along what is now Highway 93, wild horses resided on Grassy Mountain. In the winter they would move west and east into Cave and Lake Valley, respectively, to forage for the season. Horses from Lake Valley (Couge Eye) were herded south towards Pioche where the surroundings were unfamiliar to them. This method of roundup made the handling of wild horses easier for they were not as aggressive when lost. Once corralled, they were loaded and shipped to Los Angeles. There they were sold to poultry farms and fish hatcheries. Those horses remaining in Gouge Eye after the initial cleanup in 1929 were gathered annually during deer season and used as saddle horses after which time they were returned to Lake Valley.

Wild horses in Spring Valley were corralled at Indian Springs and shipped to the East. Others were herded into Lake Valley and shot at the Geyser Ranch.

During one roundup in Cave Valley a dominant member of a band jumped off a ridge and the remaining horses followed. As a result, they all were shot.

Utah mustangers kept the horse population low in Hamblin Valley. Branded horses were chased across the state line and captured in Utah so as to avoid brand inspectors. Most of these horses were claimed by Frenchie Ely who introduced the Kentucky saddlebred in Wilson Creek.

Moving wild horses was a difficult task. Wranglers used such methods as tying tails to forelegs, placing gunny sacks over horses heads, and with the more aggressive animals restricted them by using chains and/or cables around the legs. Some horses died from self-inflicted wounds that became infected.

There was always a market for horsemeat in the pelt business. At one time, horses provided fox feed for the Swallow Ranch fox farm in Spring Valley. Horsemeat was used frequently by trappers and sheepherders for predator control. They would poison carniverous animals by lacing the carcasses with strychnine. Many horses were killed by sheepherders who depended on existing vegetation to sustain their sheep. The art of chasing, capturing, and killing wild horses became more and more popular. Soon hunters from Las Vegas invaded the area killing more horses than deer.

On the west side of Fortification Range the Throughbred-Morgan influence spread as a result of raising stock bred for the Cavalry. During this period there was an attempt made to upgrade the quality of feral horses. The Army Remount Service turned out stallions of various breeds to produce horses fit for military purposes. The ranchers too practiced

genetic improvement. They eliminated the undesirables and returned the desirables to the rangelands. They, as well as the Remount Service, infused new blood into the horse herds. A rancher native to the area fed remount stallions during the winter when storms drove them off the mountains.

Work horses also roamed this region, contributing substance to the population. The influence of draft blood was evident in Cave Valley where horses weighed approximately twelve hundred pounds as opposed to horses in Lake Valley that averaged seven hundred pounds.

In 1959, after the use of mechanized vehicles in capturing wild horses was outlawed, massive roundups began to cease with the exception of those outside activities conducted by the government.

In 1966, the Bureau of Land Management authorized the removal of one hundred and fifty horses from these rangelands. (This roundup is undocumented in BLM records.) After this time, the horse population was maintained at twenty-five to thirty head by unauthorized rustlers.

As stated before, prior to the Wild Horse and Burro Protection Act, wild horses were considered to be the property of the State of Nevada. The County Commissioners were responsible for the regulation and control of wild horses. Permits were issued at the discretion of the County Commissioners, and were largely issued as the demand warranted. Only wild horse permits have ever been issued by the Commission since burros are not known to have occupied the southern half of the Schell Resource Area.

The first permit issued for the killing or capturing of wild horses was granted by the Lincoln County Commissioners in 1949. However, through personal communication with one of the "old timers" of the area, it was determined that wild horses had been captured and/or killed for many years prior to 1949. Numbers of permits issued per year have increased from one in 1949 to 14 in 1970.

The number of wild horses occupying the southern half of the resource area as well as surrounding areas, has declined drastically over past years. One "old-timer" estimated that during the peak in horse numbers, 1,000 to 1,500 horses utilized the Dry Lake Valley area, 300 horses watered at Bailey Spring, and hundreds of horses were seen in Patterson Wash, Hamblin, and Lake Valleys. He also estimated that from the early 1900's to recent times, he alone had captured some 1,500 wild horses.

Seasonal Use Areas

There are four major horse concentration areas within this herd area. The largest concentration occurs in the southern end of Lake Valley and extends north to the southern end of Lake Valley and extends north to the southern end of the Fortification Range. Horses are generally in this area year-long. This area is fairly open and horses may be observed in this area at anytime during the day.

The second major concentration area exists on the west side of the Fortification Range in central Lake Valley, specifically the Couge Eye seeding. Horses graze in the seeding from dusk to dawn and during the day move up into the pinyon-juniper zone. However, horses may be observed in the seeding during the day, but at the slightest sign of danger or some unusual activity the horses will move immediately up into the pinyon-juniper zone.

The third area of concentration can be found on the east side of the Fortification Range in Spring Valley. A very similar situation to that in Couge Eye prevails in the Cottonwood Allotment (0132), specifically in the Upper Cottonwood Seeding (0139). This tract consists of four hundred and sixty acres of crested wheatgrass. Because of the availability of forage, water, and cover horses moved into the area. Nearly twenty head resided in the vicinity of the seeding during the spring and throughout most of the summer (1978). They followed the general pattern of remaining on the benches for rest and cover until early morning at which time they trailed down to the ecotone (region of transition from pinyon-juniper to the seeding) to graze. During the summer horses move back to the benches near alternative water sources. There they feed on Indian ricegrass, needle and thread, and cheatgrass. During adverse weather they venture east into Spring Valley where winterfat becomes part of their main diet.

The fourth and final area of concentration persists between the Atlanta Mine and the airstrip to the north. Unlike the west side, this is an area of continual shifting. Bands of wild horses settle temporarily for feed and cover before moving on to water. A definite pattern cannot be depicted in their movements.

Some horses travel south to Bradshaw Spring (T. 7 N., R. 68 E., Sec. 25) where water and cover are plentiful, but adequate forage is unavailable. Others travel north along the east bench where springs provide water and an abundance of grasses grow. Certain numbers go west winding through the Horse Corral Pass lands enroute to Fortification Well or reach the well using the Power Line Road originating just west of the Atlanta Mine. Another alternative route wild horses take from this locale is east up into the Limestone Hills where water is obtained from a source referred to as "The Troughs" or Wild Horse Spring. (T. 9 N., R. 69 E. Sec. 19,20).

Horses belonging to this congregation are living under minimal conditions: circumstances which facilitate movement in order to obtain the necessary elements of forage, water, and cover. Those equines maintained on crested wheat seedings, a dependable water supply, and permanent cover subsist under optimal conditions: a state in which the habitat already supplies the horses' requirements.

Habitat and Land Use Problems

Major external influences on this herd are livestock grazing, mining, hunting, fences, and ORV use. Competition for available forage is critical at different times of the year between livestock

and horses in certain areas within this herd unit. The main areas where competition is severe are the Cottonwood Seedings, (spring, summer, fall) along the Atlanta pipeline, (summer) and the Limestone Hills (winter).

Mining activities at the Atlanta Mine have had an impact on wild horses in the Fortification Herd. Horses have been harassed while grazing, watering, and moving through the vicinity of the mine. Residents in the area have complained about the presence of wild horses on mining property. Those people affiliated with the mine and people using roads in the area are suspected of undue harassment and possible destruction of wild horses. The presence of the mine itself and human activity directly associated with the operation may force horses to alter their normal migratory routes and seek alternative water sources. Changes in movement patterns may be beneficial to the herd to avoid possible injury. Horses could be rerouted by erecting fences around the mine, especially in the vicinity of the tailings ponds which contain arsenic which is highly toxic and fatal if consumed.

Hunters may affect horses by driving over seldom-used trails. This may alter horses movements. Other ways hunters may affect horses is by chasing them, shooting at them, and by camping near waters that horses use. A positive way hunters may affect horses is by leaving gates open in fences that border seedings. However, there may be a negative affect on horses when these gates are closed and horses try to leave the seedings.

Fences in this herd unit severely restrict and in some cases completely block the movement of horses. Specifically, these fences are the ones which border the Cottonwood Seedings, on the east side of the Fortification Range, the Cottonwood Allotment boundary fence, the Geyser Allotment boundary fence on the west side of the Fortification Range, and the pasture fences which separate seedings on the Geyser Allotment. To the south of the Fortification Range there are fences which block the movement of horses into the Patterson Wash Seedings.

Off-road vehicle use in this area occurs mainly in the fall and winter during the hunting and trapping seasons. Affects of ORV use may be displacement of horse bands, running horses into fences with resulting injuries and death to horses, and causing younger animals to lose contact with the band being chased. These are only possible occurrences since no actual observations of this activity have been made.

Patterson-Eagle Herd

Seasonal Use Areas

The Patterson-Eagle Herd area extends north from the Ely-Las Vegas District line to the southern boundary of the Fortification Herd Area, is east of U.S. Highway 93, and extends to the Nevada-Utah State line.

Horses appear to be very transitory in this herd. Horses move into this area from the Las Vegas District and Cedar City District (Utah) during the spring and remain through the fall until climatic conditions force them back into their winter areas. A few horses appear to remain in this area during the winter. There may be some movement of horses into the Fortification Herd area north of this herd area and some movement west into the Dry Herd area where no fences exist along U.S. Highway 93.

Horses follow the spring greenup onto Mount Wilson and Parsnip Peak on the west, and White Rock Peak on the east. Horses have access to Hulse Seeding in Patterson Wash, the Meadow Valley Seedings, the Burnt Canyon Chaining on White Rock Peak, the Mount Wilson Burn Rehabilitation area, and the Horsethief Chaining. Horses generally move in two directions to winter; south into Las Vegas District where they winter next to private lands in Meadow Valley, Rose Valley, and the town of Panaca; or they move east into Hamblin Valley where they winter on the valley benches in the Cedar City District (Utah).

Habitat and Land Use Problems

External influences on the Patterson-Eagle herd are livestock grazing, hunting, off-road vehicle use and fences.

The principal competition between horses and livestock occurs during spring, summer, and fall. Due to better regulation of livestock use in this herd area and the low number of horses it is felt that competition for available forage is minimal. Hunting activity and ORV use may have a much larger impact on horses in this area since the Wilson Creek Range and White Rock Peak are prime deer hunting areas and attract a fairly large number of people. Also, the Eagle Valley Reservoir attracts large numbers of people during the summer for boating and fishing. The main ORVs used are four-wheel drive vehicles and motorcycles. The impacts on horses may be the same as those already stated for the Fortification Herd. Also, the people living in the communities of Pioche and Ursine use this area for recreation activities and gathering firewood, which could result in negative impacts on wild horses.

Fences in this herd unit mainly block and hinder horses from using the Meadow Valley Seedings, Patterson Wash Seeding, the Mount Wilson Burn Rehab Area, the Burnt Canyon Chaining, the Horsethief Chaining, and the Burnt Canyon Fire Rehab area.

Dry Herd

Seasonal Use Areas

Horses in this herd area occupy lands west of U.S. Highway 93 to State Route 138 on the west. The area extends from the Las Vegas District north to the southern end of Cave Valley and the southern end of Dutch John Mountain. The two main concentration areas are the southern end of the Fairview Range on the east side of Dry Lake

Valley, and the Red Mountain area south of Coyote Springs on the west side of Dry Lake Valley. Lesser horse concentration areas occur on the Bristol Range, Grassy Mountain, and the Sidehill Pass area.

There may be some movement of horses to the east into the Patterson-Eagle Herd, and west into the Seaman Herd. There is movement of horses between the Las Vegas District and the Ely District. Also, there may be some interchange between the Dry Herd and the Cave Valley Herd.

Horses generally stay on the upper benches of Dry Lake Valley and on the mountain ranges that border both sides of the valley. They appear to stay in these areas during the day and move into the valley during the early morning and evening hours to graze. During the summer months they will move into the valley to water at the reservoirs during the day, (when some of the springs and seeps dry out in the higher elevations) but return to the mountain ranges and foothills for safety.

During the winter, horses in the southern half of the herd unit remain at the higher elevations and only move to lower elevations when severe climatic conditions force them down. They generally can remain at these higher elevations because winters are usually mild in nature. Horses in the northern half of the herd area appear to retreat to the upper Pinyon-juniper covered benches during the winter because more moisture is generally received in the higher, timbered areas and climatic conditions are more harsh. Horses in the Dry Herd appear to be more stationary in nature and their movements can generally be described as moving closer to permanent water sources during the summer and farther away from these sources as moisture conditions allow them to.

Habitat and Land Use Problems

External influences affecting this herd unit are livestock grazing and fences.

Domestic livestock graze portions of the Dry Herd Unit on a yearlong basis creating competition for forage with wild horses. Utilization of vegetation by livestock in seasonal use areas grazed by horses causes a conflict between the two classes of animals.

Movement of wild horses is blocked or impeded by several fences in the Dry Herd Management Area. Horses utilize water sources and forage in the vicinity of Grassy Mountain and Steward Allotment frequently. The Grassy and Steward Allotment fences prevent movement of horses through this region. The Muleshoe Drift Fence also creates a conflict with the migratory patterns of wild horses, as do the Lake Valley Unit Fence and Dutch John Fence.

Cave Valley Herd

Seasonal Use Areas

Horses in this unit occupy the southern third of Cave Valley. They appear to range over the entire valley during the winter months and

may move south into the Dry Herd Unit. During the spring and summer they appear to move up into the higher elevations of the Schell Creek Range and the Egan Range following the spring greenup. Also, they appear to move closer to the more permanent water sources, and they may move into the Dry Herd Unit during the summer in search of forage and water.

Habitat and Land Use Problems

Livestock grazing is the major external influence acting upon wild horses in the Cave Valley Herd.

Domestic livestock utilize portions of the herd area on a yearlong basis. Competition between cattle and wild horses occurs when key seasonal use areas are grazed by both animal classes.

In 1977, numerous horses died from locoweed poisoning. These fatalities may have occurred partially due to a lack of available forage in portions of the herd unit resulting from competition between livestock, wildlife, and/or wild horses.

Another reason for the death of numerous horses may have been the drought in the summer of 1977 that prevented the growth of desirable species grazed by wild horses forcing them to utilize less desirable vegetation such as poisonous plants.

Seaman Herd

Seasonal Use Areas

There appears to be two major concentration areas in this herd unit. The larger concentration area is on the eastern benches of Coal Valley south of Timber Mountain Pass. These horses are seen frequently during the summer months, but no records are available showing their winter use areas. These horses graze along the benches during the summer and move into Coal Valley to water at the reservoirs as the intermittent springs and seeps dry out. The second concentration area is located in the White River sinks and on the benches of the Seaman Range, and on the benches of Fox Mountain. These horses move both north to Murphy Meadows and west and southwest into Coal Valley. There may be some interchange of horses between the Dry Herd Unit to the east and the Golden Gate Herd Unit to the north.

Habitat and Land Use Problems

The main external influences affecting this herd are livestock grazing, mining, and fences.

Different portions of the herd unit are used yearlong by both sheep and cattle. This grazing activity produces competition for available forage, as well as water, between domestic livestock and wild horses. The major conflict arises when domestic livestock graze in critical seasonal use areas preferred by horses.

Mining activity in the Seaman Herd Unit has increased greatly over the last few years. A large number of claims have been staked in the Timber Mountain Pass region which is a wild horse use area and migratory route. It is thought that this mining activity has forced horses out of the region since there have been few sightings in the area.

In recent years, oil and gas exploration have been conducted in the Seaman Herd Management Area. Wild horses have moved out of these active regions which were once traditional use areas.

The major conflicting fences in the herd unit are the fence along SR 38 and the Middle Coal Valley Fence. The fence along Highway 38 blocks the eastward movement of wild horses while the project in Middle Coal Valley blocks movement to the southwestern portion of herd management area.

Golden Gate Herd

Seasonal Use Areas

There may be an interchange of horses with the Seaman Herd to the south and with the White River Herd to the north.

These horses daily cover a fairly large area. Some horses will graze in the early morning and evening on unfenced meadows along the Forest Moon Ranch and the Wayne A. Kirch Wildlife Management Area, and then move back to the north end of the Golden Gate Range during the day. During the winter months horses graze in the saltbush and winterfat areas in the north end of Garden Valley and on the east side of the Golden Gate Range.

Habitat or Land Use Problems

There is little information regarding external influences affecting wild horses in the Golden Gate Herd. There are no physical barriers impeding natural patterns of movement.

Mining, recreational, and seismic activities are minimal. Adequate living space is available as well as forage, water, and cover. The grazing of domestic livestock does not conflict with the estimated 20 wild horses comprising the Golden Gate Herd.

White River Herd

Seasonal Use Areas

Horses in this herd unit range from Murphy Meadows north to above the Forest Moon Ranch. Their range extends west from the western boundary of the Wayne A. Kirch Wildlife Management Area to the north eastern benches of Garden Valley. Included in this area is the northern end of the Golden Gate Range.

There are no known external factors influencing wild horses in the White River Herd Unit; however, a natural or artificial control has removed horses from the area.

Natural means such as a lack of desirable forage species, natural water facilities, adequate cover provided by timbered areas, and living space can force horses to migrate to areas providing these necessary requirements. Artificial means which could encourage horses to leave an area would be the presence of ranching operations, grazing of domestic livestock, fences, mining activity, seismic exploration, recreational use, and lack of water developments. Horses were not seen in this herd unit during the 1979 inventory indicating a change in location.

Population Condition

The overall condition of the wild horses in the Goshute, Schell, Moriah, Cave Valley, Seaman, White River, Golden Gate, Dry Lake, Patterson-Eagle and Fortification Herd Units is good.

On occasion, horses are found in poor condition resulting from lameness, old age, injury, parasites, disease, nutritional deficiencies, and/or a lack of adequate forage. Mares sometimes exhibit poor health after having given birth and nursed a foal. In extreme cases, a horse may become so debilitated that it is unable to reach areas offering the necessary forage, water, and cover required for survival. These animals should be carefully selected from horses gathered during roundups and humanely destroyed if recovery is hopeless.

The majority of wild horses in the Schell Resource Area are serviceably sound, relatively healthy, and reasonably conformed for the type of environment they live in. The well-being of these herds can be attributed to an adequate supply of forage, water, cover, solitude, and keen leadership by the dominant members who initiate movement to avoid predators, adverse weather, and man.

Protection

Any legislative acts designed and implemented to protect wild horse herds and wild horse habitat should be promoted, supported, and strongly enforced. Without national, state, and local support and understanding for wild horse populations, illegal gatherings, processing, and harrassment will continue to occur. The wild horse must be considered as an integral part of our national resource lands in areas where they presently reside.

Roundups should be restricted during foaling season and until foals have acquired enough strength to avoid low flying aircraft without injury. Newborn foals are initially weak and unable to travel great distances, until they have obtained adequate nourishment and develop anatomical strength. Aircraft can cause undue stress and/or injury to both mares

and foals. Proper scheduling of roundups will provide the needed protection to guard against such damaging effects.

During investigations conducted over the past year in Nevada, various horse traps and illegally blocked water holes have been found. This type of activity is on the increase due to the high cost paid per pound for horse flesh.

Illegal capture, transport, sale, and slaughter have been witnessed on several occasions over the past few years. Just this winter 20 horses were shot north of Austin and last summer 7 were shot south of Eureka. In August of 1978, 12 horses were stolen from the Tippett Ranch in north Spring Valley. The horses were being held there temporarily while Ayarbee Spring, a major watering facility, was being repaired. In August of 1979, leg traps were found at the same location. Three persons were apprehended and were sentenced in a Federal Court in Salt Lake City. Those people actively involved in illegal capture and destruction of wild horses represent only a small portion of the general public.

Ranchers feel that more population controls need to be implemented to reduce present horse numbers. They state that the feral horse endangers their occupation by widespread use of forage and water needed for sustaining domestic livestock.

Hunters express a similar attitude, explaining that crucial deer and antelope habitat are threatened by the presence of wild horse populations.

On a nationwide scale, those people who do not reside in the Western states and are unfamiliar with the wild horse seek the opportunity to observe wild horse herds when traveling in this part of the country.

The attitudes of the American people are mixed with regard to the wild horse controversy. The numerous wild horse and animal protection organizations voice the strongest most positive defense in favor of continued survival of the wild horse. The Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture support the management and protection of wild horses by legislating acts directed towards preserving wild horse populations.

The Adopt-A-Horse program may be one method of introducing the public to the wild horse. Exposure to the animals themselves might aid in educating people on the needs of the horse and problems that arise on open rangelands in conjunction with large populations of wild horses. A better understanding of the Wild Horse Program is necessary in order to create a public awareness of the need to continue enforcement of laws protecting wild horses.

Wild Horses, Management Opportunities

Schell URA - 4

Introduction

There are presently ten horse herd units within the Schell Resource Area. They are as follows: Schell, Goshute, Moriah, Patterson-Eagle, Fortification, Seaman, Colden Gate, White River, Dry Lake, and Cave Valley.

Movement of wild horses in and out of their respective herd management areas (HMA's) occurs on a regular basis with few bands remaining within the confines of the present herd unit boundaries. Horses sighted in regions adjacent to designated herd areas during aerial inventories indicates interplay across the herd unit boundaries. Evidence of this migratory activity supports the need to combine those herd units that border each other and assign a common name to the herd established.

The following plan has been designed for consolidating those herd units (Table 2). Table 3 shows the current AUM deficit or surplus by the proposed herds and Table 4 shows existing AUM requirements. Table 5 identifies the habitat improvements needed for the four proposed herds.

Herd Consolidation

Table 2

Existing Herds	Proposed Herds
Schell Goshute	Antelope Herd
Patterson-Eagle Fortification	Wilson Creek Herd
Seaman Colden Gate	Seaman Herd
Dry Lake Cave Valley	Dry Lake Herd

The Moriah and White River Herd Units do not merge with other herd areas; however, they periodically migrate into adjacent regions. Horses in the Moriah Herd Management Area move into portions of western Utah and those animals in the White River Herd Unit cross over into the southern part of the Egan Resource Area.

There have been few sightings of wild horses during inventories conducted in the Moriah and White River Herd Management Areas. In these areas where horse numbers are so low management is hardly practical nor economically sound. These herd units are thus subject to removal.

A final aerial inventory should be flown to assess the present population in both HMA's.

Upon implementation of a capture plan, horses from the White River Herd Unit, located north of the Wayne A. Kirsch Wildlife Management Area, would be redistributed to the south and incorporated into the Seaman Herd Unit or transported to Palomino Valley Holding Facility in Carson City for adoption.

Horses comprising the Moriah Herd Unit could be redistributed into either Seaman or Dry Lake Herd Units or put up for adoption.

Other alternatives for removal include: humane destruction of horses unable to survive in the wild, i.e., lame or diseased, those unsuitable for adoption or to simply allow the existing numbers to remain without management or protection.

Antelope Herd Unit

Habitat Improvement Areas

The Antelope Herd Management Area can be improved by increasing forage. The opportunity exists to increase the amount of forage available to horses by reducing the number of AUM's now used by domestic livestock. An additional 386 AUM's are needed to support the present population. A substantial reserve of forage is also needed to supplement the existing vegetation during times of drought and to support future increase in numbers. This surplus can be obtained by further reduction in AUM's allocated to domestic livestock.

Another method of increasing forage production for wild horse consumption is to alternate the use of existing water sources to create a more even grazing distribution thus resting a percentage of forage at any given time. Strategic location of water sources will induce migration. This technique implements a modified rest-rotation system without interrupting the wild and free-roaming behavior of wild horses.

Specific land treatments can also be applied to raise the current rate of forage production. A potential area of 61,730 acres has been proposed for vegetal manipulation within the Antelope Herd Management Area.

Application of these land treatments would be in the form of soil modifications, plowing, burning, spraying, fertilizing, and/or seeding. Erection of temporary fencing projects will be necessary for approximately two or three years to protect seedings until establishment of seedlings. The proper mixture of species utilized by wild horses should be determined prior to application. Utilization of seedings and chainings will relieve grazing pressure on native vegetation, especially important during critical growth stages.

Completion of this program will increase the carrying capacity of the Antelope Herd Unit by 6,731 AUM's, thus providing enough additional forage to support 561 horses. The maximum number of wild horses

maintained within the Herd Management Area should not exceed 800 head. This figure is in keeping with the forage, water, and living space available within the HMA after additional water developments are provided, vegetal manipulation completed, and specific conflicting fences are removed (see Overlay WH-5).

Water Development Potential

Watering facilities within the Antelope Herd Management Area provide an adequate supply of water for the existing number of horses only if the following criteria are met:

(A) Water is available on a year-round basis
(B) Periodic maintenance inspections are conducted to assure that supply meets demand
(C) Water quality meets acceptable standards, i.e., free from impurities, toxins, algae, etc.

Placement of water sources, as shown on Overlay WAT-1, will aid in obtaining an even grazing distribution and help to relieve stress among specific bands of horses inhabiting certain territories.

Proliferation of the herd will create a demand for more water. The increase in AUM's attained through vegetal manipulation will furnish more forage thus allowing an increase in numbers of wild horses. An additional 3,071,475 gal./yr. or 9.4 acre ft./yr. will be required to sustain an additional 561 horses.

An already existing water source, Antelope Well (T. 25 N., R. 68 E., S. 26) is in the process of being improved. Restoration of the well will supplement other sources currently providing water to wild horses within the Antelope HMA. Water supplies will be increased by 8,640 gal./day or 3,153,600 gal./yr. or 9.8 acre-feet/year when the Antelope Well is in full operation (6 gal./min.). A storage tank has been installed with a capacity of 20,000 gallons.

Another development has been proposed in the southern portion of the herd unit. Blind Spring located at T. 23 N., R. 66 E., Sec. 25 can be improved by installing a pipeline to transport water to a trough approximately 1½ miles SW of the spring source (see Overlay WH-5).

Wild Horse Facilities

Provisions for managing wild horses include: removal and/or construction of fencing projects; development or improvement of water facilities; and periodic inspection and maintenance of both facilities.

Fences can be erected to delineate herd unit boundaries, and prevent access into private property, hazardous regions, and various improvements such as springs, seedings, etc., that require protection. Fencing projects can also be removed to permit access into areas where additional forage, water, and cover are available. Removal of fences also restores wild and free-roaming behavior which otherwise may have been restricted

and increases living space. Several proposals have been made to remove specific fencing projects that conflict with the movement of wild horses (see Overlay WH-5).

Maintenance of existing water sources and development of additional watering facilities are necessary for management of wild horse populations. Water supplies need to be free from toxic substances, algae growth, and other impurities. Supplies must be adequate to meet the demand which existing numbers and future increases require. Water can aid in obtaining a more uniform grazing distribution if sources are selectively placed on the range (see Overlays WAT-1 and WH-5).

Management facilities for removal of wild horses are also necessary for implementation of Wild Horse Management Plans. Equipment used during roundups includes water and wing traps for capture, loading chutes, and corrals for containment.

Only portable corrals should be used as holding facilities while gathering wild horses. This method of confinement can be strategically located, easily transported, and is very functional.

Abandoned corrals are not dependable due to the lack of maintenance and often unfavorable location. Permanent facilities invite illegal gathering activity; portable equipment discourages this practice.

Areas heavily used by wild horses need to be inventoried to determine the best location of capture facilities in order to maximize the removal of excess animals.

Living Space

The living space needed to maintain a quality free-roaming environment for wild horses is a vast, open area free from any obstructions such as: cattleguards, fencing projects, ranching and mining operations, open trenches, and seismic activities.

With the exception of the Robison/Henriod Control Fence (0475) and the Henriod Allotment Reseeding Fence (0480) in North Spring Valley, living space does not appear to be a limiting factor to wild horses in the Antelope Herd Unit; however, removal of these fences would increase available living space (see Overlay WH-5).

Conflicts

The major conflicts within the Antelope Herd Unit is grazing of domestic livestock as discussed in Habitat Improvement Areas.

Both cattle and sheep utilize the area creating competition for desired available forage. Continued use by domestic livestock in this region will cause substantial loss of key species consumed by existing horses.

Prohibiting grazing by domestic livestock will also conserve available water supplies and prevent competition at watering facilities.

Existing fences pose a second conflict within the Antelope Herd Unit. The Robison-Henriod Control Fence (0475) which designates the boundary between Tippet and Chin Creek Allotments runs 7 miles east-west across North Spring Valley, blocking north-south movement of wild horses.

Another fencing problem arises on the west end of the Robison-Henriod Control Fence where the Henriod Allotment Reseeding Fence (0480) ties in. This fence consists of 4.5 miles that encloses the Henriod Seeding, thus blocking access into and/or through the seeding. Not only does this interrupt patterns of movement but removes the seeding as another source of forage.

To resolve this conflict, the fencing projects could either be removed or access granted to wild horses by entry through the numerous gates installed along the fence lines (see Overlay WH-5).

Population Improvement

Several opportunities exist to improve the wild horse population in the Antelope Herd Management Area.

Increasing the current rate of forage production is one of the best methods of improving herd condition. Providing an abundance of vegetation insures continued survival and well-being of wild horse herds. In areas of high concentrations of horses, a percentage can be redistributed (see Habitat Improvement Areas).

Providing dependable, year-round water sources is required to maintain healthy horse herds. Water shortages can result in severe debilitation if not fatality.

Shelter and security are crucial elements in preserving herd condition. There are 161,400 acres of timber and interspersed associated dense brush species in the Antelope Herd Unit.

Wild horses rely on timbered areas for protection from predators, adverse weather, and man. Each herd management area should contain a substantial number of acres of timber and dense brush. An abundance of cover fulfills one of the necessary requirements for herd survival. The opportunity to manage a percentage of timbered acres in the Antelope Herd Unit exists and should be an integral part of the overall management plan. In areas where vegetal manipulation occurs, such as chaining, intermittent zones of timber should remain for cover and protection.

Prevention of the spread of noxious and poisonous plants will aid in maintaining a healthy herd. There are numerous noxious and poisonous plants scattered throughout the region that are hazardous to grazing animals, halogeton (Halogeton glomeratus) and greasewood (Sarcobatus vermiculatus being the most widespread in the Antelope Herd Management Area. Vegetal manipulation in areas of heavy, widespread infestations is one method of preventing increases in noxious and poisonous plants.

Proper use of the range by domestic livestock can prevent invasion of undesirables in deteriorated areas. As long as an adequate amount of desirable forage species and water are available to horses, poisonous plants should not create a serious problem (see Table 5 and Overlay WH-5).

Protection is an increasingly important factor in preservation of wild horse herds. Laws protecting wild horses from harrassment, unauthorized transport, and slaughter, whether it be for consumptive purposes or intimidation, need to be continuously enforced in order to preserve the existing wild horse population. The opportunity exists to assign aerial and ground personnel to Mt. Wilson, the Fortification Range and the NE portion of Moriah for the Moriah Herd Management Area. It is in these regions that illegal gatherings are suspected. Investigations of illegal sale of wild horses can be made at livestock auctions, also.

Protection for wild horses can be afforded by restricting aerial roundups during foaling season and until foals have developed enough anatomical strength to endure the frightening presence of aircraft. Proper scheduling of aerial roundups will provide this necessary protection.

Continued studies conducted by the BLM on the existence of wild horses on public rangelands will enhance the quantity and quality of knowledge presently available. This data will aid in managing wild horse populations more efficiently and indirectly contribute to their continued survival. Initially, inventories can be flown on an annual basis to determine an accurate population census. Further studies should concentrate on population dynamics, including mortality and birth rates, age classes, migratory patterns, physical characteristics,and overall herd condition. Habitat data can be obtained by analyzing foraging habits in each individual HMA, vegetative condition, phenological stages, nutritional content of desirable species, seasonal use areas, soil structure, climate, topography, and any limiting physical and biotic factors in the environment. Much of this information can be obtained by several different methods. By immobilizing wild horses, collars can be affixed and an examination made. Dental inspection will aid in attaining knowledge on age class. Collaring will provide important information concerning migratory routes. Behavioral characteristics can be studied through extensive observation. Documentation can be achieved with photography. Fecal analysis is an excellent means of acquiring data on forage preferences as well as nutritional content of plants grazed.

Opportunities for gathering this information are present with the manpower to conduct wild horse studies. Each individual who works in the field can fill out an observation report when wild horses are sighted.

When preparing Wild Horse Management Plans, determine a sex ratio that will maintain a viable herd yet increase the length of time between gatherings. The money normally spent maintaining population numbers can be used for habitat improvements.

Wilson Creek Herd Unit

Habitat Improvement Areas

Wild horse habitat can be enhanced by increasing forage production. One of the most successful means of raising current forage production levels is through vegetal manipulation. By applying specific land treatments to existing vegetation, more forage can be made available for consumption by wild horses. Certain areas have been chosen in the Wilson Creek Herd Management Area as potential sites for vegetal manipulation (refer to Overlay WH-5).

The total rangeland eligible for manipulation is 260,712 acres. Treatments will be applied in the form of chainings, seedings, spraying, burning, fertilizing, and/or soil modifications such as: ripping, pitting, fertilizing, furrowing, and terracing. Implementation of the prescribed methods will increase forage production by approximately 26,000 AUM's providing enough additional forage to support 2,167 horses. The existing surplus of AUM's in Wilson Creek Herd Unit will support an additional 515 head prior to any vegetal manipulation. This surplus indicates the availability of forage within the HMA not only for existing numbers but substantial increases from foal crop, movement into the area by other horses, i.e., possible exchanges from Dry Lake Herd Unit and/or horses redistributed from areas of forage shortages.

Forage can also be increased by alternating the use of available water sources. Not only will this create a more balanced grazing distribution but relieve pressure placed on vegetation growing near water facilities. Placement of watering sites should be studied carefully so as not to create stressful conditions among bands. Location should induce migration so that horses will utilize all regions of the HMA.

Another provision for improving horse habitat is securing reservations of forage for the wild horse population. An estimated 7,800 AUM's are available to horses within the Wilson Creek Herd Unit. This HMA is the only region inhabited by wild horses in the Schell Resource Area that now provides horses with a percentage of the total AUM's allocated.

Water Development Potential

Much opportunity is present throughout the herd unit for improvement of existing water sources and the development of new waters.

Four additional water developments have been proposed within the Wilson Creek Herd Management Area. A pipeline transporting water from Bradshaw Spring (T. 7 N., R. 68 E., Sec. 25) SE of Atlanta Mine, 1 mile east to troughs and/or tanks is an extremely good proposal. This development would prevent possible use of the toxic tailings ponds near the Atlanta Mine and at the same time reduce the threat of harassment placed upon horses presently utilizing water sources in the vicinity of the mine.

Another proposal for water development has been made in the region west of White Rock Mountains. Wildcat Spring NE of the White Rock Seeding

can provide a water source by piping from the spring approximately 2 miles SW to a trough continuing another 2 miles to the south to a second trough.

A third development has been designated as a pipeline originating at Horse Thief Spring (T. 2 N., R. 69 E., Sec. 16) transporting water approximately 3/4 mile west to a trough. This water source would provide additional water to wild horses inhabiting the southern portion of the Wilson Creek Herd Management Area, especially during summer and fall when many creeks in the region dry up.

The final water development proposed for the Wilson Creek Herd Unit occurs at Cottonwood Spring. An additional pipeline or a branch from the already existing one can be installed and water piped to a trough approximately 1 mile east. This source will supply water to many horses which inhabit this region that often rely on temporary sources provided for domestic livestock that graze on nearby seedings.

Present and future water sources need to be maintained to ensure adequate yearlong supplies. Quantities of water flowing from available sources can be increased by clearing overgrown vegetation from seep areas to reduce transpiration. Availability can also be improved by providing easy access to the source. Water supply should always meet demand (see Overlay WH-5 and Overlay WAT-1).

Wild Horse Facilities

Provisions for managing wild horses include: removal and/or construction of fencing projects, development or improvement of water facilities, and periodic inspection and maintenance.

Fences can be erected to delineate herd unit boundaries, and prevent access into private property, hazardous regions, and various improvements such as springs, seedings, etc. that require protection. Fencing projects can also be removed to permit access into areas where additional forage, water, and cover are available. Removal of fences also restores wild and free-roaming behavior which otherwise may have been restricted and increases living space. Several proposals have been made to remove specific fencing projects that conflict with the movement of wild horses.

Maintenance of existing water sources and development of additional watering facilities are necessary for management of wild horse populations. Water supplies need be free from toxic substances, algae growth, and other impurities. Supplies must be adequate to meet the demand which existing numbers and future increases require. Water can aid in obtaining a more uniform grazing distribution if sources are selectively placed on the range.

Management facilities for removal of wild horses are also necessary for implementation of Wild Horse Management Plans. Equipment used during roundups includes water and wing traps for capture, loading chutes, and corrals for containment.

Only portable corrals should be used as holding facilities while gathering wild horses. This method of confinement can be strategically located, easily transported, and is very functional.

Abandoned corrals are not dependable due to the lack of maintenance and often unfavorable location. Permanent facilities invite illegal gathering activity; portable equipment discourages this practice.

Areas heavily used by wild horses need to be inventoried to determine the best location of capture facilities in order to maximize the removal of excess animals.

Living Space

The Wilson Creek Herd Management Area encompasses approximately 691,000 acres. Living space does not appear to be a limiting factor due to the vast, open area comprising the Herd Management Area; however, living space can be further increased by removing existing fences, as stated in Conflicts (see Overlay WH-5).

Conflicts

The greatest conflict in the Wilson Creek Herd Management Area is existing fences. Numerous projects need to be removed or provide access to wild horses (see Table 5 and Overlay WH-5).

Approximately 39 miles of fenceline needs to be removed and 7 fences must grant access into the enclosed areas. By total removal or modification through installation of horse passes, more forage, water, and cover will be available and the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses restored.

Another conflict arises with the presence of mining activity. In the past, cases of harassment of wild horses while watering have been reported in the vicinity of Atlanta Mine. Wild horses inhabiting this area surrounding the mine can be encouraged to utilize other portions of the herd unit by developing alternate water sources away from the mine and fencing sources available at the Atlanta site.

The presence of domestic livestock creates a third conflict in the Wilson Creek Herd Management Area. Grazing by domestic livestock may discourage bands of wild horses from utilizing regions which may otherwise be crucial areas of seasonal use.

Fenced seedings or pastures reserved for livestock use prevent horses from obtaining additional forage and water. After livestock are removed from the area, once available water may be discontinued when supplies are shut off. All facilities granted for livestock use must be made available to wild horses or livestock privileges should be terminated.

Population Improvement

Several opportunities exist to improve the wild horse population in the Wilson Creek Herd Management Area.

Increasing the current rate of forage production is one of the best methods of improving herd condition. Providing an abundance of vegetation insures continued survival and well-being of wild horse herds. In areas of high concentrations of horses, a percentage can be redistributed (see Habitat Improvement Areas).

Providing dependable year-round water sources is required to maintain healthy horse herds. Water shortages can result in severe debilitation if not fatality.

Shelter and security are crucial elements in preserving herd condition. There are 522,521 acres of timber and interspersed associated dense brush species in the Wilson Creek Herd Unit. Wild horses rely on timbered areas for protection from predators, adverse weather, and man. Each herd management area should contain a substantial number of acres of timber and dense brush. An abundance of cover fulfills one of the necessary requirements for herd survival. The opportunity to manage a percentage of timbered acres in the Wilson Creek Herd Unit exists and should be an integral part of the overall management plan. In areas where vegetal manipulation occurs, such as chaining, intermittent zones of timber should remain for cover and protection.

Prevention of the spread of noxious and poisonous plants will aid in maintaining a healthy herd. There are numerous noxious and poisonous plants scattered throughout the region that are hazardous to grazing animals, halogeton (Halogeton glomeratus) and greasewood (Sarcobatus vermiculatus) being the most widespread in the Wilson Creek Herd Management Area.

Vegetal manipulation in areas of heavy, widespread infestations is one method of preventing increases in noxious and poisonous plants. Proper use of the range by domestic livestock can prevent invasion of undersirables in deteriorated areas. As long as an adequate amount of desirable forage species and water are available to horses, poisonous plants should not create a serious problem (see Table 6).

Protection is an increasingly important factor in preservation of wild horse herds. Laws protecting wild horses from harassmant, unauthorized transport, and slaughter, whether it be for consumptive purposes or intimidation need to be continuously enforced in order to preserve the existing wild horse population. The opportunity exists to assign aerial and ground personnel to Mt. Wilson. The Fortification Range and the NE portion of Moriah for the Moriah Herd Management Area. It is in these regions that illegal gatherings are suspected. Investigations of illegal sale of wild horses can be made at livestock auctions, also.

Protection for wild horses can be afforded by restricting aerial roundups during foaling season and until foals have developed enough anatomical strength to endure the frightening presence of aircraft. Proper scheduling of aerial roundups will provide this necessary protection.

Continued studies conducted by the BLM on the existence of wild horses on public rangelands will enhance the quantity and quality of knowledge persently available. This data will aid in managing wild horse populations more efficiently and indirectly contribute to their continued

survival. Initially, inventories can be flown on an annual basis to determine an accurate population census. Futher studies should concentrate on population dynamics, including mortality and birth rates, age classes, migratory patterns, physical characteristics, and overall herd condition. Habitat data can be obtained by analyzing foraging habits in each individual HMA, vegetative condition, phenological stages, nutritional content of desirable species, seasonal use areas, soil structure, climate, topography, and any limiting physical and biotic factors in the environment. Much of this information can be obtained by several different methods. By immobilizing wild horses, collars can be affixed and an examination made. Dental inspection will aid in attaining knowledge on age class. Collaring will provide important information concerning migratory routes. Behavioral characteristics can be studied through extensive observation. Documentation can be achieved with photography. Fecal analysis is an excellent means of acquiring data on forage preferences as well as nutritional content of plants grazed.

Opportunities for gathering this information are present with the manpower to conduct wild horse studies. Each individual who works in the field can fill out an observation report when wild horses are sighted.

When preparing Wild Horse Management Plans, determine a sex ratio that will maintain a viable herd yet increase the length of time between gatherings. The money normally spent maintaining population numbers can be used for habitat improvements.

Seaman Herd Unit

Habitat Improvement Areas

To date, there are no land treatments in the Seaman Herd Unit. The part of the range that the herd unit inhabits prevails in a different latitude and climate not conducive to the establishment of conventional seedings sown with introduced species such as Agropyron cristatum.

The semi-arid climate within the herd unit is characterized by extreme temperatures, brief, intense periods of precipitation, high, drying winds, and low humidity. These factors coupled with the presence of clay and/or sandy soils discourage seeding applications. Sandy soils possess high permeability properties while clay has poor absorptive water qualities; therefore, the moisture intercepted by the soil is either flushed through or is wasted as surface runoff.

For these reasons, no land treatments have been applied in this area; however, there has been a proposal to administer a treatment in the NW portion of the unit, SW of Forest Home Reservoir #3. Experimentation will reveal the success or failure of future applications towards increasing forage production (See Overlay WH-5).

Forage production can be increased by natural means. With a reduction in the numbers of domestic livestock grazing within the unit boundaries, plant vigor will improve and the invasion of undesirable species discouraged. More information is needed on seasonal use areas and migratory patterns of wild horses before additional recommendations to increase forage can be made.

Water Development Potential

Watering facilities within the Seaman Herd Management Area provide an adequate supply of water for the existing numbers only if the following criteria are met:

A) Water is available on a year-round basis.

B) Periodic maintenance inspections are conducted to assure that supply meets demand.

C) Water quality meets acceptable standards, i.e., free from impurities, toxins, algae, etc.

Proper placement of water sources will aid in obtaining an even grazing distribution and help to relieve stress among specific bands of horses inhabiting certain territories.

Three additional water developments have been proposed for the Seaman Herd Management Area. Seaman Springs, located in the Seaman Springs Allotment, (T. 1 S., R. 60 E., Sec. 13) will provide the source from which water will be piped approximately one mile SE to a trough. If implemented, this facility should be maintained so that an adequate flow from the spring continues to supply the trough on a year-round basis.

Another potential water development needed in the Seaman Herd Unit could be implemented as a pipeline originating at Oreana Spring, (T. 1 N., R. 61 E., Sec. 29) (See Overlay WH-5). Water will be piped approximately 1¼ miles west to a trough.

A third development would originate at Moon River Spring (T. 6 N., R. 60 E.,) Sec. 25) where a pipeline would transport water 1 mile southwest. This facility will furnish the northeastern portion of the Seaman Herd Unit with an additional source of water.

Management Facilities

Provisions for managing wild horses include: removal and/or construction of fencing projects; development or improvement of water facilities; and periodic inspection and maintenance.

Fences can be erected to delineate herd unit boundaries, and prevent access into private property, hazardous regions, and various improvements such as springs, seedings, etc. that require protection. Fencing projects can also be removed to permit access into areas where additional forage, water, and cover are available. Removal of fences also restores wild and free-roaming behavior which otherwise may have been restricted and increases living space. Several proposals have been made to remove specific fencing projects that conflict with the movement of wild horses.

Maintenance of existing water sources and development of additional watering facilities are necessary for management of wild horse populations. Water supplies need be free from toxic substances, algae growth, and other impurities. Supplies must be adequate to meet the demand which existing numbers and future increases require. Water can aid in obtaining a more uniform grazing distribution if sources are selectively placed on the range.

Management facilities for removal of wild horses are also necessary for implementation of Wild Horse Management Plans. Equipment used during roundups includes water and wing traps for capture, loading chutes, and corrals for containment. Only portable corrals should be used as holding facilities while gathering wild horses. This method of confinement can be strategically located, easily transported, and is very functional.

Abandoned corrals are not dependable due to the lack of maintenance and often unfavorable location. Permanent facilities invite illegal gathering activity; portable equipment discourages this practice.

Areas heavily used by wild horses need to be inventoried to determine the best location of capture facilities in order to maximize the removal of excess animals.

Living Space

Due to the vast open areas within the herd unit, living space does not appear to be a limiting factor for wild horse populations.

Conflicts

The major external influences on this herd are livestock grazing, mining, and fences.

The Seaman Herd Unit presently consists of 20 horses that require 20 AUM's/month or 241 AUM's/year to maintain the existing population. A surplus of 3,556 AUM's are available, providing enough forage to support an additional 296 head of horses.

A percentage of the herd unit is grazed by both sheep and cattle on a yearlong basis. This activity creates moderate competition between wild horses and domestic livestock, exceeding the carrying capacity of those regions and thus reducing available forage required for maintaining the wild horse herd.

The conflict arises in those areas heavily grazed by both wild horses and domestic livestock. The location of existing water sources may attribute to these areas of greatest concentration. Grazing areas for domestic livestock could be designated and closely adhered to with a possible reduction in the grazing schedule imposed until overgrazed areas recover. Another means of resolving this conflict may be to alternate the use of existing water sources to encourage utilization throughout the herd unit, and therefore obtain a more even grazing distribution. If uniform foraging habits can be achieved, this HMA has the potential to support additional numbers -- increases within the herd and/or horses redistributed from overpopulated areas.

A second conflict disrupting this herd unit is mining. Activity has increased greatly in the past few years. Mining claims staked in the Timber Mountain Pass region have contributed to the movement of numerous bands of horses out of the area. The activities of man and machinery discourage horses from utilizing this zone. Seismic exploration has also caused horses to leave traditional seasonal use areas.

Mining and seismic operations could be restricted to places not regularly inhabited by the Seaman Herd.

A third and critical element affecting the well-being of wild horses is the presence of fences. The fenceline along SR 38 completely blocks eastward movement of wild horses. The fence in Middle Coal Valley impedes movement to the southwest. These fencing projects may not be in the main flow of migratory paths but their presence removes the opportunity to increase living space and access to additional water and forage.

Access should be granted by installing horse passes. Any movement of horses thereafter will indicate the desire of wild horses within the herd unit to extend their patterns of wild and free-roaming behavior. This migration may necessitate complete removal.

Population Improvement

Several opportunities exist to improve the wild horse population in the Seaman Herd Management Area.

Increasing the current rate of forage production is one of the best methods of improving herd condition. Providing an abundance of vegetation insures continued survival and well-being of wild horse herds. In areas of high concentrations of horses, a percentage can be redistributed (See Habitat Improvement Areas).

Providing dependable year-round water sources is required to maintain healthy horse herds. Water shortages can result in severe debilitation if not fatality.

Shelter and security are crucial elements in preserving herd condition. There are 73,670 acres of timber and interspersed associated dense brush species in the Seaman Herd Unit. Wild horses rely on timbered areas for protection from predators, adverse weather, and man. Each herd management area should contain a substantial number of acres of timber and dense brush. An abundance of cover fullfills one of the necessary requirements for herd survival. The opportunity to manage a percentage of timbered acres in the Antelope Herd Unit exists and should be an integral part of the overall management plan. In areas where vegetal manipulation occurs, such as chaining, intermittent zones of timber should remain for cover and protection.

Prevention of the spread of noxious and poisonous plants will aid in maintaining a healthy herd. There are numerous noxious and poisonous plants scattered throughout the region that are hazardous to grazing animals, halogeton (Halogeton glomeratus) and greasewood (Sarcobatus vermiculatus) being the most widespread in the Seaman Herd Management Area.

Vegetal manipulation in areas of heavy, widespread infestations is one method of preventing increases in noxious and poisonous plants. Proper use of the range by domestic livestock can prevent invasion of undesirables in deteriorated areas. As long as an adequate amount of desirable forage species and water are available to horses, poisonous plants should not create a serious problem (See Table 6).

Protection is an increasingly important factor in preservation of wild horse herds. Laws protecting wild horses from harrassment, unauthorized transport, and slaughter, whether it be for consumptive purposes or intimidation, need to be continuously enforced in order to preserve the existing wild horse population. The opportunity exists to assign aerial and ground personnel to Mt. Wilson, the Fortification Range and the NE portion of Moriah for the Moriah Herd Management Area. It is in these regions that illegal gatherings are suspected. Investigations of illegal sale of wild horses can be made at livestock auctions also.

Protection for wild horses can be afforded by restricting aerial round-ups during foaling season and until foals have developed enough anatomical strength to endure the frightening presence of aircraft. Proper scheduling of aerial round-ups will provide this necessary protection.

Continued studies conducted by the BLM on the existence of wild horses on public rangelands will enhance the quantity and quality of knowledge presently available. This data will aid in managing wild horse populations more efficiently and indirectly contribute to their continued survival. Initially, inventories can be flown on an annual basis to determine an accurate population census. Further studies should concentrate on population dynamics, including mortality and birth rates, age classes, migratory patterns, physical characteristics, and overall herd condition. Habitat data can be obtained by analyzing foraging habits in each individual HMA, vegetative condition, phenological stages, nutritional content of desirable species, seasonal use areas, soil structure, climate, topography, and any limiting physical and biotic factors in the environment. Much of this information can be obtained by several different methods. By immobilizing wild horses, collars can be affixed and an examination made. Dental inspection will aid in attaining knowledge on age class. Collaring will provide important information concerning migratory routes. Behavioral characteristics can be studied through extensive observation. Documentation can be achieved with photography. Fecal analysis is an excellent means of acquiring data on forage preferences as well as nutritional content of plants grazed.

Opportunities for gathering this information are present with the manpower to conduct wild horse studies. Each individual who works in the field can fill out an observation report when wild horses are sighted.

When preparing Wild Horse Management Plans determine a sex ratio that will maintain a viable herd yet increase the length of time between gatherings. The money normally spent maintaining population numbers can be used for habitat improvements.

Dry Lake Herd Unit

Habitat Improvement Areas

Wild horse habitat can be improved by implementation of specific land treatments. Through vegetal manipulation, forage can be increased substantially. Approximately 73,000 acres constitute potential sites for rehabilitation and introduction of new species. Application of these vegetative improvements will provide enough additional forage to support 486 horses (5,832 AUM's).

Habitat can also be improved by alternating the use of existing water sources. Strategic location of watering facilities will induce migration and create a more uniform distribution. This method will act as a modified rest-rotation system by allowing only a percentage of the vegetation to be utilized at any one time. Resting key species during critical growth periods will further enhance vegetative status within the herd unit.

Forage should be secured for wild horses in Dry Lake Herd Unit. Reservations of forage for existing numbers total an approximate 760 AUM's. An additional 4503 AUM's are available to support another 375 horses. This surplus will

maintain future increases and/or any horses redistributed into the Dry Lake Herd Management Area. Wild horses are an integral part of these rangelands and adequate amounts of forage are required. AUM's allocated to domestic livestock for grazing could be reduced in areas where severe competition for forage and water exists.

Water Development Potential

Several proposals have been made in the Dry Lake Herd Management Area to develop additional water sources. One such development, if implemented, would occur at Mud Springs (T. 5 N., R. 64 E., Sec. 18). Water will be piped from the spring source to a trough approximately 1 mile southeast with continued piping to the south approximately 3¼ miles to another trough west of Coyote Wash.

Installation of another pipeline at Garden Patch Spring (T. 4 N., R. 65 E., Sec. 4) would transport water approximately 1 3/4 miles southwest to a trough 3 miles east of Coyote Wash.

Another improvement has been requested in the Grassy Mountain Allotment where trampling is occurring at the source. A pipeline from Steward Spring (T. 6 N., R. 65 E., Sec. 21) to Muleshoe Valley Reservoir, an estimated 3½ miles southwest, would relieve trampling at the source. A trough or tank could be placed away from the spring to redirect animals to the available water and a fence erected around the source.

A final pipeline is proposed to occur at Cabin Spring (T. 2 N., R. 63 E., Sec. 35) which would pipe water to a trough 1 mile to the southeast. This development would supply additional water to those horses in the southwestern portion of Dry Lake Herd Management Area (See Overlay WH-5).

The importance of water to wild horses is evident. Water is vital to health and survival. Existing and future water sources should meet quality standards, requirements of wild horses utilizing watering sites (preferably with a surplus), and should be maintained to ensure adequate supplies year-round.

Proper placement of watering locations will encourage horses to utilize specific areas of the Herd Unit. A more uniform distribution can be obtained as a result. Utilization of snow in the winter relieves pressure exerted on watering sites during the summer.

Management Facilities

Provisions for managing wild horses include: removal and/or construction of fencing projects; development or improvement of water facilities; and periodic inspection and maintenance.

Fences can be erected to delineate herd unit boundaries, and prevent access onto private property, hazardous regions, and various improvements such as springs, seedings, etc. that require protection. Fencing projects can also be removed to permit access into areas where additional forage, water, and

cover are available. Removal of fences also restores wild and free-roaming behavior which otherwise may have been restricted and increases living space. Several proposals have been made to remove specific fencing projects that conflict with the movement of wild horses.

Maintenance of existing water sources and development of additional watering facilities are necessary for management of wild horse populations. Water supplies need to be free from toxic substances, algae growth, and other impurities. Supplies must be adequate to meet the demand which existing numbers and future increases require. Water can aid in obtaining a more uniform grazing distribution if sources are selectively placed on the range.

Management facilities for removal of wild horses are also necessary for implementation of Wild Horse Management Plans. Equipment used during roundups includes water and wing traps for capture, loading chutes, and corrals for containment. Only portable corrals should be used as holding facilities while gathering wild horses. This method of confinement can be strategically located, easily transported, and is very functional.

Abandoned corrals are not dependable due to the lack of maintenance and often unfavorable location. Permanent facilities invite illegal gathering activity, portable equipment discourages this practice.

Areas heavily used by wild horses need to be inventoried to determine the best location of capture facilities in order to maximize the removal of excess animals.

Living Space

The Dry Lake Herd Management Area encompasses 497,000 acres. Living space does not appear to be a limiting factor; however, the existence of specific fencing projects impede and/or restrict movement into enclosed areas. The presence of these fences interrupts the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses and block access into additional living space. (See Conflicts).

Conflicts

The major external influence affecting horses in the Dry Lake Herd Unit is the presence of fences. Several fencing projects could be removed to restore wild and free-roaming behavior and provide access into areas containing forage and water. Specific fences blocking movement are: Muleshow Drift Fence, Steward Allotment Fence, and Grassy Fence. Approximately 14.5 miles of fenceline needs to be removed.

Access through the Lake Valley Unit Fence and Dutch John Fence could be granted to allow passage into presently inaccessible regions.

Portions of Dry Lake Herd Management Area are grazed yearlong by domestic livestock. Foraging by these animals creates conflicts when utilization occurs in key seasonal use areas grazed by wild horses. To resolve this conflict, the grazing schedule could be shortened and the percentage of the AUM's allocated to domestic livestock reduced. This action would provide more forage so that the requirements of wild horses could be met.

Population Improvement

Several opportunities exist to improve the wild horse population in the Dry Lake Herd Management Area.

Increasing the current rate of forage production is one of the best methods of improving herd condition. Providing an abundance of vegetation insures continued survival and well-being of wild horse herds. In areas of high concentrations of horses, a percentage can be redistributed (See Habitat Improvement Areas).

Providing dependable, year-round water sources is required to maintain healthy horse herds. Water shortages can result in severe debilitation if not fatality.

Shelter and security are crucial elements in preserving herd condition. There are 222,600 acres of timber and interspersed associated dense brush species in the Dry Lake Herd Unit. Wild horses rely on timbered areas for protection from predators, adverse weather, and man. Each herd management area should contain a substantial number of acres of timber and dense brush. An abundance of cover fullfills one of the necessary requirements for herd survival. The opportunity to manage a percentage of timbered acres in the Dry Lake Herd Unit exists and should be an integral part of the overall management plan. In areas where vegetal manipulation occurs, such as chaining, intermittent zones of timber should remain for cover and protection.

Prevention of the spread of noxious and poisonous plants will aid in maintaining a healthy herd. There are numerous noxious and poisonous plants scattered throughout the region that are hazardous to grazing animals, halogeton (Halogeton glomeratus) and greasewood (Sarcobatus vermiculatus) being the most widespread in the Dry Lake Herd Management Area.

Vegetal manipulation in areas of heavy, widespread infestations is one method of preventing increases in noxious and poisonous plants. Proper use of the range by domestic livestock can prevent invasion of undesirables in deteriorated areas. As long as an adequate amount of desirable forage species and water are available to horses, poisonous plants should not create a serious problem (See Table 5).

Protection is an increasingly important factor in preservation of wild horse herds. Laws protecting wild horses from harrassment, unauthorized transport, and slaughter, whether it be for consumptive purposes or intimidation need to be continuously enforced in order to preserve the existing wild horse population. The opportunity exists to assign aerial and ground personnel to Mt. Wilson, the Fortification Range, and the NE portion of Moriah for the Moriah Herd Management Area. It is in these regions that illegal gatherings are suspected. Investigations of illegal sale of wild horses can be made at livestock auctions also.

Protection for wild horses can be afforded by restricting aerial round-ups during foaling season and until foals have developed enough anatomical strength to endure the frightening presence of aircraft. Proper scheduling of aerial round-ups will provide this necessary protection.

Continued studies conducted by the BLM on the existence of wild horses on public rangelands will enhance the quantity and quality of knowledge presently available. This data will aid in managing wild horse populations more efficiently and indirectly contribute to their continued survival. Initially, inventories can be flown on an annual basis to determine an accurate population census. Further studies should concentrate on population dynamics, including mortality and birth rates, age classes, migratory patterns, physical characteristics, and overall herd condition. Habitat data can be obtained by analyzing foraging habits in each individual HMA, vegetative condition, phenological stages, nutritional content of desirable species, seasonal use areas, soil structure, climate, topography, and any limiting physical and biotic factors in the environment. Much of this information can be obtained by several different methods. By immobilizing wild horses, collars can be affixed and an examination made. Dental inspection will aid in attaining knowledge on age class. Collaring will provide important information concerning migratory routes. Behavioral characteristics can be studied through extensive observation. Documentation can be achieved with photography. Fecal analysis is an excellent means of acquiring data on forage preferences as well as nutritional content of plants grazed.

Opportunities for gathering this information are present with the manpower to conduct wild horse studies. Each individual who works in the field can fill out an observation report when wild horses are sighted.

When preparing Wild Horse Management Plans, determine a sex ratio that will maintain a viable herd yet increase the length of time between gatherings. The money normally spent maintaining population numbers can be used for habitat improvements.

AUM REQUIREMENTS, AVAILABILITY, AND DIFFERENCES
BY HERD UNIT(S) AND ALLOTMENT(S)

Table 3

HERD UNIT	Allotments within Herd Unit Area	AUM's Required to Support the Existing Horses	AUM's Available for Horse Use	AUM Deficit or Surplus
Antelope	Becky Springs	152	151	-1
Existing Numbers	Chin Creek	1411	1173	-238
252 Head	Sampson Creek	123	127	+4
	Tippet	655	675	+20
	Tippet Pass	56	58	+2
	Goshute Mt.	36	26	-10
	Deep Creek	591	428	-163
		3024	2638	-386
Wilson Creek	S. Spring Valley	1	2	+1
Existing Numbers	Cottonwood	239	460	+221
130 Head	Hamblin Valley	523	1005	+482
	Geyser	362	696	+334
	Wilson Creek	435	5577	+5142
		1560	7740	+6180
Dry Lake	Narrows	0	3	+3
Existing Numbers	Geyser	27	209	+182
63 Head	Grassy Mt.	1	9	+8
	Wilson Creek	620	4813	+4193
	Fox Mt.	25	52	+27
	Sunnyside	83	173	+90
		756	5259	+4503
Seaman	Fox Mt.	14	197	183
Existing Numbers	Oreana Springs	53	723	670
20 Head	Timber Mt.	18	238	220
	Needles	52	840	788
	Seaman Springs	35	473	438
	Wilson Creek	24	320	296
	Forest Moon	39	876	837
	Batterman Wash	0	0	0
	Sunnyside	6	123	117
	Dry Farm	0	7	7
		241	3797	+3556

AUM REQUIREMENTS FOR
EXISTING HORSE NUMBERS

Table 4

HERD UNIT	PRESENT HORSE POPULATION	AUM'S/MONTH REQUIRED TO SUPPORT EXISTING POPULATION	AUM'S/YEAR REQUIRED TO SUPPORT EXISTING POPULATION
ANTELOPE	252	252	3024
WILSON CREEK	130	130	1560
DRY LAKE	63	63	756
SEAMAN	20	20	241
TOTAL	465	465	5581

PROPOSED HABITAT
IMPROVEMENTS

Table 5

HERD UNIT	EXISTING HORSE POPULATION	TOTAL ACRES COMPRISING HERD AREA	VEGETAL MANIPULATION	TIMBERED ACRES	WATER DEVELOPMENT	FENCE REMOVAL
ANTELOPE	252	311,869	61,730	161,400	1	11.5 Miles 0480 - 4.5 0475 - 7.0
WILSON CREEK	130	691,000	260,712	522,520	4	39 Miles 0058 - 4.0 0043 - 4.6 0774 - 2.5 0660 - 6.5 0167 - 17.5 0656 - 3.9
DRY LAKE	63	496,500	72,950	222,600	4	14.2 Miles 0163 - 8.0 0970 - 4.2 4230 - 2.0
SEAMAN	20	340,100	12,281	73,670	3	No Proposed Fence Removal

NOXIOUS AND P[illegible]NOUS PLANTS

Table 6

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	LOCATION	TIME	ANIMALS AFFECTED
CHOKECHERRY	(Prunus spp.)	MOUNTAINS, VALLEYS, ROADSIDES	ALL SEASONS	ALL, MAINLY SHEEP
DEATH CAMASS	(Zygadenus spp.)	FOOTHILLS, WET DESERTS	EARLY SPRING	ALL, MAINLY SHEEP
GREASEWOOD	(Sarcobatus vermiculatus)	BOTTOMLANDS, WASHOUTS	SPRING	ALL, MAINLY SHEEP
HALOGETON	(Halogeton glomeratus	INTERMTN. REGION, SALT DESERTS	FALL/WINTER	ALL, MAINLY SHEEP
HORSEBRUSH	(Tetradymia spp.)	INTERMTN. REGION, DRY SEMI-DESERT	SPRING	SHEEP
LARKSPUR	(Delphinium spp.)	DESERTS, PLAINS, FOOTHILLS	EARLY SPRING	CATTLE
LUPINE	(Lupinus spp.)	MOUNTAINS, FOOTHILLS, SEMI-DESERTS	MOST DANGEROUS WHEN IN FRUIT	SHEEP
LOCOWEED	(Astragalus spp.)	MOUNTAINS, DESERTS, PLAINS	ALL SEASONS, ESPECIALLY SPRING	ALL
MILKWEED	(Asclepias spp.)	WASTE AREAS, SANDY SOILS, MOIST BOTTOMS	ALL SEASONS, ESPECIALLY SPRING	ALL, MAINLY SHEEP
*RUSSIAN THISTLE	(Salsola kali tenuifolia)	BOTTOMLANDS, DESERT	SPRING, SUMMER	CAN BE UTILIZED BY ALL ANIMALS

* RUSSIAN THISTLE IS CLASSIFIED AS A NOXIOUS PLANT.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Objective Number
WH-1

Objective:

Maintain and improve wild horse populations.

Rationale:

Maintenance and improvement of wild horse herds assures the continuance of healthy, viable wild horse populations.

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH 1.1

When developing Wild Horse Management Plans, adjust the sex ratio of wild horse populations as a means of slowing the rate of population increase.

Rationale:

By adjusting sex ratios within all herd units the rate of population increase to the herd will be delayed thus allowing more time between population reduction programs and more money to be spent on habitat improvements.

Support Needs:

None

12/80

Multiple-Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation.

The latest WHB Program Guidance WO IM-81-145 provides for herd sex ratios to be a component of Herd Management Plans prepared after MFP. Each herd should be considered on its unique topographic and other habital features.

1/81

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Consider herd unit sex ratio as a component of post MFP Herd Management Plans. Any adjustment from naturally occurring sex ratios should be under the following conditions:

1. Accomplished in the process of normal population adjustments as far as possible.
2. Done only to maintain herd health and breeding viability, but not for artificial selection of genetic traits (color, conformation, etc.).

WH - 1.1 (con't.)

Rationale:

BLM policy is to "...ensure viable populations of healthy free roaming wild horses in equilibrium with their habitat...". The statement does not provide for intensive breeding management or genetic manipulation.

Support Needs:

None

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation when done as part of a HMAP.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Schell	
Activity	
Wild Horses	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 1.2

Remove old, debilitated, diseased, and/or lame horses under authorization from the secretary as stated in PL 92-195, in all Herd Management Areas as the need arises.

Rationale:

Those animals that are severely handicapped or hindered by disease, injury, age, or any debilitating condition are susceptible to suffering from a lack of food, water, and/or cover if their ability to move is inhibited. Mares in a weakened condition may be unable to support the needs of their young or abort before giving birth. Widespread disease can detract from improving wild horse populations.

Support Needs:

Resources

12/80

Multiple-Use Analysis

No conflicts were identified with this recommendation.

As a manner of policy, suffering, hurt or diseased horses are removed from the herd in order to prevent their continued suffering. However, removal of old or undetectable diseased horses would present an expensive problem if done on a continuing basis; a roundup would be required in order to determine age and detect diseased animals. Horses should only be rounded up when there is evidence of a serious contagious disease in a herd that if not stopped could lead to elimination of the herd. Other removal should only be done as part of a regular roundup.

1/81

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Continue the policy of removing suffering horses as a routine matter. Only round up diseased horses when there is a possibility that the disease is contagious. Don't round up for or remove individual animals.

Rationale:
See Multiple-Use Analysis.

Note Attach additional sheets, if needed
(See instructions on reverse)

UNITE STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

me (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

WH - 1.2 (con't.)

Support Needs:

None

1/81

- -

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

- -

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 1.3

Based upon current data, allocate available AUM's to wild horses and increase or decrease horse numbers in accordance with forage reservations.

Herd Unit	Existing Numbers	AUM Demand	Maximum Numbers	AUM's Available
Antelope	252	3024	176	2110
Wilson Creek	130	1560	516	6192
Dry Lake	63	756	350	4207
Seaman	20	240	253	3036
Moriah	1	12	25	310
White River	0	0	3	35

Rationale:

Reservations of forage for wild horses are required to support the existing population within each herd unit; however, when all available AUM's have been allocated in the Antelope Herd Unit, those horses unable to be maintained on available forage will have to be redistributed into an area which will provide adequate vegetation until forage production increases. A surplus of AUM's in the Wilson Creek, Seaman, and Dry Lake Herd Units will accommodate the transfer of these horses from Antelope Herd Management Area.

Support Needs:

Range
Wildlife

12/80

Multiple-Use Analysis

The allocation of forage will be handled in the Range Section of the MFP.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendations

See RM 2.1 for Multiple Use Recommendation.

- -

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

WII - 1.3 (cont.)

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation. (1983 levels)

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

RM - 2.1 (Cont.)

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with wildlifes and wild horses recommendations for allocation of forage. Therefore, all of the forage allocation recommendations will be handled in this analysis.

Each affected activity has recommended that they be alloted enough forage to maximize their interest to the fullest. This lends itself to a series of conflicts between the different activities and even within the same activity. The magnitude of the conflict is dependent upon the number of different users that inhabit the same area.

The only certain fact is that there is not enough forage to meet the present demand of 311,928 AUM's for all the kinds of animals. (Demand is defined as follows: Livestock - Active Preference; Wildlife-Reasonable Numbers; Wild horses - Optimum Numbers.)

Over the past several years numerous adjustments in livestock grazing use have been made. Some were voluntary and others negotiated reductions in active use. There was one major horse removal in 1980, of 742 head, which helped stabilize the use in the Chin Creek Area.

During this time the overall big game populations have shown an upward trend.

The overall forage condition for cattle is poor to fair and mostly fair for sheep. Generally, the trend is stable to increasing.

The trend is an indication that the latest adjustments were appropriate.

The action taken to date has helped in some instances and with continued monitoring of all uses occurring at present levels it will be possible to take the necessary management actions to achieve an improvement in the range condition and trend.

Monitoring includes utilization and actual use on all animals by season.

Multiple-Use Recommendations

Recommendation:

Continue grazing of all large herbivors at the existing active levels

RM - 2.1a (cont.)

on all allotments (three-year average for livestock). Exceptions to this are on Sampson Creek, Tippett, Meadow Creek, Bassett Creek, Majors, Willard Creek, South Spring Valley, McCoy Creek, Irish Mountain, Wildhorse, and West Water Gap where there has been either no use or very low use. On these allotments start use at up to 50% of active preference.

Implement a monitoring program on all allotments to determine the true capacity.

Rationale:

Multiple-Use Rationale.

Support Needs:

2/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Establish an initial stocking rate for all large herbivores and base future adjustments of the initial levels on adequate monitoring data.

Livestock - obtain written agreements to establish the initial stocking rate with a goal of active use being consistent with the 3 year average shown in the EIS. The difference between total active preference and the agreed upon initial stocking rate will be shown as either regular nonuse or will be within the limits of flexibility documented in an existing approved AMP.

If an agreement cannot be reached then a decision will be issued identifing the data needed and the procedures to be used for arriving at the adjustments in authorized grazing use.

When adequate monitoring data becomes available adjustments to the livestock grazing capacity will be made that are compatible with the multiple use objectives.

Wild Horses - the numbers present in the herd area as determined by the 1983 inventory.

RM - 2.1b (cont.)

Wildlife - the actual number of animals that could reasonably be expected to use the public lands in the Schell Resource Area (during their respective season-of-use) at the time of approval of this MFP.

Rationale:

With the lack of available data the use of existing levels, as defined above, as a starting point and then adjusting use based upon adequate monitoring data is consistent with existing policy. The level of data obtained will depend upon the amount of information needed to determine if the multiple use objectives are being met. The monitoring program includes studies for Trend, Actual Use, Utilization and Climate.

Support Needs;

5/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Schell
Activity Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 1.4

Increase the wild horse population in the Antelope, Wilson Creek, Dry Lake, and Seaman Herd Units in accordance with increases in forage production achieved through vegetal manipulation. The number of acres to be converted in each herd unit are as follows:

Antelope Herd Unit	-	61,730	acres
Wilson Creek Herd Unit	-	260,712	acres
Seaman Herd Unit	-	72,950	acres
Dry Lake Herd Unit	-	12,281	acres

With increased forage production through vegetal manipulation estimated optimum numbers within each herd unit are as follows:

Herd Unit	Optimum Numbers	Total Aum's
Antelope	800	9,600
Wilson Creek	800	9.600
Dry Lake	650	7,800
Seaman	250	3,000

Rationale:

By manipulating existing vegetation, optimum numbers of horses in each herd unit can be increased in accordance with the additional AUM's provided by specific land treatments. Additional forage will improve and expand seasonal use areas.

Support Needs:

None

12/80

- -

See RM 1.2

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

WH - 1.4

(Instructions on reverse)

WI - 1.4 (cont.)

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

Attachment: RM-1.2

POTENTIAL SEEDING ACREAGES (Cont.)

MORIAH	ACRES	POTENTIAL AUM INCREASE
McCoy	3,546	355
Bassett Creek	1,456	146
Meadow Creek	435	44
Muncy Creek	18,894	1,889
Indian George	2,518	252
Mill Spring	1,972	197
Pleasant Valley	2,806	281
Tippett Pass	6,999	700
Tippett	31,164	3,116
Sampson Creek	5,775	578
Chin Creek	40,484	4,048
Becky Spring	7,047	705
	TOTAL	64,743

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This analysis will also address WL - 2.1 and WH - 2.2.
WH - 1.4.

These recommendations conflicts with or interacts with FM 1.3 - Christmas tree management, FM 1.4 - post cutting, FM 1.5 - pine nut production, FM 3.1 - premanipulation use of woodland products, FM 5.1 - prescribed burns, RM 1.2 - land treatments, WL 2.11 - reseeding antelope habitat, W 5.1 - vegetative manipulations, VM 1.2 - Class II VRM areas, and VM 1.3 - Class III VRM areas.

Vegetative conversions, by nature, are conflicting actions which must be analysed and mitigated. Such conversions can be benefical by reversing poor condition ranges, improving watershed condition, reducing completion among users, and by maintaining or increasing user numbers.

In order to gain the most from a seeding, it needs to be planned as a multiple use project. Only Watershed projects should preclude a multiple use design.

An EA should be done on the projects to analyze the site specific impacts and recommend mitigating measures.

2/81

RM-1.2 (Cont.)

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Seedings are to be implemented within the general areas shown on the Range, Wildlife, Wild Horse, and Watershed overlays in the following priority:

1. In areas where there is competition for forage between livestock, wildlife and wild horses.

2. In areas in poor condition with downward trend.

3. To maintain livestock, wildlife and wild horses at existing use levels.

4. In areas with an SSF of 60 or greater.

5. In areas where more forage is needed by wildlife to reach reasonable numbers.

6. To increase livestock and wild horses above existing levels.

All seedings are to be designed for multiple use. The only exception to this would be for watershed purposes where a multiple use seed mixture or design would not meet the purpose for the seeding.

An EA must be done to evaluate and mitigate site specific impacts.

Support Needs:

Resources
Operation

6/1

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

RM - 1.2 (cont.)

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

Recommendation: WH - 1.5

Furnish safe, sturdy, portable management facilities for the capture and containment of wild horses during gathering operations. Do not use permanent corrals.

Rationale:

Equipment utilized to facilitate the capture and confinement of wild horses during roundups should be safe to prevent injury, strong to avoid escape, and portable to provide for easy assembly, location, and transport. Avoid the use of permanent facilities or abandoned homestead or ranching resources. These forms of capture equipment invite illegal gathering and may not be safe, strong, or located in the vicinity of wild horse herds.

Support Needs:

Operations
Resources

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

No conflicts were identified with this recommendation.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Accept the Step 1 recommendation.

Rationale:

See Step 1.

Support Needs:

Operations.

1/81

WH - 1.5 (Cont.)

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Reject the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

This is a BLM policy and standard operating procedure.

Support Needs:

None.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 1.6

Remove all livestock in the Antelope Herd Management Area.

Rationale:

Utilization of available forage by livestock together with present wild horses exceeds the carrying capacity. In order to provide forage for horses in the herd area at the number recommended in WH - 1.4, all livestock will have to be removed.

Support Needs:

Range

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation is not in the interest of good multiple use management. The numbers to be allocated will be handled in the range section.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Provide forage to horses as analyzed in the allocation portion of this MFP.

Rationale:

This is based upon good multiple use management and the needs of the resource.

Support Needs:

None

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Provide forage to horses as determined to be available through the monitoring program.

WH - 1.6 (cont.)

Rationale:

Provide forage to horses as determined to be available through the monitoring program.

Support Needs:

Range Staff
Wildlife Staff

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 1.7

Restrict aerial roundups during foaling season and until foals have acquired enough strength to keep up with a band during roundups.

Rationale:

Newborn foals are initially weak and unable to travel great distances, until they have obtained adequate nourishment and develop anatomical strength. Proper scheduling of aerial roundups will prevent the possibility of foals becomming separated from the band before they are able to fend for themselves.

Support Needs:

Resources

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation is a matter of existing policy.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Drop the Step 1 recommendation.

Rationale:

This is policy

Support Needs:

None

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation

Rationale:
Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP) Schell
Activity Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

W.H. - 1.7 (cont.)

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs. 3/83

- -

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed
(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Schell
Activity	Wild horses
Objective Number	WH-2

Objective:

Manage wild horse habitat to provide optimum forage, water, cover, and living space conditions.

Rationale:

Forage, water, and cover, as well as living space are critical elements necessary for the survival of wild horse populations.

(Instructions on reverse)

WH - 2.1 (con't.)

Rationale:

The priority is set by the degree of potential multiple use conflicts.

Support Needs:

Normal District Staff Input and Review
Wild Horse Interest Groups
Other resource users and interest groups.

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation and add White River and Moriah herds as priority 5 and 6, respectively. Horse Management Plans will be based on MFP 3 Decisions.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

5/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 2.2

Increase forage production through application of specific land treatments, i.e. chaining, spraying, seeding, burning, fertilizing, and/or soil modifications.

Rationale:

Vegetation manipulations would release desirable grasses and forbs, improve horse habitat, improve range condition and trend, and provide better distribution of the horses in the Herd Management Areas. Through increased forage production optimum numbers of horses can be established in each herd unit.

Support Needs:

Operations
Resources

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

See RM-1.2 for analysis and recommendation.

12/80

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

Recommendation: WH - 2.3

Modify water developments designed to provide water only during seasons when livestock grazing occurs so that water will be available on a year-long basis for wild horses. Provide access to available water sources that prevent use by wild horses, i.e. fenced reservoirs.

Rationale:

Spring developments consist of a fenced spring source with a pipe extending from it to a trough. All are equipped with valves so that water can be turned off during seasons of non-grazing. Bureau guidelines require that water be available at all spring sources on a year-long basis.

The present restrictions do force the horses to be dependent upon and concentrate around springs where water supplies are not always available.

Other developments such as wells, reservoirs, and pipelines should also provide water on a year-long basis and be accessible. All storage tanks need to be checked periodically to insure that maximum capacity is maintained.

Support Needs:

Operations
Range
Watershed

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation with interaction with WL 3.4 - access to well water, WL 3.3 - deepening reservoirs, and other water recommendations.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Make water available yearlong at existing and future wells and other developments in Wild Horse Herd Units from April 1 to November 30 and during other periods if extra dry weather prevails. Water will also be provided at any reservoirs that may be fenced. Pumping wells,

WH - 2.3 (con't)

inspecting pipelines, etc. will be made on assignment of the resource area range rider.

Rationale:

There is usually enough natural water (snow, snow melt, etc.) during winter and spring months to meet the needs of wildlife and horses.

Support Needs:

Operations Division
Grazing permittees

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

Recommendation: WH - 2.4

Maintain existing and new waters in conditions which provide for maximum production of water.

Rationale:

Proper maintenance of water developments will enhance the availability of water during periods of limited supply. Water supply must meet demand to support existing horse population. An adequate water supply is vital in maintaining healthy horse herds especially during times of drought.

Support Needs:

Range
Operations
Watershed

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation.

This is a matter of ongoing management policy.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Delete activity recommendation.

Rationale:

This is a matter of ongoing policy and management practice and an MFP recommendation is not required.

Support Needs:

None

1/81

W.H. 2.4 (cont.)

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 2.5

Improve living space conditions for wild horses by removing fencing projects as shown on Step 4 URA Overlay (WH - 4) for the following Herd Management Areas:

Wilson Creek - 39 miles of fence removal
Dry Lake - 14.2 miles of fence removal
Antelope - 11.5 miles of fence removal

Rationale:

At the present time these fences are believed to restrict wild horses to an extent which limits access to available water sources, additional forage and cover, and reduces amount of available living space. Therefore, if these required elements are to be provided, these fences must be removed or relocated to provide optimum living conditions.

Restricting or impeding the wild and free-rooming nature of wild horses can create undue stress amongst bonds of horses comprising horse herds. By providing vast, open areas free from obstructions the survival of wild horse populations can be secured. The wild and free roaming behavior of feral horses must be preserved.

Support Needs:

Range
Operations
YACC

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with RM 1.1 - Implementing AMPs, RM 1.4 - Seasons of Use, RM 1.9 - establishing grazing systems, RM 1.10 - Custodial management and RM 4.2 - maintaining improvements.

The fences of concern have been in existence for some years and do not appear to be significant obstructions to horse movements. These fences are necessary to the basic recommendations of regulating livestock grazing for the benefit of all animals. In one case, the Tippett fence will become a herd unit boundary as recommended by WH 4.2. Others are necessary for grazing control on seedings.

1/81

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(See instructions on reverse)

WH - 2.5 (Cont.) Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

When developing a HMAP evaluate the effects of these fences upon Wild Horses and recommend the kind of modifications that are needed.

Rationale:

This matter can be the subject of field study discussed in WH-5.1 and reconsidered if necessary in HMAP's. Removal of these fences would effectively neutralize any potential for vegetative improvement through better grazing management.

Support Needs:

None

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

Recommendation: WH - 2.6

Avoid any actions which could result in the physical separation of existing wild horse habitat. Do not construct any new fences within the confines of the four herd units until definite movement patterns have been determined. When fences are constructed use smooth wire to protect horses from possible injury.

Rationale:

Physical separations could restrict normal movement of wild horses and block access to available water. Such separations could be detrimental to the seasonal use areas of wild horses unless migratory patterns are considered in the planning of such projects. Also, populations could be confined to the extent that population numbers are too great for available area.

Support Needs:

Range
Operations
YACC

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with RM-4.1 installing management facilities,

All improvements including fences will be scrutinized by the EA process prior to implementation at which time specific information relative to the proposal can be considered. Free choice horse movements should not be impeded.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Do not construct fences or other potential barriers to wild horse movement if EA indicates that the action or possible alternatives will significantly result in obstructions to wild horse movement or physically separate horses from habitat. Significance is defined as separating a majority of the horses from their home range or separating them from habitat which is necessary for their survival.

WH - 2.6 (con't.)

Rationale:

The EA process can consider site specific situations and alternatives. Gates or let down fence sections may be an alternative in conflicting situations.

Support Needs:

Environmental Staff

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 2.7

Insure that wild horse needs and habitat requirements are met in determining all management actions such as: livestock grazing, permits, licenses, allocations of forage, and wildlife habitat.

Rationale:

Livestock and wildlife management may have a profound effect on wild horse habitat conditions. Close coordination with any management action should be required for full consideration of wild horse needs. Unless the necessary requirements for wild horses are provided i.e. forage, water, cover, and living space, their survival may be endangered.

Support Needs:

Range
Wildlife

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This is a general recommendation that has multiple potential conflicts.

This recommendation reiterates BLM multiple use management policy and is the essence of the planning system.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Delete activity recommendation.

Rationale:

This action will take place in decisions resulting from this MFP and does not need this recommendation.

Support Needs:

None

1/81

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

WH 2.7 (cont.)

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 2.8

Preserve timbered areas for wild horses in each herd unit to insure adequate cover required for foaling grounds and protection from predators, adverse weather, and man. Leave intermittent zones of timber when chaining, spraying, or burning.

Rationale:

Without sufficient timber species horses are subject to harsh conditions such as extreme heat, cold, wind, and precipitation events. Wild horses are also more vulnerable to predation and harassment from man or machine. Newborn foals need shelter for the same reasons.

Support Needs:

None

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation interacts or conflicts with FM 1.2 - green firewood, FM 4.1 - juniper utilization, FM 5.1 - prescribed burns, RM 1.2 - land treatments and WL 2.11 - antelope chainings.

In general, wild horse herd areas are large enough that it is inconceivable that enough forested areas would be removed to seriously affect horses, unless these are special purpose (foaling, winter, escape) areas that need special protection. It is the policy on tree removal that boundaries are irregular, islands are left and big blocks of cleared areas are not acceptable. Removal of some forested area should provide more total forage to be shared by horses.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Consider forested area habitat for wild horses in EA's prepared for any proposed tree removal. Include special timbered area needs in wild horse studies.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

See instructions on reverse

WI - 2.8 (con't.)

Rationale:

See analysis above.

Support Needs:

Environmental Staff

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WI - 2.9

Prevent the invasion and spread of noxious and poisonous plants in all Herd Management Areas by minimizing disturbances caused by overgrazing, heavy equipment, off road vehicles, and other surface disturbance activities.

Rationale:

Consumption of poisonous plants by wild horses can cause severe metabolic disturbances and/or death if large quantities are ingested. Invasion of noxious and poisonous plants deplete soil moisture needed by more desireable species. Noxious plants can cause mechanical injury to animals and spread disease and parasites associated with certain types.

Support Needs:

Range
Wildlife

12/80

Multiple-Use Analysis

Possible conflicts are not readily identifiable, but presumably this recommendation would be affected by any restriction on use of herbicide such as WL 5.5 - restricted chemical uses.

Loco weed is the most renown poisonous plant for horses although there are others to be considered. These plants are a part of the natural ecosystems and are wildspread. Improved grazing management, including forage allocation and proper stocking rates should retard any spread of these plants and reduce forage competition that forces horses to eat these type plants. Also more natural plant competition less affected by continual intense grazing should retard further spread of noxious species as they generally do not compete well with perennial grass and shrubs.

1/81

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Do not implement grazing management practices, land treatments or other practices that lead to the spread of noxious or poisonous plants.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed
(Instructions on reverse)

WH - 2.9 (con't.)

Rationale:

The natural spread of these plants can only be controlled by proper grazing and unnatural spread by limiting direct land treatment activities.

Support Needs:

Environmental Staff

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

Recommendation: WH - 2.10

Remove hydrophytes from around seeps and springs to reduce transpiration and subsequent loss of water needed to sustain wild horse herds.

Rationale:

By clearing water loving plants surrounding seeps and springs, the water supply can be increased substantially. Seeps are potentially suitable water facilities but the quality and quantity of water are often poor due to the presence of hydrophytes. Water flow at springs can be increased greatly by removing aquatic plants.

Support Needs:

Operations
YACC
Watershed
Range
Wildlife

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with WL 2.10 - develop vegetation at reservoirs, and WL 5.5 - disturbance of riparian habitat.

Hydrophylic plants do contribute to water loss, but are very important for many species of wildlife. Usually development of springs concentrates with and makes it more available to all animals while preserving riparian type plants.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Develop springs and seeps to provide water sources for horses and other animals while preserving riparian plants important for wildlife.

Rationale:

Multiple use management can best be served by this method.

WH - 2.10a (con't.)

Support Needs:

Operations Division

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 2.11

Develop and maintain new water sources in the Antelope, Wilson Creek, Moriah, White River, Dry Lake, and Seaman Herd Management Areas.

Rationale:

With the gradual establishment of optimum numbers, additional water will be needed to support the increase in numbers of wild horses. Auxiliary developments can aid in obtaining a more even grazing distribution by controlling the availability at specific locations. These new facilities must be inspected periodically to insure supplies are adequate, quality of water is acceptable, and that water is available on a year-long basis, especially in areas of livestock grazing, unless water is being used as a tool to achieve a more uniform distribution. Watering rights should be well defined and carefully safeguarded for wild horses.

Support Needs:

Watershed
Range
Wildlife
Operations

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation. Several activities recommend water developments.

Water developments can be made to serve large and small wildlife, wild horses, and livestock.

1/81

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Accept activity recommendation.

Rationale:

None

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

WH - 2.11 (con't.)

Support Needs:

Operations Division
Environmental Staff

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 2.12

Restrict activities in the Seaman Herd Unit Area that conflict with the well-being of the wild horse population.

Rationale:

Both sheep and cattle utilize key seasonal areas inhabited by wild horses creating competition for forage. Domestic livestock should be restricted from these areas to provide available forage for wild horses until the bands move on to another use area.

Increased mining activity has forced horses out of crucial foraging areas. Mining claims should also be restricted to regions outside major use areas, as well as seismic exploration. These activities can also create water shortages. (Refer to overlay WH-).

Support Needs:

Range
Geology
Operations

12/80

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation has many potential conflicts in realty, minerals, and livestock grazing which are too speculative to be enumerated and fully analyzed here.

Restricting activities as suggested is tantamount to creating a wild horse range, which is not the intent. BLM multiple use management, forage allocation and other decisions of this MFP assure that horses receive proper management, but it will not be without conflict or tolerable disturbances to horses.

If site specific problems arise in day to day management or future studies, they can be considered in HMAP's and accompanying EA's or corrected as a matter of day-to-day work activities.

1/81

WH - 2.12 (con't.)

Multiple Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Delete the activity recommendation.

Rationale:

The effect of the recommendation would be virtual creation of an exclusive horse range. Day-to-day management authorities as well as future action through studies, HMAP's and EA's can mitigate but not eliminate most problems.

Support Needs:

None

1/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Objective Number
WH - 3

Objective:

Cooperate and coordinate information with all organizations interested in the welfare and management of wild horses.

Rationale:

Cooperation and coordination with other organizations is important for communication and obtaining input and support for the wild horse program.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH-3.1

Cooperate and coordinate information with wild horse organizations such as: Wild Horse Organized Assistance, National Mustang Association, American Horse Protection Association, International Society for the Protection of Mustangs & Burros, Animal Protection Institute of America, and America, and other national, state, and local organizations concerned with the welfare of the wild horse.

Rationale:

All of these organizations are interested in the welfare and management of wild horses. Cooperation and coordination with these organizations is important for communication and gaining input and support of these organizations for the wild horse programs. They can also assist in the management of wild horses by screening applicants for any excess horses which may have to be removed.

Support Needs:

None

12/80

Multiple-Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation that is a matter of present ongoing policy.

1/81

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Delete Activity Recommendation.

Rationale:

As a matter of present policy, there is no need for an MFP decision to accomplish the goal of this recommendation.

Support Needs:

None.

1/81

WH-3.1 (cont.)

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Objective Number
WH – 4

Objective:

Reduce the number of Herd Units as designated in the Schell Resource Area by combination of Existing Herd Units.

Rationale:

The migratory patterns of wild horses within each herd unit over extend the designated herd unit boundaries thus mixing animals labeled as belonging to a specific herd. By combining these herd units into a single herd the horses can be truly represented.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH -4.1

Combine the following herd units into four major Herd Management Areas:

Schell and Goshute Herd Units change to Antelope Herd Management Area. Fortification and Patterson Eagle change to Wilson Creek Herd Management Area. Cave Valley and Dry Lake Herd Units change to Dry Lake Herd Management Area. Golden Gate and Seaman Herd Units change to Seaman Herd Management Area.

Rationale:

Wild horses move in and out of the existing Herd Management Areas on a regular basis with few bands remaining within the confines of the designated herd unit boundaries. Evidence of these movements gathered during inventories supports the need to combine those herd units which border each other and assign a common name to the herd(s) established. This will create a more realistic management design.

Support Needs:

None

12/80

Multiple-Use Analysis

This recommendation is non-conflicting. Experience is studying and watching horse movements since 1971 has shown that horse herd movements are more widespread and herds are less autonomous than originally believed. This proposal combines herd units into more logical overall management areas.

2/81

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed
(Instructions on reverse)

WH-4.1 (Cont.)

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Accept the Activity Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as Multiple-Use Analysis

Support Needs:

Contracting for gather and trucking.
Adoption facility.

2/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 4.2

When disposing of animals under population reduction and/or maintenance programs utilize the following techniques:

1. Turn wild horses over to private individuals for private maintenance through cooperative agreements.

2. Redistribute wild horses from areas of greater concentration to less populated regions.

3. Destroy animals in the most humane manner.

Rationale:

Something will undoubtedly have to be done with excess horses removed under population reduction and/or maintenance programs. The methods of disposal identified are considered to be in the best interest of wild horses:

1. Turning wild horses over to private individuals will insure they are well taken care of, if periodic investigations follow the adoption process. In addition this is a publicly accepted method of disposal.

2. By redistributing excess wild horses from one management area to another, grazing pressure will be relieved, preserving existing forage for the horses remaining, and at the same time provide adequate forage, water, and cover for horses transported to a new location.

3. When used as a last resort for disposal, destruction of horses will make additional room available for existing wild horses and serve as a means of removing old, diseased, and/or lame horses unsuitable for adoption.

Support Needs:

Palomino Valley Holding Facility-Carson City District
Licensed Veterinarian
Resources
Operations

5/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

WH-4. 2 (cont.)

Multiple-Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation. This recommendation is in conformance with existing policy WO IM 81-145.

2/81

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Accept Activity Recommendation.

Rationale:

None.

Support Needs:

Adoption Centers.
Gathering Contracts.

2/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Drop the recommendation.

Rationale:

This is adequately covered by Bureau Policy.

Support Needs:

3/83

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN – STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)
Schell

Activity
Wild Horses

Objective Number
WH – 5

Objective:

Study and inventory wild horses to obtain information pertinent to the management of wild horses.

Rationale:

Existing data on wild horses is insufficient for the development of management plans. Information on wild horses needs to be up-to-date so that present situations can be analyzed.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 5.1

Initiate studies to determine reproduction, mortality rates, survival rates, sex ratios, age classes, and contracted diseases.

Rationale:

Studies to determine these needs and problem solutions are necessary to establish management requirements and objectives. The answers to these problems will be the basis for managing wild horse populations.

Support Needs:

None

12/80

Multiple-Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation. There are bureau-wide studies ongoing that will provide some information.

2/81

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Initiate studies to supplement other Bureau-wide studies and available data to enable reasonably accurate projections of reproduction, mortality rate, survival rates, sex ratio, age classes and contracted diseases on the local level. Work should be done on herd units in priorty order of HMAP preparation. See WH-2.1.

Rationale:

There is no need to duplicate ongoing wild horse research, but only supplement it at the local level to a reasonable degreee of accuracy.

Support Needs:

SO Specialist to supply State and Bureau data.

2/81

WH-5.1 (cont.)

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation. Studies under the monitoring program will have higher priority.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)
Schell
Activity
Wild Horses
Overlay Reference
Step 1 Step 3

Recommendation: WH - 5.2

Initiate studies to determine seasonal distribution, migratory patterns, foraging habits, cover requirements, water distribution needs, and competition with other animal species for food, water, cover, and living space.

Rationale:

These studies will provide the following information:

1. Seasonal use areas, migratory routes, and possible crucial areas by immobilizing and collaring horses and tracking them on a seasonal basis by fixed-wing aircraft.

2. Utilization, actual use, and integrated resource studies will verify and analyze forage use patterns, grazing use in specific regions, and range condition and trend.

3. Fecal analysis will also determine utilization and forage preferences.

4. Fences, water developments and improvement projects which interfere with the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses, restrict their grazing use, or present a hazard to them.

5. Biotic environment.

6. Conflicts with other resources and their effects on wild horses, i.e. human activity, mining, recreational use, domestic livestock grazing, and intensive wildlife management.

This information is needed to assure that habitat requirements of wild horses are met when managing wild horse herds. Data gathered pertaining to critical survival elements is a prerequisite to the maintenance of healthy wild horse populations.

Support Needs:

Range
Wildlife

12/80

WH-5.2 Cont.

Multiple-Use Analysis

This is a non-conflicting recommendation.

2/81

Multiple-Use Recommendation

Recommendation:

Continue studies on Wildhorses herd units in priority order of HMAP preparation to determine information needed to prepare a comprehensive HMAP. See WH-2.1 for priority.

Rationale:

Studies are an ongoing effort. Some of this information is available from ongoing studies. The study program will require expansion to include all areas with more comprehensive studies.

Support Needs:

Cooperation with other District Specialists.

2/81

Multiple Use Decisions

Decision:

Accept the Multiple Use Recommendation. This is essentially the same as the ongoing monitoring studies.

Rationale:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Rationale.

Support Needs:

Same as the Multiple Use Recommendation Support Needs.

3/83