

M 6-20-89

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE  
WILSON CREEK CONSULTATION MEETING  
June 20, 1989

The Area Manager introduced himself as the facilitator of the consultation effort for the Wilson Creek Allotment. A sign-up sheet was passed around the room to take attendance of those at the meeting (Attachment 1), and participants were asked to introduce themselves to the rest of the group. The facilitator explained how the meeting would be conducted, reviewed the purpose of the consultation group, and summarized past actions and future plans of the group. Two previous consultation meetings were primarily to present information and formulate a list of issues and problems, and the third meeting was a tour to familiarize the group with the problems on the ground. The purposes of this meeting are to: (1) present and discuss the Wilson Creek Allotment evaluation, (2) finalize the list of issues and problems, and (3) present and discuss technical recommendations and potential resolutions to problems.

Copies of the Wilson Creek Allotment Evaluation were distributed. It was explained that this document has been prepared through the technical recommendations section which is the specialists' best attempt at designing solutions to resource problems. It was stressed that no management decisions have been made and that they will only be made after consultation with all interested parties and after comments are received. The BLM then proceeded to explain and briefly summarize the following sections of the evaluation: Background and Allotment Profile, Existing Situation, Resource Objectives, and Monitoring Data. There was some discussion on wild horse numbers, the outcome of the recent court ruling, and how numbers of wild horses and livestock would be adjusted according to monitoring data. A question was raised as to how the specific objectives were derived. It was explained that the broad land use plan objectives were examined for each allotment and quantified to develop allotment specific objectives to determine the accomplishment of the land use plan objectives. Monitoring results which determine whether or not objectives were met were then presented. There was some discussion on utilization levels (short term objectives). It was explained that the land use plan for the Schell Resource Area specifically stated that utilization levels recommended in the Nevada Rangeland Monitoring Handbook would not be exceeded. Under a prescribed grazing system or seeded rangeland, allowable use levels could be higher. If grazing occurs during the critical growth period or the long term objective is to improve vegetative condition, the allowable use levels could be lower. Collection of certain monitoring information was also discussed.

The next agenda item was to go over the list of issues, problems, and conflicts. Suggestions were given to add one more issue to the list and modify the wording on two existing issues. These changes were agreed to and the list was finalized accordingly (Attachment 2).

As the presentation of technical recommendations began, it was reemphasized that these were not decisions. Rather than change technical recommendations now, all input received will be included in the Consultation section. Based on this input the final course of action would be decided and negotiations started with each person. Copies of a "Summary of Problem Resolution by Use Area" were distributed (Attachment 3). Review of the options summary generated some good discussion. Points of interest from this discussion include the following:

- Final management actions must be developed with input and concurrence of interested parties not represented at the meeting as well as those present.

- Options are basically looking at removing spring grazing from the winter range and making earlier use on the seedings since the main purpose of crested wheatgrass seedings was to remove spring grazing from native ranges. Summer and fall use would be distributed into areas presently underutilized.

- Individual options in the summary are not exclusive. Any conceivable mix of options or parts of options may be considered. The final combination of factors such as grazing system, season of use, etc. will enter into the negotiation of appropriate stocking rates for all users.

- Negotiations will begin with affected individuals after they have had an opportunity to thoroughly review the evaluation and are ready to discuss options.

- Livestock adjustments can take place through formal agreement to take regular nonuse for a specified period of time. However, if agreement cannot be reached, a decision will be issued and adjusted AUMs would be placed in suspended nonuse.

- There were brief discussions on water base AUMs, riparian policy and methods of protection other than fencing, vegetation conversion, and wildlife numbers.

Remaining tasks of the consultation group are to provide written comments on the evaluation and begin negotiation meetings with the BLM. It was decided that July 31, 1989 should be the deadline for comments on the monitoring evaluation. However, the sooner comments are received, the better so the last portions of the evaluation can be completed by July or August. Comments need to be site specific. Final recommendations developed based on this input will then be reviewed by all interested parties. If there is concurrence, agreements will be negotiated. Otherwise, decisions will be issued. Then a variety of specific activity plans will be produced with all the input from the group. Another meeting will be scheduled to consolidate future management actions. If agreements are reached, it will likely be the last meeting.

Wilson Creek Consultation Meeting 6/20/89

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Address</u>
Kraig M. Beckstrand	NDOW	Panaca, NV
Mark Barber	BLM	Ely, NV
Kerry Holt	Permittee	Enterprise, UT
Frank Delmue	Permittee	Pioche, NV
Van Gardner	N-4 Advisory Board	Lund, NV
William G. Davidson	N-4 Advisory Board	McGill, NV
Carlisle Hulet	Permittee	Summit, UT
Carrie L. Janssen-Smith	SCS	Caliente, NV
Richard Orr	SCS	Caliente, NV
Gordon Lytle	Permittee	Pioche, NV
Matt Bulloch	Permittee	Cedar City, UT
Ken Lytle	Permittee	Pioche, NV
Don Henderson	Resource Concepts, Inc.	Carson City, NV
Wayne Swenson	USFS	Ely, NV
Bert Paris	N-4 Advisory Board	Ely, NV
Kathy Lindsey	BLM	Ely, NV
Dawn Holt		Enterprise, UT
Pauline Hulet		Summit, UT
Gerald M. Smith	BLM	Ely, NV
Loran Robison	BLM	Ely, NV
Steve Surian	BLM	Ely, NV
Paul Podborny	BLM	Ely, NV

## ISSUES, PROBLEMS, CONFLICTS

- 1) Pinyon-juniper encroachment is causing a loss of understory and desirable forage for all users.
- 2) A conflict with cattle, horses, and deer occurs on deer winter ranges. Wild horses use grasses before cattle begin grazing. When the cattle begin grazing they are forced onto browse before seed ripe and the remaining browse could be limited for wintering deer.\*
- 3) A shortage of winter forage exists for livestock, antelope, and wild horses.
- 4) Wild horses, livestock, and antelope compete for spring green-up in Hamblin Valley.
- 5) In the summer use area excessive grazing use has resulted in riparian problems. The wet meadow areas are showing signs of head cutting and the associated problem of lowering the water table. However, a great deal of these areas (wet meadows) are located on private lands and the water rights are held by private interests (permittees).
- 6) Consideration needs to be given for management of juniper stringers adjacent to winterfat areas for ferruginous hawk nests. The current excessive grazing use of the winterfat areas in the winter use areas are not conducive to site improvement of these areas. The excessive use will not provide for adequate nesting habitat of the hawks.
- 7) There is currently improper distribution of livestock within the 12 use areas. This is causing a lack of forage for 100 percent of livestock use (active preference) in the allotment as a whole.
- 8) There is poor vigor of key plant species on some of the deer winter ranges.\*
- 9) There are conflicts between cattle and sheep in the Dry Lake Valley use area. This is associated with the timing of use and a lack of forage in the use area.
- 10) The summer use area for livestock is also key summer range for mule deer and elk. There are problems with excessive use on riparian areas (wet meadows), which appears to be a matter of livestock distribution.
- 11) There are forage competition problems between livestock and antelope on crucial antelope kidding areas in the Hamblin Valley use area.
- 12) The augmentation of elk into the allotment will cause increased demands on the available forage resource.

13) A large common use allotment offers little administrative control of livestock.

14) All proposed projects and actions within the Colorado River drainage portion of the allotment will be assessed as to a potential increase in contributions to the salinity of the river.

15) The livestock permittees are concerned about their maintenance responsibilities for livestock fences in the areas elk are currently using. The permittees would like to be able to renegotiate their responsibilities because the elk are causing a great deal of increased maintenance problems.

16) The livestock permittees desire to maximize economic returns under the principals of good stewardship and resource management and promote flexibility and ease of livestock management on Wilson Creek Allotment.

The following additional problems were identified as a result of the monitoring evaluation information.

17) In general, most of the short term vegetative objectives are not being met and will not be met due to utilization levels in excess of the established allowable use levels and due to improper grazing distribution.

18) Major portions of the Patterson and Meadow Valley seedings are over utilized. In some pastures it may be a factor of improper livestock distribution.

19) Major portions of the Hamblin and Dry Lake Valley winter use areas are over utilized.

20) Meadow Valley Creek riparian habitat is rated in fair condition. Excessive grazing use on portions of the area are not conducive to achieving improvement in the habitat condition.\*

21) Important sage grouse brooding complexes (wet meadow associations) in the summer use area are being over utilized.

22) Wild horse populations in the allotment are over the Appropriate Management Levels established in the land use plan.

23) Utilization of browse species on key deer summer range exceeded the allowable use level (AUL) and is attributable primarily to deer use.

24) The age class of browse species on key deer winter range is unsatisfactory.

25) Some areas of the allotment are not suitable due to lack of water.

26) Livestock Forage Condition is less than good in 15 Mile and Willow Wash pastures. This may be attributed to sage brush encroachment.

\* This indicates that current monitoring data does not indicate that these problems exist. These problems will need to be considered in detail at a later date.

Summary of Problem Resolution  
by Use Area

<u>Use Areas</u>	<u>Objective Not Met</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Short Term</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Long Term</u>
Dry Lake Valley	Utilization	1) Uneven livestock distribution resulting in areas of heavy to severe utilization	1) In Dry Lake Valley adjust livestock numbers to 1122 cattle and 4326 sheep for a season of use from November 1st to April 30th, or	1) Develop additional waters.
Hamblin Valley		2) Utilization levels were exceeded on key areas.	2) In Dry Lake Valley change season of use from November 1st to March 31st and adjust livestock numbers to 1346 cattle and 5191 sheep.	2) Implement a grazing system: a. Deferred Rotation b. Rest Rotation
Bristol			3) <del>Adjust wild horse use by 25 animals yearlong in Dry Lake Valley.</del>	3) Construct drift fences.
White River/ Deadman			4) In Hamblin Valley adjust cattle numbers to 776 and change the season of use to November 1st to March 31st.	4) Vegetative manipulation to provide spring forage.
			5) In the White River use area adjust cattle numbers to 459 cattle and 2157 sheep and change season of use to November 1st to March 31.	

Summary of Problem Resolution  
by Use Area (cont.)

<u>Use Areas</u>	<u>Objective Not Met</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Short Term</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Long Term</u>
Maloy	Utilization	1) Uneven livestock distribution resulting in 10% over-use in the area.	1) Improve cattle distribution by water hauling and salting	1) Develop waters.
Bailey Maloy		2) Two springs are in less than good habitat condition.	2) Adjust livestock numbers.	2) Vegetative treatments
Muleshoe			3) Change class of livestock from cattle to sheep.	
Patterson	Utilization	1) Uneven livestock distribution resulting in areas of heavy to severe utilization.  2) Utilization levels were exceeded on key areas.	1) Adjust livestock numbers to 5534 AUMs.  2) Change season of use from 5/1 - 10/31 to 4/1 - 10/31, or to a split season of use from 4/1-6/30 and 10/1-11/30 to reduce early spring use on native winter ranges.	1) Develop waters.  2) Vegetative conversions.



Summary of Problem Resolution  
by Use Area (cont.)

<u>Use Areas</u>	<u>Objective Not Met</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Short Term</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Long Term</u>
Meadow Valley	Utilization	<p>1) Uneven livestock distribution resulting in areas of heavy to severe utilization.</p> <p>2) Utilization levels were exceeded on key areas.</p>	<p>1) Adjust livestock numbers to 1471 AUMs.</p> <p>2) To improve livestock distribution increase herding, water hauling, and avoid salting on water.</p>	<p>1) Water improvements.</p> <p>2) Vegetation manipulation.</p>
White Rock Mountains	Utilization	<p>1) Uneven livestock distribution resulting in areas of heavy to severe utilization.</p> <p>2) Two riparian areas are in less than good condition.</p> <p>3) Heavy use of bitterbrush by mule deer.</p>	<p>1) To improve livestock distribution increase herding, water hauling, and avoid salting on water.</p> <p>2) Change season of use from 7/1 - 10/31 to 8/1 - 10/31.</p> <p>3) Remove cattle at 50% utilization on riparian areas.</p> <p>4) Adjust mule deer numbers to 1984-85 levels.</p>	<p>1) Fence riparian areas.</p> <p>2) Vegetation manipulations to increase and/or improve mule deer habitat.</p>
Table Mountain	Utilization	<p>1) Uneven livestock distribution resulting in areas of heavy to severe utilization.</p> <p>2) One riparian area in poor condition.</p> <p>3) Mule deer habitat in fair condition.</p>	<p>1) To improve livestock distribution increase herding, water hauling, and avoid salting on water.</p> <p>2) To reduce utilization and trampling on riparian areas change the season of use from 7/1 - 10/31 to 8/1 - 10/31.</p> <p>3) Adjust livestock numbers to 400 AUMs per season.</p>	<p>1) Develop waters.</p> <p>2) Vegetation manipulation to improve mule deer habitat.</p>

Summary of Problem Resolution  
by Use Area (cont.)

<u>Use Areas</u>	<u>Objective Not Met</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Short Term</u>	<u>Optional Solutions - Long Term</u>
Mt Wilson Native	Utilization	1) Heavy use of bitterbrush by mule deer.  2) Lack of adequate water.	1) Adjust mule deer numbers to 1984-85 levels.	1) Vegetation manipulation to increase and/or improve mule deer habitat.  2) Develop waters.
Mt. Wilson Burn	Utilization	1) Use pattern mapping indicates areas of heavy use by livestock.  2) Two riparian areas are in less than good condition.	1) Adjust cattle numbers, to 1390 AUMs.	1) Implement a grazing system.  2) Develop waters and fence riparian areas.
Burn't Canyon chaining	Utilization	1) Use pattern mapping indicates areas of heavy use by mule deer	1) Adjust mule deer numbers to 1984-85 levels.	1) Vegetation manipulation to increase and/or improve mule deer habitat on adjacent areas.
Burn't Canyon burn	Utilization	1) Use pattern mapping indicates areas of heavy use by livestock.	1) Remove cattle at 55% utilization.	1) Develop waters.