

2/1982

Caliente Planning Unit
Summaries of MFP—Step 3 Decisions

FEBRUARY 1982

I
BOARD OF L...

CALIENTE PLANNING UNIT
SUMMARIES OF MFP-STEP 3 DECISIONS

SEP 29 1992

INTRODUCTION

The following information summarizes all Management Framework Plan (MFP) Step 3 decisions for the Caliente Planning Unit. These multiple use decisions will establish goals, objectives, constraints, and uses which will guide future actions on BLM land in the Planning Unit.

Further details on the decisions, use recommendations, and supporting information are available in the Caliente Planning Unit Management Framework Plan document. Additionally, the Caliente Rangeland Program Summary can be referred to for a detailed discussion of rangeland management and the grazing program for the Planning Unit.

The final MFP Step 3 decisions in this Summary were approved by the State Director on November 12, 1981, and were confirmed by the Director, BLM, on February 26, 1982.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING UNIT

The Caliente Planning Unit is an area of approximately 3.5 million acres in southern Lincoln County. The Unit is bounded on the east by the Nevada-Utah border; on the south by the Clark-Lincoln County line; and on the west by the Nellis Air Force Bombing Range, the Department of Energy (DOE) Nevada Test Site, and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Battle Mountain District. The northern border of the Planning Unit is the boundary between BLM's Las Vegas and Ely Districts. The area is irregularly shaped, measuring about 102 miles east to west and 78 miles north to south at its widest points.

The Planning Unit is characterized by north-south mountain ranges separated by broad valleys. The majority of the basin floors are around 4,500 feet in elevation, while the mountain ranges generally reach 5,000 to 6,500 feet. The lowest point is found at the south edge of the Tule Desert (2,000 feet) and the highest point is Highland Peak (9,395 feet).

A dry, desert climate characterizes the Planning Unit. Precipitation is low, averaging 4.35 inches yearly. Much of this moisture falls as snow in the higher elevations in winter. Storms are relatively infrequent, although high intensity thunderstorms are common throughout the Planning Unit in late summer. Daily and seasonal temperatures vary greatly - there can be as much as a 30 to 40 degree difference in summer daytime and nighttime temperatures. Maximum summer temperatures can exceed 110°F, and minimum winter temperatures can reach below -10°F, depending on location.

The vegetation consists primarily of pinyon-juniper, sagebrush, blackbrush, and creosote bush. Found in lesser degrees are shadscale, hopsage, joshua tree, and yucca. Pinyon-juniper, sagebrush, and blackbrush dominate the northern half of the Unit, while creosote bush, shadscale, and hopsage are the dominate types in the southern half of the Planning Unit. The southeastern portion of the Unit has large quantities of annual forage (grasses and forbs) during wet years.

Land in the Caliente Planning Unit is largely in public ownership. The following table shows ownership patterns:

Land Ownership in the Caliente Planning Unit

	<u>Number of Acres</u>
Public Lands (BLM)	3,433,962
U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service Lands	4,982
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Lands	846
Nevada State Lands	17,060
Private Lands	44,490
 Total	 3,501,340 Acres

The Caliente Planning Unit contains all of the population centers in Lincoln County. About three-fourths of the county population of 3,500 live in the communities of Caliente, Pioche, Panaca, and Alamo. With 0.25 persons per square mile, Lincoln County is one of the least populated areas in the country.

Lincoln County is governed by a three member county commission in the county seat of Pioche. Caliente, the only incorporated city in the area has a council-manager type government, the five-member city council includes the mayor who is elected by the public. The unincorporated towns of Alamo, Panaca, and Pioche have town board governments.

The most important industry in terms of number of persons employed and income earned is government. Second in importance is mining; third is agriculture. More than 80 percent of the agricultural employment is in livestock ranching.

Preserve the normal wild horse distribution and movement patterns when locating and constructing fences. Give priority to fences in existing AMP areas and those areas proposed for new AMPs. (MFP, Range Management 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7)

- 13 - Develop and implement a range monitoring system that incorporates, as a minimum, the Nevada Range Monitoring Procedures developed in 1981 by the Range Studies task group under the chairmanship of the Extension Service, University of Nevada (Reno), to provide data to guide the CRMP groups in recommending necessary adjustment in use of public rangeland vegetation resources by foraging animals. (MFP, Range Management 5.1 and 5.2)

WILD HORSES AND BURROS

General Information

Wild horses and burros are found generally in the eastern half of the Planning Unit, with major concentrations observed in the pinyon-juniper areas of the Meadow Valley Wash watershed. Numbers of these animals have been expanding in recent years. It was estimated that wild horses and burros in the Planning Unit numbered 1,072 in 1977.

Wild horses and burros, along with wildlife and livestock, are major consumers of the vegetative resource; this combination of uses has subjected the area to grazing demands above the current forage capability of the range.

The wild horse and burro program would manage herd sizes and area in accordance with forage availability. In addition, the program would assure that such use is compatible with water production and other land uses.

Decisions

- 1 - Unless determined otherwise through the CRMP process, manage current estimated numbers (FY 81) of wild horses and burros within the following herd management areas:
 1. Deer Lodge Canyon (FY 84)
 2. Highland Peak (FY 83)
 3. Rattlesnake (FY 85)

4. Little Mountain (FY 82)
5. Clover Creek (FY 83)
6. Delamar Mountains (FY 81)
7. Mormon Mountains (FY 86)
8. Meadow Valley Mountains (FY 87)
9. Miller Flat (FY 82)
10. Blue Nose Peak
11. Clover Mountain
12. Applewhite

Determine, through a range monitoring system and the CRMP process, desirable numbers in each area. Develop herd management area plans for each area in the fiscal year shown (contingent upon availability of personnel and funds). Where it becomes necessary to take immediate action to effectively implement management, appropriate survey, utilization, actual use, etc., data can be obtained to initiate a beginning point in the number of animals on the public lands. Through the CRMP process, develop by FY 1982 a set of criteria to be applied in establishing desirable numbers of wild horses and burros. (MFP, Wild Horse and Burro 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5)

- 2 - Beginning in FY 82, periodically remove wild horses and burros in excess of current numbers (FY 81) in the 12 herd management areas. Concurrent with the final livestock adjustments to attain balance of grazing use, manage for desirable numbers of wild horses and burros within the herd management areas, utilizing CRMP and range monitoring. Remove excess animals as necessary to reach and maintain desirable numbers. (MFP, Wild Horse and Burro 1.2)
- 3 - Manipulate vegetation in the Herd Management Areas to increase forage or forage diversity for wild horses. Prepare an Environmental Assessment and management plan to identify the specific needs of each project. (MFP, Wild Horse and Burro 1.6)
 - For additional decisions relating to wild horses and burros, refer to WILDLIFE, Decision 8.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Caliente
Activity	Wild Horse & Burro
Objective Number	WH/B-1

Objective:

Manage wild horse and burro populations in those areas (Wild Horse and Burro Areas) where they existed at the passage of the Wild and Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act (PL 92-195) on December 15, 1971.

Rationale:

Wild horses and burros can be managed only on those areas that were utilized as all or part of their habitat on December 15, 1971 (reference CFR 4730.5). Helicopter inventories were conducted in 1973, 1974, and 1975. The information obtained from these inventories was used to determine those areas that were used by wild horses or burros as all or part of their habitat as of December 15, 1971. Those areas are defined as Wild Horse or Burro Areas (reference URA Step 3 .44c(1) and URA Step 3 Overlay .44-4).

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective is consistent with law. It has a high social and economic impact on the Lincoln County residents. The direction of the impact depends on the individual, his position, or how he is affected. The objective would have a positive benefit to the environment. Two problems arise: manpower and funding, are not sufficient to properly manage the wild horses and burros. Coordinate with the BLM's Nevada State office, the Nevada Department of Fish and Game, and the Lincoln County Commissioners will be required.

Multiple Use Objective

Modify the recommendation as follows:

Manage the wild horse and burro population in those areas where they existed at the passage of the Wild and Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act, (PL 92-195) on December 15, 1971; assure their use is compatible with forage, water productions and other land uses.

Support Needs: As identified for each MFP 2 recommendation.

Reason

Proper management of the land involves an interplay of many uses. All must be compatible with the area's existing environment.

Alternatives considered:
None.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #1

Herd Management Area #1 is located in the northeastern portion of the planning unit. It borders the Ely BLM District on the north and the Cedar City, Utah, BLM District to the east. The following Wild Horse and Burro recommendations apply to this area:

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.4 --Cooperate with Ely District in the development of a HMP.
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 163 head and utilize 1,955 AUMs of forage).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Condor Canyon	33(1)	130	532	658
Deer Lodge	--	28	168	196
Mahogany Peak	--	103	368	475
McGuffy	--	83	166	249
N-4 Admin. Area	--	32	?(2)	32+
Rabbit Spring(3)	--	20	0	30
	<u>33</u>	<u>396</u>	<u>1234+</u>	<u>1630+</u>

- (1) Total for all allotments.
- (2) Licensed by Ely District as part of a larger unit.
- (3) North of Highway 25.

- Wild Horse 1.6 --Manipulate 83,200 acres through chemical and mechanical treatment.
- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following recommendations conflict with this Herd Management Area and are listed by allotment.

Condor Canyon

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 1,636 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit.

Condor Canyon (continued)

- Recreation 1.7 --Protect the high-quality geological sight-seeing values in Gleason Canyon.
- Recreation 2.4e, g --Develop Recreation Management Plans for camping and picnicking in the Gleason Canyon and Panaca Charcoal Kilns areas.
- Recreation 9.1h --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II management level to the Gleason Canyon high quality scenic areas.
- Wildlife 3.2i --Improve mule deer habitat through burning and chaining and seeding in Gleason Canyon.
- Wildlife 4.25 --Eliminate livestock grazing March 1 - June 30 on deer winter range (growing season of plants).
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 234 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Deer Lodge

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 319 AUMs; 0 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --See above.
- Wildlife 4.25 --See above.
- Wildlife 3.2i --See above.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 28 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Mahogany Peak

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 1,311 AUMs; 0 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --See Condor Canyon.
- Recreation 2.4g --See Condor Canyon.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 258 AUMs of forage for deer use.

McGuffy Spring

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 325 AUMs; 0 with water development.
- Recreation 2.4e, g --See Condor Canyon.
- Recreation 1.7 --See Condor Canyon.

McGuffy Spring (continued)

- Range 4.1 --See Condor Canyon.
- Recreation 3.3e --Designate the Terry Bench area as ORV open area.
- Recreation 7.3 and 8.1 --Evaluate the Panaca Charcoal Kilns for entry into the National Historic landmarks.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 23 AUMs of suitable forage for deer use.

N-4 Administrative

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 0; 396 AUMs with water development.
- Wildlife 4.25 --See Condor Canyon.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 10 AUMs of forage for deer use.
- Recreation 9.1i --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II management level on Echo Canyon State Park.
- Recreation 2.3a and Lands 5.1 --Approve lease to the Nevada State Division of Parks and Recreation under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

Rabbit Spring (Small portion of allotment) No conflicts in this area.

Total forage available in this HMA is 1,955; 2,032 with water development.

Most of the above recommendations deal with protection of sight-seeing areas, VRM class levels, or campgrounds. Establishing a herd area would have only minor effects on each if an HMP were prepared. Vegetative manipulation projects would require site-by-site analysis. A review of URA II Soils information indicates restrictions (slope, pH, erosion, etc.) do exist on many of the vegetative manipulation area projects proposed. Some modification will be necessary. Direct conflicts with the livestock program do occur in the areas of season-of-use (RM 1.2), AMP development (RM 1.4), and the removal of livestock from deer crucial areas (WL 4.25). Additional conflicts exist with the development of water sources proposed by the wildlife program.

Other problems do exist with the horses in this area. The Unit Resource Analysis identifies their use occurs primarily during the winter-spring and then they move into the Cedar City and Ely BLM Districts during the remainder of the year. The Herd Management Area currently contains unfenced chained areas, private property (developments, forage, and base property), and deer crucial habitat which are continually grazed or damaged by wild horse use.

The designation and establishment of a horse herd area would have high negative social and economic impacts. The majority of the people in Lincoln County like to see wild horses, but when their presence reduces

the forage available to livestock (less numbers), income in the county, and reduces the tax base, the residents are opposed to this action. The herd area would have a long-term effect on individuals and the county which is already designated as an economically deprived county. Further economic loss would not be accepted.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

The approximately 33 head in Herd Management Area #1 should be removed as soon as possible, and no Herd Management Plan should be prepared. Coordination with both the Cedar City and Ely BLM districts is required.

Reason:

This recommendation is made based on conflicts with private property owners over damage to forage (base property for privileges), fences, and other range improvement; damage to seedings; and conflicts on deer crucial habitat.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; Las Vegas District--all activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; Nevada Department of Fish and Game; livestock operators; Lincoln County residents; and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:

1. Maintain all horses.
2. Remove all horses immediately.
3. Confine all horses to one small area.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #2

This Herd Management Area is located in the northeastern portion of the resource area. It borders the Ely BLM District on the north. The following Wild Horse and Burro recommendations apply:

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.4 --Cooperate with the Ely District in the development of the HMP.
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 2,492 head and utilize 2,442 AUMs of forage).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Bennett Springs		121	326	443
Black Canyon		24	68	90
Ely Springs Sheep		53	0	57
Highland Peak		94	2307	2401
Klondike		17	227	244
Pioche		27	160(1)	187
	28(2)	336	4088	4424

- (1) One year use - new operator
- (2) Total for all allotments

- Wild Horse 1.6 --Manipulate 106,200 acres through chemical and mechanical treatment.
- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following recommendations apply to this herd area and are listed by allotments:

Bennett Springs

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 1,436 AUMs; 2,433 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 262 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Black Canyon

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 704 AUMs; 0 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --Same as above.
- Recreation 3.3a --Designate Delamar Valley as an ORV open area.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 37 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Ely Spring (Sheep)

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 1,020 AUMs; 116 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --See Bennett Springs.
- Recreation 3.3a --See Black Canyon.
- Recreation 1.1 --Protect approximately 480 acres of land in the Highland Peak area as a research natural area.
- Recreation 9.1g --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II management level to the Highland Peak area to protect high scenic qualities.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 6 AUMs forage for deer use.

Highland Peak

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 1,028 AUMs; 1,343 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --See Bennett Springs.
- Recreation 1.1 --See Ely Spring (Sheep).
- Recreation 9.1g --See Ely Spring (Sheep) - also includes Cathedral Gorge State Park.
- Recreation 2.3d and Lands 5.1 --Approve leases to the Nevada State Division of Recreation under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.
- Lands 1.1 --Limit the transfer of public land for agricultural development to 1,200 acres in Delamar Valley.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 7 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Klondike

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 0 AUMs; 416 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --See Bennett Springs.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 12 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Pioche

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 354 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --See Bennett Springs.
- Recreation 9.1g --See Ely Spring (Sheep).

Total forage available in this herd area is 4,188; 4,308 with water development.

Most of the above recommendations deal with protection of sight-seeing areas, VRM class levels, open ORV use, or the land transfer. Only minor effects would occur by establishing a horse herd area, if a Herd Management Plan was prepared. Vegetative manipulation projects would require site-by-site analysis. A review of URA II Soils information indicates restrictions (slope, pH, erosion, etc.) do exist on many of the vegetative manipulation projects proposed in this area. Some modification will be necessary. Direct conflicts with the livestock program do occur in the areas of season-of-use (RM 1.2) and development of AMPs (RM 1.4). Additional conflicts exist with the development of water sources proposed by the wildlife program.

The present demand for forage (4,424 AUMs) is greater than the suitable forage available (4,188 AUMs), although another 4,308 AUMs are available if water is developed.

The designation and establishment of a horse herd area will have high negative social and economic impacts. The majority of people in Lincoln County like to see wild horses, but, when their presence reduces the forage available to livestock (less numbers), reduces the money available in the county, and reduces the tax base, they are opposed to this establishment. This would be a long-term effect on individuals and the county which is already designated as an economically deprived county. Further economic loss would not be accepted.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

The Highland Peak area should be designated and established as a Wild Horse Area. A management plan should be prepared that considers all the above conflicts and manages for a maximum of 40 wild horses. Forage in the amount of 480 AUMs should be allotted. The remaining AUMs should be allocated to

livestock and wildlife. These 480 AUMs should be distributed between allotments in approximately the same proportions as their present wild horse use occurs. Coordination with the Ely BLM District will be required.

The following distribution of AUMs should occur:

Allotment	Percent Use	Forage(1) Allocation	Number of Animals	Percent Adjustment
Bennett Spring	35	170	14	
Black Canyon	7	35	3	
Ely Spring (Sheep)	16	76	6	
Highland Peak	28	135	11	
Klondike	5	25	2	
Pioche	8	39	3	
	<u>99</u>	<u>480</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>+47(2)</u>

(1) Cow AUMs

(2) Percent change from present wild horse numbers.

Reason:

The Highland Peak area has forage; water; summer and winter range; accessibility to the public, and wild horses are usually available to see. It is thought that no significant effects on present users would occur. A management plan can be prepared that would be beneficial to the environment and present uses.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; Las Vegas District--all activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; Nevada Department of Fish and Game; livestock operators; Lincoln County residents; wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:

1. Remove all horses.
2. Confine all horses to one small area.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #3

This Herd Area Management Area is located in the north central portion of the resource area. It borders the Ely BLM District on the north and west sides. The following wild horse and burro recommendations apply to this area:

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.4 --Cooperate with the Ely BLM District in the develop-
ment of the HMP.
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approx-
imately 279 head, utilize 3,351 AUMs).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand (3 yr. Average)	Present Livestock AUMs Demand Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
	Number of Head	AUMs Required		
Oak Springs	9	108	1800*	1908
Rattlesnake	<u>31</u>	<u>372</u>	<u>567</u>	<u>939</u>
	40	480	2367	2847

*Estimate for pasture one of AMP.

- Wild Horse 1.6 --Manipulate 23,000 acres through chemical and mechanical
treatment.
- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to
wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following recommendations apply to this herd area and are listed by allotments.

Oak Spring (north pasture of AMP)

- Range 1.2 --Unknown numbers.
- Recreation 4.1 --Manage the Caliente Planning Unit on an interim
management basis that will allow any wilderness
characteristics to stay in their natural state
until studies are completed.
- Range 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit.

Oak Spring (continued)

Wildlife 3.2 --Recommend vegetative manipulation.
Range 2.2

Recreation 3.3a --Designate Delamar Valley as an ORV open area.

Rattlesnake

Range 1.2 --Available forage is 1,081 AUMs; 91 with water development.

Recreation 3.3a --Same as above.

Recreation 4.1 --Same as above.

Wildlife 2.2 --Reintroduce pronghorn antelope into Dry Lake Valley.

Wildlife 2.3 --Expand Gambel's Quail and chukar use to include the
Pahroc Range by introducing supplemental waters.

Most of the above recommendations deal with protection of sight-seeing areas, VRM class levels, or campgrounds. Only minor effects would occur by establishing a horse herd area, if a Herd Management Plan were prepared. Vegetative manipulation projects would require site-by-site analysis. A review of URA II Soils information indicates restrictions (slope, pH, erosion, etc.) do exist on many of the vegetative manipulation proposed in this area. Some modifications will be necessary. Direct conflicts with the livestock program do occur in the areas of season-of-use (RM 1.2) and development of AMPs (RM 1.4). Additional conflicts exist with the development of water sources (base waters) proposed by the wildlife program. The present demand for forage is greater than the suitable forage available.

The designation and establishment of a horse herd area will have high negative social and economic impacts. The majority of the people in Lincoln County like to see wild horses, but when their presence reduces the forage available to livestock (less numbers), the money available to the county, the tax base, and challenges deeded water rights, the citizens are opposed to this establishment. This would have a long-term effect on individuals and the county which is already designated as an economically deprived county. Further economic loss would not be accepted.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Designate and establish this location as the Rattlesnake Spring Wild Horse Area. Prepare a Herd Management Plan on the area that considers the above identified conflicts. Maintain a maximum of 40 wild horses and allocate 480 AUMs of forage. Coordination with Ely District BLM would be required. The following allocation should occur:

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Forage Allocation</u>	<u>Number of Animals</u>	<u>Percent Adjustment</u>
Oak Springs (North Pasture)	240	20	
Rattlesnake	240	20	$\frac{-10}{0(1)}$

(1) Percent change from present wild horse numbers.

Reason:

Yearlong horse use occurs around Rattlesnake and adjoining springs. Conflicts with livestock for forage and water do occur. Maintaining 40 horses in the area would not damage the resources or drastically affect the two livestock operators if a herd management plan is prepared. Each allotment is identified for an Allotment Management Plan which could complement each other. The outer boundary is fenced, except for the rough topography along the District line. The area has good access and horses can be seen year-round. It also contains summer and winter range.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; Las Vegas District--all activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; Nevada Department of Fish and Game; livestock operators; Lincoln County residents; wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:

1. Increase horses.
2. Remove all horses immediately.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #4

Herd Management Area #4 is located in the north central portion of the planning unit. The following wild horse recommendations were made for this area:

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 235 head, utilize 2,825 AUMs of forage).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Buckboard (2)	119(2)	243	264	507
Clover Creek (1)	177(1)	97	0	97
Cove (2)(4)		114	16(5)	130
Little Mountain (2)(3)		428	0	428
Oak Wells (1)		473	510	983
Panaca Cattle (2)		371	132	503
Peck (2)(4)		171	268(5)	439
Rabbit Spring (1)		251	0	251
Roadside (2)		29	0	29
Sheep Flat (1)		70	100 (estimate)	170
Sheep Spring (1)		1,233	0	501
Uvada		0	355	1287
White Hills (2)		72	48	120
	296	3552	1693	5445

- (1) Wild horse use of allotments combined to make 116 head.
- (2) Wild horse use of allotments combined to make 119 head.
- (3) Privileges acquired by the National Mustang Association and retired from livestock use for wild horse benefit.
- (4) Primary livestock operator has requested this allotment be changed to wild horse use.

- Wild Horse 1.6 --Manipulate 116,100 acres through chemical and mechanical treatment.
- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following recommendations apply to this herd area and are listed by allotments.

Buckboard Spring

Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 407 with water development.

Range 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit.

✓ Wildlife 4.25 --Eliminate livestock grazing on deer crucial areas during growing season of plants (March 1 - June 30).

Wildlife 3.2 and Range 2.1 --Recommend vegetative manipulation.

Recreation 4.1 --Manage the Caliente Planning Unit on an interim management basis that will allow any wilderness characteristics to stay in their natural state until studies are completed.

Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 37 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Clover Creek (northern segment)

Range 4.1 --See above.

✓ Recreation 1.10b --Protect the fishing resource in Clover Creek through stipulation.

Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 66 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Cove

Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUM; 214 with water development.

Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.

Little Mountain

Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 671 with water development.

Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.

Wildlife 4.25 --See Buckboard.

Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 33 AUMs of forage deer use.

Recreation 1.10b --See Clover Creek.

Oak Wells

- Range 1.2 --Available 518 AUMs; 24 with water development.
Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.
Wildlife 2.5 --See Buckboard.
Wildlife 3.2 --See Buckboard.
Wildlife 4.25 --See Buckboard.

Panaca Cattle

- Range 1.2 --Available 0 AUMs; 596 with water development.
Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.
Recreation 9.1e --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II management level to the Big Hogback high quality scenic area.
Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 7 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Peck

- Range 1.2 --Available 0 AUMs; 190 with water development.
Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.

Rabbit Spring

- Range 1.2 --Available 532 AUMs; 188 with water development.
Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.
Wildlife 4.25 --See Buckboard.
Recreation 9.1e --See Panaca Cattle.

Roadside

- Range 1.2 --Available 0 AUMs; 48 with water development.
Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.

Sheep Flat (northeast portion)

- Range 1.2 --Small area of rough topography - no AUMs
Range 4.1 --See Clover Creek

Sheep Flat (continued)

- Recreation 1.10b --See Clover Creek.
Recreation 4.1 --See Clover Creek
✓ Wildlife 2.7 --Improve and maintain the aquatic habitat in Clover Creek. Eliminate livestock use.

Sheep Spring

- Range 1.2 --Available 1,707 AUMs; 108 with water development.
Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.
Wildlife 4.25 --See Buckboard.
Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 156 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Uvada

- Range 1.2 --Available 554 AUMs; 0 with water development.
Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 33 AUMs suitable forage for deer use.

White Hills

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 105 with water development.
Range 4.1 --See Buckboard.
Recreation 9.1e --See Panaca Cattle.

Total forage available 3,681 AUMs; 2,551 with water development.

Most of the above recommendations deal with protection of sight-seeing areas, VRM class levels, or campgrounds. Establishing a horse herd area would have only minor effects on each, if a Herd Management Plan was prepared. Vegetative manipulation projects would require site-by-site analysis. A review of URA II Soils information indicates restrictions (slope, pH, erosion, etc.) do exist on many of the vegetative manipulation projects areas proposed. Some modification will be necessary. Direct conflicts with the livestock program, season-of-use (RM 1.2), development of AMPs (RM 1.4), and the removal of livestock from deer crucial areas (WL 4.25) and Clover Creek (WL 2.7) do occur. Additional conflicts exist with the development of water sources proposed by the wildlife program. The present demand for forage (5,445 AUMs) is greater than the suitable forage available (3,581 AUMs). Another 2,551 AUMs are available if water is developed.

The designation and establishment of a horse herd area will have high negative social and economic impacts. The majority of the people in Lincoln County like to see wild horses, but when their presence reduces the forage available to livestock (less numbers), the money available to the county, the tax base, and challenges deeded water rights, the citizens are opposed to this establishment. This would have a long-term effect on individuals and the county which is already designated as an economically deprived county. Further economic loss would not be accepted.

The National Mustang Association in 1976 purchased the grazing privileges on the Little Mountain Allotment and two others (outside this herd area). The BLM was requested to retire the grazing privileges from livestock grazing. The primary livestock operator in the Peck and Cove allotments has requested that his AUMs be used for wild horse purposes. These actions should help to alleviate economic affects of establishing horse herds.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Modify the Herd Management Area as follows:

Divide the proposed herd area into two units. Designate and establish each unit as a Wild Horse Management Area. Prepare a Herd Management Plan on each area. The plan should consider the above conflicts. The Little Mountain Herd should be managed for a maximum of 177 head and utilizing 1,401 AUMs of forage. The Miller Flat Herd should be managed for a maximum of 100 head and utilizing 1,200 AUMs of forage. The following allocation and combination is recommended.

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Forage Allocation</u>	<u>Number of Animals</u>	<u>Percent Adjustment</u>
<u>A. Little Mtn. Herd</u>			
Buckboard	120	10	
Cove	214	18	
Clover Creek (1)	24	2	
Little Mountain	638	53	
Panaca Cattle	120	10	
Peck	190	16	
	<u>1,306</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>-1</u>
<u>B. Miller Flat Herd</u>			
Oak Wells	240	20	
Sheep Spring	720	60	
Rabbit Spring	240	20	
	<u>1,200</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>-39</u>
		<u>Total for Both Areas</u>	<u>-27(1)</u>

(1) Percent change from present wild horse numbers

Reason:

Allotment boundary fences exist that divide this larger area into an east and west segments. As Allotment Management Plans are implemented for livestock program, the fences will be improved, thus becoming a greater barrier to the horses. Each area has year around range, forage, and water. It is thought that no significant effects will occur to the livestock operators with this allocation.

The Little Mountain Area has no water developments recorded with the Las Vegas BLM office. Because grazing use is occurring, some water sources must exist in the area. An inventory of these water sources should be conducted as early as possible. The National Mustang Association has expressed an interest in working with the Bureau under a cooperative agreement to help in the management of this area. The management plan and cooperative agreement should be prepared as soon as possible. This area would have 117 horses on 65,009 acres (1 horse every 556 acres).

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; Las Vegas District--all activities; Lincoln County Commissioners, Nevada Department of Fish and Game; livestock operators; and Lincoln County residents.

Alternatives considered:

1. Remove all horses.
2. Establish herd in another location.
3. Keep all horses.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #5

This Herd Management Area is located in the east central portion of the resource area. The following wild horse recommendations apply to this area:

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 228 head, utilize 2,735 AUMs of forage).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Applewhite (1)	232	0	447	447
Clover Creek (1)		223	0	223
Cottonwood (1)		807	648	1455
Garden Spring (2)	25	114	2041	2144
Henrie (2)		138	1200	1238
Morrison-Wengert (2)		3	1754	1757
Mustang Flat (1)		84	0	84
Oak Spring (1)		28	0	28
Pennsylvania (1)		557	469	1026
Sawmill (1)		111	0	111
Sheep Flat (1)		974	1968	2942
White Rock (2)		45	1329	1374
	<u>257</u>	<u>3084</u>	<u>9856</u>	<u>12,840</u>

(1) Wild horse use of allotments combined to make 232 head.

(2) Wild horse use of allotments combined to make 25 head.

- Wild Horse 1.6 --Manipulate 74,900 acres through chemical and mechanical treatment.
- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following conflicts are identified for each activity by allotments in the herd area.

Applewhite (eastern segment)

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 2 available through water developments.

Applewhite (continued)

- Range 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit.
- Wildlife 3.2 and
Range 2.1 --Recommend vegetative manipulation.
- Recreation 1.7 --Protect the high quality geological sight-seeing values of Pennsylvania Canyon.
- Recreation 4.1 --Manage the Caliente Planning Unit on an interim management basis that will allow any wilderness characteristics to stay in their natural state until studies are completed.

Clover Creek

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 368 AUMs; 0 water development.
- Range 2.1 --Same as above.
- Wildlife 3.2 --Same as above.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 66 AUMs of forage for deer use.
- Recreation 1.7 --Same as above.
- Recreation 1.10b --Protect the fishing resource in Clover Creek through stipulation.
- Recreation 9.2c, e --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II management level to Rainbow Canyon, Pine Cabin campground, and Ella Mountain.

Cottonwood

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 101 AUMs; 340 with water development.
- Range 4.1 --Same as Applewhite Allotment.
- Recreation 1.10b --Same as Clover Creek Allotment
- Wildlife 3.2,
Range 2.1 --Same as Applewhite Allotment.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 75 AUMs of forage for deer use.
- Recreation 9.1e --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II management level to Clover Creek.
- Recreation 2.4b, c, f --Develop Recreation Management Plans on Cabin Pines campground, Clover Creek, and Ella Mountain Summit.

Carden Springs

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 2,119 AUMs; 31 with water development.
- Recreation 4.1 --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 3.2 --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 248 AUMs of forage for deer use.
- Range 2.1 --See Applewhite.

Henrie (3 herd areas)

- Range 1.2 --Available 0 AUMs; 3,127 with water development.
- Recreation 4.1 --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 4.2 --Restrict road or trail construction into bighorn sheep ranges.
- Wildlife 4.3 --Fences will not be constructed within the limits of a bighorn sheep.
- Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 12 AUMs of forage for deer use and 236 for bighorn sheep.

Morrison-Wengert (3 herd areas)

- Range 1.2 --Available 343 AUMs; 700 with water development.
- Recreation 4.1, and Range 4.1 --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 3.2 --See Applewhite.
- Range 2.1 --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 4.2 and 4.3 --See Henrie.
- Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 115 AUMs of forage for deer use and 113 for bighorn sheep.
- Wildlife 4.13 --Terminate wild horse and livestock on bighorn sheep areas in the Morman Mountains and East Morman Mountains.

Mustang Flat

- Range 1.2 --Available 0 AUMs; 90 with water development.
- Recreation 9.2c --See Clover Creek Allotment.

Mustang Flat (continued)

- Range 4.1 --See Applewhite Allotment.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 8 AUMs of forage for deer use.
- Oak Spring (eastern segment) (2 herd areas).
- Range 1.2 --Small area - no AUMs.
- Recreation 9.2c --See above Clover Creek.
- Range 4.1 --See Applewhite.
- Recreation 2.3b --Approve the Recreation and Public Purpose lease for expansion of Kershaw-Ryan State Park.

Pennsylvania

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 109 AUMs; 47 with water development.
- Range 4.1, --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 3.2 --See Applewhite.
- Range 1.2 --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 4.25 --Remove livestock grazing on deer crucial areas during the growing season of the plants.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 25 AUMs of forage for deer use.
- Recreation 2.4f --Develop Recreation Management Plan on Ella Mountain Summit.

Sawmill

- Range 1.2 --Available 97 AUMs; 0 with water development;
- Recreation 2.3b --Same as Oak Spring.
(Lands 5.1)
- Range 4.1 --Same as Applewhite.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 7 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Sheep Flat

- Range 1.2 --Available 521 AUMs; 0 with water development.
- Recreation 4.1 --See Applewhite.

Sheep Flat (continued)

- Recreation 1.10b --See Clover Creek.
- Wildlife 3.2c, e, g and Range 2.1 --See Applewhite
- Minerals 2.3 --Recognize the potential value of, encourage the prospecting for, and the development of aluminum bearing rocks.
- Recreation 1.4 --Protect approximately 25 acres in the Quaking Aspen Spring area (T.7S., R.69E., Sec. 2) through designation as a natural environmental area.
- Recreation 2.4c --Develop Recreation Management Plan on Clover Creek.
- Wildlife 2.7 --Improve and maintain the aquatic habitat in Clover Creek--eliminate livestock use.
- Recreation 9.2c --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II level to Rainbow Canyon.
- Wildlife 3.10 --Fence Quaking Aspen Spring from livestock use.

White Rock (north half)

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 362 AUMs*; 543* with water development. (* Only 1/2 of allotment total.)
- Recreation 3.3 --See Garden Spring.
- Wildlife 4.2 and 4.3 --See Henrie.

Total forage available 4,020 AUMs; 4,878 with water development.

Most of the above recommendations deal with protection of sight-seeing areas, VRM class levels, or campgrounds. Establishing a horse herd area would have only minor effects on each, if a Herd Management Plan was prepared. Vegetative manipulation projects would require site-by-site analysis. A review of URA II Soils information indicates restrictions (slope, pH, erosion, etc.) do exist on many of the vegetative manipulation projects areas proposed. Some modification will be necessary. The restriction of no road, trail, or fence construction in bighorn sheep areas will have little effect on this herd area. The locations involved are at the very south end of the area. Little wild horse use occurs here. Direct conflicts with the livestock program, season-of-use (RM 1.2), development of AMPs (RM 1.4), and the removal of livestock from deer crucial areas (WL 4.25) and Clover Creek (WL 2.7) do occur. Additional conflicts exist with the development of water sources proposed by the wildlife program. The present demand for forage (12,840 AUMs) is greater than the suitable forage available (4,020 AUMs). Another 4,878 AUMs are available if water is developed.

The designation and establishment of a horse herd area will have high negative social and economic impacts. The majority of the people in Lincoln County like to see wild horses, but when their presence reduces the forage available to livestock (less numbers), the money available to the county, the tax base, and challenges deeded water rights, the citizens are opposed to this establishment. This would have a long-term effect on individuals and the county which is already designated as an economically deprived county. Further economic loss would not be accepted.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the herd area as follows:

Designate and establish a Herd Management Area in the Mustant Flat area consisting of the Clover Creek, Mustang Flat, and Saw Mill Canyon Allotments. Prepare a Herd Management Plan on the area. An inventory of water sources should be conducted as soon as possible. The maximum number of animals should be consistent with forage and water available. At present only 30 wild horses could be maintained. The following allocation is recommended. The horses in the other allotments should be removed.

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Forage Allocation</u>	<u>Number of Animals</u>	<u>Percent Adjustment</u>
Clover Creek	278	23	
Mustang Flat	82	7	
Saw Mill	90	8	
	<u>450</u>	<u>38(2)</u>	-89(1)

- (1) Percentage within these allotments.
 (2) Maximum number determined by water and forage.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; all Las Vegas BLM activites; Lincoln County Commissioners and livestock operators.

Alternatives considered:

1. Remove all livestock.
2. Establish herd in another location.
3. Establish herd on only part of area recommended.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #6

This Herd Management Area is located in the central portion of the resource area. The following Wild Horse and Burro recommendations apply to this area.

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 664 head, utilize 7,967 AUMs of forage).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate(5) (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Applewhite	17	204	447	651
Delamar (1)	220	924	4759 (2)	5683
Elgin (1)(4)		264	1612	1876
Oak Spring (1)(4)		1452	7257(3)	8709
	<u>237</u>	<u>2844</u>	<u>14,075</u>	<u>16,919</u>

- (1) Wild horse use of allotments combined to make 220 head.
- (2) Average licensed use minus Jump-Up area.
- (3) Minus estimated AUMs for pasture 1 of AMP.
- (4) Parts of allotment included in other herd area.
- (5) Total of entire allotment.

- Wild Horse 1.6 --Manipulate 38,400 acres through chemical and mechanical treatment.
- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following conflicts are identified for each activity by allotments in the herd area.

Applewhite (eastern segment)

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 2 available through water developments.
- Range 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit.
- Wildlife 3.2 and Range 2.1 --Recommend vegetative manipulation.
- Recreation 1.7 --Protect the high quality geological sight-seeing values of Pennsylvania Canyon.

Applewhite (continued)

Recreation 4.1 --Manage the Caliente Planning Unit on an interim management basis that will allow any wilderness characteristics to stay in their natural state until studies are completed.

Delamar

Range 1.2 --Available forage 5,735 AUMs; 413 water development.

Recreation 3.3 --Designate Kane Springs Valley as an ORV open area.

Recreation 4.1 --See Above.

Range 4.1, 2.1 --See above.

Wildlife 3.2 --See Above.

Wildlife 2.1 --Reestablish Desert bighorn sheep by introduction on the Delamar Mountains.

Wildlife 2.3 --Expand quail and chukar use in the Delamar Mountains by introduction and supplemental water development.

Wildlife 4.2b --Restrict new road or trail construction on existing bighorn sheep ranges--Delamar.

Wildlife 4.3 --Fences will not be constructed within the limits of bighorn sheep distribution areas or in migration routes.

Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 245 AUMs of forage for deer use and 10 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

Wildlife 4.13 --Terminate wild horse and livestock use on the southern Delamar Mountains.

Elgin

Range 1.2 --Available forage 883 AUMs; 518 with water development.

Range 4.1, Recreation 4.1 --See Applewhite.

Recreation 3.3 --See Delamar.

Recreation 1.7 --See Applewhite.

Wildlife 2.1 --See Delamar.

Wildlife 4.2 and 4.3 --See Delamar.

Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 14 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Oak Springs

- Range 1.2 --Available forage is 10,479 AUMs; 91 AUMs with water development.
- Wildlife 3.2,
Range 2.1 --See Applewhite
- Wildlife 4.2 --Restricted.
- Wildlife 2.1 --See Delamar.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 162 AUMs of forage for deer use.
- Recreation 4.1 --See Applewhite.
- Recreation 3.3a --Designate Delamar Valley as an ORV open area.
- Recreation 9.1b --Provide Visual Resource Management Class II management level.
- Recreation 1.2 --Protect the scenic quality of the Delamar Joshua Tree Forest.
- Recreation 2.3b,
Lands 5.1 --Approve leases to Nevada State Division of Parks and Recreation under the Ripp Act (Kershaw-Ryan State Park).
- Lands 1.1 --Limit the transfer of public land for agricultural development to 1,200 acres in Delamar Valley.

Total forage in unit: available 17,087 AUMs; 1,024 with water development.

Most of the above recommendations deal with protection of sight-seeing areas, VRM class levels, transfer of land, or off-road vehicle racing. Only minor effects would occur with the establishment of a horse herd area, if the Herd Management Plan were properly prepared. Vegetative manipulation projects would require site-by-site analysis. A review of URA II Soils information indicates restrictions (slope, pH, erosion, etc.) do exist on many of the vegetative manipulation projects proposed in the area. Some modification will be necessary.

The restriction of no road, trail, or fence construction in bighorn sheep areas will effect this herd area as range improvements are proposed. Direct conflicts with the livestock program do occur in the areas of season-of-use (RM 1.2) and development of AMPs (RM 1.4). Additional conflicts exist with the development of water sources proposed by the wildlife program. The present demand for forage (16,919 AUMs) is greater than the suitable forage available (17,087 AUMs), although another 1,024 AUMs are available if water is developed.

The designation and establishment of a horse herd area will have high negative social and economic impacts. The majority of the people in Lincoln County like to see wild horses, but when their presence reduces the forage available to livestock (less numbers), the money available to the county, the tax base, and challenges deeded water rights, the citizens are opposed to this establishment. This would have a long-term effect on individuals and the county which is already designated as an economically deprived county. Further economic loss would not be accepted.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

The Delamar Mountains should be designated and established as a Wild Horse Area. A management plan should be prepared that considers all the above conflicts and manages for a maximum of 170 horses and utilizes 2,040 AUMs of forage. The following allocation should be made:

Allotment	Forage Allocation	Number of Animals	Percent Adjustment
Delamar	684	57	
Elgin	144	12	
Oak Spring	<u>1,212</u>	<u>101</u>	
	2,040	170	-28

Conflicts for forage in the Riggs Spring area do occur. It is also recommended that at least 57 head of horses be removed from the general location.

Reason:

The Delamar Mountains have forage, water, cover, and good access to the public. It is thought that no significant effects on present users would occur. A management plan can be prepared that would resolve most conflicts identified. The Riggs Spring area is over-populated at this time and a reduction of approximately 57 head is needed. Because of the lack of forage in the Applewhite Allotment it is not recommended to be included in the area. The 17 animals here should also be removed. The area allows for one horse every 1,095 acres.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; all Las Vegas BLM activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; livestock operators; and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:

1. Accept the recommendation.
2. Reduce the horse numbers.
3. Increase the horse numbers.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #7

See revised HMA #7

Herd Management Area #7 is located in the south central portion of the planning unit. This area and Area 8 have the lowest elevations, highest temperatures, least numbers of permanent water sources, and the vegetation production is tied extremely close to climatic condition. It is very marginal habitat. The following Wild Horse and Burro recommendations apply to this area.

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 161 head, utilize 1,932 AUMs of forage) in the following way:

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Breedlove(2)		112	648	760
Henrie(2)		190	1200	1390
Morman Peak		380	476	857
Morrison-Wengert(2)		0	1754	1754
Rox(2)		86	681	767
White Rock(2)		95	1329	1424
	<u>72 (1)</u>	<u>864</u>	<u>6088</u>	<u>6952</u>

- (1) 72 animals: consists of 57 horses, 4 burros, and 11 mules.
- (2) Included in other herd areas.

- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following conflicts are identified for each activity by allotments in the herd area.

Breedlove Allotment (eastern 1/3 of allotment)

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 60 with water development (total).
- Wildlife 4.2 --Restrict new roads and trails--potentially conflicts with development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.3 --Limit construction of new fence in bighorn sheep migration areas--could conflict with development of Herd Management Plans.

Breedlove Allotment (continued)

See revised section that follows

- Range Management 1.5 --Classify the Breedlove Allotment as ephemeral/perennial range--shows that perennial forage (year-round) is not available on allotment.
- Range Management 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit--conflicts with designation (WH 1.1) and development of Herd Management Plans (WH 1.3).
- Recreation 4.1 --Wilderness values (as per pending regulations) will be determined before development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 20 AUMs of forage for deer use and 20 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

Henrie Allotment (southeast corner)

- Range Management 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 1,000 AUMs with water development (approximately 1/3 of AUMs).

Same conflicts were identified as for Breedlove Allotment. In addition:

- Wildlife 4.13 --Remove all horses and cattle from bighorn sheep ranges.
- Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 20 AUMs of forage for deer use and 20 AUMs for bighorn sheep use.

Morman Peak

- Range Management 1.2 --Available forage 985 AUMs, 870 AUMs with water development.

Same conflicts identified as for Breedlove Allotment. In addition:

- Forestry 3.1 --Recommended protection of Ponderosa Pine population in Mormon Mountains.
- Wildlife 4.13 --Remove all horses and cattle from bighorn sheep range.
- Recreation 1.3 --Protection of barrel cactus on East Mormon Mountains.
- Recreation 1.7, 1.9 --Withdrawal and protection of Mormon Mountain caves.
- Recreation 8.4 --Protection of Mormon Mountains cultural resource values.
- Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 325 AUMs of forage for deer use and 325 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

Morrison-Wengert Small area on southeast side

Range Management 1.2 --Available forage 100 AUMs (approximately 1/10 of forage.)

See revised section that follows

Same conflicts as identified for Henrie Allotment.

Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 115 AUMs of forage for deer use and 113 for bighorn sheep.

Rox (east 2/3 of allotment)

Range Management 1.2 --Available perennial forage 0; 0 with water development.

Two conflicts identified.

Range Management 1.5 --Classify the Rox Allotment as ephemeral range.

Range Management 4.1 --Remove all wild horses from planning unit.

White Rock (south half)

Range Management 1.2 --Available forage 362 AUMs, (1/2 of suitable forage).

Same conflicts as for Henrie, except Wildlife 4.2 does not apply to this area.

Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 17 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Total forage in unit 1,447 AUMs; 1,930 AUMs with water development.

The majority of the conflicts identified were short-term conflicts which will have to be resolved. The forage conflicts (RM 1.2, WH 1.5) are incompatible. Wildlife recommendation (4.13)--remove all horses from bighorn sheep areas--is incompatible with the designation of a Wild Horse area. The season-of-use recommendation (RM 1.1) is incompatible with the year-round use which is currently taking place by wild horses.

The social and economic impacts of designating HMA-7 a Wild Horse Management Area would be high. Forage would have to be allocated leaving less for the livestock operators.

Environmental impacts could also be severe to certain elements. Water is critically short in this area. Year-round grazing of very little perennial forage could seriously harm forage production. Conflicts (food, water) with other native animals (bighorn sheep) might have adverse effects on populations.

Current BLM funding is insufficient to develop Herd Management Plans. The manpower is also not available to properly manage the horses.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

The wild horses and burros in Herd Management Area 7 should be removed as soon as possible.

Reason:

The fragile nature of this area (water, forage) precludes the development of a Herd Management Area that can operate in harmony with the variety of multiple use values present in the area and with the environment.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; all Las Vegas BLM activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; livestock operators; and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:

Remove livestock.

See revised section that follows

corrected copy
HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #7

Herd Management Area #7 is located in the south central portion of the planning unit. This area and Area #8 have the lowest elevations, highest temperatures, least numbers of permanent water sources, and the vegetation production is tied extremely close to climatic condition. It is very marginal habitat. The following Wild Horse and Burro recommendations apply to this area.

- Wild Horse 1.1 -- Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 -- Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.5 -- Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 161 head, utilize 1,932 AUMs of forage) in the following way:

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Henrie (2)		190	1200	1390
Mormon Peak		380	476	857
Morrison-Wengert (2)		0	1754	1754
White Rock (2)		95	1329	1424
	56(1)	666	4759	5425

- (1) 56 Animals: Consists of an estimated 56 horses..
- (2) Included in other herd areas.

- Wild Horse 1.7 -- Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 -- Insure water remains available to horses.

The following conflicts are identified for each activity by allotments in the herd area.

Henrie Allotment (southeast corner)

- Range Management 1.2 -- Available forage 0 AUMs; 1,000 AUMs with water development (approximately 1/3 of AUMs).
- Wildlife 4.2 -- Restrict new roads and trails - potentially conflicts with development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.3 -- Limit construction of new fence in bighorn sheep migration areas - could conflict with development of Herd Management Plans.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #7 (Continued)

- Range Management 1.5 -- Classify the Henrie Allotment as ephemeral/perennial range - shows that perennial forage (yearround) is not available on allotment.
- Range Management 4.1 -- Remove all horses from the planning unit - conflicts with designation (WH 1.1) and development of Herd Management Plans (WH 1.3).
- Recreation 4.1 -- Wilderness values (as per pending regulations) will be determined before development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.13 -- Remove all horses and cattle from bighorn sheep ranges.
- Wildlife 4.8 & 4.9 -- Reserve 20 AUMs of forage for deer use and -20 AUMs for bighorn sheep use.

Mormon Peak

- Range Management 1.5 -- Available forage 985 AUMs, 870 AUMs with water developments.
- Wildlife 4.2 -- Restrict new roads and trails - potentially conflicts with development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.3 -- Limit construction of new fence in bighorn sheep migration areas - could conflict with development of Herd Management Plans.
- Range Management 1.5 -- Classify the Mormon Peak Allotment as ephemeral/perennial range - shows that perennial forage (yearround) is not available on allotment.
- Range Management 4.1 -- Remove all horses from the planning unit - conflicts with designation (WH 1.1) and development of Herd Management Plans (WH 1.3).
- Recreation 4.1 -- Wilderness values (as per pending regulations) will be determined before development of Herd Management Plans.
- Forestry 3.1 -- Recommended protection of Ponderosa Pine population in Mormon Mountains.
- Wildlife 4.13 -- Remove all horses and cattle from bighorn sheep range.
- Recreation 1.3 -- Protection of barrel cactus on East Mormon Mountains.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #7 (Continued)

Recreation 1.7, 1.9 -- Withdrawal and protection of Mormon Mountain caves.

Recreation 8.4 -- Protection of Mormon Mountains cultural resource values.

Wildlife 4.8 & 4.9 -- Reserve 325 AUMs of forage for deer use and 325 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

Morrison-Wengert Small area on southeast side

Range Management 1.2 -- Available forage 100 AUMs (approximately 1/10 of forage).

Same conflicts as identified for Henrie Allotment.

Wildlife 4.8 & 4.9 -- Reserve 115 AUMs of forage for deer use and 113 for bighorn sheep.

White Rock (south half)

Range Management 1.2 -- Available forage 362 AUMs, (1/2 of suitable forage).

Same conflicts as for Henrie, except Wildlife 4.2 does not apply to this area.

Wildlife 4.9 -- Reserve 17 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Total forage in unit 1,447 AUMs; 1,870 AUMs with water development.

The majority of the conflicts identified were short-term conflicts which will have to be resolved. The forage conflicts (RM 1.2, WH 1.5) are incompatible. Wildlife recommendation (4.13) - remove all horses from bighorn sheep areas - is incompatible with the designation of a Wild Horse area. The season-of-use recommendation (RM 1.1) is incompatible with the yearround use which is currently taking place by wild horses.

The social and economic impacts of designating HMA-7 a Wild Horse Management Area would be high. Forage would have to be allocated leaving less for the livestock operators.

Environmental impacts could also be severe to certain elements. Water is critically short in this area. Yearround grazing of very little perennial forage could seriously harm forage production. Conflicts (flood, water) with other native animals (bighorn sheep) might have adverse effects on populations.

Current BLM funding is insufficient to develop Herd Management Plans. The manpower is also not available to properly manage the horses.

Revised 09/30/85 PCS

Multiple Use Recommendation:

The wild horses and burros in Herd Management Area #7 should be removed as soon as possible.

Reason:

The fragile nature of this area (water, forage) precludes the development of a Herd Management Area that can operate in harmony with the variety of multiple use values present in the area and with the environment.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; all Las Vegas BLM activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; livestock operators; and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives Considered:

Remove livestock.

Revised 09/30/85 PCS

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #8

See corrected section that follows

Herd Management Area #8 is located in the southwest portion of the planning unit. This area is similar to Area 7 in that it has the lowest elevations, highest temperatures, least numbers of permanent water sources, and the vegetation production is tied extremely close to climatic condition. It is very marginal habitat. Many of the horses have been claimed by one livestock operator. Past roundups have occurred to remove them.

The following Wild Horse and Burro recommendations apply to this area.

- Wild Horse 1.1 --Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 --Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.5 --Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 87 horses and 24 burros; utilize 1,039 AUMs).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate(3) (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Breedlove		325	648	973
Elgin		14	1,712	1,726
Henrie		200	1,200	1,400
Morrison-Wengert		120	1,754	1,874
Rox		28	681	709
Schlarman		21	226	247
	<u>59(1)</u>	<u>708</u>	<u>6,221</u>	<u>6,929</u>

- (1) 59 animals consists of 35 horses and 24 burros.
- (2) Total for entire allotment.

- Wild Horse 1.7 --Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 --Insure water remains available to horses.

The following conflicts are identified for each activity by allotments in the herd area.

Breedlove Allotment (eastern 1/3 of allotment)

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 60 with water development (total).
- Wildlife 4.2 --Restrict new roads and trails construction--potentially conflicts with development of Herd Management Plans.

See corrected section that follow
Breedlove Allotment (continued)

- Wildlife 4.3 --Limit construction of new fence in bighorn sheep migration areas--could conflict with development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.13 --Remove all wild horses and cattle from bighorn sheep ranges.
- Range Management 1.5 --Classify the Breedlove Allotment as ephemeral/perennial range--shows that perennial forage (year-round) is not available on allotment.
- Range Management 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit--conflicts with designation (WH 1.1) and development of Herd Management Plans (WH 1.3).
- Recreation 4.1 --Wilderness values (as per pending regulations) will be determined before development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 20 AUMs of forage for deer use and 20 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

Elgin Allotment

- Range 1.2 --Available forage 883 AUMs; 518 with water development.
- Range 4.1,
Recreation 4.1 --See Breedlove.
- Recreation 3.3 --Designate Kane Spring Valley as an ORV open area.
- Recreation 1.7 --See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 2.1 --See Delamar.
- Wildlife 4.2 and 4.3 --See Delamar.
- Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 14 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Henrie Allotment (southeast corner)

- Range Management 1.2 --Available forage 0 AUMs; 1,000 AUMs with water development (approximately 1/3 of AUMs).

Same conflicts were identified as for Breedlove Allotment. In addition:

- Wildlife 4.13 --Remove all horses and cattle from bighorn sheep ranges.
- Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 12 AUMs of forage for deer use and 236 AUMs for bighorn sheep use.

~~See Section~~ See connected section that follows

Morrison-Wengert Small area on southeast side

Range Management 1.2 --Available forage 100 AUMs (approximately 1/10 of forage).

Same conflicts as identified for Henrie Allotment.

Rox (east 2/3 of allotment)

Range Management 1.2 --Available perennial forage 0; 0 with water development.

Two conflicts identified.

Range Management 1.5 --Classify the Rox Allotment as ephemeral range.

Range Management 4.1 --Remove all wild horses from planning unit.

Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 115 AUMs of forage for deer use and 113 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

Wildlife 4.13 --Remove all wild horses and cattle from bighorn sheep ranges.

Schlarman Allotment

Range Management 1.2 --Available perennial forage is 390 AUMs; 0 AUMs with water development.

Range Management 4.1 --See Breedlove Allotment.

Range Management 1.5 --Classify the Schlarman Allotment as ephemeral/perennial.

Recreation 1.7 ---See Elgin Allotment.

Wildlife 4.2 --Restrict new road and trail construction (conflicts with development of a herd management plan).

Wildlife 4.8 and 4.9 --Reserve 14 AUMs of forage for deer use and 13 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

White Rock (south half)

Range Management 1.2 --Available forage 362 AUMs, (1/2 of suitable forage).

*Some conflicts as for Henrie, except Wildlife 4.2 does not apply to this area.

Wildlife 4.9 --Reserve 17 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Total forage in unit 883 AUMs; 1,578 AUMs with water development.

See corrected Section that follows

The majority of the conflicts identified were short-term conflicts which will have to be resolved. The forage conflicts (RM 1.2, WH 1.5) are incompatible. Wildlife recommendation (4.13)--remove all horses from bighorn sheep areas--is incompatible with the designation of a Wild Horse area. The season-of-use recommendation (RM 1.1) is incompatible with the year-round use which is currently taking place by wild horses.

The social and economic impacts of designating HMA-7 a Wild Horse Management Area would be high. Forage would have to be allocated leaving less for the livestock operators.

Environmental impacts could also be severe to certain elements. Water is critically short in this area. Year-round grazing of very little perennial forage could seriously harm forage production. Conflicts (food, water) with other native animals (bighorn sheep) might have adverse effects on populations.

Current BLM funding is insufficient to develop Herd Management Plans. The manpower is also not available to properly manage the horses.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

The wild horses and burros in Herd Management Area 7 should be removed as soon as possible.

Reason:

The fragile nature of this area (water, forage) precludes the development of a Herd Management Area that can operate in harmony with the variety of multiple use values present in the area and with the environment.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; all Las Vegas BLM activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; livestock operators; and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:

Remove livestock.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #8

Herd Management Area #8 is located in the southwest portion of the planning unit. This area is similar to Area #7 in that it has the lowest elevations, highest temperatures, least numbers of permanent water sources, and the vegetation production is tied extremely close to climatic condition. It is very marginal habitat.

The following Wild Horse and Burro recommendations apply to this area.

- Wild Horse 1.1 -- Designate and manage this herd area.
- Wild Horse 1.3 -- Develop a Herd Management Plan (HMP).
- Wild Horse 1.5 -- Establish the maximum number of animals (approximately 87 horses, utilize 1,039 AUMs).

Allotment	Present Horse Demand by Allotment		Present Livestock AUMs Demand	
	Number of Head	AUMs Required	Approximate (3) (3 yr. Average)	Total Demand (Cow AUMs)
Elgin		14	1,712	1,726
Henrie		200	1,200	1,400
Morrison-Wengert		120	1,754	1,874
Schlarman		21	226	247
	30(1)	355	4,892	5,247

- (1) 30 animals: Consists of an estimated 30 horses.
- (2) Total for entire allotment.

- Wild Horse 1.7 -- Develop water to make additional AUMs available to wild horses.
- Wild Horse 1.8 -- Insure water remains available to horses.

The following conflicts are identified for each activity by allotments in the herd area.

Elgin Allotment

- Range 1.2 -- Available forage 883 AUMs; 518 with water development.
- Range Management 4.1 -- Remove all horses from the planning unit - conflicts with designation (WH 1.1) and development of Herd Management Plans (WH 1.3).

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #8 (Continued)

- Recreation 4.1 -- Wilderness values (as per pending regulations) will be determined before development of Herd Management Plans.
- Recreation 3.3 -- Designate Kane Spring Valley as an ORV open area.
- Recreation 1.7 -- See Applewhite.
- Wildlife 2.1 -- See Delamar.
- Wildlife 4.2 & 4.3 -- See Delamar.
- Wildlife 4.9 -- Reserve 14 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Henrie Allotment (southeast corner)

- Range Management 1.2 -- Available forage 0 AUMs; 1,000 AUMs with water development (approximately 1/3 of AUMs).
- Wildlife 4.2 -- Restrict New roads and trails - potentially conflicts with development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.3 -- Limit construction of new fence in bighorn sheep migration areas - could conflict with development of Herd Management Plans.
- Range Management 1.5 -- Classify the Breedlove Allotment as ephemeral/perennial range - shows that perennial forage (year-round) is not available on allotment.
- Range Management 4.1 -- Remove all horses from the planning unit - conflicts with designation (WH 1.1) and development of Herd Management Plans (WH 1.3).
- Recreation 4.1 -- Wilderness values (as per pending regulations) will be determined before development of Herd Management Plans.
- Wildlife 4.13 -- Remove all horses and cattle from bighorn sheep ranges.
- Wildlife 4.8 & 4.9 -- Reserve 12 AUMs of forage for deer use and 236 AUMs for bighorn sheep use.

Morrison-Wengert Small area on southeast side

- Range Management 1.2 -- Available forage 100 AUMs (approximately 1/10 of forage).

Same conflicts as identified for Henrie Allotment.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #8 (Continued)

Schlarman Allotment

- Range Management 1.2 -- Available perennial forage is 390 AUMs; 0 AUMs with water development.
- Range Management 4.1 -- Remove all horses from the planning unit - conflicts with designation (WH 1.1) and development of Herd Management Plans (WH 1.3).
- Range Management 1.5 -- Classify the Schlarman Allotment as ephemeral/perennial.
- Recreation 1.7 -- See Elgin Allotment.
- Wildlife 4.2 -- Restrict new road and trail construction (conflicts with development of a Herd Management Plan).
- Wildlife 4.8 & 4.9 -- Reserve 14 AUMs of forage for deer use and 13 AUMs for bighorn sheep.

White Rock (south half)

- Range Management 1.2 -- Available forage 362 AUMs, ($\frac{1}{2}$ of suitable forage).
Same conflicts as for Henrie, except Wildlife 4.2 does not apply to this area.
- Wildlife 4.9 - Reserve 17 AUMs of forage for deer use.

Total forage in unit 883 AUMs; 1,518 AUMs with water development.

The majority of the conflicts identified were short-term conflicts which will have to be resolved. The forage conflicts (RM 1.2, WH 1.5) are incompatible. Wildlife recommendation (4.13) - remove all horses from bighorn sheep areas - is incompatible with the designation of a Wild Horse area. The season-of-use recommendation (RM 1.1) is incompatible with the year-round use which is currently taking place by wild horses.

The social and economic impacts of designating HMA-7 a Wild Horse Management Area would be high. Forage would have to be allocated leaving less for the livestock operators.

Environmental impacts could also be severe to certain elements. Water is critically short in this area. Year-round grazing of very little perennial forage could seriously harm forage production. Conflicts (food, water) with other native animals (bighorn sheep) might have adverse effects on populations.

Current BLM funding is insufficient to develop Herd Management Plans. The manpower is also not available to properly manage the horses.

HERD MANAGEMENT AREA #8 (Continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

The wild horses and burros in Herd Management Area #7 should be removed as soon as possible.

Reason:

The fragile nature of this area (water, forage) precludes the development of a Herd Management Area that can operate in harmony with the variety of multiple use values present in the area and with the environment.

Support Needs:

BLM-Nevada State Office; all Las Vegas BLM activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; livestock operators; and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives Considered:

Remove livestock.

Revised 09/30/85 PCS

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 WH/B 1.1

Recommendation

B-1.1 Designate eight areas as herd management areas (reference WH/B MFP I rlay .44-A). Manage wild horse and ro populations within the boundaries the following eight proposed Herd management Areas (HMAs) within the Caliente Planning Unit:

Deer Lodge Canyon
Highland Peak
Rattlesnake
Little Mountain
Clover Mountains
Delamar Mountains
Mormon Mountains
Meadow Valley Mountain

Rationale

Present information indicates the proposed HMAs are areas where wild horses and burros were present on December 15, 1971. In designating specific HMAs, the authorized officer shall consider only those areas utilized by wild free-roaming horses or burros as all or part of their habitat on December 15, 1971 (reference CFR 4730.5).

Herd management areas are breakdowns of wild horse or burro areas into smaller units for management purposes. These areas will serve as the basis for herd management area plans (reference BLM Draft Manual 4700.05E).

Multiple Use Analysis (WH/B 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5):

A separate analysis prepared for each Wild Horse and Burro Herd Area is attached. The designation (WH 1.1) and establishment (WH 1.5) of a horse herd area will have high negative social and economic impacts. The majority of the people in Lincoln County like to see wild horses; but, when their presence reduces the forage available to livestock (less livestock numbers), effects their water rights, decreases the money available in the county, and reduces the tax base, the citizens are violently opposed to this establishment. This objective would have a long-term effect on individuals and the county. The county is already identified as an economically deprived county and further economic loss would not be accepted. The Lincoln County Commissioners, in an informal meeting with the National Mustang Association in 1976, agreed to the establishment of a wild horse range. Their only request was that the horses be confined in an area and be available for the public to view. The designation, establishment, and proper management (WH 1.3) of horse areas would have positive, long-term values to the environment. The lack of funds, manpower, and time will hamper any efforts to implement management plans. Many years are expected to pass before they will be completed. Coordination will be required with the Ely BLM District, the Cedar City BLM District (WH 1.4), the Lincoln County Commissioners, the Nevada Department of Game and Fish, and the National Mustang Association.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Modify the recommendation as follows:

Designate and establish the Herd Areas listed below. Prepare Herd

Attach all map sheets, if needed

Reason

The areas recommended have the following characteristics: (1) Available forage, (2) summer and winter range, (3) are in manageable units, (4) good access (bladed roads and usually yearlong), (5) usually

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse/Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3WH/B 1.1

Management Plans on the six areas. The order of listing establishes the priority for development. Allocate the following amounts of forage for Wild Horse and Burro use. Coordinate the development of HMA 2 and 3 with appropriate agencies or districts.

available to see all year, (6) have least effect on other uses of the public land.

Some areas and parts of others have been recommended for total or partial removal of the existing wild horses because of conflicts with other activities, lack of manageable characteristics, or environmental conditions (lack of forage, available water and climate).

<u>Herd Management Area and Name</u>	<u>Allotment in area</u>	<u>Allocation AUMs</u>	<u>Maximum Number of Animals</u>
HMA #1 - Little Mountain (58,748 acres)	Little Mtn.	638	53
	Peck	190	16
	Cove	214	18
	Panaca Cattle	120	10
	Buckboard	120	10
	Clover Creek	24	2
			<u>1,306</u>
HMA #2 - Highland Peak (135,703 acres)	Bennett Springs	170	14
	Black Canyon	35	3
	Ely Spring Sheep	76	6
	Highland Peak	135	11
	Klondike	25	2
	Pioche	39	3
		<u>480</u>	39
HMA #3 - Rattlesnake (75,461 acres)	Rattlesnake	240	20
	Oak Spring	240	20
		<u>480</u>	40
HMA #4 - Miller Flat (81,016 acres)	Oak Wells	240	20
	Sheep Spring	720	60
	Rabbit Spring	240	20
		<u>1,200</u>	100

Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name: MFP	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wildlife Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 2 WH/B 1.1

HMA #5 - Clover Creek (63,064 acres)	Clover	278	23
	Mustang Flat	82	7
	Sawmill Canyon	90	8
		450	38
HMA #6 - Delamar Mountain (191,570 acres)	Delamar	684	57
	Elgin	144	12
	Oak Spring	1,212	101
		2,040	170
	Total	5,956	496

Support Needs: BLM--Nevada State Office; Ely and Cedar City BLM Districts; Las Vegas District--all activities; Lincoln County Commissioners, Nevada Department of Fish and Game; livestock operators; Lincoln County residents; and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:

- Maintain all horses.
- Remove all horses immediately.
- Confine all horses in other locations.

MFP Step 3 Decision

Reason

~~Modify the MFP Step II multiple use recommendation by deleting the proposed horse management area #3 (Rattlesnake) from management consideration.~~

~~Public comment upon the proposed management levels ranged widely from total removal of all horses to the management of more horses than presently exist in the area. The analysis in the final Caliente ES found that impacts would occur to livestock operations by the implementation of this program. However, in two of the areas (Little Mountain and Clover Creek HMA's) sufficient forage does not exist to allow dual use (wild horses and livestock) and still maintain both viable livestock operations and healthy wild horse herds.~~

~~The five remaining wild horse management areas should have management plans developed within three years. The management plans should consider the above allocation as a average management level with the actual numbers varying on a five year removal cycle as needed to ensure that proper utilization of the forage is achieved and to limit disturbance to the wild horses.~~

~~The management program would maintain a wild horse population of sufficient size to ensure healthy populations and would allow in the other areas for the removal~~

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Caliente
Activity	Wildlife Horse & Burro
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3WH/B 1.1

Reason (continued)

~~and/or reduction of conflicts with livestock and wildlife. Therefore, the overall program trust is to maintain a viable, healthy wild horse program and to reduce or eliminate the present conflicts for available forage, water and space on the areas where wild horses and burro's will be removed.~~

Final MFP Step 3 Decision as approved by the State Director on November 12, 1981, and confirmed by the Director, BLM, on February 26, 1982:

Final MFP Step 3 Decision

Unless determined otherwise through the CRMP process, manage current estimated numbers (FY 81) of wild horses and burros within the following herd management areas:

1. Deer Lodge Canyon (FY 84)
2. Highland Peak (FY 83)
3. Rattlesnake (FY 85)
4. Little Mountain (FY 82)
5. Clover Creek (FY 83)
6. Delamar Mountains (FY 81)
7. Mormon Mountains (FY 86)
8. Meadow Valley Mountains (FY 87)
9. Miller Flat (FY 82)
10. Blue Nose Peak
11. Clover Mountain
12. Applewhite

(Reference WHB MFP 1 Overlay .44-A)

Determine, through a range monitoring system and the CRMP process, desirable numbers in each area. Develop herd management area plans for each area in the fiscal year shown (contingent upon availability of personnel and funds). Where it becomes necessary to take immediate action to effectively

Reason

The original decision, although reflective of overall public comment and the forage allocation process as it stood then, was flawed because:

1. BLM attempted to resolve the conflicting public stances of strongly opposed interest groups. However, groups themselves were not provided an opportunity to work together to resolve the issues in face-to-face conference. In addition, there was never a clearly defined set of criteria provided the manager to aid in reaching a decision as to desirable numbers.

2. The forage allocation process, based as it was on the 1976-1977 range survey, was not well grounded in basic data (see reason for RM-1.2).

The CRMP process, by bringing the different interest groups together to resolve their differences as best they can, will assist the manager by better defining the spectrum of publicly acceptable management options available. While it does not abrogate BLM's decision-making authority and

Note. Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions in reverse
1393/4607/4608

Wild Horse/Burro - 3b

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND AND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wildlife Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3 WII/B 1.1

Final MFP Step 3 Decision (continued)

implement management, appropriate survey, utilization, actual use, etc., data can be obtained to initiate a beginning point in the number of animals on the public lands. Through the CRMP process, develop by FY 1982 a set of criteria to be applied in establishing desirable numbers of wild horses and burros.

Reason (continued)

responsibility in terms of regulations and good resource management, CRMP should provide the manager with a decision-making framework which has greater across-the-board public acceptance.

The use of the monitoring system in reaching desirable numbers will eliminate any need to issue allocation decisions based on a one-point-in-time survey. It is expected that additional data (not simply counts) regarding wild horses will be gathered as a part of this system. Delaying a final determination of desirable numbers will allow both the public (in CRMP) and the manager to bring new data to bear on the decision.

Correction follows:

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)	Caliente		
Activity	Wildlife Horse & Burro		
Objective Number	Step 1	Step 3	WH/B 1.1

Final MFP Step 3 Decision (continued)

implement management, appropriate survey, utilization, actual use, etc., data can be obtained to initiate a beginning point in the number of animals on the public lands. Through the CRMP process, develop by FY 1982 a set of criteria to be applied in establishing desirable numbers of wild horses and burros.

Correct the Meadow Valley Mountains & Mormon Mountains HMA Boundaries by deletion of the Breedlove & Rox Allotments.

Reason (continued)

responsibility in terms of regulations and good resource management, CRMP should provide the manager with a decision-making framework which has greater across-the-board public acceptance.

The use of the monitoring system in reaching desirable numbers will eliminate any need to issue allocation decisions based on a one-point-in-time survey. It is expected that additional data (not simply counts) regarding wild horses will be gathered as a part of this system. Delaying a final determination of desirable numbers will allow both the public (in CRMP) and the manager to bring new data to bear on the decision.

3. Deletion of the Rox & Breedlove Allotments is based on the CRMP Committee recommendation that the Breedlove Allotment not be included in any Wild Horse Herd Management Area based on historical licensing of domestic horses in the area, and subsequent literature search finding no wild horses present in area. These allotments were ironically identified to be included into the Meadow Valley Mountains and Mormon Mountains HMAs. Subsequent background checks revealed that all horses using the area were on license. In fact, since the late 30's horses have been on license almost every year with as many as 100 head in the 40's. The average number of horses on license since 1939 to present is 30 head. There also were as many as 15 head of burros on license. In addition, during 1971 the BLM solicited comments from permittees concerning their knowledge of wild horses on their allotments. The response from the Breedlove permittees dated October 27, 1971 stated that there were no wild horses or burros in the allotment.

Revised 09/30/85 PCS

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	WH/B 1.
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-1.2 Remove all wild horses and burros from the Crossroads, Jump-Up, Ash Flat, and Meadow Valley allotments (reference WH/B MFP 1 Overlay .44-A), and all other areas where they occur outside the boundaries of the HMAs.

Support Needs: Division of Operations.

Rationale

Wild horses and burros can be managed only on those areas that were utilized as all or part of their habitat on December 15, 1971 (reference CFR 4730.5). Wild horses may have expanded their range into the allotments mentioned above (reference WH/B URA Step 3 and .44A4c(1)). Wild horses cannot be managed on these allotments or any other areas that occur outside of the HMA boundaries.

Multiple Use Analysis (for 1.2 and 1.6):

No conflicts were identified with these recommendations. Several complemented this recommendation and are listed below.

- Range 1.5 --Classify most allotments located in the southern half of Lincoln County as ephemeral or ephemeral-perennial.
- Range 1.10 --No grazing in the following areas: Ash Flat and Meadow Valley allotments.
- Range 4.1 --Remove all horses from the planning unit.
- Wildlife 4.13 --Terminate wild horse and burro and livestock use in the Morman, East Morman, and southern Delamar Mountain--bighorn sheep range.

The social and economic impacts could be high depending on the group or individual involved. The action would have a long-term positive benefit to the environment. Coordination would be required with the Nevada State Office, the Lincoln County Commissioners, local ranchers and wild horse associations. Funds and time constraints will greatly hamper any efforts to remove the horses. Many years are expected to pass before removal takes place.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Modify the recommendation as follows:

Remove all wild horses in the following grazing allotments and areas. (See MFP 2 overlay.) All removals should be completed within a 3-year period starting from the completion of the environmental statement. Priority for removal is recommended.

Reason

The horses and burros in these areas must be removed because of a lack of suitable forage and because of a lack of access or availability for public viewing. The size of the area cannot be managed with present manpower and funding, or it has a drastic effect on current uses.

Use additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/P)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 WH/B 1.2

<u>Areas</u>	<u>Approximate Number of Animals</u>	<u>Priority for Removal</u>
Removal Area #1	33	7
Removal Area #2	8	8
Removal Area #3 (Crossroads)	12	8
Removal Area #4	194	1
Removal Area #5 (Applewhite)	17	8
Removal Area #6	72	5
Removal Area #7	59	6
Removal Area #8 (Jumpup portion of Delamar)	13	8
Removal Area #9 (Meadow Valley/Ash Flat Allot.)	8	8
Removal Area #10	8	8

In addition, remove wild horses from the Herd Management Areas where the present use is in excess of the forage allocation.

Little Mountain Herd Herd Management Area #1	39	4
Rattlesnake Spring Herd Herd Management Area #3	10	8
Miller Flat Herd Herd Management #4	40	3
Delamar Mountain Herd Herd Management #6	50	2
Approximate Total Removal	560 head	

Support Needs: BLM-Nevada State Office; Las Vegas District--all activities; Lincoln County Commissioners; Nevada Department of Fish and Game; livestock operators; Lincoln County residents, and wild horse protection groups.

Alternatives considered:
See individual herd write-up in WH/B 1.1.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3 WH/B 1.2

MFP Step 3 Decision

Reason

~~Modify the multiple use recommendation as follows:~~

~~Remove all wild horses and burros from:
a) areas not planned for management as shown in recommendation WH 1.1 and B) those excess horses within the management areas which are in excess to the allocated forage levels. These removals should occur within two years from this final decision. Actual numbers for removal and priority will be established through the use of a horse removal plan and management plans will be given public review and will be consistent with the management levels recommended in wild horses recommendation 1.1.~~

~~The actual number of wild horses and burro's to be removed and priority for removal can only be obtained through the use of activity level planning (i.e. horse removal plans, and horse management plans). These plans will be developed consistent with the program goals shown in the previous recommendation and will be developed with input from the public. The further use of numbers (removal numbers and priorities) would be fruitless at this time because these programs (activity plans) have not been developed and are contingent upon the availability of manpower and funds.~~

Final MFP Step 3 Decision as approved by the State Director on November 12, 1981, and confirmed by the Director, BLM, on February 26, 1982:

Final MFP Step 3 Decision

Reason

Beginning in FY 82, periodically remove wild horses and burros in excess of current numbers (FY 81) in the 12 herd management areas. Concurrent with the final livestock adjustments to attain balance of grazing use, manage for desirable numbers of wild horses and burros within the herd management areas, utilizing CRMP and range monitoring. Remove excess animals as necessary to reach and maintain desirable numbers.

This revised decision complements the revised WHB-1.1 decision. An inventory has been conducted in FY 81 and will be used to estimate current numbers. To assure the interim management goals established by WHB-1.1, excess animals will have to be removed periodically. A removal operation may have to be initiated to reach desirable numbers after that decision is made.

Wild Horse/Burro - 5a

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 (M/P)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-1.3 Develop Herd Management Area Plans (HMAPs) for areas one through eight according to the following priority schedule:

1. HMA 6
2. HMA 4
3. HMA 5
4. HMA 1
5. HMA 3
6. HMA 2
7. HMA 7
8. HMA 8

Rationale

In designating specific herd management areas, the authorized officer shall develop a wild free-roaming horse or burro management plan (reference CFR 4730.5). Management plans are necessary to outline: specific objectives for managing wild horses and burros, techniques for maintaining and improving their habitat, needed management facilities, methods for the removal of excess animals, and provisions for the management of wild horses and burros on a multiple use basis with other resources.

The HMA priority development schedule was based primarily on the number of horses in each HMA and on accessibility for viewing wild horses.

See Wild Horse and Burro 1.1 for Multiple Use Analysis and recommendation.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-1.4 Cooperate with the Cedar City District and the Ely District in the development of a herd management area plan for HMA1. Cooperate with the Ely District in the development of the herd management area plans for HMA2 and HMA3.

Support Needs: Cedar City District,
Ely District.

Rationale

The HMAs mentioned share a common border with the Cedar City District and the Ely District. Wild horses are believed to pass freely between the Las Vegas District and the two previously-mentioned districts. Management of these horses will depend on cooperation between these districts.

See Wild Horse and Burro 1.1 for Multiple Use Analysis and recommendation.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-1.5 Establish the maximum number of wild horses or burros to be maintained in each HMA based on current available forage. Reserve forage for that number of horses or burros.

The maximum number of wild horses or burros to be maintained in an HMA can be determined by the total AUMs available in each HMA. The maximum recommended number of horses or burros that can be maintained in each HMA, based on the total available AUMs in each HMA (reference URA Step 4, Table 44-E), is shown in Columns 1 and 2 of Table A. Columns 3 and 4 relate to recommendation WH/B-1.8 but were included in this table for the purpose of comparison.

See attached for Table A.

Rationale

Forage should be reserved for the maximum number of wild horses or burros to be maintained in each herd management area. The optimum number to be maintained in an HMA could differ from the numbers being recommended. However, blindly reducing WH/B populations below viable levels, optimum for the present, should be considered the maximum.

Federal regulations state: "After determining the optimum number of such horses and burros to be maintained on an area, the authorized officer shall reserve adequate forage and satisfy other biological requirements of such horses and burros and, when necessary, adjust or exclude domestic livestock use accordingly" (reference CFR 4730.3).

See Wild Horse and Burro 1.1 for Multiple Use Analysis and recommendation.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

TABLE A
CALIENTE PLANNING UNIT

Available AUMs, Recommended Number of Horses or Burros,
and AUM and Acres Available Through the
Development of Water for Each HMA

	AUMs Available	Maximum Recommended Number of Horses or Burros for each HMA	AUMs Available Through Development of Water	Acres Available Through Development of Water
<u>Herd Management Area 1</u>				
Condor Canyon	0	--	1,209	26,954
Deer Lodge	319	--	--	--
Mahogany Peak	1,311	--	--	--
McGuffey Spring	325	--	--	--
N-4	0	--	386	6,493
Rabbit Spring ¹	0	--	83	1,488
TOTAL	1,955	163	1,678	34,935
<u>Herd Management Area 2</u>				
Bennett Springs	644	--	1,087	20,180
Black Canyon	378	--	--	--
Ely Springs Sheep	1,020	--	116	1,557
Highland Peak	450	--	351	7,040
Klondike	0	--	456	6,050
Pioche	0	--	432	5,666
TOTAL	2,492	208	2,442	40,493
<u>Herd Management Area 3</u>				
Oak Springs ⁴	2,270	--	--	--
Rattlesnake	1,081	--	91	845
TOTAL	3,351	279	91	845
<u>Herd Management Area 4</u>				
Buckboard	0	--	427	8,226
Clover Creek ³	137	--	--	--
Cottonwood ¹²	0	--	--	--
Cove	0	--	214	3,576
Little Mountain	0	--	671	14,948
Oak Wells	518	--	24	451
Panaca Cattle	0	--	596	14,915
Peck	0	--	190	4,890
Rabbit Spring	421	--	51	1,446
Roadside	0	--	48	874
Sheep Flat ⁴	42	--	--	--
Sheep Spring	1,181	--	108	1,835
Uvada	526	--	--	--
White Hills	0	--	105	2,723
TOTAL	2,825	235	2,434	53,884

Revised See corrected copy

	AUMs Available	Maximum Recommended Number of Horses or Burros for each HMA	AUMs Available Through Development of Water	Acres Available Through Development of Water
<u>Herd Management Area 5</u>				
Applewhite ⁵	0	--	2	44
Clover Creek	231	--	--	--
Cottonwood	101	--	340	10,194
Garden Spring	1,640	--	--	--
Henrie ⁶	0	--	1,159	29,989
Morrison-Wengert ⁷	0	--	--	--
Mustang Flat	0	--	90	2,771
Oak Springs	23	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	109	--	47	1,408
Sawmill	97	--	--	--
Sheep Flat	478	--	--	--
White Rock ⁸	56	--	809	11,539
TOTAL	2,735	228	2,447	55,945
<u>Herd Management Area 6</u>				
Applewhite	0	--	--	--
Delamar	3,435	--	--	--
Elgin ⁹	289	--	--	--
Oak Springs	4,243	--	--	--
TOTAL	7,967	664	--	--
<u>Herd Management Area 7</u>				
Breedlove ¹⁰	0	--	--	--
Henrie	0	--	938	23,221
Mormon Peak	985	--	870	15,146
Morrison-Wengert	11	--	--	--
Rox ¹¹	0	--	--	--
White Rock	936	--	10	140
TOTAL	1,932	161	1,818	38,507
<u>Herd Management Area 8</u>				
Breedlove	0	--	60	1,571
Elgin	318	--	--	--
Henrie	0	--	1,030	18,738
Morrison-Wengert	331	--	700	14,722
Rox	0	--	--	--
Schlarman	390	--	--	--
TOTAL	1,039	87	1,790	35,031

Herd Management Area 5	AUMs Available	Maximum Recommended Number of Horses or Burros for each HMA	AUMs Available Through Development of Water	Acres Available Through Development of Water
Applewhite ⁵	0	--	2	44
Clover Creek	231	--	--	--
Cottonwood	101	--	340	10,194
Garden Spring	1,640	--	--	--
Henrie ⁶	0	--	1,159	29,989
Morrison-Wengert ⁷	0	--	--	--
Mustang Flat	0	--	90	2,771
Oak Springs	23	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	109	--	47	1,408
Sawmill	97	--	--	--
Sheep Flat	478	--	--	--
White Rock ⁸	56	--	809	11,539
TOTAL	2,735	228	2,447	55,945

Herd Management Area 6

Applewhite	0	--	--	--
Delamar	3,435	--	--	--
Elgin ⁹	289	--	--	--
Oak Springs	4,243	--	--	--
TOTAL	7,967	664	--	--

Herd Management Area 7

Henrie	0	--	938	23,221
Mormon Peak	985	--	870	15,146
Morrison-Wengert	11	--	--	--
White Rock	936	--	10	140
TOTAL	1,932	161	1,818	38,507

Herd Management Area 8

Elgin	318	--	--	--
Henrie	0	--	1,030	18,738
Morrison-Wengert	331	--	700	14,722
Schlarman	390	--	--	--
TOTAL	1,039	87	1,730	33,460

Revised 09/30/85 PCS

¹ Rabbit Spring-HMAs 1, 4

² Oak Springs-HMAs 3, 5, 6

³ Clover Creek-HMAs 4, 5

⁴ Sheep Flat-HMAs 4, 5

⁵ Applewhite-HMAs 5, 6

⁶ Henrie-HMAs 5, 7, 8

⁷ Morrison-Wengert-HMAs 5, 7, 8

⁸ White Rock-HMAs 5, 7

⁹ Elgin-HMAs 6, 8

¹⁰ Breedlove-HMAs 7, 8

¹¹ Rox-HMAx 7, 8

¹² Cottonwood-HMAs 4, 5

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse and Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3 WH/B 1.6

Recommendation

WH/B-1.6 Manipulate vegetation in herd management areas where there is a potential.

Vegetative manipulation should make more forage available to wild horses or burros and improve their habitat (reference WH/B MFP 1 Overlay .44-A).

Acres within each HMA which have potential for vegetative manipulation were taken from URA Step 4, Table .44-B. The acres within each HMA which have potential for vegetative manipulation are as follows:

Rationale

Vegetative manipulations would release desirable grasses and forbs, improve wild horse or burro habitat, improve range condition and trend, and possibly provide better distribution of wild horses or burros in the HMAs. Present information is not adequate to determine site-specific vegetative manipulation areas.

HMA	Acres with Potential for Chemical Vegetative Manipulation*	Acres with Potential for Mechanical Vegetative Manipulation*	Acres with Potential for Chemical/Mechanical Vegetative Manipulation*
1	3,200	74,200	5,800
2	43,500	62,700	--
3	23,000	--	--
4	1,600	109,400	5,100
5	--	74,900	--
6	8,300	21,800	8,300
7	--	--	--
8	--	--	--

*estimate

Support Needs: Archaeology, Watershed, Division of Operations.

Multiple Use Analysis

The following conflicts occur with this recommendation:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| Watershed 1.3 | --Restrict or ban high impact uses such as intensive construction activities. |
| Recreation | --Restrict chaining and clear cutting operations to Management Class III and IV areas and provide a coordinated planning effort to minimize visual impacts upon potential and existing recreation sites. |
| Wildlife | --Restrict road and trail construction on existing recreation sites. |

with additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3 H/B 1.6

Wildlife 4.2 --Restrict road and trail construction on existing bighorn sheep ranges.

Complementary Recommendations were:

Watershed 1.2 --Classify many allotments in the southern half of Lincoln County ephemeral or ephemeral-perennial.

Forestry --Manipulate vegetation to sustain Christmas tree production.

Range 2.1 --Increase forage through mechanical treatment.

Wildlife 3.2 --Improve deer habitat through vegetative manipulation.

Vegetative manipulation projects can have conflicts with many recommendations once a site is selected. Because of diversity at each site, environmental conditions must be assessed on a site-by-site basis. A review of the URA Soils material indicates limitations for treatment and/or seeding to occur within each proposed area.

The use of chaining or burning and seeding to improve habitat is thought to have a low to moderate social value and low economic value. Each would be positive. The manipulation has different effects on the environment, depending on the methods used. To determine project location and manipulation method, and EAR and HMP should be prepared. Coordination would be required with the Nevada Department of Fish and Game in preparation of the documents. Manpower, funding, and time will greatly decide the potential of this recommendation; all are insufficient at this time.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Modify as follows:

Manipulate vegetation in the Herd Management Areas shown on the MFP 2 overlay to increase forage or forage diversity for wild horses. No project should take place until the area has an environmental assessment and management plan prepared that identify the specific need.

Support Needs: As identified in MFP I.

Reason

The developing of additional forage is needed in order that more horses can be allowed on the range. This recommendation is consistent with manual requirements; it allows for adequate evaluation, protect the environment, and assures maximum benefit for the money spent. The areas identified are quite large, and the feasibility of the project will be determined by an individual assessment, case-by-case.

Alternatives considered:

- a. As recommended in MFP 1.
- b. Allow no chainings.

See supplemental sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (M/P)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3 H/B 1.6

MFP Step 3 Decision

Accept the multiple use recommendation as written.

Reason

The final Caliente ES has indicated that these types of projects will probably be needed in order for the long-term productivity (35 yrs) of the areas to maintained. Year-long use by wild-horses can have determinable impacts to forage plants if proper management is not achieved. These types of projects can provide the necessary forage diversity and composition to ensure that the long term management goals for this program are maintained.

Wild Horse/Burro-13a

etc. Attach additional sheets, if needed

(actions 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)
Caliente

Activity
Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-1.7 Develop water to make AUMs, which occur outside of the four-mile-to-water service area, available to wild horses and burros. Columns three and four of Table A show which allotments (reference WH/B MFP 1 Overlay .44-A) within herd management areas have AUMs which would become available to wild horses or burros through the development of water.

Rationale

Development of water in the allotments shown in columns three and four of Table A should improve wild horse or burro grazing patterns by making those areas available for grazing. Also, if those AUMs were made available for grazing, they would increase the total AUMs available to wild horses or burros.

Support Needs: Archaeology, Division of Operations.

See Wildlife 3.4 for Multiple Use Analysis and recommendation.

Attach additional sheets if needed

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-1.8 Insure that water remains available to wild horses at those water sources in HMAs where wild horse use has been identified (reference WH/B MFP I Overlay .44-A and Table .44-17 URA Step 3).

Rationale

Table .44-17 in URA Step 3 lists water sources where wild horse use has been identified. Water should remain available to wild horses at those sites. Water is the nutrient most essential to the survival of wild horses. Any change in the availability of water at those water sources could jeopardize the survival of wild horses dependent upon those water sources.

See Wildlife 3.4 for Multiple Use Analysis and recommendation.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Objective Number

WH/B-2

Objective:

Obtain information on wild horses and burros in the eight proposed herd management areas through the use of inventories and studies.

Rationale:

Inventories and studies are needed to obtain information on numbers of animals, population dynamics, and habitat conditions. This information will be necessary for intensive management of wild horses and burros. Also, the Code of Federal Regulations states: "The biological requirements of wild free-roaming horses and burros will be determined based upon appropriate studies or other available information." (CFR-4730.3).

Multiple Use Analysis

In order to plan for and manage a wild horse population, data must be collected through inventories. Conducting inventories creates no conflicts and is generally compatible with other activities' recommendations. This action has a slight positive value to the local community and a high value to horse protection organizations. The environment should benefit through proper management. Because of the shortage in wild horse specialists, other manpower, and time required for research, studies, and inventories, many years are expected to pass before actions are completed.

Multiple Use Objective

Accept the objective as written.

Conduct inventories on an as-needed basis (WH/B 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10). Place priority on protecting habitat in Herd Management Areas. Carry the objective forward to MFP III.

Support Needs: As identified in MFP I.

Reason

Inventories are required as part of BLM's day-to-day work responsibilities. Adequate inventories are required by all activities to ensure that multiple use values are maintained or enhanced.

Alternatives considered:
None.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.1 Conduct intensive aerial (helicopter) inventories for wild burros in proposed herd management areas 7 and 8 to determine population size and distribution. These inventories should be conducted by FY 1980.

Rationale

Wild burros have been sighted in proposed herd management areas 7 and 8. However, the size of the population and its distribution is not known. Proper management of these burros will be dependent on knowing the size of the population and its distribution.

Support Needs: Division of Administration-helicopter contract.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

5647

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.2 Determine the foraging habits of wild horses and burros and other large herbivores by conducting a fecal analysis study for at least one full year. When conducting studies on foraging habits, an attempt should be made to obtain data relative to the forage preferences by season and competition from other animal species (see BLM Draft Manual-Physical Resource Studies--4412.31F2).

Support Needs: Division of Administration-fecal analysis contract.

Rationale

By understanding the foraging habits of wild horses and burros, determinations of which forage species are being selected from all available forage species can be made. These determinations will give some indications as to which forage species should receive greatest management attention.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

5646

Wild Horse/Burro - 18

Form 1660-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.3 Determine wild horse and burro habitat condition in herd management areas, through the use of photo plots, utilization, actual use, and integrated resource studies (see BLM Draft Manual-Physical Resource Studies--4412.31F1).

Rationale

Habitat studies will verify and analyze forage use patterns, intensity of grazing use in certain areas, and verify and analyze condition and trend.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Caliente
Activity	Wild Horse & Burro
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.4 Obtain information concerning home ranges, seasonal use areas, migratory routes, and crucial areas. The use of marked or banded wild horses and burros will facilitate the collection of this data (see BLM Draft Manual-Physical Resource Studies-- 4412.31B and 4412.31F3).

Rationale

A knowledge of home ranges, seasonal use areas, migratory routes, and crucial areas of wild horses and burros is essential for input into herd management area plans and for proper management of these animals.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.5 Develop reliable wild horse and burro population estimates with the use of a ratio-index method or some other method that would help correct for the error in aerial inventories (see BLM Draft Manual--Physical Resource Studies--4412.31D1).

Support Needs: Division of Administration-helicopter contract.

Rationale

Actual counts made during aerial surveys are not generally accepted as representing 100% of wild horse and burro populations. A correction factor needs to be developed that would help determine the actual wild horse and burro population of an area. The accuracy of aerial inventories are affected by such factors as plant cover, species of animal being inventoried, terrain, and height and speed of the observer.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

5643

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Caliente
Activity	Wild Horse & Burro
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.6 The ages of wild horses and burros should be determined by tooth replacement and tooth wear criteria, whenever possible. Wild horses and burros should be aged whenever they have been captured in reduction programs or for attachment of markers. Skulls should be aged whenever they are found. The data collected by the previous techniques will be used to determine the age structure of wild horse and burro populations (see BLM Draft Manual-Physical Resource Studies--4412.31C1a and 4412.31E).

Rationale

Age structure information is essential for intensive management of wild horses and burros. Age structure data are also essential for input into herd management area plans.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Caliente	
Activity	Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference		
Step 1		Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.7 Determine the productivity and mortality of wild horse and burro populations. The use of marked or banded wild horses or burros will facilitate the collection of this data (see BLM Draft Manual-Physical Resource Studies--4412.31C1b and c).

Rationale

Productivity and mortality data is essential for intensive management of wild horses and burros. This information is essential for input into herd management area plans.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Caliente	
Activity	Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.8 Observations of wild horses and burros should be made to collect data concerning the age groups in individual populations. A representative sample of wild horse and burro populations should be periodically classified as to age groups. Accurate data relative to age groups can best be obtained from ground observations and use of spotting scopes. Animals should be classified into three major groups: Adult, Yearling, and Young (see BLM Draft Manual-Physical Resource Studies--4412.31C2a).

Rationale

Age group data is essential for intensive management of wild horses and burros. This information is essential for input into herd management area plans.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective 1 should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed

5640

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Caliente

Activity

Wild Horse & Burro

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.9 The ratio of male animals to female animals in wild horse and burro populations should be determined as opportunities are available. Accurate sex ratio data can only be obtained by intensive observation of wild horses and burros (see BLM Draft Manual-Physical Resource Studies--4412.31C2b).

Rationale

Sex ratio data is essential for intensive management of wild horses and burros. This information is essential for input into herd management area plans.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Caliente	
Activity	
Wild Horse & Burro	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation

WH/B-2.10 Inventory water sources, other than those in Table .44-17, URA Step 3, to determine if they are being used by wild horses or burros. Only water sources within herd management areas should be inventoried.

Rationale

Table .44-17 of URA Step 3 shows which water sources were identified as being utilized by wild horses. However, there are many other water sources within each herd management area where wild horse or burro use could be occurring. This information is necessary to determine which water sources should be maintained or improved. This information is also necessary for input into herd management area plans.

This recommendation should be retained at MFP I.

Objective I should be referenced for the analysis.

Attach additional sheets, if needed