



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WINNEMUCCA DISTRICT OFFICE
705 East 4th Street
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445

IN REPLY REFER TO:

1601.1
(NV-027.8)

June 14, 1984

Dawn Lappin
WHOA
P. O. Box 555
Reno, NV 89504

Dear Ms. Lappin:

A meeting was held on April 25, 1984, to discuss the draft CRMP Plan for the Blue Wing/Seven Troughs area. Several minor modifications to the draft plan were discussed. The changes have been incorporated into the final plan, which is enclosed for your review.

A meeting has been scheduled for 10:00 a.m., July 24, 1984, at the Pershing County Extension Office in Lovelock, for the purpose of signing and approving the Blue Wing/Seven Troughs CRMP Plan. It is imperative that individuals with designated signing authority for the affected groups attend this meeting.

If you are unable to attend the meeting, please notify Paul Jancar or Rodger Bryan of my staff, so your interests can be represented. If you do not send any comments or attend the meeting, I will assume that you concur with the plan.

Sincerely yours,

Gerald P. Brandvold
Area Manager

Enclosure

COORDINATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

NAME OF PLAN Blue Wing/Seven Troughs DATE OF ADOPTION _____

LOCATION OF PLANNING AREA: Blue Wing and Seven Troughs Allotments in the Blue Wing Planning Unit of the Sonoma/Gerlach Resource Area of the Winnemucca District

Pershing, Churchill, Humboldt and Washoe COUNTY, NEVADA
_____ CONSERVATION DISTRICT

ACREAGE:	PRIVATE	<u>227,371</u>	(15%) ACRES
	PUBLIC - SPECIFY MANAGEMENT AGENCY		(85%)
	Bureau of Land Management	<u>1,279,299</u>	ACRES
	_____		ACRES
	_____		ACRES
	_____		ACRES
	TOTAL	<u>1,506,670</u>	ACRES

**BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PLANNING AREA
(KEY NATURAL/MAN-MADE CHARACTERISTICS)**

The planning area is comprised of all or part of 10 mountain ranges: 1. Selenite, 2. Lava Beds, 3. Kamma, 4. Antelope, 5. Seven Troughs, 6. Trinity, 7. Blue Wing 8. Nightingale, 9. Shawave, and 10. Truckee. The ranges are typically separated by valley floors ranging from quite small (2-3 miles across) to extremely large (10-15 miles across) in size. The area is bordered on the north by the Western Pacific Railroad tracks and on the west by Highway 34 and the southeastern edge of the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation boundary. The southern and eastern borders of the area are the respective allotment boundary lines.

MAJOR RESOURCE USES IN PLANNING AREA: _____

Livestock grazing (both sheep and cattle), wildlife, wild horses/burros, mining and recreation.

NAME OF PLAN: Blue Wing/Seven Troughs

All parties will make every reasonable attempt to accomplish the goals outlined in the CRM Plan. Funding, priorities, and management objectives will be determined by the responsible government agency. This entire plan will be reviewed yearly and adjustments made by the Lovelock CRMP group as required.

PLANNING PARTICIPANTS: Subcommittee Group

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
<u>Wes Cook</u>	<u>Sheep Operator</u>
<u>Bob Bunyard</u>	<u>Sheep Operator</u>
<u>Dawn Lappin</u>	<u>Wild Horse Organized Assistance</u>
<u>Larry Irvin</u>	<u>C-Punch Corporation (Cattle Operator)</u>
<u>Helen Reilly</u>	<u>International Society for the Protection of Mustangs and Burros</u>
<u>Phil Benolkin</u>	<u>Nevada Department of Wildlife</u>
<u>Marian McClellan</u>	<u>Mining Industry</u>
<u>John Espil</u>	<u>Sheep Operator</u>
<u>Tina Nappe</u>	<u>Sierra Club - Toiyabe Chapter</u>
<u>Buster Dufurrena</u>	<u>Sheep Operator</u>
<u>Don Greenwell</u>	<u>Cooperative Extension Service</u>
<u>Rodger Bryan</u>	<u>Bureau of Land Management</u>
<u>Ted Fitzpatrick</u>	<u>Southern Pacific Land Company</u>
<u>Jerry Reeves</u>	<u>Tharalson and Duncan (Flying M Ranch)</u>

NAME OF PLAN: Blue Wing/Seven TroughsLIST OF MAJOR PROBLEMS/ISSUES

1. Approximately 41% of the public lands in the planning area is estimated to be in poor ecological range condition and approximately 37% of the area is in fair ecological range condition (1979 estimate).
2. Approximately 39% of the public lands in the planning area is estimated to be in a downward trend (1979 estimate).
3. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory (i.e., area-of-use, season-of-use, distribution, salting, etc.).
4. All but one of the licensed livestock permittees are operating under their active preference.
5. Sheep operators would like to expand their present areas-of-use.
6. Existing rangeland improvements are inadequate.
7. The population of wild horses/burros is currently in excess of management numbers on checkerboard and noncheckerboard lands, and is contributing to the deterioration of the rangeland/habitat.
8. Crucial wildlife habitat above the 5,000 foot elevation is in less than desirable condition.
9. Sage grouse populations are being reduced by meadow deterioration and by access of off-road vehicles to ridge tops and brooding areas during crucial periods.
10. The Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) has identified the southern Selenites as a possible site for the reintroduction of bighorn sheep.
11. The wetland condition is deteriorating around springs and seeps in the planning area.
12. Unauthorized livestock drift from adjacent allotments is not manageable.
13. There are two Wilderness Study Areas in the planning unit: (1) NV-020-200 (Selenites) and (2) NV-020-201 (Mount Limbo).
14. Public access through private lands in Cow Creek, Seven Troughs Canyon, and Limbo Ranch has not been granted through formal agreements with the land owners.
15. A program to monitor and evaluate changes in rangeland/habitat condition in relation to management practices is not available for the planning area.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHSLIST OF PLANNING OBJECTIVES

1. Manage domestic livestock grazing to increase 136,318 acres from poor and fair to good, and 3,505 acres from good to excellent ecological condition; improve range condition and forage availability, to reach and sustain 33,852 AUMs of active preference for livestock grazing as follows:

	<u>Blue Wing Allotment</u>	<u>Seven Troughs Allotment</u>
C-Punch Corp.	21,460 AUMs	4,404 AUMs
B. G. Bunyard	1,505 AUMs	
Wesley Cook	1,364 AUMs	
Dufurrena Sheep Co.		1,492 AUMs
John Espil		3,627 AUMs
TOTAL	<u>24,329 AUMs</u>	<u>9,523 AUMs</u>

This objective will address the major problems/issues numbered 1-6 on page 3 of this plan.

2. Maintain a viable population of wild horses/burros in the planning area.
3. Maintain or improve the condition of wildlife habitat to accommodate the needs of all species of wildlife presently or potentially using the planning area. This objective will address the major problems/issues numbered 8-10 on page 3 of this plan.
4. Protect and enhance the water quality, quantity, and wetland characteristics of selected springs in the planning area.
5. Control unauthorized livestock drift from adjacent allotments.
6. Maintain the integrity of the Wilderness Study Areas.
7. Insure legal access to all public lands.
8. Monitor the resources for attainment of management goals.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHSACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #1: Manage domestic livestock grazing to increase 136,318 acres from poor and fair to good, and 3,505 acres from good to excellent ecological condition; improve range condition and forage availability to reach and sustain 33,852 AUMs of active preference for livestock grazing as follows:

	<u>Blue Wing Allotment</u>	<u>Seven Troughs Allotment</u>
C-Punch Corp.	21,460 AUMs	4,404 AUMs
B. G. Bunyard	1,505 AUMs	
Wesley Cook	1,364 AUMs	
Dufurrena Sheep Co.		1,492 AUMs
John Espil		3,627 AUMs
TOTAL	<u>24,329 AUMs</u>	<u>9,523 AUMs</u>

This objective will address the major problems/issues numbered 1-6 on page 3 of this plan.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. Develop a grazing management plan for C-Punch Corporation to include modifications to current areas and seasons-of-use, and livestock distribution patterns as outlined below:
 - a. Graze 350-400 head of livestock on the Seven Troughs Range from 4/1-10/31. These cattle will be moved north into the Kamma Mountains and Antelope Range and held from 11/1-3/31.
 - b. Graze 150-200 head of livestock on the west side of the Selenite Range from 4/1-10/31. These cattle will be moved south and held in the Slough House area above Nixon from 11/1-3/31.
 - c. Graze 550-600 head of livestock in the Nightingale and Shawave Mountains from 4/1-10/31. These cattle will be moved east to the Granite Springs Valley and held from 11/1-3/31.
 - d. Graze 250-300 head of livestock on the east side of the Selenite Range from 4/1-10/31. These cattle will be held on the flats between the Selenites and the Lava Beds from 11/1-3/31.
 - e. Graze 350-400 head of livestock in the Lava Beds, Blue Wing Mountains, and western slopes of the Seven Troughs Range on a rotating basis throughout the year depending on weather and forage conditions.

<u>Who</u> C-Punch Corp.	<u>What</u> Develop and implement a grazing plan.	<u>When</u> After completion of CRMP Plan, and as range improvements are developed.
BLM	Monitor the impact of this management action on vegetation to determine if management objectives are being obtained.	According to monitoring plan.

Benefits: The ecological condition of the native vegetation and watershed resources will improve. The quantity, quality, and diversity of vegetation should be improved. Competition for available forage and habitat should decrease among sheep, cattle, wild horses/burros, and wildlife. Over the long term this (combined with other actions planned to achieve this objective) should allow C-Punch Corp. and the other livestock permittees to graze at 100% of their active preference.

2. Expand Wes Cook's and Bob Bunyard's area-of-use to include portions of the old Holland Livestock sheep use area. This will not conflict with the proposed reintroduction of bighorn sheep in the southern end of the Selenite Range.

<u>Who</u> BLM, Permittees	<u>What</u> Prepare a rangeline agreement to divide the old Holland Livestock sheep use area.	<u>When</u> FY 84
-------------------------------	--	----------------------

Benefits: This action will alleviate repeated concentrated grazing use on the smaller original adjudicated areas-of-use. The expanded area will provide the permittees an opportunity to be more flexible in their operation by allowing them to follow the localized snow storms thus eliminating the need to haul water. This will help to improve the overall ecological condition in the northern Selenite Range and Dry Mountain area.

3. Develop a plan which will place salt, mineral, and protein blocks a minimum of one-quarter mile from water sources in areas of ridges and on flat spots near shade and gentle slopes that are accessible by livestock.

<u>Who</u> BLM, Permittees	<u>What</u> Salting Plan	<u>When</u> March 1984
-------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Benefits: The salting plan will achieve better distribution of domestic livestock and wild horses/burros throughout the planning area. It will help to improve the condition of the vegetation in the wet and riparian areas by reducing the amount of concentrated use.

4. Develop a series of springs, pipelines, and wells throughout the planning area. Development will depend upon funding and other district priorities.

- a. Judges Place Spring and Pipeline - Develop the spring at the Judges Place (T. 32 N., R. 29 E., Sec. 20) and construct approximately five miles of pipeline in order to provide water on the flats at the north end of the Seven Troughs Range.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%) Permittees (50%)	Spring and pipeline development	First priority

- b. Cow Creek Exclosure Spring - Develop the spring located outside the western wildlife exclosure (T. 31 N., R. 28 E., Sec. 12).

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (100%)	Spring development	Second priority

- c. Trail Canyon Spring and Pipeline - Develop the springs in Trail Canyon (T. 31 N., R. 26 E., Sec. 1 and 12) and construct approximately 10 miles of pipeline in order to provide water in the vicinity of Middle Mountain.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%) Permittees (50%)	Spring and pipeline development	Fourth Priority

- d. Twin Buttes Mine Spring and Pipeline - Develop the spring at Twin Buttes (T. 30 N., R. 26 E., Sec. 1) and construct approximately three miles of pipeline in order to provide water on the flats south of Middle Mountain.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%) Permittees (50%)	Spring and pipeline development	Sixth priority

- e. Nixon Flat Well - Conduct a well site investigation in T. 23 N., R. 24 E., and construct a well if feasible.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%) Permittees (50%)	Locate and drill well	Third priority

- f. Rocky Canyon Well - Conduct a well site investigation in the northern half of T. 31 N., R. 30 E., and construct a well if feasible.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%) Permittees (50%)	Locate and drill well	Fifth priority

- g. Toll Rock Canyon Well - Conduct a well site investigation in the southern half of T. 29 N., R. 29 E., and construct a well if feasible.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%)	Locate and drill well	Seventh priority
Permittees (50%)		

- h. Antelope Siding Well - Conduct a well site investigation in southern half of T. 35 N., R. 30 E., and construct a well if feasible.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%)	Locate and drill well	Eighth priority
Permittees (50%)		

- i. Hard To Find Well - Conduct a well site investigation in the vicinity of Hard To Find Mine in the southwest portion of T. 25 N., R. 28 E., and construct a well if feasible.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%)	Locate and drill well	Ninth priority
Permittees (50%)		

- j. Lowry Well - Conduct a well site investigation in T. 27 N., R. 28 E., and construct a well if feasible.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%)	Locate and drill well	Tenth priority
Permittees (50%)		

Benefits: The development of these springs, pipelines, and wells will yield a better distribution of livestock throughout the planning area and will open up areas to grazing that previously have not been utilized except during wet winters when standing water is available. After these waters are developed, they can be used as "tools" to manipulate grazing use at specific times of the year, which should keep utilization levels on key forage species at acceptable levels, and provide periodic rest for the vegetative communities.

5. Treat approximately 20,000 acres of sagebrush by burning or chemical control.
- a. Mule Canyon Sagebrush Control - Treat approximately 10,000 acres of sagebrush by the most cost effective and/or least detrimental method in the eastern half of T. 32 N., R. 28 E. Construct an electric fence around the treated area and allow it to receive two years rest.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM	Arrange for funding of treatment and fencing materials.	First priority
Permittees	Conduct treatment. Install electric fence.	

- b. Sagehen Wash Sagebrush Control - Treat approximately 10,000 acres of sagebrush in the northern half of T. 26 N., R. 25 E., by the most cost effective and/or least detrimental method. Construct an electric fence around the treated area and allow it to receive two years rest.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM	Treat approximately 10,000 acres of sagebrush.	Second priority
Permittees	Remove electric fence from Mule Canyon project and install it here.	

Benefits: These projects should produce more forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses/burros. The quality, quantity, and diversity of the native grasses and forbs should be enhanced once the sagebrush is removed, the canopy is opened up, and the competition for ground water is reduced. The increase in forage should allow the livestock permittees to go beyond their active preference with proportionate increase to wildlife and wild horses/burros.

6. The sheep operations of John Espil and Dufurrena Sheep Company will be managed as they have in the past in accordance with their adjudicated areas- and seasons-of-use.

Benefits: This should provide for the best utilization of the perennial vegetation and should improve the overall ecological condition in the Seven Troughs Allotment.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHSACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #2: Maintain a viable population of wild horses/burros in the planning area.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. Manage a herd of 877 wild horses and 143 wild burros. This number was agreed to by the Lovelock CRMP Subcommittee group as being compatible with livestock operations as planned, wildlife demand, and the available resources on the noncheckerboard lands in the planning area. All excess animals over and above this management number will be removed according to the following priority:

- a. First - Remove approximately 411 horses and 29 burros from the two checkerboard Herd Use Areas (HUAs); 309 horses and 29 burros from the Antelope Range and 102 horses from the Truckee Range.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM, Permittees	Horse/Burro removal	First priority

- b. Second - Remove approximately 794 horses and 139 burros from the crucial wildlife habitat areas; 640 horses and 104 burros will remain in the Lava Beds, Seven Troughs, and Kamma Mountain HUAs.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM, Permittees	Horse/Burro removal	Second priority *

- c. Third - Remove approximately 340 horses and 59 burros from the southern half of the planning area; 237 horses and 39 burros will remain in the Blue Wing Mountains and Nightingale/Shawave HUAs.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM, Permittees	Horse/Burro removal	Third priority *

*If the adoption demand exists and funding is available, the second and third priority gatherings will take place during the same fiscal year.

Benefits: This management number should insure that a viable population of wild horses/burros will be maintained in the planning area. The adjustment in animal numbers will reduce the competition for available forage with livestock and wildlife, and should result

in a positive impact to those horses/burros remaining in the area. This impact will be observed in the form of healthier horses and burros and a possible increase in adult and foal survival and productivity. In the short-term this action will provide an increase in plant vigor, production, and forage diversity. The long-term effects will be realized in the form of an upward trend in vegetative condition and an increase in plant production.

2. Prepare a Herd Management Area Plan (HMAP) for the noncheckerboard HUAs which will address the following management goals:
 - a. Maintain the wild free-roaming characteristics of the horses/burros in the Blue Wing/Seven Troughs Herd Management Area (HMA).
 - b. Preserve and perpetuate the unique spotted and pinto burro population. The management herd of 143 burros will primarily be composed of spotted and pinto animals.
 - c. Provide and develop water for wild horses/burros throughout the HMA, where possible.
 - d. Establish studies to acquire additional data on the wild horse/burro population to include information on sex ratios, age structures, mortality, rates of increase, habitat conditions, actual use, movement patterns, and validity of total population counts.

Who
BLM

What
Prepare HMAP

When
FY 84

Benefits: The preparation and implementation of this HMAP will provide the biological data used to build the foundation for sound management of the wild horse/burro population, necessary to achieve and maintain a thriving natural ecological balance on the public lands.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHSACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #3: Maintain or improve the condition of wildlife habitat to accommodate the needs of all species of wildlife presently or potentially using the planning area. This objective will address the major problems/issues numbered 8-10 on page 3 of this plan.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. Prepare a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for the planning area which will address the following management goals:

- a. Inventory the planning area for the purpose of identifying the key and crucial wildlife habitat (i.e., winter ranges, brooding areas, potential lambing and fawning grounds, etc.).

<u>Who</u> BLM, NDOW	<u>What</u> Inventory wildlife habitat.	<u>When</u> FY 84 and 85
-------------------------	---	-----------------------------

- b. Develop specific management objectives for the previously identified management species: aspen stands, meadow habitat, riparian areas, and mahogany stands. Fencing of some of these areas may be necessary to achieve management goals. Incorporate these objectives into the Blue Wing/Seven Troughs Monitoring Plan.

<u>Who</u> BLM, NDOW	<u>What</u> Set management objectives for crucial species.	<u>When</u> FY 85
-------------------------	---	----------------------

- c. Develop specific management objectives for the remainder of the wildlife habitat in the planning area, including the bitterbrush stand in T. 30 N., R. 24 E., Sec. 19-21 and 28-30. Incorporate these objectives into the Blue Wing/Seven Troughs Monitoring Plan.

<u>Who</u> BLM, NDOW	<u>What</u> Set management objectives for non- crucial species.	<u>When</u> FY 85
-------------------------	--	----------------------

- d. Cooperatively develop an enclosure around the Last Chance Spring complex at the south end of Texas Basin in T. 31 N., R. 24 E., Sec. 33 NW1/4SW1/4.

<u>Who</u> BLM, NDOW, Permittees	<u>What</u> Construct enclosure	<u>When</u> FY 86
--	------------------------------------	----------------------

- e. Reestablishment of bighorn sheep will not be considered in areas where domestic sheep are currently utilizing potential bighorn habitat, unless an agreement can be reached with the affected permittees.

<u>Who</u> BLM, NDOW, Permittees	<u>What</u> Coordinate potential release of bighorn sheep	<u>When</u> As necessary
--	--	-----------------------------

Benefits: The implementation of the HMP should restore the vegetative diversity, vigor, and quality of wildlife habitat for small game, big game, and nongame species. The long-term goal of the HMP would be to provide forage for reasonable numbers of big game animals.

- 2. Limit unauthorized ORV use within specific areas during time periods critical to wildlife populations as determined through consultation with BLM, NDOW, and the livestock permittees.

<u>Who</u> BLM, NDOW, Permittees	<u>What</u> Determine areas where vehicle use should be limited.	<u>When</u> FY 85
--	---	----------------------

Benefits: This action will help to protect wildlife populations during critical periods from harassment and stress caused by human activity.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHSACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #4: Protect and enhance the water quality, quantity, and wetland characteristics of selected springs and other water sources in the planning area.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. Inventory all water resources in the planning area and identify all water quality, quantity, and wetland problems. Plan and implement protection or enhancement practices such as fencing for identified problem areas.

Who
BLM

What
Inventory water
resources
Plan and implement
protection measures

When
FY 85
FY 86 and beyond

Benefits: Full implementation of this action should improve water quality by reducing sediment, increase available water for public uses, and improve wetland function of important springs and other water resources.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHSACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #5: Control unauthorized livestock drift from adjacent allotments.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. Construct a series of fences in the northern, western, and southern boundaries of the planning area. Construction will depend upon the availability of funding and other district priorities.
 - a. Highway 34 Fence and Cattleguard Project - Construct approximately 32.5 miles of fenceline and five cattleguards on both sides of Highway 34 from Gerlach to the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, to separate the planning area from the Rodeo Creek Allotment.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%), Nevada Dept. of Transportation (50%)	Construct 65 miles of fence and install 10 cattleguards	First priority

- b. Desert Queen Fence - Construct approximately 31 miles of fenceline and four cattleguards on the southern boundary, to separate the planning area from the Desert Queen Allotment.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%), Nevada Grazing Advisory Board (50%)	Construct 31 miles of fence and install four cattleguards.	Second priority

- c. Jungo-Sulphur Fence - The exact location of this fenceline at the northern end of the Seven Troughs Allotment will be determined at a later date through consultation, cooperation, and coordination.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM (50%), Nevada Grazing Advisory Board (50%)	Construct a fenceline and install cattleguards	Third priority

Benefits: The construction of these fencelines is basic for the success of the grazing management plan. The fences will enable the cattle operator to rotate his livestock to different use areas throughout the planning area and be able to hold them there with a minimum amount of effort. This will also provide rest for the utilized areas. The fencelines will also help to control unauthorized livestock drift from adjacent allotments. Competition for available forage should be reduced as only authorized livestock will be utilizing the planning area. This will also provide accurate actual use data, to incorporate into the monitoring plan.

2. Use administrative remedies whenever possible to deter unauthorized livestock use.

Who
BLM

What
Deter unauthorized use.

When
Ongoing

Benefits: Control of unauthorized livestock use will provide more accurate data to evaluate monitoring studies.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHS

ACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #6: Maintain the integrity of the Wilderness Study Areas.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. All actions undertaken to accomplish any of the management objectives described in this plan, will be in conformance with the "Interim Management Policy and Guidelines For Lands Under Wilderness Review" (revised July 12, 1983).

Who
BLM, Permittees,
NDOW

What
Management actions
conducted in WSAs.

When
Until final
determination
by Congress.

Benefits: Management under the nonimpairment standard will insure that both the Selenites and Mount Limbo WSAs will satisfy the definition of wilderness (as described in the Wilderness Act) when the Secretary sends his recommendations to Congress.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHS

ACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #7: Insure legal access to all public lands.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. Identify all roads currently on private land which provide access to public lands; then follow the necessary steps for easement acquisition.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM, NDOW, Private Landowners	Negotiate easements for public access	As necessary

2. If easements cannot be obtained, build alternate access roads around private lands.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM, NDOW, Interested Publics	Build alternate access roads	As necessary if unable to obtain easement

Benefits: This will ultimately ensure that public and administrative access is guaranteed.

NAME OF PLAN: BLUE WING/SEVEN TROUGHSACTION PLANNING WORKSHEET

PLANNING OBJECTIVE #8: Monitor the resources for attainment of management goals.

ACTIONS PROPOSED TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE:

1. Prepare an interdisciplinary coordinated resource monitoring plan which will address specific management objectives for livestock, wild horses/burros, and wildlife, and will conform with Bureau policy and regulations as well as the 1981 Nevada Range Monitoring Procedures developed by the Range Studies Task Group. The plan will address all the necessary studies to effectively monitor management actions. The studies conducted will include actual use, utilization, climatic, and vegetative condition and trend.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM, NDOW, Permittees, Wild Horse/Burro Groups	Prepare the Blue Wing/ Seven Troughs Coordinated Resource Monitoring Plan.	FY 84

2. The monitoring data will be summarized, analyzed, and interpreted in accordance with the evaluation schedule outlined in the monitoring plan to determine if significant progress is being made towards meeting the management objectives for the resource values identified in this plan. If these objectives are not being met within the established time frames, the alternative management actions outlined in Table I of this plan will be implemented accordingly.

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>When</u>
BLM, NDOW, Permittees	Evaluate results of monitoring data to effect alternative management actions if necessary.	In accordance with evaluation schedule outlined in monitoring plan.

Benefits: This action should ensure that the management objectives outlined in this plan, the monitoring plan, the Herd Management Area Plan, and the Habitat Management Plan are achieved within the desired time frames.

TABLE I. POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT ACTIONS THROUGH EVALUATION OF MONITORING DATA.

Evaluation Period 1/	Livestock Distribution 2/	Climate 3/	Utilization Objectives 4/	Trend Objectives 1/	Condition Objectives 1/	Management Actions 5/
Interim	Good	Favorable	AUL	N/A	N/A	May indicate understocking. Adjust livestock numbers or periods-of-use.
	Poor	Favorable	AUL	N/A	N/A	Indicates poor distribution. Change distribution patterns through range improvements, salting, etc.
	Good	Unfavorable	AUL	N/A	N/A	Indicates unfavorable climatic conditions. If conditions exist for more than two years, adjust livestock numbers or periods-of-use until climatic conditions, range condition, and utilization are favorable.
	Good	Favorable	AUL	N/A	N/A	May indicate overstocking. Adjust livestock numbers or periods-of-use.
Short-term and Long-term	Good	Favorable	AUL	Met	Met	Indicates understocking. Adjust livestock numbers or periods-of-use.
	Poor	Favorable	AUL	Met	Met	Indicates poor distribution. Change distribution patterns through range improvements, salting, etc.
	Poor	Favorable	AUL	Met	Met	Indicates poor distribution. Change distribution patterns.
	Good	Unfavorable	AUL	Not Met	Not Met	Indicates unfavorable climatic conditions. If conditions exist for more than two years, adjust livestock numbers or periods-of-use until monitoring indicates conditions are more favorable.
	Good	Favorable	AUL	Not Met	Not Met	May indicate overstocking. Adjust livestock numbers or periods-of-use.
	Good	Favorable	AUL	Not Met	Not Met	Trend and condition objectives not being met, for unknown reasons. Reevaluate monitoring procedures and/or intensify monitoring.

1/ Specific time frames and objectives will be outlined in the monitoring plan.

2/ Distribution is identified as "good" (livestock well distributed throughout pasture) and as "poor" (livestock concentrated near riparian, watering sites, on flats, etc.).

3/ Climate is identified as "favorable" or "unfavorable." Favorable and unfavorable conditions can be derived from deviations in normal temperature and precipitation patterns.

4/ AUL - less than the allowable use levels on any key species as shown in the monitoring plan.
 AUL - greater than the allowable use levels on any key species as shown in the monitoring plan.

5/ This column shows the conclusions that can be derived from the combination of monitoring results from the other columns, as well as what management actions could be used to help the range meet monitoring objectives.

①

Blue wings / Seven Troops HMA 877 H
143 B

Sub units (1) Lava Bed / Seven Troop
(2) Nightingale / Shawane

751,955 ac public lands
320 ac private land

Southern + eastern Checkerboard ^{Railroad} Land Grant
north western Pacific Railroad tracks.

Are horses to be eliminated in the
Antelope + Truckee Range?

Page 1 + 2 states, "animal quality,
condition, sex ratios, age structure,
reproductive and mortality, immigration,
and emigration is relatively unknown
for the HMA."

May WNSOA suggest the Bems apply
techniques from NSO Manuals to
determine these data. Also establish
a specific time of year (whether yearly
or not) when censusing will be done
so the data will be comparable.

4700-0-6
off-mgmt
of animals

Page 4 (2)

What measures are being taken
to increase water availability in
the Summer Range? While Bems
generally regards capture of excess
horses as management, the lack
of fences preventing siphoning of wild
horses onto private lands, and the
lack of water, show that a new
vision must be sought to protect
wild horse habitat.

Page 5

Was the southern fence line constructed in FY 85?

Page 13

- (1) a portion of each year's w/H monies should be budgeted to partially fence checkerboard areas, even if it takes 5 years to complete.
- (2) The Dist had better contact specialists in this field in order to protect the genetic pool, before it's too late.
- (3) Some demographic data can be assumed based on capture data.
- (4) Should seek alternative funding for water developments, P.E. Trail Committee.
- (5) WSOA will actively resist any fencing for livestock mgmt within the HMA. Especially in light that these same permittees refused to maintain populations on checkerboard.
- (7) ~~Is~~ a specific time of year for censusing, over a period of years, especially after reductions, the accuracy would be apparent.
- (8) If livestock AMP's are developed, a specific time of year for turnout, the reading of utilization sites should give a good idea of how much and what horses are eating.

chq
AMP

(2)

(9) Since PL 92-195 did not allocate forage for WH, it is expected that AUM's would have to come from livestock preference. I believe it to be rather provincial to believe they'll return to preference. It is realistic to believe WH + wild life will demand habitat commensurate with public support.

II B.

- 1) WNOA objects strenuously to the \pm 30-35% below AML. Is BEM going to reduce livestock to 35% below current use? If data is unknown (pg 2, para 1) how does the BEM support of the 30-35% below AML? Who gets the extra forage available during the build up?
- 2) If BEM is fearful of monies not being available for management, how do you know you'll have it for monitoring?
- 4) This objective conflicts with the AML (Page 13, # 2) BEM risks litigation if the paper is put at risk. The implied assumption is that renewable resources will restore themselves through natural regenerative processes when in fact the regenerative capacity of the resource cannot always make up for the excesses of human

actions.

- 5) Some assumptions can be made through the compilation of data collected on previous captures.
- 6) Can this be done through fecal samples + observation?
If so monitoring ~~and~~ schedules could include observation of plant species.
- 7) Capture timing for the culling a % of WH in each area should provide general movement patterns. Dist is based on water availability

III A 1. Will monies ^{+ manpower} be available for monitoring +

3. data will be necessary to change the AML.

B 1. Will monies be available + what dates.

C. 1. Object to the 30-35% below AML.

2. same as above

(date)
E. 2. When is fencing planned?

3

With the exception of several items, the HMP appears to address the positive factors in WH mgmt, and implies that reduction to be only a part of w/p protection, mgmt, & control.

Problems:

- 1) We see no dates (even estimates) of when fences, water, tagging, etc might be contemplated. The BSM has been "promising" all these things for 16 years! It is too much to ask for trust that they will be done, we request a schedule.
- 2) The 30-35% below AMU is too severe a reduction from present #'s; ~~unless you get an agreement from permittees that put their reductions into suspended AMU use~~ The Dist have normally used 15-20% and we see no reason to adjust that
- 3) Any reduction below ^{the # of genetically preserved} ~~the AMU~~ that threatens the juvto burro population will instigate litigation. The PL 92-195 gives authority for open protest that pay, even if it reduces livestock.

5

When is it scheduled for completion?

~~Has a trespass been~~

Has there been any trespass actions since the camp agreement?

If so, when & where?

(2) Wildlife pg 11

How do you separate ^{livestock} cow use from WH use with no grazing system?

d Problem Issue pg 13

- (1) The BEM should specify a date in which this issue will be resolved or a time table, so lay people are aware that they don't have to wait another 16 years for BEM to do what PL 92-195 mandated in 1971
- (2) In an attempt to reach a the ^{art} Amh, the pulvuro pop is threatened, then appropriate litigation will ensue.
- (3) All the Dist has to do is use their info in the index.
- (4) Again BEM needs to identify some ~~lodigat~~ ^{lodigat} ~~order~~ priorities.
- (5) There is no way WFOA will agree to any interior fences to benefit livestock mgt. ~~when in fact WFOA could not get permission to mgt even a WH on checkerboard.~~
BEM may use this letter as a request to be informed of any such proposal.

(6) WFOA is not sure why the objective is limited to improving only 136,000 acres. WFOA's fear is that BLM will reduce WH to improve habitat ^{temp.} only to replace it with cows.

(7) Repitition

(8) It is assumed because only WH have been reduced to any extent.

(ii) by cows & horses?

(9) There are many reasons why livestock #s are low, ~~social~~ dietary changes, market, ~~the~~ etc. WFOA might counter that WH must be eliminated in areas & greatly reduced in others, because of historical overuse, trespass.

II. Management Objectives

¶
The Dist has generalized in terms of objectives, the public needs the objectives quantified.

A (1) Maintain where, improve where?
(2) Provide water when & where?

B. (1) WFOA was a member of the CRMP & we did not agree to a $\pm 30-35\%$; There is no evidence, given recent history, monies will not be available for mgt.

7

- (3) See Problem Issue d (5) response.
- (4) BLM should seek input from geneticists
- (5) See your index + NSO manuals for instruction of compilation.
- (6) When?
- (7) When?

B. Hab. Plan. Og. II A 2.

1. a, b, c, d, e, f. — When?
2. When

G. Animal Plan. Og. II B 5.

I'm amazed that this info is sought (future) when WNOA has been arguing your 11% + 14% ext. rates of increases in numerous letters, based on non-comparable data.

The Dist is to be commended if indeed ~~this issue will be addressed~~ it has abandoned its non-comparable data + assumptions + instead agreed to use NSO Manual inst. in compiling that data

Given the fact WNOA has repeatedly disputed data and methods used in the Dist claim of 11% - 14% rates of increases, the low level of understanding of habitat requirements; WNOA generally feels the Dist is beginning to grasp.

(8)

work
sheet

WHOA obviously supports the collection of monitoring data, but then Bern told us in 1971 they were collecting data, what we didn't know what much of what was acquired was based on assumptions.

As a Commissioner for the State of Nevada (Neil Commission) those dist utility & following NSO manuals on compilation of data will be given extra consideration in funding projects.