

m 9/6/84

MINUTES CRMP LOCAL #1
Humboldt County Extension Meeting Room
Sept. 6, 1984

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Ugalde at 7:34 P.M. List of persons attending are attached to the original copy of these minutes. Motion by Dufurrena seconded by Griggs that minutes of June 27 meeting be approved, carried.

REVIEW PURPOSE & GOALS OF CRMP LOCAL # 1

Berogan stated that this topic was brought up at a county RAC meeting and suggested for inclusion at the next CRMP meeting. That because the attendance of meetings was low, perhaps a review of direction and purpose was in order. Hill stated that he felt that the plans first put in have been changed with input from BLM only. Griggs refuted the statement as not in line with what had occurred earlier in the day. Thackaberry comments that the original purpose for organizing Local # 1 was to resolve problems. That the reason attendance has fallen off was that there were less big problems facing us, but this group can change and do anything we want to.

Dufurrena added that he felt that there have been many problems resolved by or through the CRMP group even though some problems remain. Jones stated that for the past year or so little if any accomplishments have occurred. For some members the lack of interest may be from lack of visible progress or items of accomplishments. In further discussion he felt that slow progress on some project was funding and lack of effort in prioritizing by BLM at higher than local office - that other governmental agencies can get funds by prioritizing needs. Ugalde said she felt CRMP plans would be fewer because of economical situations which we are currently in. Ranchers are not able to accomplish things which several years they would have included in a plan and there was interest in developing.

Thackaberry then reminded that several years ago when the Paradise-Denio EIS came out, ranchers were facing an average 50% grazing allotment cutback and to date that cutback has not taken effect. Oke stated that it should be remembered that there are 3 or 4 plans approved which AMP are currently in progress by BLM and more plans simply couldn't be worked on. Tipton stated that he had watched the development of the U.C. and Little Owyhee allotment plans and was quite enthusiastic. But when BLM began stating there was insufficient funds for implementation and more compromises came about from the original plan, he backed off with a plan.

In spite of an apparently negative discussion the vocal consensus of most members was to stick with the CRMP process. Oke interjected that without the approved CRMP plans, the wildhorses removal was a priority item which would not be possible if it were not for CRMP.

Chairperson Ugalde then asked if our main goal was addressing problems. Some affirmative response.

Sweigert asked the group to take a closer, finer look at approved plans that were scheduled to be reviewed. To see if plan was followed, etc. and evaluate. Discussion followed concerning the speed and progress in plan development. Also financing or funds which have determined the speed of plan implementation.

Concerning the completeness of plan reviews, Thackaberry stated that BLM and permittee are most directly involved. If both are satisfied then Local # 1 should not be involved. If problems or differences are encountered then these can be brought to CRMP group. The few vocal comments were in agreement with this. Lengthy discussion on wildhorses: gathering, numbers, existing and gathered, priorities. Ugalde again asked whether the goals and continuation of Local # 1 were agreeable. Consensus affirmative.

SCOTCH THISTLE SPRAYING - Bengochea

Coordinated control spraying BLM, Forest Service, State Ag Department and Nevada First Corp. The thistle blossomed late this year so about 50% success. Decided on the basis of late growth this year that two sprayings may be necessary next year and in the future. Thackaberry questioned achieving a high amount of control based upon Oregon and Idaho claim that scotch thistle is their most major weed problem. Griggs stated that BLM is looking into possible funds for pest control and will be getting with state agriculture about control efforts in a planned program.

ALDER CREEK ACCESS ROAD - Jim French

Sub-committee consisting of Jones, Cavakis, Griggs, Pacheco, Jim Smith and French met Aug. 9th. Identified problems of the old road and prepared a proposal for a new alternate access road to facilitate Onion Lake fishing during more of the legal fishing season which is being lost because of access problems. The latter portion of the statement brought about a lengthy heated discussion concerning; where users were coming from, amount of use decline - 20% of 770 angler use per year, road condition due to weather conditions at the early time of use, priority use of funds, condition of existing fisheries habitat, legal fishing season as it effects access road and vice versa.

Ugalde stated that two ranchers do not oppose the road construction but object mainly to the time of use and the nuisance or responsibility of pulling people out. Discussion followed on road closure, how and who is responsible for assisting the stuck vehicles.

At this point the discussion became fast and furious. Jones finally brought discussion back to the original reports basic topic. That a new road is not being constructed but an access around private property is being proposed. Discussion then shifted to Knott Creek use and stocking. Use of the entire mountain area use by various recreational users.

Ugalde then asked if the county will be constructing part of the access road. Answered by several persons that county agreed to maintain the access from the county road across the flat area to the foothills approximately 1½ mile Smith explained, he agreed to break a road across the flat area, if county commissioners approved. Discussion followed, about the cost of road construction - range from \$3 to \$25 thousands per mile, volunteer help for construction.

Lengthy dissertation by French about the Lahontan Cutthroat trout. Interrupted by secretary asking for brevity and a less argumentative approach. Pam Wilcox pointed out that arguments were taking place because the important CRMP process format wasn't followed and that is the statement of proper objective. Dufurrena then recommended that the sub-committee meet again to decide upon proper objectives and provide further detailed information on their proposal, construction costs, maintenance, handling of problems such as restricting access.

ALLOTMENT PLANS - Progress report by Okes

JORDAN MEADOW - Okes stated BLM staff will be meeting with parties concerned on this plan. Hill interjected that N J ranches will pull out of the Jordan Meadow CRMP plan and go with an AMP.

ALDER CREEK PLAN - This ranch is in process of being sold, so no further action will take place on this allotment plan. BLM feels that with the time and information gathered, they will proceed with the format of an AMP on this allotment.

WILDHORSE GATHERING PRIORITIES - Griggs

Number one priority is the T Quarter Circle where all horses will be gathered, estimated at over 400 head. 2nd priority - Blue Wing, Seven Troughs - CRMP plan agreement to leave 1120 head. 3rd priority - Little Owyhee, reduction down to 250 head in 1985.

Ugalde asked about the status of the rest of the county. Reply that this would be contingent on funding by Congress.

NEXT MEETING - Contingent upon Alder Creek access sub-committee report, annual review of allotment plans and other items.

Roy Leach NDOW, stated that the department has a presentation concerning bighorn sheep introductions on Blue Wing allotment which they would like to present to Woolgrowers and also Local # 1. Dufurrena suggested the Nevada Cattlemens Asso. and Woolgrowers joint meeting to be held in Winnemucca as a possibility. At request of Leach, Dufurrena will ask the Woolgrowers Asso. that the NDOW be placed on the program schedule. Letter request to be sent to Dept. When confirmed, the date and time to be sent to secretary for distribution to Local # 1 members.

ALDER CREEK ACCESS - subcommittee meeting, Oct. 17

Pam Wilcox informed the group that there is a draft bill being proposed by asso. of Conservation Districts for range improvement low interest funds. The bill is similar to one presently used in Utah. The request would be for one million dollars. Copy to be sent with these minutes. Note this draft is just in the discussion phase.

Meeting adjourned 9:24 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Sakurada
Secretary

RANGELAND IMPROVEMENT ACT

AN ACT RELATING TO IMPROVEMENT OF RANGELANDS IN THE STATE; PROVIDING FOR INSTITUTION OF RANGELAND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST; PROVIDING FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THIS PROGRAM BY CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AND THE STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION; CREATING THE NEVADA RANGELAND IMPROVEMENT LOAN FUND; AND APPROPRIATING \$1,000,000 FROM THE GENERAL FUND AS AN INITIAL APPROPRIATION TO THIS FUND.

Be it enacted by the legislature of the State of Nevada:

Section 1. The legislature recognizes and finds:

1. That it is essential to the general welfare of this state and it would be in the public interest that multiple use rangeland development should be implemented on a broader scale on both public and private lands in the state;

2. That due to numerous economic and practical problems, including coordination, insufficient attention has been given to this resource;

3. That it appears to be sound public policy for the State of Nevada to provide a revolving-continuing loan fund to the end that rangelands within the state can be made to provide the greatest benefits to all concerned, this fund to be so administered that no project will be undertaken except upon prior approval by competent rangeland specialists.

The purpose of this act is to provide a means to increase the availability of funds for the improvement and increased development of multiple use rangelands, working through existing statutory provisions pertaining to local conservation districts, under supervision of the conservation commission, and in cooperation with appropriate federal, state and local agencies and the owners and operators of rangelands.

Section 2.

1. In addition to the powers, functions, and duties of the conservation districts and state conservation commission provided for in NRS 548, these districts and commission shall have the following additional powers, functions, and duties:

a. The conservation districts shall, under the supervision of the conservation commission, administer and implement the state rangeland improvement loan fund program.

b. The commission shall supervise the districts in implementing the rangeland improvement loan fund program and shall, within the funds available, allocate funds to the districts for that purpose.

c. The commission shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

d. The conservation districts shall determine whether funds are available before approving any rangeland improvement application and after having made such determination may enter into any necessary contracts. Repayment of any funds so expended shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by the commission and shall be deposited in the Nevada rangeland improvement loan fund provided for in section 3. Costs of administration of this act shall be borne by the loan fund in accordance with those rules and regulations and shall not exceed _____ percent of the funds available in any given year.

delete

Section 3.

1. There is created a fund to be known as the Nevada rangeland improvement loan fund, which shall consist of all monies which may be appropriated to it by the legislature or which may become a part of it under this section. All monies made available to the state for rangeland improvements, together with any interest that may be earned from same, shall, unless otherwise provided by law, become part of this fund. The fund will be a continuing fund and will not lapse into the general fund at the end of the fiscal year. The conservation commission, through the local conservation districts, may expend from the fund such sums as it shall deem necessary for rangeland improvements as provided for by this act and under such terms and conditions as provided for in its rules and regulations.

2. There is appropriated to the Nevada rangeland improvement loan fund from the general fund the sum of \$1,000,000.