

5-21-86

IN REPLY REFER TO



United States Department of the Interior

4120(C-028)

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Surprise Resource Area Hdqrs.
P.O. Box 460
Cedarville, California
96104

May 21, 1986

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

Dear Dawn:

Enclosed are the rough draft minutes from the May 15, 1986 High Rock/Massacre Mountain TRT meeting. Please provide corrections within the next couple of weeks.

Sincerely,

Lee Delaney
Surprise Resource Area Manager

Enclosure (2)
1-High Rock/Massacre Mtn. TRT Draft Minutes
2-High Rock/Massacre Mtn. TRT Recommendation Summary



Save Energy and You Serve America!

MODOC/WASHOE EXPERIMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

High Rock/Massacre Mountain TRT Meeting
May 15, 1986

On May 15, 1986 the High Rock/Massacre Mountain TRT met at the request of team members Rose Strickland and Bob Bunyard.

Those present were:

TRT Members: Rose Strickland, Dawn Lappin, Cecil Pierce, Roger Farschon, Larry Hill, Bob Bunyard, John Lowrie, Jim Jeffress, Mike Del Grosso and Ed Dunkley.

Absent TRT Members: Francis Riddell

Others: Lee Delaney, Mike Dobel, Roy Leach, Ernest Eaton, Bill Phillips, Hugh Bunten, Rick Delmas

Lee Delaney read the guidance from the Steering Committee and outlined the goals of the meeting:

1. Review TRT recommendations
2. Identify concerns
3. Revise, replace recommendations through consensus

Rose also wanted to discuss:

1. The group being formed to assist the BLM in the management of the ACEC
2. The proposed road up Pole Canyon
3. Park Service vs BLM management (i.e. BLM's ability to manage under reduced budgets, etc.)

Lee briefly addressed points 1 & 2 that Rose wanted to discuss. He explained that he had a meeting scheduled for May 23, 1986 to bring together groups and individuals who had expressed a willingness to help BLM manage the High Rock Canyon complex (the ACEC area). His intent is to form a group who could provide volunteer services such as labor, materials or funding through the development of a Cooperative Management Agreement (CMA). Rose expressed concern about using a CMA to accomplish the goals. Other TRT members also stated that some people were hung up on the term. Lee stated that if that presented a problem, it could be called something else. However, the concept for this proposed CMA would be different than the livestock CMA's as the BLM would be heavily involved in supervision and coordination. Ed Dunkley stated that his association only does projects with the approval and supervision of BLM under their CMA for the Mojave Trail.

Lee also explained that the private land owners who would like a road into their private land in Pole Canyon, had not filed an application. BLM has informed them that they would not be granted a right-of-way to construct a

road. The BLM is actively encouraging an exchange between the landowners and Ken Earp for private land outside of Pole Canyon. The BLM then would negotiate with Ken for an exchange.

Rose stated that one of the reasons that the proponents who favor Park Service management of the High Rock area supported the TRT recommendations was the feeling that BLM would follow through with their commitments. However, in light of what has been accomplished to date, maybe this should be revisited. Discussion then ensued amongst the group, with some stating that they felt BLM could manage for multiple uses better than the Park Service. Also under tight budgets, the Park Service may have no better ability to manage than BLM.

Lee reviewed each TRT recommendation and detailed the actions taken to date. Individual team members identified concerns with recommendations numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 16, and 20 from the 6/24-25/82 TRT meeting and recommendation number 2 from the 2/24/83 TRT meeting. Lee explained that in the absence of consensus to revise, replace or drop recommendations, the original agreements would serve as the basis for future BLM decisions. Discussions were as follows:

6/24-25/82 TRT Meeting (see attachments/):

#2 Bob Bunyard stated he does not intend to convert to cattle now. Questions were posed to the Nevada Department of Wildlife as to how this would impact the bighorn sheep reintroduction. Jim Jeffress stated that if Bunyard stayed with domestic sheep, it would lower the High Rock area in priority for a reintroduction. However, as soon as the areas that did not have problems were full, the Department would then reintroduce bighorn sheep into High Rock.

Bob was asked if there was a possibility for converting to cattle and then back to sheep in the future. Bob stated there would be too many problems and that if he converted to cattle, he would stay with cattle.

Dawn asked if the MFP had to be amended for Bob to stay with sheep. Lee stated that the MFP only allowed Bunyard to convert but the decision was his, therefore, an amendment was not necessary.

There being no consensus to revise, replace, or drop the recommendation, the recommendation stands.

#3 Bunyard stated he was totally against the fence as it would put too much cattle pressure on him. Jim Jeffress stated that everyone agreed that other resources were high^{er} priority than livestock in the Canyon complex, that livestock grazing should be excluded to protect the other values and that everyone had agreed the fence was the best way to accomplish the goals for the area. Someone asked if there were other means to reduce the cattle pressure. Bunyard replied more fences but he was also against them.

Rose Strickland stated that if Bunyard didn't live up to the agreements, she would consider court action to move the Sub Unit 1 boundary back to the original MFP line and to not allow livestock grazing in Sub Unit 1 per the original MFP.

Larry Hill was asked if Earp had changed his mind. Larry replied that Earp will support the original agreements.

There being no consensus to revise, replace, or drop the recommendation, the recommendation stands.

#4 Bunyard stated he was not being treated equally.

Larry Hill stated that Earp has not changed his position.

There being no consensus to revise, replace or drop the recommendation, the recommendation stands.

#5 Bill Phillips stated that there might be some problems with the prescriptive grazing as detailed in the HMP.

Rose stated that she was supposed to be consulted in the development of the prescription but was not.

There was consensus to take another look at the prescription. Rose, Roger Farschon, Mike Dobel, Bill Phillips and Hugh Bunten were assigned the task.

#6 Roger Farschon stated that wilderness constraints could affect the implementation of this recommendation (i.e. not grandfathered).

Lee Delaney stated that BLM will still try to locate sites and survey and design them so as to be within the non-impairment criteria as detailed in the BLM Interim Management Policy.

There was no action required on this recommendation.

#7 Bunyard again stated his opposition to the fence west of High Rock.

There was no action required on this recommendation as this is BLM policy and Bunyard's concern was adequately discussed earlier.

#13 Dawn Lappin expressed great concern regarding wild horse deaths in the area. Dawn asked if the BLM knew how many horses were killed each year and if BLM conducted annual inventories to determine attrition and cause. She was not confident BLM could protect the wild horses at the agreed upon management levels if losses were occurring through illegal killing. Bill Phillips and Lee Delaney stated that BLM did not know how many were killed and because of limited funding, inventories would only be conducted just prior to gathering every 2-3 years.

Dawn stated that she would like emphasis placed on those areas suffering losses.

When asked if something should be done regarding the recommendation, Dawn said she did not know, but if Bunyard appeals future decisions, she would consider action also, possibly appealing BLM's gathering plan.

There was no action required on this recommendation.

#16 Initially, there was a great deal of discussion about cattle use in the canyons, particularly by Rose Strickland. However, after discussion of what the BLM was going to require in the future and the fact that it appears there will be 100% nonuse of cattle in 1986, this became a moot issue.

There was no action required on this recommendation.

#20 SCS and the private land owners have not investigated riparian habitat improvement on private lands.

There was consensus that the SCS, ASCS, NDOW and the private land owners will get together to develop a plan(s) for private lands. Roger Farschon stated the the plan(s) should be developed in the context of overall management for the area. In other words, analyze to see if a riparian area (i.e. Grassy) can be included in the management of a larger pasture rather than as a smaller individual unit.

2/24/83 TRT Meeting (see attachment)

#2 Everyone agreed the concerns surrounding this recommendation paralleled those of #16 above, therefore, there was no further discussion.

In summary, there were no changes made to the existing recommendations nor were new ones formulated. Bob Bunyard stated that he was going to appeal all future decisions and no longer supported the TRT agreements. This created a high degree of frustration among other team members. Dawn and Rose both stated that if Bob appeals and destroys the TRT agreements, then they felt they would also as they had dealt in good faith and they felt they needed to do so to protect their legal rights and resources. Dawn stated that she was deeply disappointed in Bunyard's actions as she, Rose, other TRT members and M/W ESP Steering Committee members had all personally worked very hard to help him.