

**Bureau of Land Management
Susanville District
East Lassen Management Project**

**Comments Received
in the
East Lassen Public Workshops
November 16 and 17, 1992**

Following are the comments provided by participants in the work groups convened as part of the Bureau of Land Management's public workshops on the East Lassen Project. The comments are verbatim from those recorded on the flip charts. Brackets [] indicate words added for clarity.

**Sacramento Workshop
Monday, November 16, 1992
Radisson Hotel**

Questions received from the general audience. (These questions and answers are not verbatim, but are summaries).

- Why is the BLM taking time to collect data now? Didn't the agency already have data (for cattle and sheep, wildlife and wild horse use)?
 - Response from District Manager Rick Hanks: In the current process the BLM looked at existing land use plans to determine whether amendments will be needed. It appears amendments will not be needed. But existing activity plans will be changed and incorporated into integrated activity plans that will fall under existing land use plans. We are moving from a single focused approach into an integrated approach. John Bosworth added to this explanation of where the East Lassen Project is headed. He said the examination of existing land use plans showed they are fairly general and do not conflict. He said the current proposed boundary for the East Lassen project encompasses about 80 percent of the East Lassen Deer Herd range. Bosworth also explained the internal watershed functional analysis process that will enable specialists to prioritize areas for development of integrated activity plans. Hanks pointed out current activity plans are narrow in focus -- often limited to single species -- and new plans would look at areas with a broader view and consideration as to how the various components of an ecosystem interact. Hanks explained that management guidance for the region will be completed by April 1993.
- Has data been gathered for the entire [East Lassen] area?
 - Bosworth: Monitoring is continuing.
- Why is this process taking so long? Are there areas [within the East Lassen area] that are so critical that they won't wait [until BLM is finished gathering data]?
 - Bosworth: It is a large area. BLM must prioritize needs and take on the most critical first. Data is needed to allow for prioritization.
- In 1988 NDOW and CDFG agreed to write a deer herd Habitat Management Plan. It is not done. Is BLM waiting [for the HMP before proceeding]?

- Hanks: No. We will integrate their HMP into our East Lassen Integrated Plan.
- On activity plans...BLM's traditional way of doing business has been to do an Allotment Management Plan, then get funding to implement it. Has this changed?
 - Hanks: Yes. The Integrated approach is quickly becoming the accepted method of planning in the BLM.
- FLPMA and PRIA addressed development of AMPs. Other plans such as HMPs, HMAPs are not addressed in those [laws]. How will BLM address them?
 - Bosworth: The Integrated Management Plan will address them all and meet the objectives of the Land Use Plans. We want to avoid the trap of doing one [plan] and ignoring other needs.
- Comment: Speaker "has a problem" that one document can address all of these [activity plan needs]. It is overwhelming. How many activity plans are we talking about? Six? More?
 - Hanks: See no reason to have more than six.
- Would there be several IMPs for the entire area?
 - Hanks: Yes.
- With this being watershed based, will you change your [management] boundaries?
 - Bosworth/Hanks: Would change the boundaries as far as the way we look at the resources and the way we determine the highest priority issues/needs.
- There have been seven years where nothing has been done [by the BLM].
 - Hanks: A lot [of activity planning and implementation] has been done. It has not been integrated. We have not been sitting on our hands for seven years.
- Comment: It could be two and a half years from the time the guidance is completed until some actions are taken on the ground.
 - Hanks: Agree with the word "some." We will be able to implement on the ground actions while planning is ongoing in other areas. We won't wait for completion of the entire Integrated Management Plan to begin implementing needed on the ground actions.
- Are [last summer's] environmental assessments on Twin Peaks and Tuledad the guiding EAs [for the integrated plans]?
 - Hanks: Those EAs were drafted in conjunction with last summer's interim actions [grazing decisions]. Because we are not anticipating amending land use plans, EAs will not be needed for the integrated activity plans.
- Comment (Brent Espil): Many feel BLM has done nothing. Doesn't agree. From 1960s to 1970s there has been a 37 percent reduction in AUMs, Tuledad. The Casey grazing permit was suspended in the 80s. There have been more regulations on cattle. Reductions in the entire area since the 1960s is probably close to 70 to 75 percent. On the ground work, that has been done in the area has been to benefit livestock and all other range users.
- Will BLM begin implementing changes after April 1993?
 - Hanks: Where there are opportunities to correct things immediately, we will do it.

Workgroups

The audience was divided into three workgroups to provide comments and recommendations to the BLM. Each group was assigned a BLM facilitator and scribe.

Group One (BLM facilitators Bruce Durtsche and Ken Visser)

- [What are] the time frames?
- [What is] the relationship of effort to existing planing (Land Use Plan activity)?
- When will permittee consultation occur in this process - "touchy feely"?
- [There will be] real intensive CCC this summer, probably.
- If there is any planning direction provided and the permittees aren't involved, there will

- be "trouble."
- A whole new route from the traditional planning process.
 - Sounds like we are revamping Land Use Plans. BLM is not taking this position.
 - Where does this "huge integrated action plan" stop and land use plan revisions begin?
 - We're "covered" already in the NEPA process.
 - Integration was inevitable and common ground is the veg. process.
 - There have already been efforts made to reassess objectives of the Twin Peaks AMP.
 - Don't want to see previous efforts concerning management planning for the Twin Peaks allotment be ignored, wasted, etc. (AMPRC).
 - [There is a] misconception that nothing has been done.
 - Range condition in the Bryant Spring, Gerlach Springs, Cottonwood Mountain area is in terrible condition. Saw more horses than deer.
 - Wild horses aren't indigenous [there are] numbers year-round.
 - Deer are getting the "leftovers" and are in real poor shape. Sagebrush/browse are just devastated.
 - Make sure you know which areas you are talking about.
 - [We need] equal control of deer numbers, livestock numbers and wild horse and burro numbers.
 - Got to have doe hunts to keep deer herds vital (healthy).
 - Balance populations to match carrying capacity.
 - We're getting set for another deer die off, especially if there is a bad winter.
 - Fish and Game should monitor habitat and population.
 - BLM manages habitat but the states manage populations.
 - Critical deer winter range has little potential.
 - What monitoring information is collected on wild horses and burros?
 - Horse use on riparian areas.
 - Integrating statistics/ studies for various users, historical correlation between wild horses and burros, livestock, deer and antelope numbers.
 - Have we overlooked the sum total for all forage?
 - Timely responses to immediate vegetation overuse by BLM is a concern. How did Gerlach Spring/Bryan Spring get to look so bad without BLM doing something about it?
 - Wilderness Study Area constraints on management developments (fences, etc.)
 - BLM needs to relate information faster and better and not speak jargon.
 - How processes come about needs to be made more clear to the public.
 - Need for ecosystem management.
 - Need for more public orientation to the history and purpose of BLM (legislative, public land laws, water law, mining law, environmental law).
 - You have to educate the public.
 - The environmental organizations have preconceived notions concerning public land management.
 - Draw line between eco-extremists with separate agendas and true environmentalists.
 - Game agencies took pictures and didn't allow the operators to participate, and it is BLM's fault.
 - Given the effects of drought, what about grazing next year (93)?
 - We need to assess the effects of livestock use and not regulate them off before we have a true understanding of all the effects.
 - [We need to consider] the human element/economic element in management decisions.
 - Too many horses, not enough deer.

Group Two (BLM facilitators George Wingate and Tara deValois)

1. Land management decisions should be resource driven ie. land soil, water, native flora and fauna (wild horses and burros are non-native) for the health of the ecosystem. Health of resources should take priority over economics (livestock, wildlife, etc.)
2. How to enforce our regulations policy, plans, etc?
3. Wild horses and burros are non native, hard on the environment and should be a low priority. Cause damage even in small numbers.
4. Basis for health of ecosystem? Bioregional data?
5. How much quantitative data, ie: comparison to drought, non natives?
6. Comparison with impacts of livestock. Comparison with impacts of wild horses and burros.
7. Implementation (lack of) current plans and obligations.
8. We should not have had to resort to adversarial legal appeals from other professionals.
9. How can we manage for ecosystem without man and non natives when the ecosystem has changed to adapt?
10. How can we use livestock to benefit the ecosystem with management?
11. Healthy ecosystem is good economics. They should have equal priority.
12. Economics should not be a constraint to obtaining healthy ecosystems. If ecosystem is suffering, source of problem should be stopped until it becomes economically feasible to continue without impacting healthy ecosystems.
13. Grazing management should be based on ecosystem/biological information not just calendar dates (plant phenology).
14. Resource monitoring should be a first priority for BLM financing. Once data complete then prioritize management activities.
15. Discrepancy between how wildlife and range personnel interpret observed range conditions.
16. Time problem: plans take so long to complete that data is out of date before the plan is implemented.
17. Monitoring -- if we cannot adequately monitor actions should be stopped.
18. Formal monitoring is best -- less subjective.
19. Management options.
20. BLM has managed livestock for operators for too long. Should stop. Shouldn't be a no. 1 priority.
21. We need to manage truly on a multiple use basis. We haven't in the past.
22. Publics are very concerned because our public lands are in obviously degraded condition.
23. Improper livestock use is the major negative impacting force on public land.
24. Livestock operators need to adapt operation to protect health of resource, ie. different seasons, shortened seasons, etc.
25. Deer are a symbol of condition of range; however, condition of ecosystem is more important.
26. All interests and agencies need to work together.
27. We are the game agencies going to have HMAs for the area?
28. Water Quality.
29. Fire as a management tool. Fire suppression and prevention, fire as part of the ecosystem. Wildfire as a negative impact.
30. Fire prevention - livestock grazing is not effective.
31. Wild horses and burros should be strictly controlled to stay within constraints of ecosystem health.
32. Mining.
33. Scenic qualities.

Group Three (BLM facilitators Joe Wagner and Gina Sato)

- Riparian and Aspen Groves
 - most important [habitats]
 - Suffered the most
 - livestock and wildlife [are] dependent on both
 - riparian and aspen stands [are] related [in terms of management.
- Riparian areas are easiest to fix:
 - simple [to fix]: build a fence
- Springs on the Skedaddles [run] from private to private could fix.
- Bull Flat [is a] concentration area; vegetation problems; grazing attributed
- Consuming more AUMs by wild horses
- [Group member says he does] not sympathize with feral animals; [they] devastate the land
- Organizations and public want, like feral animals
- Public can be educated; public do not know
- Public intervention is recent
- Many people [are] demanding wildlife and recreation
 - [They] feel they are entitled
 - Last 15 years, education [has] come a long way
- If public understood wild horses, they would understand their destruction.
- Wild horses are glorified.
- Most spring sources are on private land.
- How much longer [will there be the] ability to provide the private water to all resources?
- Stuck with it.
- Stockpersons, recreational/sport hunting, recreational, viewing interests.
- Need to assess the importance morally and economically (the rest of the thought, not on flip chart) resources to hamburgers; resources to hunting; resources to photography -- do not think [this is] important
 - Need to prioritize
 - If problems with bitterbrush, for example not enough, how [can we] wait one and a half years to address [the] concern.
 - Plants (bitterbrush) same as 10-20 year old plant condition?
 - Bureau managed for grass:
 - Rowland Mountain: all decadent plants
 - Big Sage, also grasses [present] managed well for grass
 - Maybe need more to address than grazing
 - Loss of whitehorn
 - Deer browsers, not grazers; bitterbrush [is] important.
 - Bass Hill as example:
 - Critical for deer; CDFG excluded livestock; wildfire [occurred] ; lost deer range; fire [was] slower on private [lands] where [there were] still livestock but public lost everything
 - Attempts to regenerate; deer eating it, so not regenerating
 - Population growing; need control[of] hunting; control [of] livestock
 - letting animals alone [is] not the answer
 - ex: 1956 forage problem, so doe hunt [established]; 1960? [there were] high numbers
 - Managing habitat relates to managing game
 - Need to control game so resources renew.
 - Bitterbrush coming back on Spanish Spring or Shinn Peak

- Two springs, water is limiting factor
- Habitat [is] shared by lots of things other than wildlife
- Have we determined that eating bitterbrush [is] keeping it from regenerating?
- How old [do] seedlings need to be before [they are] not destroyed by grazing? (Joe discussed bitterbrush regeneration in response.)
- [In] lots of parts of [the] west bitterbrush [is] not touched by cattle; there [is] so little else, cattle have to use it.
- Reinforcement of multiple use; properly managed, [we] can succeed.
 - No point in picking on one commodity
- Things go in cycles; drought [goes in cycles]; [we] need to be patient. If not abused nature [can] take care of it.
 - [We should] take things slow
 - Putting someone out of business or removing wild horses [is] not [the] answer
 - Livestock grazing is 30 percent of original adjudication
 - John Espil: only ones with less sheep than when [reductions] started.
 - Need to keep livestock moving
- How important are wild horses relative to other wildlife [and] livestock?
 - In the greater scheme of things?
- Federal law gives them importance. (Joe discussed public law and BLM management. Said it was an emotional issue.
- Are horses managed at 1971 levels? 1976 numbers are extrapolated backwards.
- Impact of [wild horses] on livestock business?
 - Tremendous impact; tremendously destructive.
- [There are] several groups with different interests in different resources but wild horses [have] no control.
- Good money on habitat management [is] being spent on wild horses.
- Laws [are generated by] public policy [which is generated by] public sentiment.
- [We] have tools e. g. emergency horse gathering, if [there is] resource damage
- Two[uses] with economic value: livestock and hunting.
- What is [there] economic value of horses? Something that adds to the economy?
- Livestock operator pays for water and use of public land; sport hunter pays for tag; what is paid to take photographs?
- How important is livestock grazing on public land?
 - [Removing livestock grazing] can injure small towns, but [is it] important to the industry as a whole?
- Agriculture industry [has] not grown proportionately with return. paid as years ago.
- Agriculture is here to stay. Rather than fight [we] need to look at places to work together
- Wild horses make [a] significant impact; only user not specifically as regulated as others (wildlife, game, livestock)
- Need public education to change public sentiment to change law.
- If wild horses are not indigenous why are they there?
- [Do we have any] idea of carrying capacity of bitterbrush for deer?
- Cattle are European riparian grazing animals.
- Have you fenced out cows and seen what deer do alone?
- Wildlife utilization of bitterbrush will go up as availability goes down.
 - worse the shape, the more utilization
 - drought related?
 - overgrazing
- Need to plant more alfalfa [on private property]
- Deer need bacteria and plant mix.
- What is BLM doing for riparian management?

- Needs more familiarity.
- condition of deer [is] poor. Numbers not bad. Tremendous number of predators.
 - [Discussion of Tuledad allotment on Buckhorn Road; speaker hunted the area].
- Juniper invasion [is] displacing forage for livestock and deer.

After the workshops concluded the suggestion was made that we have yearly meetings to continue the cooperation that was shown here tonight.

Susanville Workshop Tuesday, November 17, 1992 Lassen High School

Questions received from the general audience. (These questions and answers are not verbatim, but are summaries).

- There is a problem using watershed units [to evaluate the area]. There are different soil types, vegetation types, etc. Why use it as opposed to other types of units?
 - Susanville District Hydrologist George Wingate: The District East Lassen Team will use watersheds as a guide for analysis of management constraints, social and functional significance and other factors. He stressed the watershed analysis is a tool for analysis, not for determining management unit boundaries.
- In this process, will activity plans be rewritten without Land Use Plan amendments?
 - Hanks: The Land Use Plans are broad. We don't feel we need a land use plan amendment to rewrite the activity plans.
- The East Lassen project boundary includes the deer winter and transition ranges. Why not summer? Will more telemetry work be done to determine summer ranges.
 - Frank Hall, California Department of Fish and Game: Deer seem to summer in the higher areas -- the Skedaddles, McDonald Mountain, Cottonwood, some in the Hays Range, some in the Warners. More telemetry work would allow for better data.

Workgroups

The participants were divided into four workgroups to provide comments and suggestions to the BLM. Each group was assigned BLM staff people to serve as facilitators and scribes.

Group One (BLM facilitators Bruce Durtsche and Ken Visser).

- Chukar should be part of the wildlife considerations.
- What's happening with drought and grazing activities?
 - Do assessments on a site by site basis
 - Technical-type assessment and response.
- Current situation (drought) is not the norm.
- Why revise all the activity plans? Maybe they don't need it.
- Are the time frames realistic to do activity plans?
- Make dates and products learn to people so they don't have failed expectations.
- Role of County?
- Assure local involvement and consideration. economic, social and human elements
- Avoid a repeat of the Lassen National Forest situation. Need major public involvement. keep the doors open.
- Update of county general plan. Needs to be coordinated.
- Local culture and customs need to be addressed.

- Any information on the carrying capacity for wildlife?
- Impacts of season long use by horses and burros.
- Riparian.
- Keep the medusahead problem in check.
- Evaluate the wild horse and burro situation and relate to the vegetation and other animal needs.
- Should reduce horses and burros and allocate that forage to wildlife and things will be resolved.
- How can horse and burro consideration be brought back in line (because of the legal mandates) with all the other considerations (wildlife, livestock, etc.). They should be.
- Horse and burro people need to be involved in this process.
- Get everyone involved because everyone feels that wild horses and burros are an issue.
- Use this as a forum to work it out or elevate higher.
- Show/educate others about the conflicts (especially horses and burros versus others).
- Fish and Game agencies have got to get reinvolved too.
- DFG, NDOW and BLM need to work jointly with habitat and population management.
- BLM needs to meaningfully address wildlife needs in a timely manner.
- Make it clear what the time frames are.
- Address priority areas.
- In a timely manner
- Implement things now.
- Be realistic about proposing things that may never be funded.
- What should be done in the meantime (while seeking funding)?
- Incorporate the experience of others to solve or alleviate problems and concerns.
- Seek out good ideas and don't reinvent the wheel.
- Should the Modoc NF be involved because the East Lassen Deer Herd uses the Warner Mountains. Get them to stop throwing rocks.
- Look at the whole area involved with the East Lassen Deer herd.
- Conditions in one seasonal use area influenced other seasonal use areas.
- Desired plant communities
 - Affects of cheatgrass relative to our DPCs. It is a constraint.
 - Assess potentials and constraints of sites so DPCs are realistic and valid.
- Juniper is a major concern. What should be done to keep it in check, Prefer to have it reduced back to what we really "need".
- Actions to achieve [juniper control] need to be worked on.
- Seasons of use and distribution and numbers of livestock need to be consistent with goals and objectives (DPCs).
- Once there is a problem there is a lack of timely response by BLM ie. overuse occurs and nothing is done to remedy. When vegetation is damaged everyone loses.
- What about dealing with the constraints of wilderness, wild horses and burros, etc.?
- While trying to achieve DPC goals and objectives?
 - There needs to be more water for livestock and other animals (and other improvements).
 - Elk and bighorn should be looked at too. They are key and may be in the long run the most successful and cheaper compared to maintaining deer habitat forever (given cost, fire, etc.).

Group Two (BLM facilitators George Wingate and Tara DeValois)

1. Honesty to public from BLM and other agencies. Propaganda, ex: deer die off occurred with deer on cheatgrass. Deer need habitat improvement and deer population controls to meet cc of environment.
2. Lack of control of deer numbers. lack of knowledge of numbers.

3. Use current information to start management activities now.
4. Balance is needed between horses, livestock and wildlife.
5. Deer and antelope are taking a back seat.
6. Fire necessary if done right. Fire plus proper management equals deer habitat. Keeping cows out after fire equals loss of shrubs.
7. Need objectives for prescribed burns. example: reduce [juniper?] needs hot fire hard on shrubs, hard on deer habitat. In general hot fires plus low grazing equals grass. Present shrubs result of past heavy use.
8. Concern that BLM not be adversarial with the community like the Lassen National Forest. Should not negatively impact lifestyles. Should consider local economics.
9. Permits have economic value. Grazing fee issue: operators "buy" permits, IRS recognized value, etc. Impacts value of intermingled private land. Riparian and waters are often private. Use of private by wildlife and horses on private land should be considered in plan.
10. Public often judges agencies' effectiveness of livestock management on the condition of unfenced often riparian private land.
11. In the past [there were] more sheep, cattle, deer and fewer wild horses and BLM employees.
12. Wild horse and burro negative impacts:
 - year round use
 - They prevent livestock use of riparian areas especially in drought years.
 - When water is gone, livestock leave, horses don't
 - Horses should be managed like livestock ie. remove them during drought.
13. What is BLM's bottom line? What is our primary purpose?
14. BLM multiple use limited resources. Apparently less forage now due to older age antelope bitterbrush more big sagebrush. Not much young antelope bitterbrush. Wood harvest early on allowed more forage growth.
 - After catastrophic die off of all ungulates, took time to come back, shrubs rested and grew. Numbers are back, range in decline.
15. Antelope bitterbrush -- something needed to regenerate.
16. Savory System -- extreme use, short term is what drives improvement.
17. BLM is incapable (low dollars, low manpower,) of developing and enforcing complex systems.
18. Inconsistency between agencies and within agencies over time. Fore example, CDFG and NDOW can't agree.
19. Wildlife agencies want livestock off. Don't believe anything has been done to help wildlife in four years. [they] refuse to meet. Only litigation.
20. Livestock are presently the only manageable tool. Horses are out of control.
21. Intensive disturbance is needed to improve habitat.
22. Westwide move toward grass communities with only small pockets of antelope bitterbrush communities; EISs are directing change.
23. Mule deer are browsers. In 10 years we will have a serious scarcity of deer. Mule deer cannot adapt to grass communities.
24. How do we improve habitat? Removing livestock will not bring back proper habitat for mule deer. Band aid approaches are not acceptable.
25. Balanced livestock use a reasonable tool.
26. Do we have expertise to know how to use livestock as a tool to improve habitat?
27. Antelope bitterbrush will not come back with present wildlife numbers.
28. When antelope bitterbrush rejuvenating, livestock should be off.
29. All available leader growth on Buckhorn Road (Rowland/SOB) is taken every year even when no livestock [are present] after July 6.
30. When antelope bitterbrush regenerating (as after burn), hit hard with livestock in early

spring when grass is green.

31. Antelope bitterbrush seed is there. We need to find out how to grow it.
32. High voltage fencing around the BLM office is needed.
33. One and a half years work [in]Twin Peaks wasted -- started over. Needs, objectives set with CDFG, NDOW, BLM. Game agencies left because BLM kept changing the rules. Process stopped by BLM.
34. NDOW has chosen not to be involved in East Lassen.
35. Operators are being excluded from East Lassen.
36. 580 type programs are the future because of the high value of wildlife. And because operators are already supporting wildlife.
37. Game agencies negatively impact present 580 programs.
38. US government should sell to private and allow local communities to determine management. Private industry can do a better job managing land efficiently.
39. Multiple use should extend to water resource. Example: the same dollars can buy a well (many uses) as a guzzler (one use).
40. Use of herbicides to release antelope bitterbrush

Group Three (BLM facilitators Joe Wagner and Gina Sato).

- Don't see major conflict if work together and establish goals.
- [There is a] definitive lack of inventory; need to be specifically spelled out inventory) before goals [and] decisions; need to inventory what's out there.
- Issue: Conflicts between user groups
 - Goals of livestock industry, wildlife utilization goals, environmentalists, wild horses.
 - conflict is lack of understanding of other groups, needs
 - could modify needs if [all groups] know others' needs
- Hard to put a handle on it [issues]: big area
 - habitat needs are so diverse
 - hard to relegate
- Interested in doing projects on riparian areas for livestock and wildlife; probably on public; [more of a] challenge on private (ex: Espil's)
- Key is communication
- Tuledad: 80 percent privately owned waters
- Cattle [are] picked on
- Problem with [deer] collars; want to see more collar work
 - Who determines what areas [are] involved?
 - Hays Canyon [and] land across 395, where are deer? [Are these part of the East Lassen herd?]
 - Deer [are] coming back in bad shape
 - Need more agency work.
 - East Lassen deer herd is a big deer herd
- [East Lassen area is in a] rain shadow; not a lot of moisture
 - [It is] critical for deer to come in [to East Lassen Area] is best shape possible.
- Example [Owens'] FootHill Ranch (Chico) [participant in } 580 program. [Has done] burning; bucks [are]coming in [but] deer starving.
- Deer [are] starving in the Warners.
- On private [land] could run five times [the] deer with deer management because they have the water (ex. Oregon ranch)
 - Tremendous among [of] food matter [that] deer eat.
 - Private [lands], [they can] rotate sheep [and] cattle.

- Need to reach common ground
- [For] cattlemen [and] livestock [the] biggest thing affecting them is wildlife.
- Carrying capacity; need to understand.
- Livestock and deer throughout the west.
- Burns are a tool if used right
 - timing [is important]
 - [burning is]stonewalled by wildlife [advocates]: e. g. Rowland
 - sage bitterbrush just about dead; mountain mahogany also.
 - could burn, stonewalled
- Areas without fire for [a] long time [get] hot burn; affects grasses
- [In] Nevada, [there is] peavine [lupine]. Different users different times. Important to deer. Where there is big wild horse use, no peavine.
- Wild horse [is about equivalent to] three cattle. See what a horse does.
- Wild horses eat bitterbrush. Horse problem.
- We need predator control
 - lions, coyotes, all predators
 - concern of sportsmen and cattlemen
 - [predators are a] reason for deer decline
 - CDFG [does] not have enough control on public lands.
 - fawn ratios [are] down
- Control burns [are] good in some areas; but if in fawn area, [burns] remove cover.
- Fawns [are] vulnerable to predators
 - South of Warners and Skedaddles. no burns. Fawn ratios [are] up.
 - [At] mcDonald, ratio [is] down. [Burns at McDonald:] wildfires.
 - Big Spring wildfire raised hell with fawn habitat [and] intermediate range.
- No [as much] bitterbrush [and] mountain mahogany in [the] pat as today.
- [With] livestock, perennials [are]removed, brush takes over.
 - brush is decadent, old; no regeneration
 - how [can we] manipulate to get more?
 - or do we go backward? Not a lot of deer historically.
 - [there] were a lot of antelope and wild sheep; do we go back? or do we focus on deer?
- Need to focus on water.
 - In the desert, water is gold.
 - Fish and Game needs to focus on private lands [and] work with different people.
 - [This would] benefit wildlife, livestock and others
 - Needs to benefit everything
- How to manage riparian: for everything
 - [can be done on] public land
 - use sportsmen [and] volunteers
 - benefit everything
 - do we include wild horses?
- Problem with wild horses
 - Some bands [are] quite large
 - In riparian areas [there are] numbers [of horses] destroying the area
 - [Speaker] questions numbers.
- Economic value: economic value of deer is very high
- [Zone] X5b:
 - [need to] come up with food source before raising deer herd.
 - livestock [are] not doing 10 percent [of the] damage.
 - To quickly raise numbers, convince private landowners [to provide a] non-native

- food source (ex. Casey Ranch) to get over the hump
- Relevant to balance: [with respect to] livestock, deer wild horses, can't have more than the range can support
 - condition: [is it] decadent? [is there] regrowth?
 - Most of the area [is] in bad shape
 - Drought [has] impacted everything out there
 - tough to manage
 - [we] need to strike a balance in terms of what we have
 - [Are there] too many deer than what it can support?
 - Summer range [is] not good.
 - Mountain mahogany: what [is its] value?
 - [provides] cover
 - [It is] used at 10 to 15 years old [but] after 20 years [it is] useless.
 - Have to keep regenerating
 - If drought, first thing to go is old deer, then fawns and yearlings.
 - [so,] where are 5-7 year olds?
 - Problem here in Lassen County.
 - [People can] sell horns for \$25,000
 - [There is a] poaching problem. Nobody turns them in.
 - 580 program: [we are] able to determine worth of deer. (speaker opposed to 580).
 - Deer have very definite value; [it is] quite high.
 - How do we get monies to do on the ground projects?
 - [suggestion of requiring] more money for a tag up here
 - [people] would pay if money is to help.
 - [In the] West, winter habitat [is] small [and] mostly private. Carrying capacity is high.
 - could get backlash [from efforts]
 - if we take public land away [from livestock use], private land use [would] decline. [This] could result in subdividing [private lands for] economic reasons. Backlash effect on deer.
 - Subdivision [is] not as prevalent here.
 - Mule deer [are] becoming [an]endangered species
 - Little wintering ranges because of subdivisions.
 - Need to work with private [landowners] , not by using 580 [program]. Want to work together to do the best.
 - Future of the desert:
 - Hall spring (south pasture, Observation) [was] rested two years.
 - Riparian [areas]: go look at them. Beat to hell by horses.
 - Livestock, wild horses, mule deer grouse all use riparian zones. Only livestock getting hit.
 - If fence Hall Spring (private), what would be brought in?
 - Lost [the] balance [of vegetation] to top of Shinn Peak: cheatgrass.
 - What wasn't it [Shinn Peak] seeded?
 - [If planted with] winter rye, deer would winter and survive, but horses would use [it].
 - Shinn Mountain [has] winter and summer [range].
 - If [there was a] clean burn, [we could] seed something for deer herd.
 - But year-round horse grazing.
 - Trespass problem [of] people who don't care.
 - Trespassing obliterates
 - Casey's and Roberts in Shinn Mountain Burn Bitterbrush [is] down to nothing
 - Would horses use [it]?

- Horses would prefer grass over bitterbrush (drilled seed [for grass]).
 - Maybe in spring [but] not late in summer
- Seeding program [is] costly. Would need to put up fences.
- Bass Hill [has] bitterbrush seeding [and] deer fencing.
- Could [have] years ago, in canyons [there was a] bitterbrush and sage die off. BLM brought people in. Anything come out of that?
- Drought: When through [with drought], would like to see BLM program put in place to restore habitat affected by drought.
- Zone X5A: lava rock [and] medusahead
 - Not as many [deer] as before. Lot of area [has been] without cows in last five years. Bitterbrush [is] dying off from drought [and is] not different from areas where cows [are] running.
- Medusahead [on] Bull Flat, Five Springs, Three Springs.
 - If [there was] perennial green up in fall, deer could use [the area].
 - But [with] medusahead, no perennials left.
 - [This] could be adversely affecting deer.
 - [There is a] medusahead invasion
- [There is] juniper invasion in north, pulling moisture [out of the ground causing] cover decrease.
- [In] riparian areas, [there is] juniper invasion.
- [In] riparian areas, [there is] juniper invasion, [pulling] 40-50 gallons a day, [causing] havoc.
 - [Use] control burns [to control juniper]
 - Start whacking [juniper]
 - [Juniper is] nice in some areas for cover but [it is a] weed in riparian areas.
- [With] juniper cutting (in private [lands]), water [is] up in riparian areas even in drought years.
- Aspen stands:
 - Notice [that] livestock, if run through quickly, [does] not impact.
 - Only if [livestock are left] standing in [aspen stands], then problems [occur].
 - If livestock used or moved [through] quickly, [there would be] no problem.
 - Season [important]. Spring [use has] less potential [for damage].
- Not sure if [we are] not looking at big enough country.
 - Different ranges.
 - Know they [deer] cross 395, Hall Canyon; maybe go to Oregon.
 - Need to fix entire deer herd. Body fat [is] low. [Deer are] coming in bad.
- Local deer vs. migrating in deer. [Is their] condition different? Should focus study.
- Buffalo Hills [was] never historically good. If in good [condition], [deer] could winter over.
- Summer range is key.
- Most critical is summer range.
- Fawn ratios [in] summer; [by the time deer reach] winter range, [ratios] already depressed.
 - What happened?
- [There is a] summer range problem.
 - juniper [invasion]
 - decadent plants, no regeneration. Need younger plants for feed.
- In [the] past, [there were] more livestock in [the] area than now.
 - [this] supports [the] idea that [the] problem is with plants [and] habitat.
 - Animals [are] not the problem.
- Need to talk entire East Lassen deer range.

- Need more monitoring of deer. [Need to know] exactly where they're coming from. 1985 study is antiquated.
 - [Current information] could establish trend, but need 2-3 years [of] good sampling, 40-50 deer, [to] get pattern. How far [are they] coming?
 - Don't want to focus too narrowly.
- Rather see deer collared on winter range then find out summer [range].
- Not know percentage of deer herd in different areas.
- As [a] hunter, [would] want to see wild sheep introduced.
- Scratch 580 program.
- Pronghorn [are] doing quite well.
 - Let them keep coming strong.
 - [Need] more predator control for pronghorn. Lions, coyotes, all predators.
- Want preservationists and environmentalists to understand needs out there (re: predator control).
- What are you going to do for money without 580 program?

Group Four (BLM facilitators Tony Danna and Alan Uchida)

- [Are there] now fewer deer and fewer cows? In the past there were more deer and more grazing by cattle.
- Interest groups are looking at existing condition (range) not taking into account the last six years of drought.
- Natural die off of deer may not be totally caused by livestock grazing.
- Lack of summer range for East Lassen deer Herd.
- Deer coming down to the winter range in poor condition.
- Resident deer in better condition
- Better identification of deer summer range and habitat.
- Objective standards and guidelines to be developed with consultation and coordination with permittees and interest groups. Objectives must be attainable.
- Summer range for deer must include USFS lands. USFS summer range has a big impact on what the condition the deer arrive on the winter range.
- Properly managed livestock can complement deer herds.
- Fluctuation in deer numbers are a natural process in nature.
- Livestock numbers are being reduced by permittees. Are wild horses going to be reduced in the same percentage?
 - Deer are naturally dying off.
 - Development of water sources by permittees that benefit wildlife. If not developed by permittees, areas would be totally dry.
 - Most permittees would rather fence off the riparian areas and pipe the water off into troughs, keep the riparian areas for wildlife habitat.
 - Objectives on aspen may not be attainable if beavers are present.
 - Too much focus on cattle. Need to look at horses. 800 year long. Big contributing factor to condition of forage in tough years.
 - What are the horse mandates?
 - Look at our horse numbers compared to the drought conditions and available forage.
 - Look at available forage more than precipitation. Some precip on high intensity events causes high runoff and not much infiltration.
 - Use the data to defend the multiple use concept. That livestock can be managed with wildlife.
- Resident deer herds increasing, using alfalfa fields.
- Before livestock are restricted from areas, data showed support that there is a conflict for

forage.

- If conflict for forage exists, look at cutting back on all use, horses, cattle, deer, etc.
- Reduced AUMS can mean reduced dollars for improvements.

Workshop Participants
Sacramento, CA Monday, November 16, 1992
(Names taken from workshop registration sheets)

Matthew A. Bailey
Sierra Club
Dutch Flat, CA

John Espil
Property Owner/Permittee
Susanville, CA

Eric Loft
California Department of Fish and
Game
Sacramento, CA

Brent Espil
Property Owner/Permittee
Susanville, CA

Carolyn Richardson
California Farm Bureau Federation
Sacramento, CA

Bob Schweigert
Intermountain Range Consultants
Winnemucca, NV

George M. Clark
California Native Plant Society
Orangevale, CA

Richard A. Cox
The Mule Deer Foundation
Reno, NV

Jay Wilson
California Wool Growers Association

Michael Chiera
CBH
Citrus Heights, CA

Kevin Hansen
Mountain Lion Foundation
Sacramento, CA

Mary Messmer
Sierra Club
Sacramento, CA

Greg Milloway
Mule Deer Foundation
Salinas, CA

Dano McGinn
California Mule Deer Association
Lincoln, CA

William R. "Butch" Kughn
California Bowman Hunters
State Archery Association
Granite Bay, CA

Kristen Koontz
U. C. Davis
Davis, CA

Ed Dunkley
Orangevale, CA

Scott A. Wilkinson
Mule Deer Foundation
Chualar, CA

**Workshop Participants:
Susanville, California, Tuesday, November 17, 1992
(Names taken from workshop registration sheets)**

Joe Bertotti
Lassen County Planning Department
Susanville, CA

John and Carolyn Espil
Espil Sheep Co.
Susanville, CA

Martin Sisk
Miller Hay and Cattle
Litchfield, CA

Chris Miller
Miller Hay and Cattle
Litchfield, CA

Wil Lederer
The Mule Deer Foundation
Reno, NV

Glenn Nader
University of California
Susanville, CA

Noel Z. Owens
The Mule Deer Foundation
Reno, NV

Frank Hall
California Department of Fish and
Game
Susanville, CA

W.C. Roney
Lassen Range Association
Chico, CA

Jack Hanson
Rancher
Chairman, Susanville BLM District
Advisory Council
Susanville, CA

Wes Cook
Rancher, Member Modoc Washoe
Experimental Stewardship Group
Cedarville, CA

Richard Cox
The Mule Deer Foundation
Reno, NV

Wayne Jambois
Organized Sportsmen
of Lassen County
Susanville, CA

Leland E. Wood, Jr.
Rancher
Susanville, CA

Jack and Laura Hamby
Bureau of Land Management
Susanville, CA

Lyle Lough
Lassen County Board of Supervisors
Susanville, CA

Doug Sayers
Lassen Sportsmen's Club
Susanville, CA

Daren Hagata
Lassen County Cattlemen's Association
Susanville, CA

Ron Laver
Livestock Permittee
Susanville, CA

5vim-

saw the #s were derived

Mat^{therr} waters in North Twin Peak -

Mat gath. S. range

S. range