

6/24-25/1982

6-24-82

TRT Recommendations

MASSACRE MOUNTAIN/HIGH ROCK TRT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the Cowhead/Massacre MFP III be modified, if necessary, to allow all the following recommendations.

RATIONALE

Several of the recommendations conflict with the MFP decisions. The Team felt that their recommendations meet the overall objectives, but specific recommendations are in conflict with the MFP. Otherwise, the Team agreed with the existing MFP III decisions.

2. We recommend that Bunyard be allowed to convert his sheep AUMs to cattle AUMs.

RATIONALE

Mr. Bunyard made a request to the Team that he be permitted to switch his class of stock from sheep to cattle. Bunyard's sheep operation has become increasingly uneconomical due primarily to losses from predators. A change to cattle would eliminate this problem. Additionally, conversion to cattle would greatly reduce potential disease problems between livestock and big-horn sheep.

3. We recommend that cattle grazing be allowed on the west side of High Rock Canyon. A solid fence west of the Canyon is required to restrict cattle grazing from canyons and eastern benches except as prescribed for wildlife and watershed enhancement. The fence will be built concurrently with adequate water development on the west side.

RATIONALE

The Team felt that the canyon complex was the key problem in the Allotment. If the Canyon could be managed primarily for resources other than grazing, then there was no substantial reason for excluding cattle west of the Canyon. The eastern benches provide very little livestock grazing use, are primary horse and antelope use areas and would be expensive to manage separately from the canyon complex.

The solid fence was recommended as the most practical method of providing livestock control in the protected area.

Prescription grazing in the canyon complex and east was recognized as a tool to manipulate vegetation for wildlife and watershed purposes.

4. We recommend that all livestock operators in the Allotment be treated equally.

RATIONALE

This is to effect a change in the MFP III decisions that gave preference to Bunyard's operation. The Team felt that all operators should be treated equally.

5. We recommend that the prescription grazing program in the canyons and on the east benches be designed to not detract from the following values:

- Cultural resources
- Wild horses
- Wildlife
- Recreational
- Wilderness
- Aesthetic
- Rare and endangered plants and animals*
- Paleontological*

* Not presently identified

RATIONALE

The Team was concerned that since the canyons and east benches were being removed from regular livestock use because of sensitive resources that the prescription use be designed to enhance values in the area rather than continue the existing grazing related problems.

6. We recommend that water developments on the east benches be constructed primarily for wildlife and wild horses.

RATIONALE

The eastern benches are poorly watered, causing wildlife and wild horses to be highly concentrated during dry periods. Construction of additional waters would disperse the animals, potentially increasing carrying capacity. Additionally, these water developments would benefit prescriptive livestock grazing.

7. We recommend that fences and water development not reflect adversely upon the evaluation and boundaries of Wilderness Study Areas. These developments should be designed to have minimal impact upon the wilderness values.

RATIONALE

There was a concern that the projects required to make the Team's recommendations work on the ground have the potential to change the areas suitability

for inclusion into wilderness. The recommendation was included to make sure that the projects do not change the potential wilderness characteristics of the area.

8. We recommend that any water development and any other project work in WSA's (Wilderness Study Area) be in accordance with the IMP (Interim Management Policy).

RATIONALE

This recommendation is to add assurance that all work in WSA's will be done in such a manner that the wilderness qualities or values will not be impacted.

9. We recommend that BLM develop a rehabilitation for the canyon bottom to stabilize streambanks, reduce soil erosion and restore riparian vegetation.

RATIONALE

The canyon complex exhibits a wide range of riparian degradation. The limiting of livestock grazing will allow for improvement on many of the sites, but large areas will not respond until positive watershed manipulation procedures are installed.

10. We recommend that motorized vehicle travel be allowed only on existing MFP designated roads and that seasonal travel controls be implemented during critical raptor nesting periods and inclement weather conditions. High Rock area roads shall be improved only as necessary to provide resource protection and safe public access.

If bighorn sheep are reintroduced and if there is a conflict between lambing and recreational use then the Canyon should be closed to public access until Memorial weekend.

RATIONALE

The Team felt that vehicle use should be restricted to prescribed areas and use periods to prevent undue degradation of resources.

The second part of the recommendation recognizes that there is a potential to increase the restricted use periods.

11. We recommend that the Cultural Resource Management Plan be completed and implemented for Sub Unit 1.

RATIONALE

The Team felt that since this plan would place restrictions on other activities it should be finalized to provide guidance on the other programs.

12. We recommend that a recreation visitor plan be developed to manage visitor use.

RATIONALE

The Team felt that since livestock use in the canyon complex was being limited, the other significant factors contributing to resource degradation should also be managed through development and implementation of a visitor plan.

13. We recommend that priority be placed upon preparation of a Wild Horse and Burro Management Plan.

RATIONALE

The Team felt that since this plan could place some restrictions on or influence other activities that it should be completed to provide guidance to the other programs.

14. We recommend that the Allotment be grazed in common initially. Later, if feasible, the Allotment could be split into two individual allotments.

RATIONALE

The Team felt that at this time it would be impossible to split the Allotment into use areas for each operator, but that sometime in the future when the grazing use has stabilized a split may be a desirable goal.

15. We recommend that the stocking rate recommendation be deferred until after additional field data are collected, and that the Stewardship Committee consider the issue.

RATIONALE

Until the exact boundaries of the areas to be grazed, the classes of livestock, and the grazing system were finalized, the stocking rate could only be estimated. The Team felt that now that BLM has a firm proposal to work from, they should complete the field work necessary to determine an initial stocking rate and present the data to the Stewardship Committee.

16. We recommend that utilization of the major use areas on native range be limited to 60% by weight of key forage species.

RATIONALE

This standard will be used to evaluate the stocking rate for this Allotment. Utilization of 50 percent was recognized as being proper on ranges grazed season long. It was felt that 60 percent utilization would be proper for areas receiving a growing seasons rest or a deferment during the grazing season. This also conforms to MFP III guidance.

17. We recommend that the season of use be from April 1, or later depending on soil moisture conditions, and continue to September 30. If cattle turnout in the south (Little High Rock Bench), the earliest date will be April 16.

RATIONALE

The area identified for turnout (Dog Leg Area) is early use country. The soils in this area are relatively sandy and dry up early and vegetation begins growth early. Most years by April 1, this area is suitable for grazing. Soil moisture conditions will be the main reason grazing will be delayed later than April 1. The southern portion of the Allotment is also suitable for spring use. However, it does not dry out as rapidly as the Dog Leg Area and would normally not be suitable for grazing until mid-April.

18. We recommend that the seedings in the Dog Leg and in the Long Valley Allotment be completed as soon as possible. Also, the Powers Well Unit of Long Valley (not needed to satisfy Long Valley preference) should be included in Massacre Mountain Allotment.

RATIONALE

A seeding in the Dog Leg Area would help defer spring use on the native range until May 1 or later. Including the Powers Well Unit into this Allotment will provide for two spring turnout pastures which will be used on an alternate years basis. This would allow for deferment, of native range beyond May 1. The Powers Well Unit is part of the Long Valley Allotment. Regulations prevent this area from becoming part of this Allotment until total preference of the Long Valley permittees is satisfied.

19. We recommend that a systematic grazing system be implemented on the Allotment. The system would:
- A) Alternate turnout use between the Dog Leg and the Powers Well Unit to provide deferment on the rest of the Allotment,
 - B) Alternate use in the rest of the Allotment - drifting south one year and drifting north one year.

RATIONALE

A systematic grazing system is needed to improve the vegetative condition and still maintain a livestock grazing operation on this area. Part A will provide an early turnout area with a portion of that area receiving rest every other year. This will improve early spring use by having old forage to turnout onto while every other years rest will improve and maintain plant vigor. Part B will provide for a growing seasons rest every other year. This will provide for improved plant vigor especially among the grass species. This is a simple system and can be implemented without additional fencing.

20. We recommend that private land owners, SCS and BLM investigate the feasibility of improving riparian habitat.

RATIONALE

Most riparian areas are on private land. This recommendation would allow for the improvement of all riparian areas regardless of whether they are private or Federal lands. These areas should be investigated since at this time it was not certain what type of practice, if any, would be applied to any particular sites. Riparian vegetation is very rare in these areas and any improvement will have important impacts on all resource values, especially wildlife.

21. We recommend that BLM negotiate to acquire by exchange the private mineral rights in High Rock Canyon Complex.

RATIONALE

In order to protect and manage all the values found in the Canyon it is important that BLM have control over sub-surface mineral rights as well as surface control. Exchange is the most logical way to try and acquire these rights.

22. We recommend the BLM consider ACEC designation of the canyon complex. We also recommend that all management recommendations made by the TRT be incorporated in ACEC planning.

RATIONALE

Because of archaeology, historical, wildlife, political, recreation, grazing, and wild horse values recongized and discussed in the canyon complex and because of the reduction of the original proposal found in the MFP III, the Team felt that it was important to consider an ACEC designation to assure that the canyon complex area and associated values will receive special protection and management.

23. We recommend that BLM actively pursue a land exchange for the remaining land in Pole Canyon.

RATIONALE

The Team recognized that in order to implement the proposed recommendations, the BLM should have control of all the lands within the canyon complex. It was also mentioned that the private land owners were interested in exchanging land with the BLM. Exchange is the best way to acquire private land since the approximate ratio of private and Federal land remain the same.

24. We recommend that the Stewardship Committee accept all the TRT's recommendations as a unit.

RATIONALE

These recommendations were put together as a total management package for the Massacre Mountain Allotment. A change or dropping of any one recommendation will have an impact on the success of the total management program. The Team felt very strong about this recommendation.

CONFLICTS NOT RESOLVED

The following conflicts were not resolved by the implementation of the Teams management recommendations.

#8	#16	#20
#9	#17	#23
#10	#18	#24
#11	#19	

The Team felt that these identified conflicts were very complex and would not be resolved through the implementation of a management program.

MODOC/WASHOE EXPERIMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

High Rock/Massacre Mountain TRT Meeting
2/24/83

On February 24, 1983 the High Rock/Massacre Mountain TRT met to resolve the stocking rate issue (who shall take the reduction?) and to develop an interim grazing management system.

Those present were:

TRT Members: Rose Strickland, Dawn Lappin, Cecil Pierce, Ben Collins, Larry Hill (rep. Ken Earp), Garth Portillo (for Francis Riddell), Mike Del Grosso, Bob Bunyard, Ernest Eaton, Jim Jeffress and Donnel (Mick) Richards (rep. Mrs. Ken Earp)

Absent TRT Members: Lee Chauvet and Francis Riddell

Others: Rick Cooper, Bill Phillips, A.J. Johnson, Lee Delaney, Richard Westman, Roger Farschon (BLM Staff), Jim Cockrell (Ken Earp) and Jerry Hillyard.

Ben Collins opened the meeting with a reiteration of the success enjoyed by the Team to date.

Lee Delaney outlined the goals of the meeting:

1. Develop an interim grazing management system.
2. Obtain agreement on a stocking rate if possible (the basic question being who should take the reduction?).

Lee informed the group of the progress to date pursuant to the recommendations submitted in June, 1982. BLM has:

1. Developed a draft Cultural Resource Management Plan - out for review.
2. Started planning for a Habitat Management Plan - completion scheduled for FY'84.
3. Delineated a proposed Area of Critical Environmental Concern for the High Rock Canyon Complex.
4. Developed a proposed fenceline on westside of High Rock Canyon.
5. Presented stocking rate issue to Steering Committee and Executive Committee.
6. Met several times with livestock operators on stocking rate issue.
7. Expanded the range survey west of High Rock.

Jim Cockrell and Bob Bunyard then explained their livestock operations in the Massacre Mountain/High Rock area. Jim estimated a maximum of 200 cattle used the canyon in August and September. A.J. Johnson estimated utilization was 40-45% in the canyons for 1982. Bob stated he will run sheep in the Allotment this spring but intends to be out of the sheep business by fall. It was requested that the BLM present the carrying capacity data determined for the area west of High Rock Canyon. Bill Phillips presented the data along with a review of the 1963 range survey and other proposals as follows:

1963 - projected 18 SA/AUM carrying capacity (7,108 AUMs)

1981 - projected 11 SA/AUM carrying capacity (5,942 AUMs) in north portion of Massacre Mountain Allotment.

1982 - Expanded 1981 survey west of High Rock

- Projected 12.2 SA/AUM carrying capacity for Massacre Mountain (6,737 AUMs)
- Projected 30.1 SA/AUM carrying capacity for Little High Rock (959 AUMs)
- Projected 14.4 SA/AUM carrying capacity overall (7,696 AUMs Massacre Mountain and Little High Rock Allotments combined)

Bunyard Proposal (Individual Allotments)

- Bunyard area of use - 1981 survey projects 8.8 SA/AUM. This would provide 2,582 AUMs. Bunyard's active preference is 2,254 AUMs.
- Earps area of use - 1982 expanded survey projects 14.4 SA/AUM. This would provide 5,377 AUMs. Earp's active preference is 8,283.

BLM Proposal (Common Allotment)

- License Bunyard for 2,254 AUMs (current active preference)
- License Earp for 6,243 AUMs (Earp's proportionate share after reduction)
- Total 8,497 AUMs which would require 13.1 SA/AUM. 1982 expanded survey projects 14.4 SA/AUM carrying capacity (7,696 AUMs)

Other proposals were:

Rose Strickland Proposal (Common Allotment)

- License Bunyard for 2,254 AUMs (100% of active preference)
- License Earp for 5,746 AUMs (100% of reduction, 69% of active preference)
- Initial increases (up to 8,283 AUMs) would go to Earp when available.

Transfer - Lease (Common Allotment)

- AUMs would be exchanged between Earp and Bunyard either through a lease or transfer so as to maintain Bunyard's current active preference.

Interim grazing system (Common Allotment)

- This would provide livestock grazing in the canyon bottoms and east on a restrictive basis until prescriptive grazing is implemented.

Reductions based on proportionate shares (Common Allotment)

- Bunyard - 1,757 AUMs (22% reduction)
- Earp - 6,243 AUMs (25% reduction overall, includes 35% reduction in Little High Rock Allotment and 22% reduction in Massacre Mountain Allotment).

Lengthly discussions ensued on the proposals. Larry Hill said Earp will take his proportionate share of a reduction if Bunyard took his. Hill rejected any proposal in which Earp took all of the reduction or his proportionate share if Bunyard didn't take his proportionate share. Hill also rejected Bunyard's proposal for individual allotments until water, seedings and fences were on the ground and could be evaluated. Bob Bunyard said he would appeal any decision which contained a reduction or didn't designate individual allotments. Rose Strickland had major problems with an interim grazing system which had the main purpose of allowing grazing in the canyons and east of High Rock Canyon to offset reductions.

At this point it appeared an impasse was developing on both the stocking rate and interim grazing system. Ben Collins then briefed the group on issuing a decision based either on an agreement by the group or on BLM policy if an agreement was not reached. Basically Ben said an agreement would result in things happening on the ground within a short time period. However, a decision issued otherwise, can be appealed, takes five years to monitor and five years to adjust thereby creating a situation where things may not happen on the ground for a long time.

At this point the group broke for lunch at 12:30 PM.

The meeting reconvened at 1:45 PM. At this point, Lee Delaney rededicated the group and BLM to meeting the goals of the June, 1982 agreement. Lee also graphically illustrated the effects of a decision not based on an agreement:

- Monitor for five years
 - Issue two year notice
 - Five year adjustment
- } overlapping time periods } 10 years +
- If appealed:
 - Status quo
 - no reductions until appeal settled (normally takes 1-2 years)
 - no livestock conversion until appeal settled.

More discussion ensued, but little progress was made. All parties stuck by their earlier statements. At this point, an impasse was clearly developing. Ben Collins then polled the group as to their preferences for resolving the issues - decision based on BLM policy or decision based on an agreement. Everyone's preference was by agreement.

Bob Bunyard broke the impasse on the individual allotment issue by agreeing to drop his demand if the feasibility of an individual allotment would be studied over the next five years. Everyone agreed to this. Ben Collins emphasized that there was no guarantee of an individual allotment at the end of the five years but that we would study it.

Jim Cockrell then broke the impasse on the stocking rate issue. He stated that a reduction is needed, especially when Bob Bunyard converts his sheep to cattle. To help Bob, he offered to reduce his herd to 1000 head beginning in 1984. He stated there were other allotments that he could get if given time. 1000 head of cattle for six months requires 6000 AUMs. This left 243 AUMs of nonuse which Jim said Bob could use contingent upon Earps' approval. Both Larry Hill and Donnel (Mick) Richards felt they could get Ken and Doris Earp to agree to this and they also felt they could get agreement to start at the 6,243 AUM level if Bob started at 1,757 AUMs. At first, Bob rejected the idea, but then he agreed to the 22% reduction after reconsideration. The Team then agreed that an agreement should be drawn up reflecting Jim's proposal for Cockrell's, Bunyard's, Earps' and BLM's signatures. Jim emphasized the agreement could only be good if Earps concurred and for the length of his lease with Earps. It was also agreed that should Cockrell, Bunyard, Earps, and the BLM not reach an agreement, the BLM should move to reach the goals of the June, 1982 TRT agreement by issuing a formal decision on stocking rate, etc.

Two alternatives were proposed for reducing to the 8,000 AUM stocking level:

1) Drop to the 8,000 AUM figure in 1984

- Earp -	6,243 ^{1/}	AUMs
- Bunyard -	<u>1,757</u>	AUMs
Total	8,000	AUMs

1/ Bunyard would use 243 AUMs under an agreement with Earp's and Cockrell.

2) Equal successive increments beginning in 1984

<u>Permittee</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Bunyard	
1984 (-4.4%)	2,155 AUMs
1985 (-4.4%)	2,056 AUMs
1986 (-4.4%)	1,957 AUMs
1987 (-4.4%)	1,858 AUMs
<u>1988 (-4.4%)</u>	<u>1,757 AUMs</u>
Total (-22.0%)	1,757 AUMs

<u>Permittee</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Earp	
1984 (-5%)	7,875 AUMs
1985 (-5%)	7,467 AUMs
1986 (-5%)	7,059 AUMs
1987 (-5%)	6,651 AUMs
<u>1988 (-5%)</u>	<u>6,243 AUMs</u>
Total (-25%)	6,243 AUMs

In summary, the following agreements were reached and supported by the Team:

1. Bob Bunyard agreed to drop the demand for individual allotments if the feasibility would be studied over the next five years.
2. Bob Bunyard agreed to the proposal 22% reduction. (Hill had committed Earp to accepting proportionate share of the reduction during June, 1982 TRT meeting.)
3. Contingent upon the Earps approval and for the life of the Base Property lease, Jim Cockrell will license 243 AUMs as nonuse. Bob Bunyard then may use the 243 AUMs as temporary nonrenewable. An agreement will be drawn up reflecting this if the Earps concur.
4. The Team will support the Earps' choice of which alternative to use in reducing to 8,000 AUMs (either reduce to 8,000 AUMs in 1984 or reduce to 8,000 AUMs in five incremental steps beginning in 1984). Hill and Richards will present these alternatives to the Earps and then get back to the BLM to incorporate into the agreement noted in #3.
5. The Team agreed that if an agreement is not reached, the BLM should move to reach the goals of the June, 1982 TRT agreement by issuing a formal decision.
6. Rather than try to develop an interim grazing system, the Team agreed to prioritize the following with the thought that the AMP, CRMP, HMP, HMAP, and RMP contain the specifics.

- Priority

1. Develop water
 2. Burn in the Dogleg
 3. Seed in the Dogleg
 - 3a. Wild Horse Management
 4. Fence west of High Rock Canyon
- 1-4. Study feasibility of individual allotments (equal in priority to all above).

Rose Strickland indicated she wanted to be involved in developing the prescription for grazing in the canyons and east. On the west side, she only wanted to be involved in the project development in the WSA's.

The group then discussed the proposed ACEC as delineated by the BLM. A number of people expressed concern that it was larger than they had envisioned. Mike Del Grosso suggested dropping a portion east of High Rock Canyon and a portion below Stevens Camp and adding all of Mahogany Canyon. Rose Strickland stated she felt those portions should be left in, especially the portion below Stevens Camp since it contained a portion of the Lassen/Applegate Trail. Most everyone agreed with the Trail portion but felt the portion east of High Rock Canyon could be dropped since it did not contain the values contained in the rationale for the original TRT recommendation. Jim Cockrell argued strongly to drop Little High Rock Canyon from consideration at this time. He then stated he would support Little High Rock also if he could get a water gap into the canyon. It was agreed the BLM, Cockrell, and Don Holmes (Bare Ranch) should get together to work out an agreement.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

MASSACRE MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENT
141,691 acres

480 in 1980
- 126
350+ cact
No. 70-100 head

Ranch
MASSACRE BENCH-- 5158 acres
no wild horses

MASSACRE MOUNTAIN - 27379 acres
no uniform horse use

CANYONS - 16147 acres
some use Bottom slopes winter

EASTERN UPLANDS - 21342 acres
25 wild horses

MASSACRE LANE - 10792 acres

GRASSY TABLE - 25381 acres
limited horse use

LITTLE HIGH ROCK = 35492 acres
32 wild horses

Sheep graz west of HR Can. - yes
Cattle graz " " " - No
(herding difficult)

o - water

