

6-13-89

DRAFT
MINUTES

MODOC/WASHOE EXPERIMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
June 12-13, 1989

Time: 9:17 AM
Date: June 12, 1989
Place: Forest Supervisor's Office, Alturas CA.

Steering Committee Members Present:

Ernest Eaton for Harold Harris	Rich Heap
Jean Schadler	Fred Wright
John Weber	Jack Armstrong for Tom Ballow
Mike Fisher for Barry Reiswig	Rex Cleary
Joe Harris	Wes Cook
Banky Curtis for Spike Naylor	Jeanni Conlan
Rick Delmas	Terry Jay
John Lowrie	Bill Britton for Doug Smith
Ray Page	Jim Stokes

Members Absent:

Harold Harris	Wayne Burkhart
Barry Reiswig	Bruce Main
Tom Ballow	Chris Lauppe
Doug Smith	

Others Present:

Karen Shimamoto	Forest Service	Cedarville
Tony Danna	BLM	Cedarville
William Poole		San Francisco
Nancy Gardner	Forest Service	Alturas
Richard Westman	BLM	Cedarville
Jeff Fontana	BLM	Susanville
Eugene Jensen	Forest Service	Cedarville
Bill Phillips	BLM	Susanville
Jim Walker	Forest Service	Cedarville

1. MEETING TO ORDER

Wes Cook called the meeting to order at 9:17 am.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Attachment 1)

Moved by Jim Stokes, Seconded by John Weber, that reading of the minutes from the February 28 & March 1, 1989 meeting be dispensed with. Fred

Wright pointed out that Susan Lynn's name was misspelled and should be changed, pg. 12 of minutes. Minutes approved by consensus with the noted change in spelling of Susan Lynn's name.

3. INTRODUCTIONS

Rex Cleary introduced Tony Danna as Surprise Resource Area Manager replacing Lee Delaney, and William Poole, free-lance writer from San Francisco. Jack Armstrong was introduced as Tom Ballow's substitute, and Mike Fisher from Fish & Wildlife Service represented Barry Reiswig.

4. AGENDA REVIEW (Attachment 2)

The agenda was reviewed and accepted. Bin items included the 580 Program.

5. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

John Lowrie reported on the Salt Lake City meeting of Experimental Stewardship representatives. The joint meeting will be in Logan, Utah at the University. Report by Lowrie - Attachment 3.

6. HORSE PLANS - BILL PHILLIPS (Attachment 4)

Bill reported on the wild horse plan. He stressed the improved adoptability of horses managed under the plan. Forest Service horses are presently excluded. A number of word changes were recommended. Jean Schadler moved & Rich Delmas seconded to accept "Policy Statement for the Management of Wild & Free Roaming Horses & Burros in the Susanville District" as edited by the Steering Committee. Accepted.

7. OBJECTIVE WRITING TASK FORCE - RICH HEAP

Four people were selected to resolve concerns and come up with objectives using the objective setting process. Objectives were to include describing the desired plant community.

8. HIGH ROCK CANYON GRANT - JOHN LOWRIE (Attachment 5)

John Lowrie reported on High Rock Canyon progress. Susan Lynn is taking over our grant writing.

9. BILL REAVLEY REPLACEMENT - RICH HEAP & JOHN LOWRIE (Attachment 6)

John sent a letter to Dick Hubbard of the Natural Resource Council of California. He will also send one to the Shasta-Cascade Wildlife Society.

10. SOCIETY FOR RANGE MANAGEMENT MEETING - JOHN LOWRIE (Attachment 7)

The Steering Committee submitted a video proposal for a presentation at the 1990 SRM meeting in Reno, Nevada.

11. ANNUAL REPORT STATUS - JOHN LOWRIE

John felt there was not much energy to complete a joint report. We may have to complete one ourselves.

12. FOREST PLAN STATUS - BILL BRITTON

From March 15 to May 15, two working groups met to discuss Forest Plan issues. Bill Britton reported the Range group had 31 rangeland issues. Many issues were resolved and presented to Doug Smith. The Final Plan is scheduled for April 1990. The timber interests have indicated they will appeal.

Joe Harris congratulated the Forest Service on their progress. Rex Cleary moved and Jean Schadler seconded the motion that the congratulations be put in the record. Carried by consensus.

13. WARNER MOUNTAIN BIGHORN SHEEP - KAREN SHIMAMOTO (Attachment 8)

As a result of the Warner Mt. bighorn sheep TRT meeting, a group of interagency biologists met to develop guidelines for mountain sheep in northeastern California. She requested these guidelines be reviewed and recommendations sent to her prior to the next meeting.

14. WARNER MOUNTAIN ALLOTMENTS - GENE JENSEN (Attachment 9)

Gene updated the committee on the 5 allotments with ongoing or planned TRTs.

A flow chart was handed out to describe the linkage between TRTs and the NEPA process.

The workplan for the Bearcamp Allotment TRT was discussed. Some work has started, and when the TRT is formed field trips will be scheduled for team member participation in data collection.

15. RANGE MANAGEMENT DELEGATION - BILL BRITTON (Attachment 10)

Bill Britton presented a comparison of delegation authorities between BLM and FS line officers.

16. LASSEN CREEK SLIDE SHOW - KAREN SHIMAMOTO

Karen Shimamoto presented a slide show describing how the Hapgoods participated in the development of Lassen Creek and the presentation of an award to them.

17. MT. VIDA AREA EIS - JIM WALKER (Attachment 11)

Jim Walker described the Mt. Vida area and some resource information. He also described the public involvement process and provided handouts to each member. He requested public comment by the end of Sept. The Steering Committee formed a subcommittee of Ray Page, Banky Curtis, and Jim Stokes.

18. NEXT MEETING AND SOME AGENDA ITEMS

Date: October 26 & 27, 1989 NOTE: This is a change from Nov. 14 & 15.
Place: Cedarville, CA - BLM Office

Some Agenda Items -

1. 580 Program - 4 hrs.
subcommittee - Banky, John L., Wes Cook, Jean S.
2. Recommendations & Stocking Rate on Massacre Mt. - 4 hrs.
BLM - committee not assigned.
3. Mt. Vida
subcommittee - Ray Page, Banky Curtis, Jim Stokes
4. Policy
Jeannie

19. Meeting Adjourned at 5:21 pm

20. DINNER AT GOLDENS

A presentation by Bill Flournoy on Tule Mt. After the presentation Bill gave a very entertaining recitation.

Date: June 13, 1989
Place: HIGH ROCK CANYON TOUR

Members and guests met at BLM office, Cedarville, CA at 6:30 am. Tour of High Rock began at 7:15. Description of tour - Attachment 12.

QUOTABLE QUOTES

Double Uglies

Respectfully Submitted,

Ernest Eaton
Executive Secretary

FINAL
MINUTES

MODOC/WASHOE EXPERIMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
February 28 & March 1, 1989

Time: 9:20 AM
Date: February 28, 1989
Place: Forest Supervisor's Office, Alturas

Steering Committee Members Present:

Jim Stokes	Tom Ballow
Jeanni Conlan	Chris Lauppe
Ray Page	John Lowrie
Doug Smith	Wesley Cook
Rex Cleary	Irv Toler (Bruce Main)
Fred Wright	Rick Delmas
Rich Heap	Jean Schadler
Banky Curtis	Wayne Burkhardt
Joe Harris	Harold Harris

Members Absent:

Marv's acting	Bill Reavley
John Weber	
Terri Jay	

Others Present:

Jeff Fontana, Susanville BLM
Andy Leven, Forest Service, San Francisco
David Jay, Forest Service, San Francisco
Bill Britton, Modoc NF
Paul Roush, Alturas/Surprise BLM
Karen Shimamoto, Modoc NF, Warner Mtn. RD
Richard Westman, Surprise BLM
Eugene Jensen, Modoc NF, Warner Mtn. RD
Alan Uchida, Surprise RA, BLM
Juanita Bicondoa, Permittee
Bill Cockrell, Permittee
Roger Farschon, Surprise RA, BLM
Tracey Irons, Surprise RA, BLM
Bob Sherve, Susanville BLM
Bill Phillips, Susanville BLM
Nancy Gardner, Modoc NF
Bob Davis, Modoc NF

1. MEETING TO ORDER

Wes Cook called the meeting to order at 9:20 AM.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Tom Ballow and seconded by Rick Delmas that the minutes for the October Steering Committee meeting and the January Executive Committee meeting be approved. Minutes approved by concensus.

3. INTRODUCTIONS

Those in attendance introduced themselves.

4. AGENDA REVIEW

GAWS presentation deferred by Exec. Comm. because the agenda was full. Bin items started. Agenda accepted.

5. HAYS CANYON BIGHORN SHEEP TASK FORCE - Fred Wright, Rich Heap

Fred Wright reported on the Task Force's final recommendations (Attachment 1). He made special note that of the membership, only Regina Pratt and Joe Harris were directly affected by the subcommittee's actions. Both contributed in a positive manner in spite of their concerns and reservations. Ed Berryessa and Bill Cockrell also contributed positively to deliberations.

Overall recommendation is to move ahead with reintroduction of Calif. bighorn with management to cover the Hays Canyon range and not just the Bicondoa Allotment.

Fred reviewed the objective and facets. He also discussed the evaluation and resolution of the facets. Fred then presented 8 recommendations to the Steering Committee.

In summary the recommendations are:

- 1) Reintroduce Calif. bighorn sheep
- 2) Convert Bicondoa Sheep permit to a cattle permit, if possible. If not then proceed with cancellation of the permit.
- 3) Disclaimer signed by NDOW and BLM offering the local livestock interest relief from their concerns over unforeseen wild sheep losses and feared repercussions.
- 4) Forty-nine Mountain slide area be the site of the 1st release.
- 5) Bicondoa release site will be considered pending water development and disposition of sheep allotment.

Rich Heap discussed NDOW's Hays Canyon Bighorn Sheep Reestablishment Plan (Attachment 2). Proposed reintroduction for Hays Canyon is in the

1990-1992 release plan, which is expected to be approved by May. The logical reintroduction time would be next December. NDOW would release 15 sheep with expectations of 100 sheep in 10 years. They may augment the herd with a ram or ewes from another herd to increase genetic diversity.

This the first time NDOW has gone through this process. Usually the land management agency does the paperwork and NDOW acquires and releases the animals. Recent experiences have been injunctions and lawsuits. Rich believes this process is good - many assumptions were cleared-up and dealt with. There is now better understanding.

Rich reminded us that bighorn sheep are of international interest. Canada has some of the last California bighorn sheep. Our interests are mutually served by expanding the species range, but to do so requires cooperation and good relations. Nevada also has the largest population of desert bighorn sheep. Sportsmen such as NBU can raise \$25,000-50,000 in one night.

Tom Ballow complimented Chairperson Wright for allowing full discussion.

See disclaimer proposed by NDOW regarding grazing.

Q/A -

Will the sheep be bled and tested? (Wes Cook)

The State Dept. of Agriculture and NDOW maintain a health profile on each bighorn (i.e., blood, nasal swab, fecal samples, etc.). Additionally British Columbia has done extensive health profiles on their herds. They realize the sheep must pass customs to get across the border. It is not in their interest to send diseased animals. (Rich Heap).

What is the contingency plan for a die-off? (Doug Smith)

If an animal dies, it will be sent to Reno to the State Dept. of Agric. for a necropsy.

Also Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game vet Dave Hall is proposing a study on disease reaction to domestic sheep. This proposal will go before the Western Assoc. of Fish & Game in June. Funding is being requested from NA Bighorn Sheep. Study costs are estimated to be \$750,000. (Rich Heap).

Motion by Rex Cleary and 2nd by Tom Ballow that the Hays Canyon Bighorn Sheep Task Force Report be accepted and their recommendations adopted.

Discussion - Jean Schadler asked if Mrs. Bicondoa was invited to participate in the task force. Joe Harris was to include her interests. Mrs. Bicondoa said she discussed matters with Lee Delaney, but not with Joe Harris or Regina Pratt. She said she was OK with converting the permit to cattle. John Laxague reminded the group that only a part of permit was to be converted to cattle,

with the rest phased out. Rich Westman responded that the decision was to look at the ground, but the proposal was: 175-200 AUMs - converted to cattle
~ 168 AUMs - suspended non-use

368 AUMs

Bill Cockrell said \$7000-8000 was needed for water. He is OK with starting with 200 AUMs (mid March - mid April) and then seeing if water helps capacity.

Rex Cleary revised his motion to include AUMs above 175-200 be included in suspended non-use. Wayne Burkhardt 2nd.

Discussion - Water for bighorn sheep? Nevada Bighorn Unlimited will probably fund water in "slide" area. What happens when the population reaches capacity? Experience is they don't move much. NDOW will initiate a harvest program based on age and point structure. When 30% exceed 144 points, they issue 1 tag. Three herds are now hunted in Nevada.

Consensus Reached.

Fred Wright moved that the associated issues (#2-5) be brought to the Executive Committee for a future agenda item. Seconded and consensus reached.

6. PERMITTEE MEETING - Wes Cook

Administration problems were reviewed by the Forest Service and the BLM. Sherm Swanson gave a stream classification slide talk.

7. LONG VALLEY & NEVADA WATER RIGHTS - Richard Westman

FY89 Prescribed burn, Lone Spring seeding fence, Massacre Mtn. spring maint.

FY90 Lone Spring seeding

- Issues -
- 1) Long term projects identified through TRTs - water, fences, land treatment.
 - 2) Nevada water rights - Nevada Supreme Court ruled that BLM can hold rights.
 - 3) Changing Direction -
 - a) 18 months to schedule projects
 - b) Wilderness
 - c) 8100 funding
 - 4) Change to water projects in FY93+

Now that the Nevada Supreme Court ruled for BLM, shifting back to water projects is appropriate, but scheduling doesn't allow an immediate shift.

Within Wilderness Study Areas, proposed projects are scrutinized more than normal. State Office approval for projects is required. There are 32 water projects in the WSAs.

8100 Funding - The allocation process is changing in FY90. In the past the grazing advisory board divided the money equally. However, these small amounts of separate monies made it difficult to fund projects. Beginning in FY90, the process will be: 85% of funding to one resource area, 10% to another, and 5% to the third resource area. In FY90, Surprise will get 85%. Projects for FY90 are due April 1, 1989, which means water projects will not be ready for FY90 funding. It will be FY93 before Surprise will get 85% of the funding.

Impacts to Long Valley - (TRT recommended seeding 10,000 acres.)

- develop a rotation grazing program for LV permittees
- satisfy Class I demand (suspended non-use)
- use seedings for other users only
- test the capacity using temporary, non-renewable
- determine long-term solution for using seeded pastures.

Seedings are divided into 3,000-4,000 acre fields. It's been suggested that Massacre Mtn permittees be moved to LV. Since seedings are not in-place, this cannot occur. Additionally there is insufficient water developed. In addition to needing new wells, the existing springs are marginal and existing wells need improvement.

Q/A & Comments -

Are there \$\$ available from the Nevada ASCS? Jeanni Conlan will look into.

Jean Schadler is concerned about the investment in seedings and the underuse. She wants adequate water and full harvest of the forage. Suggested looking into more cost-sharing; C2N \$\$.

8. DAVID JAY, DEP. REGIONAL FORESTER

Dave shared his perspective on ESP. He did not feel it was experimental any longer; that in 10 years time, the program has become well established. While he was on sabbatical at Hewlett-Packard, he learned about selling wares and a program. He was concerned that ESP was not marketing itself well enough to the lay public, and that the market was not northern California, but San Francisco, and southern Calif.

FS manages about 20 million acres with 6500 people on 18 National Forests. Staffing is down 10-15% from 10 years ago. The budget is \$350 million, while Treasury receipts are \$230 million. It is difficult for the FS to market this receipt against the budget.

The FS has increased staffing commitment to conflict resolution. If conflict/impacts rise, our environmental documentation goes from environmental assessments (EAs) to environmental impact statements (EISs). Our approach now is EISs unless shown otherwise.

Wood products come from 50% federal land and 50% private land. About 70% comes from California sources, while the remaining 30% is imported from outside the state. Areas south of San Francisco use 85% of the products.

Grazing continues to be scrutinized. FS and its permittees need to manage the land and the grazing use to its best. As management increases, costs increase.

The FS organization will change. About 50% of the people who will work for the FS by the year 2000 are not yet hired.

Discussed a publication "Vision: California 2010" written by the California Economic Development Corporation. (Attachment 3).

9. ANDY LEVEN, ASST. REGIONAL FORESTER FOR RANGE & WATERSHED

Range Budget: \$ 3 million (1982)	Staffing: 45 (1982)
2 million (1985)	35 (1985)
2.5 million (1989)	28 (1989)

Result has been to switch range responsibilities to hydrologists and wildlife biologists.

After presentation of this information to Calif. Cattlemens and National Cattlemens Associations, they passed resolutions requesting the FS increase the number of range conservationists.

10. WARNER MOUNTAIN RANGER DISTRICT ALLOTMENT PRIORITIES - Bill Britton

The list of allotment priorities are still in draft form, but an important criterion is riparian concerns in Rosgen "C" Type streams. This summer, the Forest is continuing its efforts to classify streams. Also, LMP riparian S&Gs will be more appropriate for certain stream types than others.

Q/A -

Will these types be assigned to an entire stream? No, to section or reaches.

How many allotments have C type streams? The Forest has not finished compiling the data.

Can we integrate funding? Yes, we already are.

What will be the management on A type streams? Don't know because we need to decide on an allotment-by-allotment basis. Probably left alone.

When is a stream a stream? We are addressing perennial streams, those with the potential to be perennial streams, and ephemerals important to fish & wildlife.

11. DILLON ASSIGNMENTS - Bill Britton (Attachment 4)

Economics committee - For your information read Attachment 5 on the Wyoming ESP economic report. Establishes the economic benefit of cooperative management instead of litigation.

Futuring Committee - John Lowrie and Rick Delmas will prepare our accomplishments

Publicizing - Jeff Fontana and Nancy Gardner to complete assignment.

There was a motion and 2nd to work on these three areas and drop the rest of the tasks. Consensus.

12. SALT LAKE CITY MEETING - Wes Cook

Meeting of 3 ESP areas to improve contact. Meeting postponed until March 15. Wes hopes to change date to April or May. Items of discussion: 1) Problem areas (e.g. GAO report); 2) 1990 Report; 3) Any ideas from each steering committee.

Concern that the successes of ESP have not been measured. Our task should not be to rebutt the GAO, but instead prepare a report which offers a different perspective then the GAO report.

Rex reminded us that ESP was a sidelight to the GAO report because of politics. The random sampling of allotments and questionnaires may not properly reflect the true picture of ESP, but instead misperceptions of other agency personnel.

Moved, seconded and carried that ESP pay for Wes's expenses.

13. BILL REAVLEY REPLACEMENT - John Lowrie, Rich Heap

John and Rich thought about filling Bill's position by sending out a "job announcement." In brief, we desire a professional wildlife person with adequate time to devote to ESP. This individual needs to be able to travel. Must have a broad interest in wildlife from deer to endangered species. Able to represent a broad constiuency of interests."

John is willing to draft a letter to the Northern Calif. Chapter of Wildlife Society. If they could not provide us a person, perhaps they could refer us to others.

Fred suggested contacting the Natural Resource Council, Dick Hubbard, Berkeley. They are the Calif. affiliate for the National Wildlife Federation.

Doug agreed to get with John to contact Dick Hubbard.

14. CALIF. FISH & GAME USER FEES -

Other Announcements:

Spike Naylor appointed to Marine Fisheries Council as Special Assistant.
Banky acting for Spike.

Habitat Development Crews on eastside; proposed in the Governor's budget for location at Honey Lake. Will work between Reno and Oregon border. This crew will need work projects.

Release of 16 Merriam's turkeys (mountainous critters) on private land at the base of the Warner Mountains.

CALIF. WILDLAND PROGRAM

Wildlife passes (\$7.50) for sale to visit 9 wildlife areas. Purpose to capture dollars from nongame users. Each area has interpretive specialists. \$1 Million in sales projected statewide. Interpretive objectives - to explain about the Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game, and about the fish & wildlife resources.

Banky agreed to bring an interpreter to one of our meetings.

15. BIN ITEMS

1) Nevada Water Rights - Nevada Supreme Court ruled against the State Dept. of Agriculture saying the Federal Government can hold water rights. Tom Ballow sent a copy of the judge's ruling to all steering committee members.

Issue started about 10 years ago. Via press release, BLM said they would file for stock & wildlife waters on public lands, and would also protest private filing on public lands. State interpreted this as a federal water rights grab. Although litigation ensued, a number of agreements were made including transferring of rights to private individuals and withdrawing protests. During this time, hundreds of ranchers filed for rights on public land.

Supreme Court also ruled that water for wildlife (as associated with recreation) was a beneficial use.

Federal needs amounted to about 300 rights instead of the original estimate of 6,000.

Fred Wright commented that the Nevada Wildlife Federation was an intervenor in suit, and discussed wildlife ruling and diversions. Felt only "losers" in this issue were those who disagreed from a philosophical perspective.

2) Range Improvement Committee - Long Valley seeding is underutilized in part because of non-use, and in part because of inadequate water supply & distribution. Because of changing priorities (caused by water rights, wilderness study areas, and 8100 funding) the current emphasis is on

another seeding in FY90. Jean Schadler understands why the next seeding should be completed as a priority, but the existing seeding needs water sooner than is planned. If the BLM doesn't have the money, private investments or other government funding may be necessary.

John Laxague and Joe Harris think permittees need to get together with BLM and work something out.

Richard Westman said existing wells need improvement and additional wells can be drilled. Existing number of livestock use is limited by water.

Motion from Tom Ballow that \$\$ be requested from the State Director for unused 8100 funds. Seconded. Consensus

Discussion of water projects in WSAs. Proposal to discuss later.

Date: March 1, 1989
Time: 8:00 AM

John Lowrie brought the second day of the meeting to order, in the absence of Chairperson Wes Cook.

1. OBJECTIVE SETTING PRESENTATION - Jim Stokes

Jim Stokes and Banky Curtis explained the workshops would be four to five hours long, using problem-solving techniques. This morning would be a mini-session as a demonstration, and for committee input.

Jim Stokes briefed the group on how to write objectives, address philosophies.

- 1) Never argue over "goals" vs "objectives". Determine at the beginning of a session to use one term or the other.
- 2) Objective statement normally is given at the beginning of a meeting. What needs to be done is to clearly define the objective. (Usually a statement that no one can disagree with.)
- 3) Be aware of constraints (laws, regulations, etc.) so as not to conflict.
- 4) List concerns; however, make it clear that concerns are analyzed to assure they are truly concerns (i.e. is it really a problem?)
- 5) Problem evaluation:
Three kinds of problems - a use problem, a problem for a resource, and problems caused by a resource.

If the group works on a problem of the resource, it is easier to get the group working together. Starting with discussions on using the resource causes problems.

Start with problems that are less controversial. Identify the problem(s) by using the following: is it new or old; is there a known solution; is there a trend to the problem - is the problem increasing/decreasing; identify "threat time" - when is this problem going to start and what "lead time" is needed to mitigate.

Banky and Jim presented a short role-play exercise, demonstrating communication using riparian area as an example. The first role-play demonstrated the wrong way to approach the problem. An example of the right way followed, which included the following items: Identify specific objective; use specialists and interest groups; on-the-ground information gathering; group agreement on the problem; group participation in setting objectives; follow-up with specialists.

Bill Phillips and Bill Britton provided an objectives handout, using three objectives for the Oxendine Allotment. The group participated in stating the objective for bitterbrush, action to be taken, time frames for accomplishment, and items to monitor for success. (Attachment 6)

The feed-back from Committee on Jim and Banky's presentation indicated the workshop would need more time. The committee felt on-site information was needed to begin objectives. Banky suggested that since the objective of a workshop was to teach attendees how to use the objective-setting process, there may be a need for both quick workshops and extended workshops.

After the morning break, Chairman Wes Cook continued the meeting. An evaluation of the mini-session brought out the following items:

- 1) Problem of "personal baggage" and how to get around the simple matter of non-agreement.
- 2) Land Management Plan describes land usage - the objective is to meet those plans/goals.
- 3) Need to work out problems of the resource first, and more controversial items later.
- 4) Suggestion to have interest groups try to work on each others concerns to give more understanding.

It was resolved to go ahead with the objective-setting workshop. Wes, Rex, Wayne, and John were to meet at break and to recommend action to the group at the close of the meeting.

Chairman Wes Cook asked for a report from the group who discussed objective-setting workshops during lunch break. The group suggested that a small group of "key" people (Rich, Rex and/or staff, Jim Stokes, and Bill) take 1-2 days to tackle an allotment. Suggested Tuledad, in particular the deer/bitterbrush question; look at desired plant community concept. Keep the group small. The purpose of having key people take a look at an allotment would be to see if objectives can be developed, using the 7-step methods outlines by Jim Stokes. Tuledad would be used as a setting only - not in place of the Tuledad TRT.

Motion was made and seconded to go ahead with the objectives group. Tentative dates of April 25-26 were selected. Rich Westman and Bill Phillips will get data together, background material on Tuledad Allotment. Rich will let everyone involved know where and when to meet. Feed-back on how the process worked will be provided to Banky.

2. BUNYARD DECISION - Rex Cleary

A) Executive Committee appointed a three-person committee to review problems of High Rock reduction: R. Delmas, J. Weber, J. Laxague. Due to the volume of material, the presentation will be made at the next meeting. Jean Schadler has also participated on the special committee.

B) Terri Jay is to develop grant proposal for land acquisition. She will need to put a hold on the project for one month due to time constraints. Susan Lynn may be able to take over the grant responsibilities in early April.

3. WILD HORSE DISPLAY -

Tracy Iron's wild horse display was presented. Management plans include committment to manage herds in the Susanville District. Would like to bring specific language to next meeting for committee endorsement.

Rich Heap made a motion that the Steering Committee send a letter to Tracy Irons regarding her excellent wildhorse display. The motion was seconded, and Rich will draft the letter for Wes's signature.

4. CELEBRATING SUCCESSES - Rex Cleary

Rex provided a portion of the Society for Range Management symposium, a list of articles from the proceedings. Information was provided from the Billings symposium also. Topics for the upcoming SRM meeting are being solicited, due by May 1, 1989. Suggested the ESP Committee put together a success story. BLM resources will be available if the committee would like to use a video. Long Valley was suggested as one success story. Another suggestion was stewardship itself with video of successes. Also possible use of Yankee Jim allotment, Lassen Creek. (Attachment 7)

It was motioned and seconded that the 5-yr report committee (Rick Delmas and John Lowrie) be used to develop a "success story" in conjunction with the report to Congress.

5. FS ANNOUNCEMENTS - Doug Smith

Doug Smith provided a handout on the Vegetation Management for Reforestation EIS and announced the March 15, 1989 meeting on the Modoc Plan. (Attachments 8 & 9).

6. AREA MANAGER/DISTRICT RANGER ROLE - Karen Shimamoto, Richard Westman

Rex Cleary provided Lee Delaney's Area Manager Role Statement; a summary of Lee's thoughts on how he perceived and carried out his role. Rex also provided his own thoughts on how the BLM has managed TRTs. (Attachment 10).

Karen asked for input from the Steering Committee in the following areas, specifically addressing the role of the AM/DR:

(1) Steering Committee Meetings

- Facilities
- Minutes
- Agenda
- Clerical Support
- Dinners
- Awards
- Distribution of information

(2) Subcommittees and Task Forces

- Minutes
- Writing Reports
- Clerical Support
- Facilities/Equipment
- Participation

(3) TRTs

- Participation
- Working relationship with TRT members
- Review of issues, objectives and alternatives
- Reports - writing, "fleshing-out"
- Clerical Support
- Reporting to the Steering Committee

As there is no clear definition of the roles and responsibilities or the BLM Area Manager/FS District Ranger, Karen lead a discussion to clarify these roles. There was also confusion as to the possible duplication of work by agency specialists.

FS/NEPA process as it relates to TRT: Karen provided the group with a review of the NEPA process. She included the steps from Letter of Intent, Issues, Field Reports, ID Team Meetings, etc. A big part of this process is the willingness to work together and understand how the TRT work fits within the NEPA process.

Following discussion and input, Karen agreed to draft a role/responsibility statement for presentation at the next meeting.

7. NEXT MEETING

June 12 & 13, 1989

Next meeting agenda:

- Report on High Rock Grant
- Report on Objective Writing Task Force
- Horse Plans - Adoptability
- "Cowfish" - Bill Britton (may be postponed)
- Bunyard Decision
- Bill Reavley's replacement

Tour to High Rock and Hog Mountain Mine: suggested one-half day meeting with dinner, and the tour the following day. J. Schadler volunteered to

help with the tour. W. Cook will take care of awards. H. Harris will take care of dinner at Golden's at 7 pm.

AGENDA

Modoc/Washoe Experimental Stewardship Program
Steering Committee Meeting
June 12-13, 1989
Modoc Forest Supervisors Office
Alturas, CA

June 12, 1989

9:00 a.m.	Meeting to order Minutes Chairman's Report Salt Lake City Meeting Sub-Committee Status	Cook
10:00 a.m.	Horse plans - Improved adoptability	Phillips
10:45 a.m.	Break	
11:00 a.m.	Report on Objective Writing Task Force	Heap
11:30 a.m.	Report on High Rock Grant	Lowrie
12:00 noon	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Bill Reavley Replacement SRM success story and annual report status	Heap/Lowrie Lowrie/Delmas
1:30 p.m.	Forest Plan Status	Bob Davis
2:00 p.m.	Warner Mtn. bighorn sheep	Shimamoto
2:30 p.m.	Warner Mtn. allotments	Jensen
3:00 p.m.	Break	
3:15 p.m.	Range Management Delegation	Britton
3:30 p.m.	Lassen Creek slide show	Shimamoto
4:00 p.m.	Mtn. Vida Planning Area EIS	Walker
4:30 p.m.	New directions Next meeting Agenda items	Cook
6:00 p.m.	Happy Hour at Goldens	
7:00 p.m.	Dinner at Goldens Presentation by Bill Fournoy on Tule Mtn. Management Program	

580 program discussion

June 13, 1989

7:00 a.m. Meet at Cedarville BLM Office for tour of High Rock Canyon Area
8:00 a.m. Tour Massacre Mtn. Area
12:00 noon Lunch at Stevens Camp
1:00 p.m. Tour High Rock Canyon
6:00 p.m. Return to Cedarville

PROPOSED FORMAT AND INFORMATION FOR 10 YEAR STEWARDSHIP REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

A. LEGISLATION: Brief description of sec. 12, PRIA.

B. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

A. GOALS

B. AREA DESCRIPTIONS

C. OPERATIONS OF STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

III. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. SUCCESSES

1. Management Implementation

a. Grazing Management Systems -

The goal of the Stewardship Committee was to implement grazing management throughout the Stewardship Area. They did not take the approach of setting up a few example allotments to show what could be done. There are enough demonstration areas already existing throughout the west and they felt it was time to put our knowledge of grazing management into practice on a large scale. The Stewardship Committee formed teams (TRT's) made up of field-level technicians from the BLM, state departments of wildlife, soil conservation service, environmental representative and the permittee. Other special interests were added as needed. The TRT's were instructed to visit the allotments on-the-ground and to come back with recommendations they could all support. The first allotment review met with success, the process was quickly put to use to identify and solve other livestock grazing conflicts. This process evolved into a planning tool used by the BLM to review and make recommendations on 22 allotments within a 2 year period (1981-1982). Although a few allotments required extensive investment in range improvements to be fully implemented, most could be implemented with a moderate investment. Each plan also contained an interim system which would get management started with little or no investment of money. As result of this effort, 26 of the 30 allotments, or 85% of the allotments identified for intensive management in the Surprise Resource Area have some degree of grazing management being practiced. Many of the interim systems, along with those fully implemented, are showing significant signs of resource improvement.

b. Resource Monitoring Program -

The Steering Committee recognized the importance of monitoring the results of range management practices. A monitoring Subcommittee was formed and a "common sense" two-phase monitoring system was proposed and has been implemented on the Resource Area. The first phase of the system involves short term data - utilization, season of use, distribution of livestock, etc. This data is helping the management agencies to measure whether or not the AMPs are being followed. The long term phase of the monitoring program is aimed at measuring range condition and trend over time. As management plans are implemented, the short term data will tell if management is on track, the long term data will tell if management is reaching the goals intended. In the high desert environment, characteristic of a large part of the Stewardship Area, this long term information will not be meaningful for several more years.

The implementation of this monitoring program has resulted in the establishment of 247 monitoring studies on 1,243,320 acres which cover 27 allotments. These studies consist of trend plots, utilization transect and photo plots. Precipitation data is also collected for each allotment. All of this information is very critical to measuring the success of each grazing management system.

c. Management Plan Evaluation -

Once management had been implemented, the next step in the process was to evaluate each grazing system and demonstrate the success that is occurring. Two allotments that have been implemented for about 10 years were selected to be evaluated. A major problem that surfaced during this evaluation was that objectives were not definite enough to permit a measurable follow-up evaluation. Therefore, a goals and objective subcommittee was appointed to develop recommendations to help in the development of clear, measurable objectives. As a result of the efforts by this sub-committee, the following results were achieved. A seven step process which would aid in the identification of objectives was developed. The M/W ESP sponsored an objective writing workshop which helped to explain and refine this process. This sub-committee also recommended that all AMPs be developed into Stewardship Management Plans. These will become activity plans that address all significant resources within the allotment. This sub-committee also developed an evaluation process in which the TRT would be an essential part of the evaluation. This keeps all interested parties involved with grazing management long past the initial planning stages.

d. Resource Improvement -

The success of the program must ultimately be measured through improvement in range condition. Most range scientists, participants, and observers agree that it will take many years

to increase the ecological range condition class on many of the rangelands. However, there are several indicators that we can monitor, other than range condition, that can let us know if our management program is headed in the right direction. These include such factors as improved utilization patterns, improved plant vigor, increased plant cover, frequency, plant composition and litter. Change in these factors are being recorded through utilization studies, trend transect, photo points and documented observations of field technicians. Using a composite to this information the following changes are beginning to occur. Of the 26 allotments in which grazing management has been implemented; livestock utilization patterns have improved on 18 allotments, eleven allotments have shown moderate to high improvement in the upland range areas, six allotments have shown moderate improvement in the bitterbrush, mahogany and aspen stands, and ten allotments have shown moderate to high improvement in the meadow and stream bank vegetation.

2. Special Management Areas/Programs

The Modoc/Washoe Experimental Stewardship Committee looked at many resource issues and realized management of many unique areas would require more than the implementation of livestock management to solve these more complex issues. The results were that livestock grazing was either excluded or the planning efforts were driven by resource values other than livestock grazing.

a. High Rock Canyon ACEC / Massacre Mountain Decision

High Rock Canyon is the most scenic as well as the most controversial piece of land in the Stewardship Area. Sheer rock cliffs; nesting golden eagles; the historic Lassen - Applegate Emigrant Trail; pioneer inscriptions intermixed with Indian cultural sites; wild horses. The canyon and surrounding area is grazed by cattle and sheep and is important to three livestock operators, while the peaks and candidates for bighorn sheep reintroduction. ORV'ers, rockhounds, campers, hunters, and hikers compete for parts of the scenic canyon.

In early 1982, the Stewardship Committee appointed a 10-person TRT that represented all interest groups to come up with a consensus management plan. The team began to develop recommendations that would address 16 resource conflicts. The task was difficult, but on March 15, 1983 the team members put their signatures on the list of agreements and recommendations establishing: a High Rock Canyon ACEC, cultural management resource plan, wildlife habitat management plan, wilderness study area recommendations, establishing a livestock exclusion area in the canyon bottom and bench lands to the east, riparian rehabilitation, and others. The thorniest issue, livestock stocking rate, remained to be settled through litigation.

Litigation failed to clearly solve the issue on the allocation of a proposed 1,992 AUM reduction. The Stewardship Committee

took up the issue one more time. A sub-committee was appointed and made a detailed review of all the facts and issues surrounding the proposed reduction. This sub-committee then put together their report along with a recommendation for a final grazing decision for the Massacre Mountain Allotment. This sub-committee developed a decision in which they felt was equitable to all three of the permittee involved.

b. Massacre Lakes Arch. Exclusion -

c. Sand Creek Riparian Exclusion -

d. Biconda Bighorn Sheep Reintroduction

e. Wild Horse Experiment

3. Project Development -

a. Development of fencing and waters

b. Land Treatments

4. Administrative Programs

a. Actual Use Billing -

b. Fee Credit Program

c. Expanded Flexibility in AMPs

5. Economics of Program/Stability of the Livestock Industry

B. FAILURES

1. Controversial Decisions
 - a. High Rock Implementation
2. Permittee Involvement in Monitoring
3. Integrated Management of all Land Ownerships within an Area

C. CONCLUSIONS

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

IV. APPENDIX

- A. TABLE OF RESOURCE IMPROVEMENT BY ALLOTMENT
- B. TABLE OF SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS
- C. TABLE OF RANGE IMPROVEMENTS
- D. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS TABLE
- E. BEFORE AND AFTER PHOTOS
 1. Land Treatments
 2. Riparian Areas
 3. Upland Range Areas
 4. Bitterbrush/Aspen Areas

B. ECONOMIC INFORMATION: E. PIONEER WILL USE FOLLOWING BREAKDOWN-

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS DATA

Investments reflect improvements installed 1980-1989 in all cases.

ESP ALLOTMENTS EXCLUDING EXTENSIVE WATER DEVELOPMENTS

Number of Allotments	#of AUM	\$ FS	\$ BLM	\$ Permittee	FSS /AUM	BLM\$ /AUM	Other\$ /AUM	Permittee \$/AUM	Avg \$ /AUM
----------------------	---------	-------	--------	--------------	----------	------------	--------------	------------------	-------------

ESP ALLOTMENTS INCLUDING EXTENSIVE WATER DEVELOPMENTS

Number of Allotments	#of AUM	\$ FS	\$ BLM	\$ Permittee	FSS /AUM	BLM\$ /AUM	Other\$ /AUM	Permittee \$/AUM	Avg \$ /AUM
----------------------	---------	-------	--------	--------------	----------	------------	--------------	------------------	-------------

COMPARABLE NON-ESP ALLOTMENTS EXCLUDING EXTENSIVE WATER DEVELOPMENTS

Number of Allotments	#of AUM	\$ FS	\$ BLM	\$ Permittee	FSS /AUM	BLM\$ /AUM	Other \$ /AUM	Permittee \$/AUM	Avg \$ /AUM
----------------------	---------	-------	--------	--------------	----------	------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

COMPARABLE NON-ESP ALLOTMENTS INCLUDING EXTENSIVE WATER DEVELOPMENTS

Number of Allotments	#of AUM	\$ FS	\$ BLM	\$ Permittee	FSS /AUM	BLM\$ /AUM	Other \$ /AUM	Permittee \$/AUM	Avg \$ /AUM
----------------------	---------	-------	--------	--------------	----------	------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

(WE MAY WELL WANT TO DROP OUT DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN THOSE WITH & WITHOUT MAJOR WATER DEVELOPMENTS, DEPENDING HOW IT COMES OUT FOR ALL AREAS. THE BEAVERHEAD HAS INSTALLED NUMEROUS NON-ESP WATER SYSTEMS PRIOR TO 1980, AND TWO EXTENSIVE SYSTEMS ON ESP ALLOTMENTS BETWEEN 1980-89. BECAUSE OF COSTS TO ESP ALLOTMENTS FOR WATER, WHEN SIMILAR SYSTEMS WERE NOT INSTALLED ON NON-ESP DURING THE REPORTING TIME FRAME, ARTIFICIALLY HIGH COSTS DEVELOP ON ESP EVEN IF WE WOULD HAVE DONE SAME DEVELOPMENTS ELSEWHERE IF NEED WAS IDENTIFIED. WE CAN EXPLAIN SITUATION NARRATIVELY AND AVOID DIFFERENTIATION IF OTHERS AGREE.)

Meeting Report
Joint Area Chairman
Experimental Stewardship Program
Salt Lake City
March 15-16, 1989

In attendance: Keith Axline, Idaho Conservation League
Ross McElwain, Challis Ranger District
U.S. Forest Service

Charles Hahnkamp, Rancher
Dan Pence, U.S. Forest Service

John Lowrie, representing Wesley Cook
Richard Westman, Bureau of Land Management

Primary reasons for the meeting were to increase the level of communications between experimental stewardship areas, to share common and unique problems, and circumstances, and to learn from other areas their views and attitudes towards the stewardship program. Another item was to assist the Salt Lake BLM District with the development of an agenda for the summer National Stewardship Conference, to be hosted by the Randolph Stewardship area.

The evening of the 15th the reps from the three areas meant to discuss briefly the subject matter or theme for the summer conference. On the 16th we met with Leon Berggren, Area Manager for the Bear River Resource area, and Deane Zeller, District Manager for the Salt Lake District to help develop the agenda for the summer conference. The group decided that the theme should be 'how to deal with the "Cattle Free by 93" movement'. Primary focus for the main conference session will be a panel discussion, featuring national environmental groups, cattlemen, sportsmen, and others who will share their vision for the future of the public ranges. Some names, or groups included the Wilderness Society, Nature Conservancy, Wildlife Society, Sierra Club, National Cattleman's Association, Lonnie Williamson (Editor-at-Large) for Outdoor Life, Doc and Connie Hatfield (Oregon Cattle people), Thad Box, Utah State University, and others. Salt Lake BLM will handle contacts, and invitations.

We felt it was also important to address the following subjects in some sort of fashion; riparian management, progress measured through monitoring, area reports, committee reports. How this will be addressed was left up to the BLM.

The conference is scheduled for August 23, 24, and 25. It will be held at the Utah State University campus. University Inn will handle bookings.

Several items of mutual interest were discussed both formally and informally during our two days in Salt Lake. I'll try to list them as best I can from my notes.

1. Challis people felt that their producers sensed that the "cattle Free in 93" movement was real. There is a lot of pressure to reduce or eliminate grazing by cattle for several reasons in or around the Challis area. Riparian management, elk forage requirements, wilderness interests, to list a few. "Sportsmen", rather than environmentalists seemed to be pushing in many cases at the local level.

2. Challis talked some about recent attempts to "buy out permits", in order to dedicate management to riparian and fisheries concerns. It seems that the permittees are willing sellers, however the sportsmens groups contacted were not interested in buying AUM'S. The sportsmen took a position that "we are not going to help, but expect the Forest Service to take care of it. In other words, we expect the FS to cut the numbers, and let the chips fall where they may. As a result of this situation, the Challis group was very much interested in our High Rock Canyon proposal.

3. East Pioneer was not so concerned about the "Cattle Free in 93" movement. They felt that water rights, and the demands for public access to streams (on private property) were the issues that they were most concerned with.

4. We discussed the five year progress report, and I got some guidance. The report has not been requested by Congress. Someone simply felt that it was time to put together another report. The group did agree that if we move ahead that the Boise futuring and goal setting exercise, contained elements suitable for a report format.

5. Dan Pence of East Pioneer suggested we put together a joint video of the successes made by the stewardship areas for the Society of Range Management meeting in Reno. He indicated that it was important that it be a video. I brought up that M/W had thought of putting our own presentation together for Reno, and that we were thinking more of a slideshow than a video.

I think it would probably be best if you sat down with Richard and I sometime before things get too stale, so we can clear up any questions.

John M. Lowrie

POLICY STATEMENT FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF
WILD AND FREE ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS
IN THE SUSANVILLE DISTRICT

DRAFT 06/01/89

NEW

Background

Eighteen (18) years have elapsed since the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act. For these eighteen (18) years the number one problem for the program has been, what to do with horses removed from the range that are unadoptable or difficult to adopt.

The unadoptable problem is costly, creates public animosity and is extremely frustrating. It cries out for solution.

If there are to be healthy, viable herds of horses to perpetuate these animals for future generations, they will propagate excess progeny. Furthermore, the larger the populations, the greater the excess. In the absence of effective predators it is essential to control the populations. Therefore, the unadoptable problem can not be solved by stopping the gathering of excess.

It is within the capability of management to control populations using a combination of the Regular Adoption Program and the Sanctuary Program in the short term. However, the need for sanctuaries can be reduced over the long run. Three major actions are needed to accomplish population control and at the same time solve the unadoptable animal problem:

1. To select parent breeding stock for each herd that will propagate adoptable progeny.
2. To manage the habitat and care for the animals so that they arrive in the adoption program in a healthy state at their genetic potential.
3. The most important action is to leave the horses that are unadoptable, solely because they are over four years of age, in the breeding herd. In the past many horses that were capable of producing adoptable offspring were removed and wasted through non-selective gathering. They were placed in feedlots and in the Fee Waiver Program for the simple reason that they were more than four (4) years of age.

These concepts are being put to the test with three herds under sponsorship of the Modoc/Washoe Experimental Stewardship Program. The concepts appear to have sufficient merit for expansion of the program. In 1988 the program was expanded to include the entire Susanville District. By 1992 these concepts will be fully implemented in all Susanville District Herds.

This is being done so the concept can be tested with a larger and more meaningful sample.

In order to place this program in effect the following policy statement will be the guidance for the management of the Wild Horse and Burro Program in the Susanville District.

Goal

To meet the intent of Public Law 92-195 as summarized in the preamble which states in part "... to require the protection, management, and control of wild free roaming horses and burros on Public Lands."

Objectives

1. Maintain the numbers of all herds within the population ranges established in the Land Use Plans.
2. Perpetuate healthy, viable, and wild populations for future generations.
3. *Strive to* Achieve 100% adoptability of excess animals that are removed in order to stop contributing animals to the unfortunate and costly pool of unadoptable animals gathered from public lands.
4. Achieve a strong and effective California adoption program for excess animals removed from California herds.
5. Maintain the habitat within the Herd Management Areas in the Susanville District.

Policies

District land use plans will allocate sufficient forage to properly maintain the planned population levels established for each horse management area.

- Herd # will be balanced with*
1. ~~Sufficient forage will be provided to properly maintain healthy, planned population levels established for each Herd Management Area.~~
 2. Animals will be gathered in ~~the~~ ^a safest and least stressful ^{minimal} manner possible.
 3. Animals will be handled, transported, fed and processed in a manner so that they will be ~~kept free of injury~~, protected against ^{injury,} disease, and receive proper nutrition to keep them in top condition while at BLM holding facilities.
 4. Because horses older than four years of age are more difficult to adopt, the Susanville District, to the extent practical, will work toward placing all excess progeny of the Susanville herds into the Regular Adoption program at four years of age and younger.
 5. The Base Herd horses for each Herd Management Area will consist of horses that are selected on the basis of their apparent ability to propogate adoptable progeny.

NOTE: The Base Herd is the breeding herd selected and left on the range *to achieve the herd objective.*

6. Once selected for the Base Herd, horses will remain in the Base Herd until they die. When they die they will be replaced by younger horses (four years of age and younger) selected from the herd or by horses selected from other ^{horse} Herd Management Areas.
7. When selecting Base Herd horses, consideration will be given to maintaining herd integrity (residual animal characteristics).

NOTE: In general, a high degree of integrity should be maintained for each herd. However, there may be some logical reason to bring about some change. The selection process offers an excellent opportunity to preserve some unique characteristics of some groups of horses.

8. Develop and continually update the management plan for each specific Herd Management Area to implement policy.
9. Perfect marketing techniques to increase public awareness and understanding of the Wild Horse and Burro Management Program, including the role of the adoption program in California.

OLD

Attachment II

FinalPOSITION STATEMENT AND GUIDELINES FOR INTERIM
MANAGEMENT OF WILD HORSES AND BURROS WITHIN
MODOC/WASHOE EXPERIMENTAL STEWARDSHIP AREA

In response to the continuing controversy over existing wild horse and burro legislation and recently proposed amendments, the Modoc/Washoe Experimental Stewardship Steering Committee has developed the following position and operational guidelines for management pending final resolution of this important land use issue.

POSITION STATEMENT

The position of the Modoc/Washoe Experimental Stewardship Committee is one which neither supports nor rejects the existing Wild and Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act or the recently proposed amendments. Any direct involvement in the ongoing legislative controversy is considered to be well beyond the intent of Congressional mandates and the announced role of this Committee. However, it is also recognized that the mission of the Stewardship Program cannot be met unless the wild horse and burro issue is addressed from a purely functional point of view. In order to keep pace with the planning and implementation strategies contemplated and those already established for the Modoc/Washoe Stewardship Area, the following statements reflect the current position of this Steering Committee on the wild horse and burro issue.

1. More effort is needed to develop creative and effective ideas for on-the-ground wild horse and burro management in those allotments where such opportunities exist. Horse interest groups outside of Federal agencies should assume a stronger role in the joint development of plans which promote the welfare of these animals consistent with other legitimate uses of public land.
2. The present Adoption Program should not only be maintained but needs to be made more effective in terms of meeting expressed public demand. Regulation, legislative, or policy changes that facilitate the flow-through of animals or otherwise speed up the adoption process are useful to meeting our overall objectives for the responsible management of native ranges.
3. Funds collected from adoption fees or sale (if authorized) should be recycled back to the state and agency district where horses were gathered. These funds will be used in the wild horse and burro management program.
4. If sale authority is granted it should be implemented on an interim basis and limited to a five year period or until management levels are reached (whichever occurs first). Once acceptable management levels are attained, selective gathering should make future sale unnecessary.

MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

In order to move forward with the Modoc/Washoe Stewardship mission, the following management guidelines are recommended for implementation.

1. Herd Management Planning

The Technical Review Team process should be the primary vehicle for the development of wild horse and burro management plans on an allotment basis. It is essential that horse interest groups or pre-selected representatives participate in the process at this planning level. The TRT reports will document and address the following management components and any others that might be identified.

- a. Existing numbers, distribution and natural movement patterns will be identified.
- b. Determine acceptable management levels consistent with land use plans and explore feasible opportunities specific to enhancing habitat quality for these animals.
- c. Coordinate (a) and (b) into the overall allotment plan to minimize conflict and insure equitable consideration of all user groups.

2. Removal of Excess Animals

Once the populations of wild horses have been reduced to management levels, the Committee endorses removing the excess animals exclusively from the young animals and allowing the remainder to live out a natural life span and die a natural death.

The maximum age of the animals to be removed should be flexible. Factors to consider are cost effectiveness in gathering the excess as well as adoptability of the animals. The maximum age limit to consider for removal should be four years of age. In any event, all animals beyond a given age should live out their natural life and die a natural death rather than be subject to removal.

Excess is defined as the number of young animals beyond that which is necessary to offset natural death loss or, conversely, the number of young animals allowed to stay in the population will equal natural death loss so that replenishment offsets death loss and the number of animals in the population remains stable.

This approach to removal of excess has several important effects:

- a. Over time, a population will develop a more uniform age structure by minimizing gaps or surpluses in certain ages. A more uniformed age structured population will be more stable and more immune to catastrophic and life threatening forces.

- b. The animals that are removed from the population will be exclusively young, highly adoptable animals. Once the populations are down to management level, the adoption program will be capable of taking care of all the excess.

- b. Leaving the animals on the range to die a natural death will suppress the overall reproductivity of the herd because the last years of the animals life span are nonreproductive. This will reduce the number of animals to be removed and thus, reduce the expense of population management.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE

Soil
Conservation
Service

1030 North Main, Suite 101
Alturas, California 96101
916-233-4137

Susan Lynn
Public Resource Associates
1755 E. Plumb Lane, Suite 170
Reno, NV. 89502

May 23, 1989

Dear Ms. Lynn:

Fred Wright suggested that I send to you the enclosed information. The documents are related to Modoc Washoe Experimental Stewardship Program efforts to create an education- research center in the Massacre Mountain- High Rock Canyon area of northern Washoe County.

I have arranged the documents in chronological order. I hope they give you at least some idea of how our present proposal evolved. I tried to keep this initial packet as brief as possible, anticipating that our committee will be able to meet with you in the near future. To briefly describe each document:

1. 11/30/87- Minutes of the first High Rock Implementation sub-committee meeting. Our initial task was to develop recommendations to BLM on how to best implement a grazing management strategy for the Massacre Mountain- Little High Rock grazing allotments.
2. 1/27/88- At the second meeting of the committee we attempted to visualize what we ultimately wanted to "see" in the Massacre Mountain High Rock Canyon area. We now refer to this document as our "Vision Statement".
3. 10/10/88- First draft of a funding request for initial elements of our proposal. This draft was put together by Terri Jay. (please excuse all the notes and hen scratches).
4. 1/17/89- Second draft of our initial funding proposal. Once again developed by Terri Jay.
5. 2/20/89- Third draft, including problem analysis matrix, developed by Terri Jay.
6. 2/27/89- Executive summary developed to gain support for the proposal. Our intention is to send out this summary to identified individuals and groups, to determine if there is any interest or support for the concepts we are proposing. This summary was developed by Rich Heap of the Nevada Department of Wildlife. We have also compiled a mailing list to be used if and when this summary is released.

I hope this information is adequate to get a feeling for what our committee is trying to accomplish. I would suggest that once you have had a chance to review our proposal, we get together. A meeting between yourself and the committee would give us the chance to answer any questions you have, and to see where we go from here!.

Please feel free to contact me at anytime, my number is (916 233-4137. Thank you very much for your interest in our efforts.

Sincerely,

John M. Lowrie
Chairman, High Rock sub-committee
Modoc Washoe Experimental
Stewardship Program

MODOC WASHOE EXPERIMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM
STEERING COMMITTEE
P.O. BOX 220
CEDARVILLE, CA. 96104

May 15, 1989

Dick Hubbard
Natural Resource Council of California
638 Key Route Blvd.
Albany, CA. 94706

Dear Mr. Hubbard:

The Modoc Washoe Experimental Stewardship Program (M/W ESP), based in Cedarville, California, currently has a vacancy on its steering committee, that we would like to fill. The position is identified as the "California Wildlife Representative" to the M/W ESP Steering Committee. For the last nine years the position has been held by Bill Reavely. Bill initially represented the National Wildlife Federation, and upon his retirement from that organization, sought and received sponsorship from the Wildlife Society.

Our committee is looking for a person with the following qualifications and characteristics:

1. A professional wildlife Biologist or Manager, either employed, consulting, or retired.
2. Ability and interest in addressing a broad range of issues associated with multiple use land management and planning on lands within the Warner Mtn. Ranger District of the Modoc National Forest, and the Surprise Resource Area of the BLM Susanville District.
3. Individual must have the time available to attend and participate in meetings of the steering committee (usually meets 4 to 6 times per year, often for two day sessions), and to contribute on a voluntary basis to on-going subcommittee activities.
4. Individual should be able to represent a broad constituency of groups and individuals interested in wildlife management issues associated with public land management.
5. Individual should be familiar with group decision making processes, consensus building, and conflict resolution.

This position is without pay or compensation, other than the knowledge that wildlife have benefitted directly from the contribution of time.

If you or your organization knows of anyone with these qualifications, and who might be willing to participate in the Modoc Washoe Experimental Stewardship program, would you please notify us at your earliest convenience?.

For further information, please contact:

Richard Westman
Bureau of Land Management
Surprise Resource Area
P.O. Box 460
Cedarville, Ca. 96104
(916) 279-6101

or

John M. Lowrie
USDA Soil Conservation Service
1030 North Main Street
Alturas, Ca. 96101
(916) 233-4137

We are looking forward to hearing from you!.

Sincerely;

Wesley Cook
Committee Chairman

Randall R. Hall
1990 Range Excellence Symposium Co-Chairman
USDA Forest Service
324 25th Street
Ogden, Utah 84401

PROPOSAL FOR EXCELLENCE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF RANGE ECOSYSTEMS
SYMPOSIUM- 1990 SOCIETY OF RANGE MANAGEMENT MEETING- RENO, NV

VIDEO PRESENTATION- " WORKING TOGETHER "
THE SUCCESS STORY OF THE
MODOC WASHOE EXPERIMENTAL
STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

EDITORS- RICHARD DELMAS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

JOHN LOWRIE, USDA, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

JEFF FONTANA, USDI, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The presentation will focus on the operating philosophy, decisionmaking process, and on the ground successes of the Modoc Washoe Experimental Stewardship Program, over the last ten years. Elements to be discussed include:

1. How a broad representation of wildlife groups, conservation interests, agencies, recreational interests, and livestock producers involved in decisionmaking partnership with the federal land managers.
2. How respect for open communication, and the process of consensus decisionmaking has been used to resolve resource conflicts and create supportable management decisions.
3. How Technical Review Teams (TRT's) are used to resolve specific resource issues " on the ground ".
4. Showing, by example, documented improvement in the health and productivity of riparian systems, rangeland plant communities, and forestlands, while meeting multiple landuse demands.

FORMAT- 1/2 inch video tape VHS

TIME LENGTH- 20 minutes

For further information and response to proposal, please contact:

JOHN M. LOWRIE
USDA, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE
1030 NORTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 101
ALTURAS, CA. 96101

DRAFT - FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT ONLY

6/9/89

CALIFORNIA MOUNTAIN SHEEP
RECOVERY AND CONSERVATION ~~PLAN~~ GUIDELINES
FOR NORTHEASTERN CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA MOUNTAIN SHEEP
RECOVERY AND CONSERVATION PLAN
FOR NORTHEASTERN CALIFORNIA

Guidelines

Northeastern California Mountain Sheep Interagency Advisory Group*
May 1989

* A formal interagency group composed of wildlife biologists from the California Department of Fish and Game, Susanville District of the Bureau of Land Management, Lava Beds National Monument, Modoc National Forest, and Klamath National Forest, and University of California.

CALIFORNIA MOUNTAIN SHEEP
RECOVERY AND CONSERVATION PLAN
FOR NORTHEASTERN CALIFORNIA

Guidelines

Prepared by: Northeastern California Mountain Sheep Advisory Group

Approved by:

Rex Cleary,
District Manager, Susanville District,
Bureau of Land Management

Date

Doris Omundson,
Superintendent, Lava Beds National Monument

Date

Douglas Smith,
Forest Supervisor, Modoc National Forest

Date

Robert Rice,
Forest Supervisor, Klamath National Forest

Date

Banky Curtis, Region 1 Manager,
California Department of Fish and Game

Date

Chairman,
Modoc-Washoe Experimental Stewardship Committee

Date

Individuals who have participated in the Interagency Advisory Group are:

Tim Burton	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game, Siskyou Co.
Bruce Carter	Lava Beds National Monument
Mike Ferguson	Bureau of Land Management, Sacramento
Frank Hall	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game, Lassen Co.
Steve Hawks	Bureau of Land Management, Susanville
Bob Mason	U.S. Forest Service, Klamath N.F.
Clint McCarthy	U.S. Forest Service, Modoc N.F.
Bud Pyshora	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game, Redding
Tom Stone	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game, Redding ¹
Gary Smith	U.S. Forest Service, Lassen N.F.
Charisse Sydoriak	Lava Beds National Monument ²
Doug Thayer	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game, Modoc Co.
Richard Weaver	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game, Sacramento
John Wehausen	Univ. of Calif., White Mt. Res. Station
Marty Yamagiwa	U.S. Forest Service, Modoc N.F.

1) Replaced Bud Pyshora, California Dept. of Fish and Game

2) Replaced Bruce Carter, Lava Beds National Monument

I. INTRODUCTION

Before the arrival of European man, California mountain sheep (Ovis canadensis californiana) were distributed from the southern Sierra Nevada north Canada in suitable habitats within the Cascades and Great Basin mountain ranges and river breaks of California, Oregon, northwestern Nevada, Washington, and British Columbia. Sheep apparently occurred wherever appropriate rocky terrain and winter range existed.

Since Cowan's taxonomical work on North American wild sheep (1940) most of the remaining sheep populations west of the Rocky Mountains from California to British Columbia were considered one subspecies (Ovis canadensis californiana). The taxonomic relationships of these populations are currently in question. While bighorns from the central Sierra Nevada share some morphological affinities with those from British Columbia, recent work using mitochondrial DNA analysis suggests the former to be quite distinct from the latter, as well as from desert mountain sheep (O. c. nelsoni). Also, a number of extant native populations east of the Sierra Nevada in California and Nevada, classified as desert sheep to date, probably share more characteristics with the Sierra Nevada sheep.

In northeastern California, mountain sheep historically occurred in the Amedee/Skedaddle Mountains, Lava Beds/ Mount Dome area, Warner Mountains, and the Goosenest/Mt. Shasta area. Habitats in this area are similar to those occupied by extant populations of mountain sheep in British Columbia.

Most of these herds disappeared by 1900, probably due to disease transmission from domestic livestock, compounded by competition with livestock for forage and by overhunting (Buechner 1960, Wehausen 1980). Only the Mt. Baxter and Mt. Williamson populations have survived to the present in the Sierra Nevada. In 1971, sanctuaries were established for these two herds, and about the same time mountain sheep in the Sierra Nevada were classified as rare by the state of California.

Only one large productive population of California mountain sheep currently exists within the state, the Mt. Baxter herd. This population has been used as the basis for three transplant sites in the southern Sierra Nevada; Lee Vining Canyon, Mt. Langley, and Wheeler Crest. The total statewide population is estimated at approximately 325 animals.

At the present time none of the historic or potential habitats in northeastern California have mountain sheep present.

II. MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this recovery plan is to provide recommendations to improve the status of California mountain sheep in northeastern California and to serve as a guideline for the reintroduction of the species into this area. This plan focuses specifically on northeastern California and does not discuss management in the southern Sierra Nevada. The objectives of this recovery plan are:

- 1) Insure the future of mountain sheep by promoting the establishment of two or more large populations (exceeding 100 animals each) that are geographically isolated from other populations in either the Sierra Nevada, western Nevada or southeast Oregon.
- 2) Restore mountain sheep to former ranges within northeast California where it is ecologically, economically and politically feasible, and where conditions could be made favorable to their success.
- 3) Ensure a geographic and/or physical separation that will provide a near zero probability of direct contact between domestic sheep, goats, and mountain sheep and minimize contact between mountain sheep and cattle.

To achieve these objectives, three management elements will be evaluated and implemented in northeastern California. These are:

- 1) Reintroductions,
- 2) Habitat Management, and
- 3) Monitoring and Research.

Habitats that have the propensity for supporting mountain sheep habitats are discussed on the basis of these criteria. This plan will be reviewed annually and revised as new information from research and monitoring become available.

A. Reintroductions

1. Site Analysis

- a. Evidence of Historic Use - Documentation of historic use of an area by mountain sheep is a good measure of habitat suitability and will be considered in selecting and prioritizing reintroduction sites.
- b. Quality of Winter Range - Good winter range should contain precipitous rocky escape terrain on south-facing slopes where snow melts quickly enough to prevent excessive accumulation. It also provides adequate forage with mixtures of shrub and grass species for use under different phenological and snow conditions.
- c. Accessibility to Summer Range - Unobstructed migratory corridors between suitable winter and summer ranges are essential to any successful reintroduction. Where escape terrain is adequate along potential migration corridors but forest canopy is dense, timber removal could be used to create a usable migratory corridor. Once migratory routes are present, adequate summer range is not expected to be a limiting factor.
- d. Carrying Capacity - Sites are preferred that appear capable of supporting relatively large populations (e.g. over 100 animals). Such populations are expected to have greater

intrinsic stability. They also would provide greater protection of mountain sheep in California through the potential to serve as reintroduction stock in the event of catastrophic loss of the other herds.

- e. Proximity of Site to Domestic Sheep/Goats Use Areas - Due to the propensity of lethal disease transmission from domestic sheep or goats to mountain sheep, it is imperative that release sites include an adequate buffer to prevent contact between these species.
- f. Proximity of Site to Adjacent Land Ownerships - Management practices on lands adjacent to reintroduction should be compatible with mountain sheep habitat requirements. Coordination with adjacent landowners is an integral part of the scoping process and should be one criteria in the analysis of a transplant site.
- g. Propensity for Significant Human Disturbance - Sites should be evaluated in terms of the potential for human disturbance in prospective transplant sites.

2. Review of Potential Transplant Sites in Northeastern California

a. Historic Habitats

Amedee/Skedaddle Mountain

The Amedee Range, including Skedaddle and Amedee Mountains, is historic mountain sheep habitat. It is located approximately about 25 miles east of Susanville in the Cal-Neva Planning Unit of the Susanville District of the Bureau of Land Management. It encompasses approximately 25 square miles of the Great Basin is a predominantly arid environment. The dominant topographical features include the Skedaddle and Amedee Mountains which ascend from 4,000 feet at the Honey Lake floor to 7,000 feet at Hot Springs Peak. Precipitation varies between 4 and 12 inches.

Several factors make the Amedee Range as a desirable reintroduction site. Range conditions on the upper elevations of the Amedee Range are relatively pristine owing to the inaccessible nature of the terrain to livestock and restriction on available surface water that limit cattle use to the lower elevations. Escape cover in the form of large vertical rock outcrops are common throughout the Amedees. Because of mild to moderate winters and low snowfall, the Amedee Mountains contain excellent habitat for year round use.

Range surveys completed on the Skedaddle-Amedee Mountains indicate that a major portion of the upper elevation is composed of desirable mountain sheep forage species (bluebunch-wheatgrass, Thurber's needlegrass). Much of the

upper elevation grasslands are thought to be in near pristine condition. Grasses are especially abundant and would supply a stable forage source for mountain sheep diets. This is partially due to the large number of acres that are inaccessible to livestock and thus grazed very lightly.

Human disturbance is a potential problem in the area. Hunting, particularly for chukar, is a popular use of the Skedaddle and Amedee Mountains. Hiking, horseback riding and camping are also occasional uses with the area. It is anticipated the frequency and concentration of these uses will increase over the next ten years. Another disturbance that may affect mountain behavior are Sierra Army Depot demolitions discharges. These are detonated daily during the summer months. There are usually several successive explosions occurring on the reserve southeast of Thousand Springs Canyon between the mountains and Sand Pass-Wendel Road. The sound is loud, abrupt and thunderous when in close proximity (for example, the top of Thousand Springs Canyon) but muffles and dissipates with distance. The extent to which these explosions will disturb mountain sheep is unknown as is likelihood of sheep becoming accustomed to the repeated disturbance. The sheep may abandon or avoid the area. This would exclude the southern and a major portion of the Amedee Mountains that has good forage and water sources. All off road vehicle use within the reintroduction area should be eliminated. In addition, any additional road developments providing access into or around the introduction area should be curtailed. The area should also be withdrawn from mineral entry. Existing mining activity should be managed to have minimal impact and disturbance to the mountain sheep and their habitat.

Water sources in the Amedee Mountains are not presently adequate or located close enough to provide optimal water availability. Two guzzler sites should be developed to extend the water availability and should not be located further than two miles from any other source.

Elimination of conditions for forage overlap between livestock, feral horse, and mountain sheep would increase the habitat and forage available to mountain sheep. There is not adequate forage to support the major dietary needs of cattle, sheep, horses and mountain sheep in the Amedee Mountains. To insure a successful, productive mountain sheep population, livestock grazing should be reduced or transferred to another area. Feral horse use should be reduced or eliminated as well.

Foot rot has been a problem with mule deer in the Skedaddle-Amedee area. However, treatment of all water holes and springs with bluestone (copper sulfate) has proven effective in controlling this disease. Water sources in the

entire Skedaddle-Amedee Mountain complex should be treated in the springtime with a copper sulfate slurry or with copper sulfate crystals sealed in a quart jar with holes punched in the lid to create a time release capsule. This would be the only disease treatment afforded the mountain sheep other than inoculation or treatment by California Department of Fish and Game veterinarians at the time of translocation.

Warner Mountains

Fossil remains of mountain sheep have been found in the Warner Mountains indicating historical use of the area. Bones of mountain sheep were found in Bare Cave, west of the Bare Ranch in the south Warners, and two ram skulls were found in the vicinity of Barber Creek, also in the south Warners. In 1980, 4 mountain sheep (2 rams and 2 ewes) were captured from the Lava Beds and were moved to Raider Canyon in the South Warner Wilderness. Six sheep died during the transplant operations. It was determined at that time to augment the 4 sheep from the Lava Beds with 4 rams and 2 ewes from the Mt. Baxter herd in the Sierra Nevadas.

The Warner Mt. Herd population reached 55-60 animals until an all age die-off occurred in the winter of 1987-88. Before the die-off, the mountain sheep utilized an area ranging from Raider Creek north to Owl Creek. Occasionally rams were observed outside of this area, with one roaming as far as Cedar Pass near Cedarville. Steep cliffy habitat, water and forage is abundant in this portion of the Warner Mountains. The estimated carrying capacity of this range is 80-100 sheep based on the limitations of the winter range.

The winter range lies between 5,000 and 6,000 feet. It is steep and rough with numerous patches of vegetation scattered throughout. The drainages run easterly and coupled with the broken topography afford many south facing slopes. Forage production is sufficient to support sheep in the winter. The transition range lies between 6,600 and 7,400 feet. It is a mid-elevational bench between winter and summer ranges with moderate slopes. The summer range lies between 7,400 and 9,000 feet with portions extending to 9,700 feet. The topography is very steep with many cliffs and peaks.

Livestock use occurs adjacent to Raider Basin. The Cottonwood cattle allotment to the north and Emerson Cattle Allotment to the south is in a three pasture rest-rotation system with each pasture receiving one full season of rest followed by reduced use (40 head) and the full use (80 head) the third year. Permitted season is July 1 - September 15. The Cottonwood-Owl Creek Sheep Allotment to the west has 1000 ewes and lambs from July 1 - July 31. This sheep band is trucked to an area near Pepperdine Camp. They are then trailed to the south side of Squaw Peak. Permitted use is

for approximately 14 days in the Cottonwood Basin and 5 days in Owl Creek Basin. The remainder of the season is on the west slopes in the Mill Creek area. Other permitted livestock use occurs in the Granger and Yankee Jim allotments. The Granger allotment is approximately 6 miles north of Raider Basin. Ninety head of cattle are permitted from June 1 - September 14. The Yankee Jim, located on the west slope of the Warners, normally has 100 cows with calves in the Pine Creek portion of the allotment.

Soldier Creek basin, northwest of Cedarville, also has potential as suitable habitat. Drainages here run easterly, with broken topography very similar to Raider Basin. This site is geographically separated from Raider Basin, but it is close enough to allow for occasional contact between herds if mountain sheep were reintroduced to both sites. Unlike the South Warner Wilderness, Soldier Creek is accessible by motor vehicle.

Both of the Warner Mountain sites are bordered by private land to the east. There is a strong possibility of habitat overlap with livestock (cattle and sheep) while mountain sheep are on their winter range. Migrating rams may also come in contact with livestock on private lands adjacent to the forest boundary.

Lava Beds/Mt. Dome

Mountain sheep were last reported in the Mount Dome area in 1913 with the last known sighting within Lava Beds occurring in the late 1880's around Schonchin Butte and Gillem's Bluff. Re-establishment of mountain sheep was recommended for Lava Beds National Monument in 1963 by the Leopold Report to the Department of the Interior. In 1971, mountain sheep were reintroduced to the Lava Beds National Monument. These sheep (2 rams and 8 ewes) were brought in from British Columbia. The Lava Beds population was not a free ranging population. They were confined by fence to an area of 1,100 acres. The Lava Beds herd grew to 31 animals until July of 1980 when an all age die-off occurred, probably as a result of contact with domestic sheep on adjacent Forest Service administered lands.

Future reintroductions in this area would need to address habitats adjacent to Lava Beds National Monument. The Monument alone does not provide the necessary habitat components to support a large free-ranging population. The Mount Dome/Gillem's Bluff area is the only suitable habitat for ewes. Wehausen and Douglas speculated (1982) that a free ranging herd would use this area as a portion of its home range. Wolfe (1979) cites Muir (1874) who found sheep in this area.

Observation Peak
Needs to be filled in.

Mt. Shasta
Needs to be filled in.

- b. Potential Non-historic
Two sites were identified that have potential as mountain sheep habitat, but were apparently not historic ranges. Although known historic sites should be given a higher priority for analysis, these sites should be evaluated for their potential to provide for additional populations.

Mt. Eddy
Needs to be filled in.

Pit River Canyon (near Fall River Mills)
Needs to be filled in.

3. Source Of Stock
The availability of transplant stock varies considerably from year to year. Most likely, animals for reintroduction purposes will come from out of state; California mountain sheep from either Oregon or British Columbia.

Animals from the Mount Baxter herd in the southern Sierra Nevada are committed for transplants in the Great Western Divide of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park; and augmenting existing transplants in Lee Vining Canyon, Taboose Creek and Wheeler Crest.

4. Transplant Operation Guidelines
- a. An environmental assessment must be prepared and approved by the appropriate management agencies prior to any transplant operation. A cooperative agreement outlining agency responsibility and an action plan will be prepared for each new site.
 - b. Mountain sheep will be captured by whatever methods are deemed most efficient and safest by Department of Fish and Game personnel and are in accordance with the policies of the land management agency responsible for the area involved. Currently successful techniques include drop netting, drive netting with a helicopter and free range capture using immobilizing drugs and projectile syringes.
 - c. Capture teams will attempt to transplant at least 20 animals with about 2/3 of them female. If fewer sheep are released the herd will be augmented at the first opportunity. Initial release at any site will not involve fewer than 10 sheep.
 - d. Reintroduced populations may be augmented at later dates to compensate for excessive losses, to add genetic variability,

to increase population growth rate or to add telemetry collars.

- e. Any plans for the transplant of mountain sheep in northeastern California, or predator control in conjunction with a mountain sheep transplant should be developed in conjunction with the Northeastern California Mountain Sheep Interagency Advisory Group.

B. Habitat Management

1. Habitat manipulation may be used on some ranges to increase carrying capacity or to provide migration corridors.
2. To protect mountain sheep from serious effects of disease transmission, domestic sheep grazing should not be permitted within two miles of mountain range (Jessup, Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game). Cattle could be permitted in areas adjacent to mountain sheep range in the absence of vectors for diseases that could impact the mountain sheep. Where vectors are present, cattle use should not be permitted within two miles of mountain sheep range. Special topographic or wind conditions may alter the size of the buffer needed between mountain sheep range and areas of sheep or cattle grazing.
3. Resource activities such as mining, recreation and timber harvest that are proposed in or adjacent to mountain sheep range should be designed so as to minimize impacts on mountain sheep and their habitat.
4. Management plans and environmental assessments will be prepared on an individual site basis.
5. Habitat management plans and the associated environmental assessment should be reviewed by the Northeastern California Mountain Sheep Interagency Advisory Group.

C. Monitoring and Research

1. Monitoring

The purpose of monitoring is to provide information on mountain sheep distribution, habitat use, population status, reproduction and mortality. This information is necessary to make recommendations for habitat improvement, herd augmentation or herd reduction, and to compare results with predicted effects. For reintroduced herds, monitoring is essential for determining the outcome of the release.

a. Reintroduced Herds

At least 40 percent of the sheep released at a site should be fitted with telemetry collars.

Sheep will be monitored daily for at least two weeks immediately following reintroduction.

Sheep should be monitored winter and summer for the first two years following reintroduction.

Reintroduced herds should be monitored annually until their population exceeds 50 or have stabilized at some lower number.

Once reintroduced are established, optimal conditions should be taken advantage of so as to obtain good census data approximately every three years.

The monitoring program, funding and other responsibilities will be determined prior to any reintroduction.

A status report will be written yearly so long as annual monitoring continues, and following each census thereafter.

2. Research

Continued research will enable more accurate evaluation of habitat on potential reintroduction sites. Of particular interest is habitat from the standpoint of both nutrition and predation and the tradeoffs mountain sheep make between these factors. Both these factors will strongly influence population growth rate.

III. MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Consonant with the policies and directives of the individual management agencies, and in keeping with the provisions of this plan, the following actions are recommended. The agencies responsible for each action are listed in parentheses. Identification of responsibilities and approval of this plan indicate agency support of the needed work and priorities, but are not a promise or commitment of funds. Work will be completed as funding becomes available. These recommendations will be updated regularly.

A. Reintroductions

1. Initiate the environmental assessment process to evaluate the feasibility of reintroducing mountain sheep to each proposed site where adequate weather, habitat and disease potential data are available. (Klamath/Lassen/Modoc National Forest, Bureau of Land Management-Susanville, Lava Beds National Monument)
2. Evaluate habitats on potential mountain sheep ranges for reintroduction feasibility where all habitat parameters are not known. This includes an assessment of snow depth, forage availability and migration corridors to seasonal ranges. (Klamath/Lassen/Modoc National Forest, Bureau of Land Management-Susanville, Lava Beds National Monument)

3. Determine the presence or absence of insects that vector diseases in potential sites where domestic grazing is present. (Klamath/Lassen/Modoc National Forest, Bureau of Land Management-Susanville, Lava Beds National Monument, California Department of Fish and Game)
4. Determine the impacts of management on adjacent private lands in relation to mountain sheep management objectives.

B. Habitat Management

1. If permits for domestic sheep on or adjacent to historic mountain sheep habitat become available for any reason, then the reallocation of these AUMs for mountain sheep habitat will be considered prior to reissuing the permit for domestic sheep.
2. Monitor habitat improvement projects done on mountain sheep habitats to determine effectiveness for mountain sheep.

C. Monitoring and Research

1. When reintroductions are approved, research should be conducted to address the following:
 - a. Evaluation of transplant outcome.
 - b. Seasonal distribution and food habits of transplanted sheep.
 - c. Importance of forage quality and habitat conditions relative to individual and population growth rates for California mountain sheep.
 - d. Determine population level that animals can be removed for hunting or additional transplants elsewhere.
2. Investigate the potential for disease transmission from cattle, goats and llamas to mountain sheep.

Literature Cited

- Buechner, H. K. 1960. The bighorn sheep in the United States, its past, present, and future. Wildl. Monogr. No. 4. 174 pp.
- Wehausen, J. D. 1979. Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep: an analysis of management alternatives. Coop. Admin. Report; Inyo Nat. Forest and Sequoia-Kings Canyon, and Yosemite Nat. Parks. 92 pp.
- _____. 1980. Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep: history and population ecology. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Michigan. 243 pp.
- _____. and C.L. Douglas. 1982. Bighorn sheep in Lava Beds National Monument: future reintroduction potential. Coop. National Park Res. Studies Unit, Univ. of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV. Contrib. No. CPSU/UNLV Admin. #4. 6 pp.
- Wolfe, L.M. (ed.) 1979. John of the mountains. The unpublished Journals of John Muir. The Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

TRT/AMP UPDATE

EMERSON/COTTONWOOD

This Allotment Management Plan was approved in 1982 and involved a 3-pasture rest rotation system. Several years of heavy rains rendered the trail system up Cottonwood Canyon inaccessible for livestock. For several years the original management system was in use by default, resulting in unacceptable resource damage around North Emerson Lake and the riparian areas down Eagle Creek.

Non-use by one permittee on Bear Camp Allotment in 1988 provided the opportunity to move the Emerson/Cottonwood livestock there, allowing a one-season rest for the Emerson/Cottonwood Allotment.

We have just completed trail repair up Cottonwood Canyon with labor provided by California Conservation Crews to reimplement the rest rotation system. These crews camped in the area and spent approximately 1375 hours working on the trail. A recent labor contract for comparable work went for \$22/hour. A contract for the trail project at that rate would have been around \$30,000. Our actual cost for the CCC's was \$3,400. Our cost for support to the crew (packing in supplies and food and supervision/coordination with/by our 3-person trail crew probably added an additional \$4,000

We inspected the trail on June 5 (a week ago) with the permittee. All agree that his livestock can be moved to the Cottonwood Unit this season. Emerson Unit will be rested.

Responsibility for future trail maintenance will be turned over to the permittee.

BALD MOUNTAIN

1989 will be the last year of the trial period to evaluate the stocking rate. Additional utilization transects were installed in 1988. The allotment will be tested again this season with full numbers.

Projects scheduled in the AMP are on line. Permittee (Ray Page) will construct an electric fence around Billy's Camp this field season.

YANKEE JIM

Fences, cattleguards, and water developments needed to make the Interim Plan work were installed in 1988. We will implement the I.P. this season. This plan provides for a 3-pasture system rotating use between the low country on alternate years.

We have been fortunate to have found alternate pastures for part of the livestock permitted on Y.J. over the last 3 years. This allowed the allotment to receive less than half the previous grazing use.

The area now being used by Yankee Jim livestock on Devil's Garden Ranger District will not be available in 1990. If permittees want to turn out full numbers on Y.J. in 1990 we will do so, and document the impact to the allotment. We have utilization data for the past two seasons as base line for comparison.

The TRT will meet during the summer to bring this AMP to a close.

LASSEN CREEK

The recommended AMP has been signed by all TRT members. Forest Service is working on blending the NEPA and PRIA processes together to bring this one to a close.

The TRT recommended not using Nesham Canyon again until the severely degraded riparian areas recover. We changed the turnout area in 1989 to implement this recommendation. The permittee ignored the Annual Operating Plan which directed him to a different area and placed his cattle in Nesham Canyon. We are using our administrative process to get his cattle out of Nesham Canyon. His Term Grazing Permit is in jeopardy.

BEAR CAMP

Work Plan has been prepared for this allotment. TRT will be assembled this field season to begin work on the Allotment Management Plan. (Give copy to ESP Committee). Much of the work cannot be completed during the current year. It will be 1990 before the TRT will have all the information available for making management recommendations.

FLOW CHART FOR BLENDING NEPA AND TRT PROCESSES

District Ranger/Forest Supervisor signs AMP. Process is complete when Environmental Document and Allotment Management Plan are both signed.

Report to ESP Steering Committee with final set of TRT signatures on recommended AMP.
ESP accepts/modifies or gives further direction to TRT

Develop management system (AMP)

TRT sets management objectives and develops grazing and monitoring plan for multi-resources.

Tour project area as needed to observe findings of FS specialists. TRT may also collect resource information. Begin developing management objectives and formulating alternatives.

Team reviews TRT slide tape program & receives orientation to the process. Reviews available information. Use Forest Service specialists as needed. Review Workplan. Identify preliminary ICO's. Develop preliminary ideas for allotment management.

ESP approves/modifies. Assign task to Technical Review Team (TRT). Gives specific charge and direction.

Agency (Forest Service) propose project to ESP Steering Committee. Propose makeup of TRT group. Summarize known information, preliminary Issues, Concerns, Opportunities, and Workplan.

Monitoring & Annual Feedback to ESP Steering Committee

District Ranger signs AMP

Schedule projects; Implement *Stewardship management Plan*

Report to ESP Steering Committee

Final I.D. Team analysis

TRT propose AMP (Multi-resource vegetative management plan)

In-house Review; District Ranger, Forest Supervisor Staff

TRT propose grazing plan

I. D. Team meeting-- Scoping Document

TRT field trips as needed

Forest Service Specialists provide resource information to F.S. rep

1st TRT meeting (office setting)

Forest Service Specialists collecting data (work plan)

Assign Technical Review Team (TRT)

Pre-tour Packet

ESP Steering Committee

Interdisciplinary Team (I.D. Team)

Agency proposal

Letter of Intent (Call Letter)

Schedule multi-resource projects. Schedule monitoring (Forest Service, permittees, interested TRT members). Implement AMP. Important to do good job in monitoring plan to outline what to do if objectives are not being met.

Final I.D. Team Analysis. Prepare Environmental Document. Finalize alternatives. Add Environmental Consequences. Prepare Decision Notice/Finding Of No Significant Impact (DN/FONSI) for District Ranger or Forest Supervisor signature.

District Ranger review for NEPA compliance. Forest Supervisor staff review. If consensus reached in TRT process go to Final AMP and take to ESP Steering Committee. Then use as input to NEPA process (Environmental Assessment). If consensus not reached take TRT information and Agency recommendations to ESP Steering Committee OR consensus reached to test grazing plan or interim basis.

Discuss findings. Develop Scoping Document. (Issues, Concerns, Opportunities, Indicators, Affected Environment, Alternatives, Management Direction, Monitoring Direction)

Forest Service specialists provide information as collected or as needed to F.S. Representative on TRT.

Forest Service specialists following work plan collecting resource data. Prepare findings. Include TRT member as desired.

Information packet containing maps and details about physical features, vegetation, wildlife, present grazing system, management constraints, TRT responsibilities and direction.

Forest Service Interdisciplinary Team (I.D.) reviews known information and prepares workplan to collect additional resource information. Identify preliminary Issues, Concerns, and Opportunities (ICO's). Review applicable Management Direction, Prescriptions, BMP's, Standards & Guides. Identify TRT members.

Process starts with proposal for doing as in an Allotment Management Plan (AMP) Forest Service calls for known/readily available resource information from F.S. specialists. Informs affected allotment permittees. Newspaper release of proposal.

EXTERNAL SCOPING

INTERNAL SCOPING

* Interchanging information by F.S. Rep (on both teams)

start here →

NEPA

FS Director

BEAR CAMP ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN--TRT PROCESS

The Bear Camp Allotment is planned for review by a Technical Review Team in 1989. This team will be charged with preparing an ~~Allotment~~ ^{stewardship} Management Plan providing for multiple rangeland improvement projects benefitting wildlife, fish, livestock and riparian-dependent wildlife species.

The following work plan outlines the information needed for the team to accomplish this task, the responsible specialists and estimated time frames:

WORK PLAN

<u>DATA REQUESTED</u>	<u>RESPONSIBLE PERSON</u>	<u>DUE DATE</u>
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
1. Identify known Cultural Resource Sites and associated management requirements	G. Gates	06/01/89
2. Survey as applicable for proposed allotment improvement projects	G. Gates	09/30/89
FISH		
1. Identify known fish species	G. Sato	06/01/89
2. Identify Management Indicator Species (including T&E, Sensitive, and "other" categories)	G. Sato	06/01/89
3. Identify which streams support fish and describe habitat requirements	G. Sato	06/01/89
4. Identify current and potential habitat conditions	G. Sato	09/30/89
5. Recommend monitoring program to identify effects of grazing activity on fish populations	G. Sato	06/01/89
6. Identify or describe past, present, & foreseeable actions that have impacted (or can impact) fish resource (can be positive or negative)	G. Sato	09/30/89
7. Identify applicable management requirements, prescriptions, and		

standards & guides.

G. Sato

06/01/89

RANGE

1. Summary of allotment permittees, permitted numbers, permitted animal months (head months), class of livestock, season of use, utilization records, existing management system G. Jensen 06/01/89
2. Identify range vegetation types K. Roscoe, S. Smith, C. McCarthy, M. Yamagiwa 09/30/89
3. Identify potential range improvement projects K. Roscoe, 09/30/89
4. Identify or describe past, present, & foreseeable actions that have impacted (or can impact) range resource (can be positive or negative) K. Roscoe 07/01/89
5. Estimate allotment forage capacity K. Roscoe/Karen 08/01/89
6. Identify potential for range improvement through application of timber harvest techniques K. Roscoe/Gene 08/01/89

RIPARIAN AREAS

1. Determine existing Rosgen Stream Type of perennial streams. Determine which stream(s) are in an altered state and determine what the recovery potential and recovered state could be. Recommend management practices that will recover streams that have a recovery potential of medium or greater. G. Sato/M. Yamagiwa 09/30/89
2. Determine amount of stream bank erosion by sampling representative reaches of perennial streams. Recommend management practice changes on all stream reaches that have greater than 20 percent bank erosion. G. Sato/M. Yamagiwa 09/30/89
3. Establish photo points of representative reaches of all perennial streams. G. Sato/M. Yamagiwa 09/30/89
4. Establish a stream cross section transect at representative reaches of perennial streams. Determine width to depth ratio of each transect. G. Sato/M. Yamagiwa 09/30/89

- | | | | |
|----|---|---------------|-----------|
| 5. | Determine amount of cover (shade) over water at representative reaches of perennial streams. Recommend management practice changes on reaches with less than 80 percent stream cover. | G. Sato/Marty | 09/30/89 |
| 6. | Collect ecosystem classification data in East Creek and tributaries | S. Smith | 09/30/89 |
| 7. | Provide classification document consisting of keys; riparian ecological type descriptions and management implications | S. Smith | Winter 90 |
| 8. | Provide training in use of classification system | S. Smith | Summer 90 |

SENSITIVE PLANTS

- | | | | |
|----|---|-----------|-----------|
| 1. | Identify known populations and potential habitats | K. Roscoe | 08/01/89 |
| 2. | Identify management requirements, prescriptions, and standards & guides | K. Roscoe | 08/01/89 |
| 3. | Survey suitable habitats to determine if species exist (as applicable) | K. Roscoe | Summer 89 |
| 4. | Identify or describe past, present, & foreseeable actions that have impacted (or can impact) sensitive plants (can be positive or negative) | K. Roscoe | 07/01/89 |

SOILS

- | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|----------|
| 1. | Provide soil data:
a. soil map with types
b. erosion hazard rating
c. range sites--potential productivity | K. Luckow | 09/30/89 |
| 2. | Identify areas of soil degradation | K. Luckow | 09/30/89 |
| 3. | Identify opportunities for improving grazing management from soils perspective | K. Luckow | 09/30/89 |
| 4. | Identify potential for watershed improvement (seedings, etc.) | K. Luckow | 09/30/89 |
| 5. | Identify or describe past, present, & foreseeable actions that have impacted (or can impact) soil resource | K. Luckow | 09/30/89 |

(can be positive or negative)

TIMBER

1. Identify status of existing timber sales, cutting prescriptions, and planned Sale Area Improvement activities
J. Walker 07/01/89
2. Identify planned timber sales and status of planning process
J. Walker 07/01/89
3. Identify opportunities for modifying harvest prescription to benefit wildlife/livestock
J. Walker 08/01/89

WATER

1. Determine water temperature of major streams. In those streams where water temperatures exceed Central Valley or Lahontan Water Quality Control Board objectives, recommend management practices to correct this condition.
D. Jones Done
2. Determine other water quality objectives not being met and recommend management changes to correct the problem(s).
G. Sato 09/30/89
3. Recommend BMPs to be used and describe effectiveness.
K. Luckow, G. Sato,
K. Roscoe 09/30/89
4. Identify and map opportunities to correct watershed problems. (Submit as WIN projects where applicable)
G. Sato, K. Luckow 09/30/89

WILDLIFE

1. Identify Management Indicator Species and other species of concern
M. Yamagiwa,
C. McCarthy 07/01/89
2. Identify applicable management requirements, prescriptions, and standards & guides for wildlife
M. Yamagiwa 07/01/89
3. Describe existing and potential habitat conditions for Management Indicator Species
M. Yamagiwa 09/30/89
4. Identify or describe past, present,

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|----------|
| & foreseeable actions that have impacted
(or can impact) wildlife resource
(can be positive or negative) | M. Yamagiwa | 09/30/89 |
| 5. Develop baseline techniques for
monitoring | M. Yamagiwa,
C. McCarthy | 09/30/89 |
| 6. Propose projects for wildlife habitat
improvement | M. Yamagiwa | 09/30/89 |
| 7. Identify opportunities to coordinate
projects with other resources | M. Yamagiwa | 09/30/89 |

RECREATION

- | | | |
|---|------------|---------|
| 1. Identify significant dispersed use
recreation locations | B. Tierney | 9/30/89 |
| 2. Identify potential Grazing/Recreation
conflicts | B. Tierney | 9/30/89 |
| 3. Identify opportunities for recreational
developments | B. Tierney | 9/30/89 |
| 4. Describe past, present, & future actions
that have impacted (or can impact) the
recreation resource (can be positive
or negative) | B. Tierney | 9/30/89 |

1203 - DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY
INTERNAL WORKING DOCUMENT

Ref. Code	Activity	Authority delegated to:												
		910	912	920	930	940	950	DM	ADM Adm	ADM Mins	ADM L&RR	ADM Ops	ADM AM	
3580	Approves Special Leasing Areas (issued under procedures 3510-3567).	X				X (943.2)								
3590	Approves all actions related to operating regulations for exploration, development and production for solid minerals other than coal.	X						X						
3590	Approves Sundry Notices for solid minerals other than coal.	X						X						X
3592.1	Approves or rejects operating plans for prospecting permits for solid minerals other than coal.	X						X						X
3592.1	Approves major mining plans or modifications for Searles Lake operations.	X		X										
25 CFR 216.6	Approves exploration plans and plan modifications on Indian lands for solid minerals.	X						X						
25 CFR 216.7	Approves mining plans and plan modifications on Indian lands.	X						X						
3598.4	Approves exploration and mining operations inspections to assure compliance with regulations, lease terms, and conditions of plan approval and issues notices of noncompliance for solid minerals other than coal.	X						X						X
3600	Approves all actions relating to any contract for the sale or disposal of mineral material including approvals and cancellations.	X						X						
3600	Approves designation, modification or cancellation of fill use areas for petrified wood on lands under the jurisdiction of other Federal departments or agencies, other than the Department of Agriculture, with the consent of the other departments or agencies involved.	X						X						X
3700- 3746	Approve all action necessary under Group 3700— Multiple Use; Mining.	X				X (943.1)								
3800-3873	Approves all actions necessary under Group 3800—Mining Claims Under the General Mining Law.	X				X (943.1)								
3802	Approves Plan of Operation for Exploration and Mining, Wilderness Review Program.	X						X						X
3809	Approves Plan of Operation for Surface Management.	X						X						X
3809	Approves Cooperative Agreements with Counties.	X						X						
4120.3-2 and 4120.3-3	Approves Cooperative Agreements and Permits for Range Improvements.	X						X						X

1203 - DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY
INTERNAL WORKING DOCUMENT

Ref. Code	Activity	Authority delegated to:												
		910	912	920	930	940	950	DM	ADM Adm	ADM Mins	ADM L&RR	ADM Ops	AM	
4110.1 & 2	Determines qualifications of applicants for grazing use, and requirements of land and water base properties.	X						X						X
4110.2	Allocates grazing preference, increases, and decreases.	X						X						X
4110.2	Designates allotments for livestock grazing.	X						X						X
4110.2-3	Approves transfers of grazing preference.	X						X						X
4110.3-2	Decreases in forage allocations (permanent reduction or temporary suspension).	X						X						X
4120.2 and 4130.2	Implements grazing management through allotment management plans and grazing systems.	X						X						X
4120.3-6	Authorizes removal of range improvements, requires removal, or determines compensation value.	X						X						X
4120.3-7	Accepts contributions for range improvements.	X						X						X
4130	Issues grazing permits and leases, free-use permits, crossing permits, exchange-of-use, authorizations, nonrenewable permits, and special grazing permits.	X						X						X
4130.1-2	Adjudicates conflicting applications.	X						X						X
4130.2 and 4130.6	Specifies numbers and kinds of livestock, livestock, and periods of use; incorporates other terms and conditions as appropriate in grazing permits and leases.	X						X						X
4130.7	Collects and deposits fees for grazing use, and approves refunds. - Collections only (DO deposits).	X						X						X
4140, 4170	Issues notices of violations and other actions (other than, less than, arrest authority).	X						X						X
4150	Takes corrective and disciplinary actions as necessary on violations; initiates trespass and impoundment actions; accepts settlements.	X						X						X
4150.4-1 and 4150.4-2	Issues Notices of Intent to impound unauthorized livestock and takes action to impound with notification of CA-932.	X						X						X
4160	Issues proposed and final decisions on matters of grazing administration and management.	X						X						X
4711.3	Enters into Memoranda of Understanding for the purpose of managing, protecting, and controlling wild horses and burros.	X						X						
4713.2	Approves the gathering of claimed branded or unbranded horses and burros entering onto public land after November 15, 1973 (43 CFR 4720.2(a)).	X						X						X

1203 - DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY
INTERNAL WORKING DOCUMENT

Ref. Code	Activity	Authority delegated to:											
		910	912	920	930	940	950	DM	ADM Adm	ADM Mins	ADM L&RR	ADM Ops	
4713.27	Approves trespass charge for private horses or burros captured in BLM conducted roundup (43 CFR 4720.2 (b)).	X						X					X
4730.5	Designates and maintains wild horse and/or burro ranges.	X						X					
4740	Administers all law enforcement.	X						X					
4740.3	Authorizes the capture, and removal of excess animals.	X						X					
4740.3b	Approves the destruction of animals where it is not possible to relocate them or an adoption demand does not exist or dying animal found.	X						X					
4740.4-2	Approves transfer of excess wild horses and burros for private maintenance or adoption.	X			X			X					X
4740.5	Grants title to wild horses and burros.	X			X			X					X
4750.3	Approves the removal of wild horses and/or burros from private land.	X						X					X
5400	Disposes or permits the free use of forest products, including the sale of over 25 MMBF of timber.	X			X ¹ (932)								
5400	Sells timber on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation.	X						X					X
5400	Acts on matters involving rights-of-way acquisition and the approval of road construction projects to provide access to timber.	X						X					
5400	Disposes of timber and other vegetative resources including those on unpatented mining claims located after July 23, 1955.	X						X					X
5400	Makes timber disposals on lands withdrawn for other public functions with the consent of the other public agencies.	X						X					X
5402	Disposes of timber and other vegetative resources where values do not exceed \$1,000.	X						X					X
5402	Approves negotiated timber sales of less than 250,000 board feet. Special justification needed to exceed 250 MBF.	X						X					X
5410	Develops an annual timber sale plan, including any subsequent changes, alterations, or amendments.	X						X					X
5410	Approves Timber Sale Plans.	X				X ¹ (932)							
5420	Establishes minimum selling values by species and/or products.	X				X ¹ (932)							
5420	Determines a form of measurement of timber or other vegetative resources to be in the public interest.	X						X					

¹ Cannot be redelegated.

TITLE 2200 - RANGE MANAGEMENT

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 7. Approve allotment management plans involving wilderness, primitive, or wilderness study areas. | Yes |
| 8. Approve agreements under the 1966 memorandum of understanding with the Bureau of Land Management (FSM 2251.4). | Yes |
| 9. Approve agreements and memoranda of Understanding with Soil Conservation Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Extension Service (FSM 1531.12e). | Yes |
| 10. Approve plans and enter into agreements for control of stray or unbranded livestock, noxious weeds, and forage destroying insects. | Yes |
| 11. Approve management plans involving wild free-roaming horses and burros. | Yes |
| 12. Adjust or abolish wild free-roaming horse and burro territories in accordance with Forest Plans. | Yes |
| 13. Issue term permits to Indian tribes on the basis of rights reserved by treaty. | Yes |
| 14. Approve nonuse for Conservation Reserve up to the length of the approved agreement. | Yes |
| 15. Establish criteria for allowable administrative costs and conservation practice requirements on National Grasslands and Land Utilization Projects (FSM 2245.03). | No |

2204.3 - Forest Supervisors. Forest Supervisors have responsibility and authority to:

- | <u>Responsibility/Authority</u> | <u>May be delegated to District Ranger</u> |
|--|--|
| 1. Establish range allotments. | Yes |
| 2. Approve Allotment Management Plans. | Yes |
| 3. Approve applications for and issue term permits (FSM 2231.1). | Yes |

TITLE 2200 - RANGE MANAGEMENT

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 4. Approve nonuse of term permits for the following purposes: | |
| a. Permittee convenience for up to three consecutive grazing seasons on a year by year basis. | Yes |
| b. Resource protection. | Yes |
| c. To conduct research, administrative studies, or other fact finding, for the length of the proposed activity. | Yes |
| 5. Confirm waivers of term grazing permits. | Yes |
| 6. Modify term permits. | Yes |
| 7. Establish criteria for issuing, extending, modifying, suspending, or cancelling term, temporary grazing, or livestock use permits. | No |
| 8. Suspend or cancel up to 100 percent of a term, temporary grazing, or livestock use permit for violation of terms or conditions. | Yes |
| 9. Approve applications for and issue temporary grazing and livestock use permits. | Yes |
| 10. Issue free livestock use permits. | Yes |
| 11. Make seasonal extensions of term, temporary grazing, or livestock use permits. | Yes |
| 12. Determine allowable administrative costs and conservation practice requirements on National Grasslands and Land Utilization Projects (FSM 2245.03). | Yes |
| 13. Establish audit schedules for National Grassland Grazing Associations. | No |
| 14. Approve refund or credit of grazing fees. | Yes |
| 15. Establish requirements for and approve performance bonds. | Yes |

TITLE 2200 - RANGE MANAGEMENT

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 16. Determine the adjusted value of permanent range improvements; negotiate and settle cases involving compensation for permittee interests. | No |
| 17. Establish and terminate livestock driveways. | No |
| 18. Negotiate and authorize exchanges of grazing uses with Federal and State agencies. | No |
| 19. Recognize and withdraw recognition of local livestock associations and approve special rules. | Yes |
| 20. Administer Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act. | Yes |
| 21. Establish base property requirements within limits established by the Regional Forester. | No |

2206 - REFERENCES. Handbook on Range Seeding Equipment. This handbook describes equipment adapted to or designed for use in site preparation, seeding, and control of undesirable plants. The Vegetative Rehabilitation and Equipment Workshop (VREW), formally Range Seeding Equipment Committee (RSEC), prepared this handbook. It was published jointly by the Department of Agriculture and Interior. Handbook can be obtained from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 - Stock No. 001 - 001 - 00518 - 5.

2209 - RANGE MANAGEMENT HANDBOOKS

2209.1 - Internal Service-wide Handbooks

2209.11 - Range Project Effectiveness Analysis Handbook. This handbook provides methodology for analysis of cost-effectiveness of allotment projects.

2209.12 - Range Management Information System Handbook. This handbook provides instruction for developing and operating a computer-based information system for Forest Service range operations.



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Modoc NF
Warner Mountain
Ranger District

Wallace Street
P.O. Box 220
916-279-6116

Reply To: 1950

Date: **JUN 12 1989**

Dear Concerned Citizen:

Thank you for your interest in the Mt. Vida area. We are happy to send you the package you requested regarding this beautiful portion of the Warner Mountain Ranger District. We hope that the data will be helpful in providing background information including planning processes, physical description, resources, and alternative themes. We will propose detailed alternatives after we receive public comments.

In your comments, please be very specific regarding conditions or events occurring within, or affecting, the Mt. Vida area. We will accept public comments until **September 30, 1989**.

As our field season gets into full swing, our resource specialists will be gathering more data which we will share with you at an informal workshop to be held later this summer. We will keep you posted.

If you would like more information, please don't hesitate to call or drop in anytime.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Karen Shimamoto".

KAREN SHIMAMOTO
District Ranger

MT. VIDA AREA

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT by September 30, 1989

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

The Warner Mountain Ranger District of the Modoc National Forest is requesting public comment on management of the Mt. Vida Area. The District will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to analyze and display the effects of any actions proposed within this area.

Previous resource management plans and the Draft Land and Resource Management Plan for the Modoc National Forest have determined that the lands under consideration are capable of and suitable for sustaining management proposals which include but are not limited to:

- timber harvest, including clearcutting
- reforestation, including the use of herbicides and pesticides for vegetation and animal control
- road closures
- road construction and reconstruction
- timber and range vegetation manipulation for wildlife habitat improvement
- private land-line survey
- riparian habitat improvement
- development of recreation and interpretive facilities

We will develop detailed proposals after we receive public comment. Comments should be very specific to conditions or events occurring within, or affecting, this area.

SCOPING

Requesting your comments is called scoping, and it is the first step in the EIS process. Scoping tells us who is interested in the proposal and their concerns. It also helps us recognize all issues in the early stages of planning. We have already identified several concerns:

- entries into roadless areas
- public safety
- choice of arterial haul route
- high costs of logging systems on steep slopes
- protection of water quality, soil productivity, and fishery habitats

- improving habitats for selected wildlife species
- protection of visual quality
- improving the quality of developed and dispersed recreation

We will send personal mailings to all parties who have previously expressed an interest in the area or in our planning processes. In addition, we will post notices in public buildings in local areas, submit news releases, and publish a formal Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register*.

GATHERING AND ANALYZING INFORMATION

This summer, District resource specialists will gather more information about the Mt. Vida area. In November 1989, an interdisciplinary (ID) team will propose management activities, and analyze their effects. We have identified themes for several alternatives:

1. No Action:

Under a no-action theme, activities are conducted under the current level of management; activities under subsequent themes are excluded.

2. No Roadless Area Entry:

Under a no-entry theme, new activity with roadless areas are excluded. Activities in the remainder of the Mt. Vida area may be proposed and implemented if they accommodate the values promoted under the theme.

3. Produce Outputs Tiered to the Forest Plan:

Under this theme, outputs of which the area is capable are produced according to direction outlined in the Forest Plan.

4. Economic Efficiency:

Economic efficiency is emphasized under this theme while meeting all physical and biological requirements.

5. Emphasize Silviculture:

This theme examines the silvicultural conditions of forested portions within the Mt. Vida area, and recommends treatments that will assure forest renewal and growth into perpetuity.

6. Emphasize Selected Fish and Wildlife Habitats:

Through vegetative manipulation, fish and wildlife habitat is improved and protected, and diversity is maintained or enhanced.

7. Emphasize Soil and Water:

Under this theme soil productivity increases. Watersheds and waterways are protected, improving water quality.

Regardless of the theme, no resource is excluded from management as required by law. Rather, unemphasized resources would be managed to complement the value or practice highlighted under a particular theme. Additional themes may be proposed later. We will develop a preferred mix of resource management proposals in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) based on public comments and management concerns.

By January 1990, we will prepare a DEIS in which we will outline a preferred proposal for management activities in the Mt. Vida area. This DEIS will

be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency. The public may review the proposals during a 45-day review period. We expect to complete the Final EIS in June 1990.

WHERE TO WRITE

Comments will be accepted until September 30, 1989. However, some comments may require additional field data gathering. So that we have enough time to adequately respond to comments, please return them as early as possible to:

**Karen Shimamoto, District Ranger
Warner Mtn. Ranger District
Modoc National Forest
P.O. Box 220
Cedarville, CA 96104**

For more information contact Karen Shimamoto, James Walker, or Doug Schultz at the above address, or phone 916-279-6116.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MT. VIDA AREA

Location: The Mt. Vida area lies in the extreme northeast corner of California (see attached map). The northern border is the California/Oregon boundary with the Fremont National Forest immediately north, and BLM land in Nevada to the east. Privately owned land is interspersed within the area.

The Mt. Vida area is approximately five air miles northwest of Ft. Bidwell, CA, and one air mile south-east of New Pine Creek, OR.

Roads: Modoc County Rd. 2, which stretches from New Pine Creek through the Mt. Vida area to Ft. Bidwell, is closed seasonally because of snow-pack. County Rd. 2 has a native surface (no rock or gravel) and can be traveled only at low speeds (about 15 mph). This road is the most commonly used access to the area. A minor, unimproved road accesses the area from the north through the Fremont NF. Numerous native surface roads traverse the area. Some have been designed and constructed; others have originated from use.

Historical Richness: The Mt. Vida area is rich with numerous old structures and other historical remains. The Highgrade gold rush (1905-1915) was centered here. Many mining claims still exist today.

Unimproved roads associated with these claims criss-cross the landscape.

Watersheds: The Mt. Vida area is dissected by a ridge line which is the divide between the Surprise Valley and Goose Lake watersheds. To the east, Bidwell Creek and its tributaries flow into Upper Alkalai Lake of the Surprise Valley watershed. To the west, Pine Creek, Badger Canyon, Cloud Canyon, Cottonwood Creek, Barnes Canyon and Pleasants Canyon flow to Goose Lake. In times of high water, Goose Lake overflows into the Pit River, both of which are subject to regulation by the Central Valley Region of the California Water Quality Control Board. The waters of the Surprise Valley watershed are subject to regulation by the Lahontan Region of the California Water Quality Control Board.

Elevation and Slope: At 8,224 feet above sea level, Mt. Vida is the most prominent geologic feature of the area. The major ridge, which is the east/west watershed divide, extends through the area in a northeast-southwest line at elevations between 7,600 to 8,000 feet. The lowest elevation within the area is about 5,000 feet, with approximately 80% of the area above 6,000 feet. The Mt. Vida area is characterized by narrow ridges and deep, steep-

walled canyons. More than half of its slopes are greater than 40%.

Soil and Vegetation: Many soil types within the area are rocky and contain little organic material. Volcanic activity produced many small lakes with no outlets, and long, narrow talus slopes.

Vegetation within the area ranges from grasses to over-mature timber. On most south aspects, grasses, forbs, low shrubs, sagebrush, *Ceanothus spp.*, mountain mahogany, bitterbrush and juniper dominate the landscape. On north aspects, timber stands of commercial species are predominant. From lower to higher elevations, the species are ponderosa-Jeffrey pine, white fir and western white pine, and lodgepole pine. We have not generated management activities in most of these timber stands for the past three decades.

Wildlife, Fish and Recreation: The Mt. Vida area is home for a variety of fish and wildlife. Prominent fish species include rainbow, eastern brook, brown, and redband trout. Major wildlife species are mule deer, blue grouse, goshawk, and hairy woodpecker.

Cave and Lily Lakes, small developed campgrounds, attract many visitors each year. In addition, a dispersed site at Little Lily Lake is also popular. Fishing and hunting are favorite recreational uses.

Approximately 1.5 miles of a National Recreation Trail meander through the area; but they are not connected to a trail system at either end.

Roadless Areas: The Mt. Vida area contains portions of the Mt. Vida and Crane Mtn. roadless areas, and is adjacent to the Mt. Bidwell roadless area. When these roadless areas were studied for nomination to the wilderness system during the second roadless area review evaluation (RARE II), we determined that they did not possess qualities necessary for nomination. In RARE II, we said the roadless areas should be managed under the multiple use concept.

All three roadless areas are distinct: we could not create a cumulative effect by combining them. They almost completely surround the developed portion of the Mt. Vida area, yet each is separated by a well-developed road system.

Mt. Vida roadless area is two roadless areas joined by a small isthmus atop the ridge which divides the east/west watershed. Nearly half of this roadless area is within the Bidwell Creek drainage, including Mill Creek. The rest is located within the Pine Creek, Badger Canyon, Cloud Canyon and Cottonwood Creek drainages. Mt. Vida roadless area encompasses about 9,100 acres.

Approximately 10% (2,000 acres) of the Crane Mtn. roadless area lies within the Mt. Vida area. Of this acreage, about 600 acres are privately owned. The total area is contiguous, with the stateline an artificial division. The remainder of Crane Mtn. roadless area is on the Fremont NF.

The Mt. Bidwell roadless area is outside and immediately adjacent to the eastern edge of the Mt. Vida area.

Modoc/Washoe Experimental Stewardship Program
Field Tour of Massacre Mountain Allotment
June 13, 1989

DESCRIPTION OF AREA

The Massacre Mountain/High Rock Area encompasses 147,103 acres in northern Washoe County, Nevada, of which 141,691 acres are public and 5,412 acres are private.

The Area supports wild horses, deer, antelope, sage grouse, chukar, cattle, sheep and numerous non-game wildlife species (most notably high densities of golden eagles). Riparian zones (meadows associated with live water) are in moderate to extreme states of deterioration throughout the Area.

The Area also has exceptional archaeological and historic values as well as high value as potential pronghorn sheep habitat. Vandalism of the historic and prehistoric resources is common through the Massacre Mountain/High Rock Area.

The present livestock operations consist of one desert sheep operation (2,000 ewes) and three cow/calf operations (1,400 cattle). The sheep operation's use periods are April 1 to June 30 and October 16 to December 7. The cattle operation's use of the Allotment is from April 1 to October 15. A livestock grazing management system is not in effect at this time.

Three operators receive licensed use in this Allotment. Bob Bunyard who controls a cow/calf operation and a desert sheep operation which is currently being leased by Tom Rice. Ken Earp controls the smallest cow permit and White Pine Ranches controls the largest cow permit of the three operators.

Grazing preference (AUMs) are as follows:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Suspended</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Exchange of Use</u>
Bob Bunyard	2,818	564	2,254	176
White Pine	7,769	1,486	6,283	-0-
Ken Earp	569	114	455	-0-
TOTAL	11,156	2,164	8,992	176

In order to facilitate a detailed discussion of the Area, we have broken the Area into seven units.

Unit 1 - MASSACRE MOUNTAIN UNIT

The Massacre Mountain Unit consists of all those areas above the 6000 foot elevation line in the north end of the Allotment. In this portion of the Resource Area, the 6000 foot elevation corresponds reasonably well to the bottom of the bitterbrush zone. Additionally, the 6000 foot line corresponds well to the break in slope between relatively flat benches and the mountain area.

The Massacre Mountain Unit contains approximately 29,191 acres, of which 27,379 acres are public and 1,812 acres are private.

The Unit is a mixture of higher elevation vegetation types. 1981 Range Survey data indicates the vegetation in the Unit to be mostly big sagebrush types with scattered low sagebrush stands. Bitterbrush is found throughout the Unit. The 1981 Range Survey data places 72% of the Unit in good condition, 11% in fair to good condition, 15% in excellent condition, and 2% in poor condition. Browse condition varies from good to excellent.

The Unit is grazed by both sheep and cattle. Turnout for the Allotment is April 1, however, sheep use is normally made from May 1 to June 30 and October 20 to November 30. Cattle use in the Unit is normally from May 1 to October 15. Higher concentrations of cattle use this Unit during late summer and early fall. The livestock use patterns are due to the high productivity of the area and to the availability of water.

The Unit provides year round habitat for moderate to high populations of mule deer. Moderate to high numbers of antelope use the Unit in the late summer to winter months. High numbers of sage grouse use numerous upland wet meadows scattered throughout the Unit. Very small resident chukar populations are associated with steep rocky draws. Non-game species diversity is high.

There are 20 known cultural resource sites in this area. However, areas near water sources, such as springs and canyons, have a high potential to contain National Register Quality sites.

Unit 2 - MASSACRE RANCH BENCH

The Massacre Ranch Bench Unit consists of the benches and drainages below and north of the 6,000 foot elevation of the Massacre Mountain Unit.

The Unit contains approximately 5,898 acres of which 5,158 acres are public and 740 acres are private.

The Unit is almost exclusively big sagebrush with a few scattered fingers of low sagebrush. Bitterbrush is only rarely found in the Unit. 1981 Range Survey data indicates 91% of the Unit to be in fair to good condition and 9% to be in good condition. The privately owned wet meadows at Massacre Ranch are in good condition. Limited water sources have resulted in the Unit being underutilized by livestock, however, there are localized utilization problems around the existing waters.

The Unit is grazed by both sheep and cattle. Sheep use is made during late May-June while the ewes are being sheared and just prior to the sheep leaving the allotment to be trailed to the forest. Cattle use is from April 1 to late summer. Forage quality and quantity is good during the late summer months, but available water is limiting in this Unit.

The Unit receives little deer use and some antelope use during spring and summer. Sage grouse use the few meadows (private) during brooding. Non-game wildlife diversity is relatively low due to the homogeneity of topography and vegetation, which also limits the potential.

The vicinity around Mud Spring contains cave sites, lithic scatters and other significant cultural resource sites. The Lassen-Applegate Trail passes through the southwest corner of this area. There are an estimated 100-200 known sites of which the majority are quarries and lithic scatters. Areas near water sources, such as in canyons and near springs, also have a high potential to contain National Register Quality sites.

Unit 3 - GRASSY TABLE

The Grassy Table Unit is a large area of benches, rolling hills and abrupt drainages. The Unit is bounded by Massacre Mountain on the north, Home Camp on the west, Yellow Rock on the south and High Rock on the east.

The Unit contains approximately 25,631 acres of which 25,381 acres are public and 250 acres are private.

The Unit is almost exclusively low sagebrush with big sagebrush confined to swales and drainages. 1981 Range Survey data indicates 94% of the Unit is in fair condition, 2% in good condition and 2% in good to excellent condition.

The Unit is grazed by both sheep and cattle. Licensed turnout in the Allotment is April 1, however, sheep make use in this area after May 1 following lambing. Sheep will move through this area until such time as the early season forbs begin to diminish. Cattle use this area from April 1 to June 15. Forage quality and quantity begins to decline for cattle in this area by June 15, as does water availability.

The Grassy Rock-Yellow Rock Area of the Unit serves as winter range for high populations (approximately 1000) of antelope. Low to moderate antelope numbers use the Unit in the late spring and summer period. Antelope kidding occurs throughout the Area. Deer winter use of the Unit is low to moderate. Sage grouse populations are generally moderate with high numbers found around the Grassy drainage. Non-game diversity is low due to low topographical and vegetal diversity. A predator control program is conducted in the Unit within the parameters established in the Susanville Predator Control Plan.

There is limited wild horse use in this Unit. Horses will move from east of High Rock Canyon into this Unit during the winter months on occasion.

There are five (5) National Register sites recorded and areas near water sources such as springs and in canyons have a potential to contain additional National Register Quality sites.

The majority of the Unit is contained within WSA's CA-020-913A and B.

Unit 4 - MASSACRE LANE

The Massacre Lane Unit is the narrow dogleg west of the main portion of the allotment. A fence in the lane separates this Unit from the Massacre Mtn. Unit.

The Unit contains approximately 13,002 acres of which 10,792 are public and 2,210 acres are private.

The vegetation in the Unit consists of big sagebrush benches and slopes and alkaline flats dominated by greasewood and rabbitbrush. Patches of low sagebrush are found on the ridges. 1981 Range Survey data indicates 86% of the Unit is in fair range condition, 10% in good condition, and 4% in fair to good condition.

The Unit is presently used only by cattle. Cattle use is confined to the spring due to the low availability of water. Use can be limited in this area due to the presence of larkspur (poisonous plant) in the spring.

The Unit receives very little use by big game, mostly by antelope. Sage grouse use the eastern portion in winter. Non-game species diversity is expected to be low due to the dry, homogeneous conditions, which limits

Unit 5 - LITTLE HIGH ROCK

The Little High Rock Unit is bounded on the north by the Grassy Table Unit, on the west by the Home Camp and Denio Allotment fences, on the south by Little High Rock Canyon. The Unit is dissected by Mahogany Canyon.

The Unit contains approximately 35,492 acres which are all public.

The vegetation of the Unit is dominated by low sagebrush with patches of big sage at higher elevation and in swales. There is also some bitterbrush on north facing slopes of the higher elevations. Range conditions varies from poor in the vicinity of water to good in areas away from water. It is estimated 5% of the area is in poor condition, 30% in fair condition, 55% in good condition, and 10% in excellent condition.

The Unit is grazed by cattle and sheep. This Area is used as a lambing area by sheep. The use period is from April 1 to April 30. Cattle use in the area is presently licensed from April 16 through September 30. However, cattle primarily graze the Unit during the spring and early summer due to lack of water and low forage quality which limits later use.

The Unit provides yearlong habitat for a small population of mule deer. Higher concentrations of deer use Yellow Rock and the Mahogany Canyon areas in winter. On a yearlong basis the antelope population is low to moderate, with relatively high densities using the south end of the Unit in winter. Sage grouse use is low to moderate on a yearlong basis. The vicinity of Little High Rock Canyon supports a moderate to high density of chukar. Non-game species diversity is moderate based upon good habitat diversity but limited water. Raptors nesting in the canyons use this Unit as a prey base.

The Unit presently supports approximately 32 wild horses. This area is a preferred use area for horses. In the past two years BLM has removed 94 horses. On drought years water availability severely limits the horse use areas, and causes overgrazing around remaining water sources.

The Unit contains three large National Register Quality Archaeological Districts and many National Register quality sites, and there is a high potential for additional National Register quality sites.

The entire Unit is contained within portions of three WSA's (CA-02-913, 913A, 913B).

Unit 6 - EASTERN UPLANDS

The Eastern Uplands Unit consist of the area between Upper High Rock and Pole Canyons and the area east of Pole Canyon and lower High Rock Canyon.

The Unit contains approximately 21,342 acres all of which are public.

The Unit is almost exclusively low sagebrush with limited big sagebrush in a series of north-south drainages. It is estimated that 10% of the area is in poor condition, 30% in fair condition and 60% in good condition.

The Unit receives no sheep use and very limited cattle use. The limited cattle use in this Unit is due to a lack of available livestock water. Livestock use is restricted to accessible areas and available water.

The Unit receives moderate to high deer winter use. Antelope use is low to moderate yearlong with somewhat higher use in winter and spring. Sage grouse use is moderate with several large strutting and nesting areas. Non-game species diversity is relatively low due primarily to a lack of water and low vegetal diversity. Raptors use of the Unit is moderate to high as hunting territory and nesting habitat.

The Unit presently contains approximately ³³25 horses, and ~~6~~ burros. This Unit is a preferred horse use area, with ridges being used by horses and wildlife exclusively. The horses in the Unit are dependant upon water in Pole and High Rock Canyons. There may be some horse movement between this Unit and the Winnemucca District.

There is one recorded cultural resource site in this Unit. Areas near water sources, such as springs and in canyons, have a high potential to contain National Register quality sites.

The entire Unit is within WSA CA-020-914.

Unit 7 - THE CANYONS

The Canyon Unit is a series of all or portions of five deep canyons. These canyons are High Rock Canyon, Grassy Canyon, lower Yellow Rock Canyon, Mahogany Canyon and Pole Canyon.

The Unit contains approximately 16,547 acres of which 16,147 acres are public and 400 acres are private.

The Unit consists of two distinct vegetation types. The canyon bottoms are dry or semi wet meadow sites in poor condition dominated by sagebrush/rabbit-brush with heavily utilized understories of ryegrass and various meadow species. The canyon walls are steep rocky slopes broken by rims, talus and rock slide areas. Vegetation is a sparse mixture of high vigor grasses and upland shrubs.

Livestock use is limited to cattle. Cattle use becomes concentrated in this area from mid-June to October 15. This concentrated use occurs when water availability on the surrounding benches becomes limited during the course of the grazing season.

The Unit is home for a small resident deer population, with moderate to high use in winter and spring. Antelope do not use the Unit. Chukar frequent the rocky slopes. Nesting raptors are common, while other non-game species diversity is expected to be high due to topographic and vegetative diversity. The Unit has potential for supporting a minimum of 200 bighorn sheep. Sage grouse use is low to moderate during the brooding period.

Wild horses use the canyon bottoms for water and some slopes for forage in winter.

This Unit contains a number of significant cultural resource sites such as rock-shelters, occupation sites, quarries, and lithic scatters. Approximately 25% of the area has been surveyed for cultural resources. There are six archaeological districts and ten sites eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and high potential for more. Additionally, the Lassen-Applegate Trail is included in the National Register of Historic Places. There is a high potential for vandalism and impactation. There is a high level of interest in designation of the Unit as a National Monument.

The entire Unit is within portions of three WSA's (CA-020-913-913B and 914).