



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Nevada State Office
300 Booth Street
P.O. Box 12000
Reno, Nevada 89520

9/7/82
IN REPLY REFER TO

4700
(N-931.3)

B. 10/5/82

September 7, 1982

MEMORANDUM

To: Chief, Division of Resources *9-9-10*
Through: Chief, Branch of Biological Resources *(Signature)*
From: Wild Horse and Burro Specialist
Subject: Wild Horse/Burro Herd Management Area Plans

The attached document is a HMAP prepared by the Las Vegas District for the Nevada Wild Horse Range. This plan is the first WH&B activity plan which has been officially submitted to this office since my arrival in September of 1980. I have reviewed this plan and generally found it to be primarily a justification for removing wild horses. HMAPs of this type have resulted in significant and valid criticism from wild horse interest groups for many years.

In general, the attached plan lacks the specificity required to establish management direction, lacks coordination between and a logical sequence of development for the various sections and lacks a plan of action for sound positive management of the animals and their habitat. I have selected a few specific examples of these problems to illustrate my concerns. My intent in highlighting these problems is to demonstrate the need for technical overview of HMAPs at least until some prototype plans have been developed.

Problem 1

Section III B, of the plan states that no vegetative inventory has been completed and that the grazing capacity will be determined through monitoring studies. However, section IV B(2) identifies a plan objective of managing for a number of wild horses which the range can support as determined by estimating available suitable forage within 4 miles of water. This type of estimation involves a vegetation height classification as well as application of suitability criteria. Since no vegetation inventory has been conducted, such an estimation would be extremely difficult to support if challenged.

In addition to the above, the monitoring studies to be used in establishing the grazing capacity are not identified in sufficient detail in Section VIII A and B (Studies and Assessment) to provide guidance in both the type and frequency of studies to be used.

Problem 2

Section III D(1)(a) of the plan states that the wild horse herd is in direct conflict with mule deer and bighorn sheep. This section also states that horses are utilizing the same forage species as antelope and uncontrolled horse population increase and expansion will likely result in reduced productivity of bighorn sheep and mule deer.

There is absolutely no data presented in the plan to demonstrate that wild horses are in direct conflict with any of the other herbivores. In fact, such a statement as it relates to mule deer is contradictory to available research on wild horses and mule deer diets.

In addition, there is no correlation between wild horse population increase and productivity of bighorn sheep and mule deer. More important however, is the fact that data presented in the plan regarding wild horse productivity indicates a reproductive rate of only 8 or 9 per cent. With reproductive rates this low, it is doubtful if wild horse population increase has been significant. This is due to the fact that if there has been any mortality at all, the rate of increase will be below 8-9 percent.

Problem 3

Section III B(2) discusses range condition and trend on the NWHR. Since studies were not established until 1981, this narrative focuses upon apparent trend and apparent condition. The conclusions drawn in the plan regarding apparent trend are not based upon established procedures for estimating this parameter and there is no such thing as apparent condition in rangeland evaluations.

Problem 4

Section III D(1)(b) discusses a problem with suspended particulates which are interfering with visibility and weapons testing by the military. This section goes on to claim that the increased dust is a direct function of reduced ground cover created by overgrazing by wild horses. This type of statement cannot be supported by existing data and in fact, is contrary to existing information on the effects of overgrazing. The primary result of overgrazing is not a reduction in ground cover, but a change in vegetation composition. The exception would be extreme concentration areas near water where vegetation trampling and removal may create bare ground. However, it is unlikely if such areas present a major source of dust on the NWHR.

Problem 5

Section IV (Objectives) identifies all of the objectives for managing wild horses and their habitat on the NWHR. Unfortunately, the objectives presented are primarily a restatement of law or don't say anything specific. For example, the objective for water on the NWHR is

to maintain present waters and not to develop new waters. What is needed is a listing of the waters to be maintained, the type of maintenance required and a maintenance schedule.

Problem 6

Section V (Management Methods) is supposed to identify the specific management actions to be undertaken by BLM to achieve the plan objectives. However, the NWHR plan simply talks about reducing wild horse numbers.

Problem 7

Section VIII (Studies and Assessment) is supposed to identify the specific studies and their scheduling that are to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the management actions in meeting the objectives of the plan. However, the NWHR plan simply states that monitoring studies have been started and that the Fish and Wildlife Service is interested in studying population dynamics on the NWHR.

The above problems exemplify what I believe reflect a major deficiency and lack of understanding as to the purpose and function of HMAPs. These problems also demonstrate the reason why BLM is looked upon as only being interested in getting rid of wild horses, rather than managing the animals.

It is my understanding that one of the primary functions of my position in Nevada is to bring an advocacy role to WH&B management and to develop a positive management program for the animals in an attempt to reduce or minimize adverse criticism of BLM's management efforts. As a result, I recommend that for the present time, all wild horse HMAPs which are developed in Nevada, be reviewed in the Nevada State Office prior to being implemented at the District level. If desirable, this review could be limited to the first two or three HMAPs developed by each district. By adopting such a policy, I believe that considerable improvement could be made in our HMAP program with a corresponding reduction in criticism of our management efforts.

Milton A. Free

NEVADA WILD HORSE RANGE AND USAF TACTICAL
FIGHTERS WEAPONS CENTER RANGE COMPLEX

WILD HORSE HERD MANAGEMENT AREA PLAN

Nevada Wild Horse Range and USAF Tactical Fighter
Weapons Center Range Complex
Wild Horse Herd Management Area Plan

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Plans Purpose
- III. Background Information
 - A. Location
 - B. Resource Data
 - 1. Vegetative Resource
 - 2. Range Condition
 - 3. Soils
 - 4. Water
 - 5. Animals
 - a. Wildlife
 - b. Livestock
 - c. Wild Horses
 - d. Burros
 - 6. Seasonal Use
 - C. Existing Projects
 - D. Coordination
 - 1. Relationships to Other Resource Users and Resource Conflicts
 - a. Wild Horse - Wildlife
 - b. Wild Horse - U.S. Air Force and Department of Energy Withdrawal
- IV. Objectives
 - A. Habitat
 - 1. Forage
 - 2. Cover
 - 3. Water
 - B. Wild and Free Roaming Horses
 - 1. Primary Objectives
 - 2. Animal Numbers
 - 3. Specific Objectives
 - a. Kawich Area
 - b. Goldfield Area
 - c. Stonewall Area

- V. Management Methods
 - A. Minimal Management
 - B. Methods to be Used
 - C. Timing
- VI. Cooperative Arrangements
- VII. Management Facilities and Equipment
- VIII. Studies and Assessment
 - A. Habitat Studies
 - B. Animal Studies
 - C. Animal Census
 - 1. Wildlife
 - 2. Wild Horse
- IX. Modification
- X. Persons, Groups, and Government Agencies Consulted
- XI. Participating and Review Staff
- XII. Signatures

Appendix

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|----------|---|
| 1. | | Base Map | 1 |
| 2. | Seasonal Use Areas
and Home Range | Overlay | 1 |
| 3. | Existing Projects | Overlay | 2 |
| 4. | Resource Conflicts | Overlay | 3 |

I. Introduction

The Nevada Wild Horse Range (NWHR) was established in 1962 by a cooperative agreement with the Department of Defense and the Department of Interior. Wild horse population estimates at that time were placed at 200-400 head. These horses were mainly in the area designated as the NWHR. Since 1962 the wild horses have expanded their range and roam over a much larger area. The present population estimates are 4000-5000 wild horses on the NWHR and surrounding area. The NWHR is 394,000 acres of unfenced range lying within the northeast corner of the USAF Tactical Fighters Weapons Center Range Complex in Nye County. The total area of the present home range is estimated at 1,165,000 acres. (See map), which is presently covered by a five party agreement for management with the U.S. Air Force (USAF), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Department of Energy (DOE), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW).

Historically this area was grazed by livestock, horses and wildlife. Even though the area was withdrawn for military purposes in 1940, livestock grazing continued until 1979. Attempts were made during the fifties and sixties to discontinue livestock grazing to no avail. In 1979 a fence along the northern boundary was completed thus eliminating livestock grazing from the area. Nationally the NWHR is not well known and does not generate much public interest, because of its remoteness and the inaccessibility of the area. The National Wild Horse Association, a Las Vegas based organization, has shown considerable active interest and has been involved in helping develop and maintain water improvements. The members are also very much interested in the welfare of the wild horses. The USAF and the DOE has an on-going program of weapons development and military aircraft training which is presently increasing. These activities lessen and/or prevent even agency access to the area, especially the area designated as the Tonopah Test Range.

II. Plans Purpose

The major purpose of this plan is to manage the wild horses according to the Wild Horse and Burro Act of December 15, 1971, (Public Law 92-195) as amended by Public Law 94-579 and Public Law 95-514.

III. Background Information

A. Location

The NWHR is located in the northeast corner of the USAF Tactical Fighters Weapons Center Range Complex (Range Complex) approximately 40 miles southeast of Tonopah, Nevada. (See area map) The general topography is of broad flat valleys and steep rocky mountains.

The area the wild horses are presently using is shown on overlay No. 1. The acreage is as follows:

NWHR	394,000 acres
Remaining Use Area	<u>771,000 acres</u>
	1,165,000 total acres

B. Resource Data

1. Vegetative Resource

No vegetative inventory has been conducted nor is one planned. To determine the grazing capacity monitoring studies will be conducted. Because of the security restriction placed on the area outside the NWHR, monitoring will be conducted on NWHR only.

Utilization studies initiated in 1980 show that heavy to severe use is being made within 1/2 mile of all water facilities. Outward from waters to about 4 1/2 miles the use is moderate to heavy and even past this point, the vegetation appears to have been mown.

Cactus Flat and Kawich Valley should have similar vegetative communities. However this is not the case. The intense grazing made on Cactus Flat has altered the vegetative community and rabbitbrush is increasing to a high percentage in the plant community.

Generally the communities in the valleys are composed of galleta grass, Indian ricegrass, numerous forbs, big sage, low sage, rabbitbrush, buckwheat, desert globemallow, pinyon pine, and juniper.

2. Range Condition and Trend

Condition and trend studies were initiated in the spring of 1981. Vegetative trends can only be determined after many years of data collection. Based on the physical damage to the forage plants from trampling, and grazing and the abundance of undesirable plants, the apparent trend is down.

The apparent condition varies from good to poor depending on the distance from water. These areas within 1/2 mile of water are in very poor condition whereas those farther removed are in fair to good condition, depending on distance from water sources. The visual appearance and field observation of comparison areas were used to derive the apparent condition.

3. Soils

Soils in the NWHR area are primarily aridisols and entisols. A few mollisols occur on the upper elevations of the mountains and high plateaus. No soil survey has been conducted nor is one planned.

Again, this could be described better using 90% utilization figure on key vegetation. BB

Without use of apparent, this situation could be easily described by intensifying existing vegetation, etc. W.H.E.M. are indicators of trend. BB

No such thing as apparent cond.

small

4. Water (see overlay #2)

Water sources for the wild horses and wildlife in the home range consist mainly of undeveloped springs and natural catchment basins. Past livestock operations had developed some of the spring and pipelines, but since these operations have been restricted from the Range Complex, these developments have deteriorated to the point that they provide water only at the source.

The BLM with assistance from the National Wild Horse Association has developed five springs. Two of these spring developments are the water source for two pipelines for better water distribution.

Waters in the Cedar Peak area are maintained by the Nevada Wild Horse Association. Summer and Cedar Springs, along with George's Water, are maintained by Mr. Joseph Fallini. The Air Force maintains the water well at the Operations and Maintenance Compound on the Tonopah Test Range.

Wild horse use areas are restricted to the above mentioned water sources especially during the summer months.

5. Animals

a. Wildlife

An estimated 200-300 mule deer, 120 antelope, 35-50 desert bighorn sheep, and four (4) mountain lions make year long use of the area. The mule deer are found on all mountain ranges within the area. The antelope use the foothills and the valleys. Main concentrations are in the northern portion of Cactus Flat and all of Kawich Valley with occasional sightings around Stonewall Mountains. The desert bighorn sheep and the mountain lions are on and around Stonewall Mountain.

Other wildlife species found in the area include a variety of raptors, such as Golden eagles and hawks, numerous small birds and small mammals and many reptiles. Jackrabbits and cottontails are common, but population levels fluctuate periodically in high/low cycles.

No endangered species are known to exist in the area.

b. Livestock

Livestock are no longer licensed to graze this area and only an occasional livestock trespass occurs.

c. Wild Horses

Origin of the wild horse in this area is not known, but it was probably from domestic stock of ranches and mining operations. Estimated wild horse population in the late 1950's was a 200-400 herd according to USAF personnel. Little emphasis has been placed on data collection, particularly due to the restricted entry and remoteness of the NWHR. In 1960 a Wild Horse Management Plan was developed for the NWHR. Even though both parties agreed to the plan it was never implemented. The BLM and USAF have been conducting aerial horse inventories since 1977. The present population is 3122 (actual count), with an estimated population of 3500-4000 horses present.

Horse colors vary from white to black and all shades in between. However, the predominant colors are bay and sorrel with a few pintos in the Stonewall Mountain area. The wild horses are found mainly within the NWHR. There are two other herds as shown on the base map. No efforts have been made to control the wild horse population at least for the past twenty years. Prior to that period data is sketchy.

Most animals appear to be in good condition. Some poor condition animals have been seen intermixed with animals of good condition. These poor condition animals could be the result of old age, sickness, parasites and nursing (mares).

There is no data for sex ratio, age structure, or mortality. Productivity based on limited data from one year's observation is approximately 8 or 9 percent.

d. Burros

There are no burros on the NWHR at this time. Burros do exist around Stonewall Mountain and the Goldfield range. Present population estimates are:

Stonewall Mountain - 110 burros
Goldfield Range - 50 burros

Most of the burros are off the Range Complex but they do occasionally migrate onto the range.

The animals appear to be in good condition.

6. Seasonal Use Areas (See Overlay # 1)

The horses tend to concentrate in the areas close to the water source during the summer months. Most of these areas are along the upper portions of the piedmont slope. During the cooler months the horses use a much larger area extending 10-15 miles from known water sources.

*If we have
inventories from
1977 - should we
we have more than
one year?
ETS*

7. Home Range (See Overlay # 1)

Three home ranges have been identified in the area, Kawich, Stonewall, and Goldfield hills.

Horses in the Stonewall home range do not mix with the other two herds. The Kawich and Goldfield herds do intermix during the winter months near the Mud Lake area.

C. Existing Projects (See Overlay # 2)

1. Water

Water projects consist of three spring developments with troughs at the source and two spring developments with a pipeline distribution system. These projects are maintained by the National Wild Horse Association.

Water projects left over from past livestock operations have deteriorated and are in need of repair. The pipeline projects are no longer functional and provide water only at the spring source. There are also numerous nonfunctional wells and silted in reservoirs.

2. Fence

The northern boundary of the Range Complex has been fenced to restrict cattle movement into the range. There are no interior fences.

D. Coordination

1. Relationship to Other Resource Use and Resource Conflicts

a. Wild Horse - Wildlife (See Overlay # 3)

Present estimate of big game are 35 to 50 Desert Bighorn Sheep, 120 antelope, and, 200-300 mule deer.

In the Stonewall herd area the wild horses (500 +) are making heavy demands on the water and forage resources. The highest mountain peaks show sign of horse use. This herd is in direct conflict with the mule deer and desert bighorn sheep.

The Kawich herd area has approximately 120 head of antelope and 1500 to 2000 herd of horses. During the winter months the antelope frequent the areas between the Silver Bow and Rosebud springs. However, as the wild horses move back into the area in early spring the antelope leave this area. It is not known if the

Only way to describe this is to describe uses on the vegetation which may reflect utilization & competition - A-Force feed "RB" situation may exist.

Not supported by other research on deer & horses

horses are responsible for their departure or just a seasonal movement of antelope. The horses are making heavy demands on the vegetative resources and are utilizing the same forage species as the antelope.

Based on what? 100% overlap? I doubt it.

The resident herd of mule deer is very small in numbers at the present. The NDOW feels that this is the result of too many horses in and around the deer habitat. Two to three hundred deer are estimated in the area on a seasonal basis mainly from a migratory herd.

control has never been a factor who said they were increasing. The data doesn't show this.

Continued heavy use of forage ~~and uncontrolled horse population increase and expansion of horse use~~ will likely result in reduced productivity of bighorn sheep and mule deer in the area. Should the heavy forage utilization by horses continue, a demise of native big game species could occur in the area.

for all foraging animals.

b. Wild Horse - U.S. Air Force and Department of Energy Uses

The U.S. Air Force has used the NWHR and surrounding area as a military training area for the past forty years. Initially there was little conflict between wild horses and the Air Force use because of the low wild horse population. In the last 10-15 years the horse numbers have increased and have interfered with the military's training to the point of in direct conflict between the two.

DOE, through a contract with Sandia National Laboratories, has used the northern portion of the Range Complex for military weapons test and development for more than ten years. The weapons development systems requires the use of many optical devices in which good visibility is necessary in order to be effective. The suspended particulates have increased to the point that, at times, the optical equipment is rendered useless. The increased particulates are the result of reduced ground cover from overgrazing.

Isn't this a little thing for a reason? What is this?

Another problem is that of wild horses on or near the test site air field. This presents a potential safety hazard to aircraft that use the airfield.

The increased vehicular use and the large wild horse population have resulted in vehicle/horse collisions. To date there have been no human injuries, but the potential for serious accidents exists.

Considering that whole country isn't there?

IV. Objectives

A. Habitat

Same as comment on previous page

Again - describe use on veg. to at least reflect an overuse situation between animals JB

Since the info presented doesn't support this conclusion or ~~judgment~~ based on utilization - seems the statement needs to address "foraging animals" at this time. JB

- Not too strong a point - but all part of the whole issue.

Up to this point I still don't know what the utilization SMIPSS indicate.

1. Forage

Maximum allowable use on the key forage species should be 55% for perennial grasses and forbs, and 45% for shrubs.

2. Cover

The main source of cover is provided by the pinyon-juniper on the mountain slopes. Some cover is provided by the canyons and rocky outcrops along the foothills.

3. Water

Present waters will be maintained. No new developments are planned.

B. Wild and Free Roaming Horses

1. Primary Objectives

The primary objectives are to manage, protect and control wild free roaming horses where they existed in 1971. The wild horses will be managed in accordance with Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act, and the Range Land Improvement Act for protection against capture, branding, harassment, or death.

2. Animal Numbers

Representatives of the five agencies responsible for management of the NWHR, Tonopah Test Range, Desert Game Range and USAF Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Center Range Complex (formerly Nellis Air Force Range) made the following recommendations on February 12, 1982:

- a. Reduce the numbers of horses from the present numbers to an average of 1000 animals.¹
- b. Confine and manage these animals to the Kawich Home Range.
- c. Remove the horses/burros from the Stonewall and Goldfield Ranges.

¹ These interim numbers were derived by estimating the available suitable forage within a four mile radius of water. Numbers to be managed on NWHR will be derived from monitoring studies over a period of years. The selected number will be allowed to fluctuate an average of 20 percent between periodic removal operations.

Specific Objectives for the Three Home Ranges are:

UTILIZATION + Travel distance more closely together - now at this point in time

I HAVE NO PROBLEM IN KEEPING HORSES IN THEIR ORIGINAL HORSE AREAS.

What's W/H interests here?

But you don't know have an inventory of horses go further from H&O

Horses do go further from H₂O than cattle. The 4 miles is based on "base property" water. I would think we would need to tie utilization + Travel distance more closely together - now at this point in time

B3

a. Kawich (See Overlay #1)

Aerial counts in May 1981 showed 1700 horses using this home range. The horses have expanded this range in the recent past which is evident by the difference in vegetal cover in the Cactus Flat area to that in Kawich Valley. Livestock operators using the Kawich Valley possibly kept the wild horse level at a minimum in area.

A difference in veg cover does not indicate expansion. A change in cover may or may not

If this herd is not reduced to a level that is in line with the vegetative carrying capacity serious resource damage can be expected. *but you said you don't know this*

An average herd size of 1000 horses will be maintained.

b. Goldfield Range (See Overlay #1)

The area is within the Tonopah Test Site and ground entry is severely restricted. Only aerial horse count and general vegetative data have been collected.

No monitoring studies can be conducted in this area because of the inherent danger and security restriction.

All horses will be removed from this area.

THIS may BE some of me itself as we can NOT manage under this situation. B

c. Stonewall Range (See Overlay #1)

There are approximately 570 head of horses currently using this area. The Nevada Department of Wildlife recommends total removal from this area because of the conflict between wildlife and wild horses. Only a small portion of the "home range" can be monitored, and the recommendation is to remove all horses from Stonewall Mountain.

This is more significant than conflict use at this point.

4. Wildlife Objective

Increase Desert Bighorn Sheep herd population on Stonewall Range to 150 head.

Increase resident mule deer herd on Stonewall range to 300, Kawich range to 80.

Increase Antelope population on Kawich range to 300.

V. Management Methods

A. Minimal Management

I assume this increase would come as a result of taking horses "off" their expanded territory, etc. B

OTHERWISE way is w/c objective or how is objective tied to w/c objective. Horses not always reduced to increase w/c leads w/o reason.

WHAT'S THIS telling me as a decision maker? Not supported enough. B

This statement is not supportable in itself. As a statement it can apply to all grazing animals.

In order to keep management at a minimal level, there will be no pasture fencing even though a higher population level might be maintained if fencing were used. The objective can be attained by reducing the wild horse population to the current grazing capacity of the suitable range. Wildlife demands shall be considered when determining the grazing capacity.

B. Methods to be Used

Methods to be used to reduce the wild horse population will be water trapping and/or helicopter gathering.

C. Timing

The initial reduction should take place in FY82 in accordance with the U.S. Air Force and Tonopah Test Range scheduling. Close coordination is required in order to effectively accomplish any removal of wild horses. A longer period (three years) of reduction may be required due to limited funding.

WIS is capture plan

VI. Cooperative Arrangements (See Five-Party Cooperative Agreement)

The Bureau has entered into a Cooperative Agreement with the U.S. Air Force, Department of Energy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the Nevada Department of Wildlife. This agreement details the different roles and responsibilities of each cooperator.

VII. Management Facilities and Equipment

Existing management facilities on the Kawitch consist of two pipelines and two corrals plus five spring developments. (See Overlay #3 for location). The pipelines and spring developments have increased the area of use made by the wild horses. The corrals are in disrepair and serve no purpose at this time, but could be repaired easily and used in a capture operation.

VIII. Studies and Assessment

A. Habitat Studies

Monitoring studies have been started on the Kawich area (NWHR) to evaluate range condition and trend, utilization, climate and grazing patterns.

1981 1980

B. Animal Studies

The Fish and Wildlife Service is interested in assisting in conducting a population dynamic study to determine age structure, mortality, natality, sex ratio, and a life table. The service will submit a proposal to the BLM to see if there is a possibility for funding the study. This information is greatly needed in order to manage the wild horses.

we will get it from capture data. We trained Las Vegas BLM personnel in July in procedures for analyzing the data

C. Animal Census

1. The NDOW will continue annual wildlife census.
2. BLM will continue annual wild horse census.

IX. Modification

This plan may be modified as new data and evaluation deem necessary.

X. Persons, Groups and Government Agencies Consulted

U.S. Air Force Nellis Air Force Base,
U.S. Department of Energy,
Nevada Department of Wildlife
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
National Wild Horse Association
Wild Horse Organized Assistance
Animal Protection Institute
Humane Society of Southern Nevada

XI. Participating and Review Staff

Dave Pulliam, Staff Wildlife Biologist
Terry Driver, Staff Range Conservationist
John Jamrog, SERA Range Conservationist
Stan VanVelsor, Caliente RA Range Conservationist
Marta Witt, Writer Editor (P&EC)
Cheryl Hoke, Environmental Coordinator (P&EC)

XII. Signatures

Prepared by:

5-27-82
Date

William T. Combs
William T. Combs, WH&B Specialist

Reviewed by:

05-06-82
Date

Terry Driver
Terry Driver, District Range Specialist

6-1-82
Date

David E. Pulliam
David Pulliam, Wildlife Specialist

6/15/82
Date

Approved by:

Edward T. Ciliberti
Edward T. Ciliberti, Chief
Division of Resources

5/6/84
Date

Darwin Anderson
Darwin Anderson, Area Manager
Caliente Resource Area

6/27/82
Date

Kemp Conn
Kemp Conn, District Manager, Las Vegas
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Date

Commander Nellis Air Force Base
Department of the Air Force

Date

Regional Director, US Dept. of Interior
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Date

Director
Nevada Department of Wildlife

Date

Manager, Department of Energy
Nevada Operations Office

UNITED STATES
 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
 ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO			ACTION	ROOM NO.
CODE	NAME	ORGANIZATION		
910	SPANG	RB	10/5	
910.1	ATC	10/5		
930	Resources			

Indicate Action by Number

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Necessary action | 6. Note and surname |
| 2. Approval | 7. Note and return |
| 3. Signature | 8. Your information |
| 4. Prepare reply | 9. See me |
| 5. Your comment and return | 10. |

From	Date	Room No.
<i>E</i>	9-24	
Office	Phone	
930		

Remarks

I'm sure Sist will not see this as we have. Want you to be aware of 930 concerns. If we want to remove horses on Range, it probably can be done based on other than inadequate data

ASD for 10/5

res —

10/5/82
D. Perry

I have reviewed the NWHC (Nellis) rather closely because it is a first since my effort to get the W/H+B program is more of a positive nature of management, with capture only a ~~part~~ part or portion of the total.

1. My comments, ^(here or in the flow) are not intended to be critical of this plan as it generally follows the "Capture Plan" concept of dd.

2. What we need to do is attempt to put this in an "management" mold. It's not an easy task.

My suggestion is to have the NSO W/H+B Spec. to work with the ^{DO's} development of the ~~the~~

Plan. I feel we need to "walk" through the development on the first few vs just a review capability.

3. My comments in the text are directed more as approaching the various subjects ~~which~~ in discussion. I would hope the modifications ^{suggested} would tend to treat "considerations of ^{all} foreign users" more on a equal footing ^{at the beginning} ~~and~~ which could lead to a point of beginning vs the beginning point ^{starting at} ~~use~~ "cut" - and we attempt to justify from there. End result may be reduction by agreement, etc - but we need to build the building blocks better (even w/o specific data in all cases) which lead to professional / and consultation judgments for a beginning (CERP, etc)

Note
 This is not intended
 to establish a format
 for future plans. I'm
 portraying conceptual
 differences in
 approach (I hope) (2)

4. In vision this plan could have been
 approached as follows: It has
 2 sides to it.

Vegetation & Animals / Mgt
 (all)

Nellis Objectives / Animals / Mgt

(No structure)

(No structure)

1. Describe vegetation issues,
 problems, utilization, range,
 veg. indicators, etc. etc. -
 professionally ~~the~~ from
 this one can acknowledge
 a "problem" exists because
 of overutilization by
 "foraging animals."

1. ~~Regulate~~ Possibly
 the restrictions in
 themselves will
 preclude us (Bim)
 from managing
 the horses. Such
 a conflict with
 Security would suggest
 "no horses."

2. Utilization can reflect
 "force feeding" - if this
 is the case, describe
 it and one can see
 realize that uses are
 extreme on all plants -
 thus competition exists. Results
 something is wrong.

2. Objectives of Nellis
 may suggest "~~the~~
~~best~~" ~~in~~ less
 because of security,
 safety, etc. etc. -
 certain things have
 to be met and
 if a foraging animal
 intrudes

Continued

22

3. Animal relationships
- Conflicts ~~are~~ normally present if "X" situation exists
(over utilization & force feeding on plants generally not eaten by a specific animal.)

4. Balance on utilization should be this xxx. Again, in describing xxx, we need not say which animal ~~death~~ takes preference, as we are ~~dealing~~ dealing with "proper utilization" requirements only; at this point in time.

5. Now — with above background (and more as approp) we can go CLMP (for example) and arrive at a beginning point for next, which may include adjustments ~~as~~ one of the beginning tools.

on these factors — some action may be necessary.

3. (This side ^(column) ties more into issues/problems that impact the security mission and our ability to manage.

3. Now — arrive at point of beginning as "the action" or as soon comprise action.

Note: the above ^{2 columns} ~~does~~ not
preclude some combination
of both "sides". ~~the postage~~

I have no problem of review by USA
but I feel we probably should have
been working with D.O. ~~for~~ more
prior to this plan being jelled.

Knowing what we are
trying to accomplish,
let's take the further
step to get there.