HUBBARD VINEYARD ALLOTMENT EVALUATION
SUMMARY REPORT
Bureau of Land Management (BLM) - Elko Field Office
October 2007

A. INTRODUCTION

This report describes changes to the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment Evaluation issued on 3 May 2007 based on public comments and additional input from the Elko BLM Field Office staff and provides a summary of conclusions regarding attainment of the rangeland health standards and allotment specific objectives.

The Hubbard Vineyard Allotment Evaluation analyzed monitoring data that had been collected during the evaluation period (1986 - 2006). The evaluation drew draft conclusions to determine whether existing management practices were meeting or making significant progress towards the Standards for Rangeland Health and Resource Management Plan (RMP), Rangeland Program Summary (RPS), and key area multiple use objectives.

The BLM provided a comment period lasting from 4 May 2007 to 31 May 2007 for individuals, organizations, and agencies to submit written comments, information and concerns regarding the revaluation. The BLM received four comment letters: Leta Mae Collord dated 23 May 2007 and received via mail on 25 May 2007; an undated letter from Boies Ranches received via FAX on 31 May 2007; Toiyabe Chapter Sierra Club via FAX on 1 June 2007; and State of Nevada-Department of Administration received on 1 June 2007. The comments are presented in a scoping report included in the Consultation and Coordination chapter in the Preliminary Environmental Assessment for the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment Multiple Use Decision.

B. CHANGES TO THE ALLOTMENT EVALUATION

The following changes have been made to the evaluation for the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment Evaluation dated May 2007:

1. Section 5.2.8(b)- Lentic PFC Survey Results

The BLM re-evaluated the lentic areas in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment in May and June of 2007. The comparison between the 2003 and 2007 readings are displayed below.

2003 Spring Name	Rating	2007 Spring Name	Rating
Cold Springs Mountain, Upper and Lower Hubbard Basin, Devil's Table Pastures			
HV-10	FARD	HV-10A Leo Spring	PFC
HV-06	NF	HV-06	NF
HV-07	NF	HV-07	NF
HV-08A	FARD	HV-08	FARD
HV-04A	FARD	Antelope Spring	NF
HV-09A	FARD	HV-09	NF

HV-05	FARD	HV-05	NF
HV-01	FARU	Twin Ledges	FARU
HV-02A	FARU	North Twin Ledges	PFC
HV-03	FARD	HV-04	NF
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	Corner Reservoir	NF
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	Willow Reservoir	NF
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-36	PFC
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-38	PFC
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-39	FARD
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	Mud Spring	FARD
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	Mud Springs 1	No Rating
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	Table Reservoir	NF
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-37	PFC
Middle Pasture			
HV-24	FARD	HV-24	FARU
HV-20	FARD	HV-49	PFC
HV-21	FARU	HV-21	PFC
HV-22A	FARU	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
HV-22B	FARU	HV-22B	PFC
HV-23	FARD	HV-23	FARU
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-20	PFC
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	Jakes Creek	PFC
Triangle Pasture			
HV-17A	FARD	HV-17	FARD
Coon Creek Pasture			
HV-15	FARD	HV-15	FARD
HV-16	FARD	HV-15B	FARD
HV-14	FARD	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-14	NF
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-52	NF
Flat Pasture			
HV-34	FARU	Mud Springs South	PFC
Jakes Creek Mountain Pasture			
HV-25	FARD	HV-25	PFC
HV-26	FARD	HV-26B	PFC
HV-27	FARU	HV-27	PFC
HV-28	FARU	HV-28	PFC
HV-29	FARD	HV-29A	PFC
HV-18	FARD	HV-19	FARN
HV-19	FARD	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
Not Assessed	*Not Assessed*	*HV-18*	*FARN*
Not Assessed	*Not Assessed*	*HV-29*	*PFC*
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-51	PFC

Not Assessed	*Not Assessed*	*HV-50*	*PFC*
Dry Creek Mountain Pasture			
HV-30	FARU	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
HV-31	FARU	HV-31A	FARD
HV-32A	FARD	HV-32A	FARN
HV-33	FARD	HV-33	PFC
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-40	PFC
Not Assessed	*Not Assessed*	*HV-30*	*FARN*
Not Assessed	Not Assessed	HV-32	No Rating
Bull Camp Mountain Pasture			
HV-11	FARD	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
HV-12	*FARD*	*Not Assessed*	*Not Assessed*
HV-13A	FARD	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
Not Assessed	*Not Assessed*	*HV-13*	*PFC*
Not Assessed	*Not Assessed*	*HV-13A*	*PFC*
Not Assessed	*Not Assessed*	*HV-13B*	*PFC*

Springs noted in *italics* are on private land.

Narrative comparisons

The narrative comparisons between the 2003 and 2007 assessments are displayed below. Additional information on many of these springs can be found in the Allotment Evaluation document. The names of the spring are displayed as **2003 Spring ID/2007 Spring ID.**

Cold Springs Mountain, Upper and Lower Hubbard Basin, and Devils Table Pastures

HV-10/HV-10A Leo Spring: This spring had been developed in the past and was fenced in 1996. The 2003 PFC assessment rated this spring as Functioning at Risk with a Downward Trend based on livestock impacts (trailing and grazing). A second crew did another evaluation of this spring in early 2007, using photographs taken in October 2006 as compared to photographs from 2000 and 2003. This crew rated the spring as Functioning at Risk with an Upward Trend. The 2007 PFC crew rated the spring at Properly Functioning Condition in their site visit.

HV-06/HV-06: Spring developed in the past, with the development largely consisting of a dirt stock tank. The 2003 PFC crew rated this spring as non-functional due to livestock grazing and watershed condition. The 2007 PFC crew also rated this spring as non-functional but did not specify reasons for the determination.

HV-07/HV-07: Spring developed in the past, with the development consisting of a dirt stock tank. 2003 PFC crew rated this spring as non-functional due to watershed condition. The 2007 PFC crew also rated this spring as non-functional but did not specify reasons for determination. The 2007 crew also recommended that this site not be assessed in the future unless major changes occur.

HV8A/HV-08: Spring had been developed in the past, with water piped to a trough and a dirt stock tank constructed below the development. Spring development appears to be largely non-functioning in both 2003 and 2007, with the stock tank full of water in the spring of 2007. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend in both 2003 and 2007 due to livestock impacts (hoof action and shearing, headcut, hummocking, and heavy grazing).

HV-04A/Antelope Spring: Spring had been developed in the past, with a spring box capturing water out of the source and piping it to a trough. The spring source is within an exclosure. The spring source did have an aspen stand showing regrowth, but sage and cheatgrass were also present. Spring rated as Functional At Risk in with a Downward Trend in 2003, with no causal factor identified. The 2007 PFC crew rated the spring as non-functional. The spring in 2007 has a healthy aspen component, but very little other riparian vegetation. The exclosure is vegetated primarily with sagebrush and cheatgrass. The design of the development leaves no water at the source to support any riparian communities.

HV-09A/HV-09: Spring had been developed in the past, with water piped to a trough. The pipe ended several inches short of the trough at the time of the 2003 visit, which resulted in water spilling onto the ground. This had been corrected at the time of the 2007 assessment, but the trough hardly had any water in it and the standing water in the spring source indicates the development to be non-functional. Spring rated in 2003 as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock impacts (hoof action, headcuts, hoof shearing, hummocking, and heavy grazing). Spring rated as non-functional in 2007 for the same reasons.

HV-05/HV-05: Spring rated in 2003 as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to grazing (hoof action, heavy utilization) and road encroachment. Spring rated as non-functional in 2007 due to extreme hoof action/hummocking.

HV-01/Twin Ledges: Spring had been developed and fenced in the past, with water piped to a trough. Spring rated in 2003 as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend, with livestock and dewatering listed as limiting factors. Spring also rated as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend in 2007 due to exclosure area over-run with rose and the lack of a float valve on the trough robbing water from the spring.

HV-02A/North Twin Ledges: Spring fenced in 1996. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend in 2003. Assessment noted enlarging riparian area, recovering hoof action and headcuts, and upland species dying back from around edges. Spring rated as Proper Functioning Condition in 2007.

HV-03/HV-04 Dynamite Spring: Spring developed in the past, with a springbox and a pipe. At time of 2003 assessment a plastic trough was present, but located several feet from the end of the pipe, which allowed all water to spill out into ground. This situation persisted in 2007. Spring rated in 2003 as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock (hoof action, utilization) and watershed condition. Spring rated as nonfunctional in 2007 due to hoof action and lack of riparian vegetation.

Not Assessed/Corner Reservoir: This source not assessed in 2003. This is a large dirt reservoir that is the primary water source in the area. No riparian vegetation present. Reservoir rated as non-functional in 2007.

Not Assessed/Willow Reservoir: This source not assessed in 2003. No sign of a reservoir. Primary riparian vegetation present consisted of Nebraska sedge and Baltic rush. Riparian area heavily impacted by trampling and hoof action. Source appears to be drying out and is rated as nonfunctional in 2007.

Not Assessed/HV-36: This spring not assessed in 2003. Spring area in 2007 showed a diverse riparian plant community with some evidence of livestock impacts. Spring rated as Proper Functioning Condition.

Not Assessed/HV-38: This spring not assessed in 2003. Spring area in 2007 featured a diverse riparian plant community. Spring rated as Proper Function Condition.

Not Assessed/HV-39: This spring not assessed in 2003. Spring developed in the past. No float valve in the trough, with the overflow watering a riparian area below the development. Site dominated by non riparian obligate species, with riparian vegetation limited to spring source. Area around spring moderately to heavily trampled and grazed by livestock. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend.

Not Assessed/Mud Springs: This spring not assessed in 2003. Spring area bisected by fence separating Hubbard Vineyard and O'Neil Allotments. Diverse composition of riparian plant species present, but wet areas are subject to moderate to extreme hoof action and heavy utilization especially near the fenceline. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend.

Not Assessed/Table Reservoir: This source not assessed in 2003. Source is a reservoir fed by an ephemeral stream that was dry at time of 2007 assessment. No riparian vegetation present. Numerous wildlife trails and wildlife tracks around source. Source rated as nonfunctional.

Not Assessed/HV-37: This spring not assessed in 2003. Source consists of a small seep in a draw with an old dirt stock tank below. Riparian vegetation present in good quantity, but extent limited due to small production of the source. Spring rated as Proper Functioning Condition.

<u>Middle Pasture</u>

HV-24/HV-24: Spring had been developed in the past, with water piped to a trough. Water system fully functional in 2003 and 2007. Spring rated in 2003 as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock grazing (hoof action, trampling, utilization) and watershed condition. 2007 PFC crew noted spring area looked considerably better that earlier assessment, with hummocking noted in 2003 showing almost full recovery. Spring rated in 2007 as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend.

HV-20/HV-49: Spring area rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend in 2003 due to livestock grazing (Hoof action, frost heaving, and grazed areas). Spring area showed almost complete recovery from these impacts in 2007 and was rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-21/HV-21: Spring rated as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend in 2003, with livestock identified as a limiting factor. Some hoof action and frost heaving present, with livestock trails around perimeter. The 2007 re-assessment noted a lot of the past hummocking and hoof action was well on the way to recovering and rated the spring at Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-22A/Not Assessed: Spring rated as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend in 2003. Spring not re-assessed in 2007.

HV-22B/HV-22B: Spring assessed with #22A above in 2003 and had the same rating. Re-assessment in 2007 noted full recovery of deficiencies identified in 2003, with the spring rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-23/HV-23: Spring rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend in 2003 due to livestock and watershed condition. The 2007 re-assessment found most of the spring areas in full recovery or at least in much better shape than the 2003 assessment, which resulted in a rating of Proper Functioning Condition with an Upward Trend.

Not Assessed/HV-20: Spring not assessed in 2003. The 2007 assessment noted substantial recovery from past hoof action and a healthy riparian vegetative community. Spring rated as Proper Functioning Condition.

Not Assessed/Jakes Creek: Source not assessed in 2003. This is a small meadow area in the floodplain at the confluence of two forks of Jakes Creek. No apparent or visible spring source. The site supported a healthy and diverse riparian plant community and was rated Proper Functioning Condition.

Triangle Pasture

HV-17A/HV-17: The original evaluation stated this spring had been fenced in 1996 and lay within the Middle Pasture. This is erroneous, as the fenced spring is actually just to the south and this spring is within the Triangle Pasture. The 2003 assessment noted the spring area mostly dry and grazed, with a road limiting the size of the spring area. The spring was rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend. The 2007 assessment found extreme hoof action, much bare dirt, and hummocking, with the spring rated as Nonfunctional.

Coon Creek Pasture

HV-15 & 16/HV-15 & 15B: Two springs in close proximity, both with dirt stock tanks in the drainages below the sources. The 2003 assessments noted erosion, hoof action, and

hummocking, with both springs rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock, watershed conditions, and dredging activities. The 2007 re-assessments found similar conditions and gave the springs the same rating.

HV-14/Not Assessed: The 2003 assessment found generally dry conditions, with minimal hoof action and heavy utilization of the riparian vegetation. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock and watershed condition. Spring not assessed in 2007.

Not Assessed/HV-14: This spring not assessed in 2003. The 2007 assessment found extremely dry conditions, with high hummocking in the few wet areas and upland grasses almost completely encroaching the former meadow area. Spring rated as Nonfunctional.

Not Assessed/HV-52: This spring not assessed in 2003. The 2007 assessment found the spring at the confluence of two gullies. Minimal riparian vegetation present, with extreme hoof action, hummocking, and erosion noted. Spring rated as Nonfunctional.

Flat Pasture

HV-34/Mud Springs South: This is a complex of at least five spring sources, with the entire complex fenced in 1996. The 2003 assessment found adequate riparian vegetation and evidence of past livestock impacts along with some bare soils. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend. The 2007 assessment found the old hummocking in full recovery and the riparian vegetation community occupying the site, with the spring rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

Jakes Creek Mountain Pasture

HV-25/HV-25: The 2003 assessment found the spring to be near its potential extent, but also noted trampling, heaving, hoof action, and a road impacting the area. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend. The 2007 assessment found most of the hummocking detailed in the 2003 assessment to be fully recovered, with some very minor impacts from current livestock grazing. Spring rated as Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-26/HV-26: The 2003 assessment found the spring impacted by trampling, hoof action, livestock trails, and some road encroachment. The spring was rated as Functioning at Risk with a Downward Trend. The 2007 assessment found the impacts noted in 2003 to be almost completely recovered, with the spring rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-27/HV-27: The 2003 assessment noted a large and diverse riparian area, with some hoof action noted. The spring was rated Functioning at Risk with an Upward Trend. The 2007 assessment found the old hummocks to be filled in and the ground to be very wet, with the spring rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-28/HV-28: The 2003 assessment noted a large and diverse riparian plant community, with some bare areas around the base of some willows noted along with a dirt reservoir, some bare

areas, major areas of hoof action, and livestock trails. The 2007 assessment noted none of the impacts detailed in 2003, with riparian plants exhibiting high vigor and the spring rated out as Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-29/HV-29A: The 2003 assessment noted a diverse plant community with hoof action, headcutting, hummocks, and bare areas noted. Spring rated as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend. The 2007 assessment noted recovering past hoof action, compacted soils, and minor erosion, with the spring rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

HV-18/HV-19: The 2003 assessment noted a diverse plant community with large un-shaded areas, bare soils, erosion, hoof action, and road encroachment noted. The spring rated out at Functioning at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock and road encroachment. The 2007 re-assessment found the spring area heavily impacted due to hoof shearing, which the PFC crew attributed to elk. The spring rated out at Functioning at Risk with No Apparent Trend due to the elk impacts.

HV-19/Not Assessed: The 2003 assessment found a diverse riparian plant community with some upland plant encroachment, with hoof action, trailing, road encroachment, and drying noted. Spring rated at Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend. Spring not assessed in 2007.

Not Assessed/HV-18: This Spring is on Private Land. No assessment in 2003. The 2007 assessment noted a diverse plant community, but no surface water could be found. Spring rated as Functioning at Risk with No Apparent Trend.

Not Assessed/HV-29: This Spring is on Private Land. No assessment in 2003. The 2007 assessment is included with #29A above.

Not Assessed/HV-51: This spring not assessed in 2003. The 2007 assessment noted a large and diverse riparian plant community, with all evidence of past hoof action/hummocking almost completely recovering. Spring rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

Not Assessed/HV-50: This Spring is on Private Land. No assessment in 2003. The 2007 assessment noted a large and diverse riparian plant community, with evidence of past livestock use in recovery. Spring rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

Dry Creek Mountain Pasture

HV-30/Not Assessed: Schlitz Spring, enclosed by a fence in 1996. PFC crew in 2003 noted recovering impacts from past livestock use and an old road passing through the spring area. Spring rated as Functioning at Risk with an Upward Trend, with watershed condition listed as the limiting factor.

Not Assessed/HV-30: This spring on private land. The 2007 PFC crew did not assess the Schlitz Spring above, but instead rated a wet meadow lying just outside the Schlitz Spring exclosure. The assessment noted a riparian plant community, but also noted that the area was

very dry. No livestock impacts noted. Area rated as Functioning at Risk with No Apparent Trend.

HV-31/HV-31A: Dry Creek Spring. This spring fenced in 1996. The 2003 PFC crew focused their assessment on the actual spring area inside the exclosure, where they found an enlarging riparian area along with some minor hoof action, trails, and grazing, all due to horses that had been penned up in the exclosure. The spring area rated at Functioning at Risk with an Upward Trend. The 2007 PFC crew did not evaluate the spring area inside the exclosure, with their assessment focused entirely on a small seep coming underneath the exclosure fence from the seep area. The assessment found hoof action and hummocking and areas of bare soil, with the area rated at Functioning at Risk with a Downward Trend. **The difference in where the two assessments were conducted make any trend analysis at this spot meaningless.**

HV-32/HV-32A: The 2003 assessment found several riparian plants, with the spring area impacted by hoof action, small headcuts, and hummocking. The spring rated out as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock. The 2007 re-assessment found much of the same conditions, but no evidence to indicate that it was recent damage. The crew did note that the apparent drying out of the spring area likely hampered recovery from the past damage. The spring rated as Functional at Risk with No Apparent Trend.

HV-33/HV-33: The 2003 assessment noted a riparian plant community, with the spring area impacted by hoof action, trampling, bare areas, and erosion. The spring rated out as Functioning at Risk with a Downward Trend. The 2007 assessment noted some impacts to the spring area attributed to both livestock and elk, but the low amount of impact and healthy and mature riparian communities rated this spring at Proper Functioning Condition.

Not Assessed/HV-40: This spring not assessed in 2003. The 2007 assessment noted a healthy and diverse riparian plant community, with evidence of recovering past hummocking. The spring rated out at Proper Functioning Condition.

Bull Camp Mountain Pasture

HV-11/Not Assessed: The 2003 assessment noted an apparently shrinking riparian area supporting a riparian plant community, with cut banks along stream channel, minor hoof action, a minor head cut, and patchy areas of heavy utilization noted. The spring rated out as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend due to livestock and watershed condition. This spring not re-assessed in 2007.

HV-12/Not Assessed. This spring on Private Land. The 2003 assessment noted conditions and a rating almost identical to HV-11 above. Spring not assessed in 2007.

HV-13A/Not Assessed. The 2003 assessment noted the spring area almost completely dried out, with much upland plant species encroachment and heavy utilization levels present. The spring rated out as Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend. Spring not re-assessed in 2007.

Not Assessed/HV-13, 13A, and 13B: These spring are on Private Land. These springs not assessed in 2003. The 2007 assessments noted a complex of springs supporting willows a diverse riparian plant community. Some evidence of past livestock use that is recovering, with the PFC crew attributing recent hoof action to deer and elk. Entire spring complex rated at Proper Functioning Condition.

The 2007 lentic PFC data creates the following updates to the land use plan and multiple use objective conclusions.

2. Updates to Section 6.2.3 Riparian/Stream Habitat

1. Improve 10 springs in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment to good or better condition.

Met
Spring areas rated at Proper Functioning Condition are considered to be in good or better condition, while spring rated at Functioning at Risk with an Upward Trend or lower lack the vegetative height, density, or cover to justify a good condition rating. The spring areas in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment have been assessed twice, once in 2003 and again in 2007. The 2003 assessment evaluated 35 lentic spring and seeps, with 10 rated as Functional-at-risk (FAR) with an upward trend (FAR↑) (29%), 22 were FAR↓ (downward trend) (63%), and 3 were non-functional (NF) (8%). The 2007 assessments evaluated 51 springs, seeps, and reservoirs, with 24 rated as Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) (47%), 3 rated at Functional-at-risk (FAR) with an upward trend (FAR↑) (6%), 4 rated as Functional-at-risk with no apparent trend (FARN) (8%), 7 rated as FAR↓ (downward trend) (14%), and 11 rated as non-functional (NF) (21%). Two of the sources did not receive any rating (4%). Three of the areas rated non-functional are livestock reservoirs. The objective to improve 10 springs to good or better condition has been more than met.

The O'Neil/Salmon Falls Habitat Management Plan (HMP) proposed to improve 50 springs in the O'Neil/Salmon Falls RCA. The HMP specifically identifies 25 springs, six of which lie in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment. The HMP allows flexibility in identifying the remaining 25. The six springs specifically identified in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment are:

- Leo Spring, Hubbard Basin Pasture, T44N, R62E, S 9, SWNE. This spring was fenced in 1996 and was rated as Proper Functioning Condition in 2007.
- North Twin Ledge Spring, Hubbard Basin Pasture, T43N, R62E, S 1, NESE. This spring was fenced in 1996 and was rated as Proper Functioning Condition in 2003.
- Unnamed Spring, Middle Pasture, T43N, R62E, S 16 SESW. This spring remains unfenced and was rated as Functioning At Risk with an Upward Trend in 2007.
- Corral Spring, Middle Pasture, T43N, R62E, S 22 NESW. This spring remains unfenced and was rated as Functioning At Risk with an Upward Trend in 2003.
- Dry Meadow Spring, Triangle Pasture, T42N, R62E, S 9 SWSE. This spring was fenced in 1996 and was rated as Functioning at Risk with a Downward Trend in 2007.
- Mud Spring, Flat Pasture, T42N, R63E, S 21 NESW. This spring was fenced in 1996 and was rated at Proper Functioning Condition in 2007.

The BLM has completed three additional exclosure projects in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment:

- S. Fork Jakes Creek exclosure, Middle Pasture, T43N, R62E, S 27 SWNE. Spring rated as Proper Functioning Condition in 2007.
- Zchlitz Spring, Dry Creek Mountain. Pasture, T42N, R61E, S 12 NESW. Spring fenced in 1996 and rated as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend in 2003. The 2007 assessments looked only at a meadow area adjacent to- and outside of- the spring area that was rated as Functioning at Risk with No Apparent Trend.
- Dry Creek Spring, Dry Creek Mountain Pasture, T42N, R61E, S 13 NENW. Spring fenced in 1996 and rated as Functional at Risk with an Upward Trend in 2003. The 2007 assessments did not evaluate the spring area, with the efforts instead focusing on a seep that came out from underneath of the exclosure fence that was rated Functional at Risk with a Downward Trend.

The 1980-81 Elko District wildlife habitat and water inventory data showed 30 springs within the Hubbard/Vineyard Allotment which were in less than good condition. The 2007 assessment indicates that 27 are now in good condition or in an upward trend.

C. FINAL DETERMINATIONS- NORTHEASTERN GREAT BASIN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR RANGELAND HEALTH

This section makes final determinations regarding:

1. Progress towards or attainment of the standards for rangeland health,
2. Whether livestock management is in conformance with the guidelines, and
3. Whether existing grazing management or levels of grazing use are significant factors in failing to achieve the standards or conform to the guidelines.

a. Upland Sites: Upland soils exhibit infiltration and permeability rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate and landform.

This standard for rangeland health is being Met in most areas, and livestock grazing management is considered to be in conformance with the guidelines.

The determination is based largely on evaluation of the RPS objectives 1, 2, and 3 and key area objectives HV-01, HV-02, HV-03, HV-04 and HV-05 presented above**.** The results of the long term key area studies indicate that ecological status and condition is being at least maintained on much of the allotment, which translates into sufficient amounts of vegetation present to protect soil resources. Variations noted across years appear to be more connected with precipitation levels than any other factors. Livestock distribution continues to be an issue in some pastures, but the periodic resting of pastures each year allows plants to complete their growth and reproductive cycles. The BLM has observed little to no soil movement on most parts of the allotment.

The few areas of abnormal soil erosion are almost always associated with the old mine roads. The roads received little to no maintenance after the first era of large scale mining activities

ceased. The revival of the mines has brought regular maintenance back to some of these roads. The portions of the allotment with deficiencies in vegetation cover appears to be chiefly caused by natural limiting factors in the soils.

b. Riparian and Wetland Sites: Riparian and wetland areas exhibit a properly functioning condition and achieve state water quality criteria.

Significant progress is being made in the attainment of this standard across the allotment. Livestock grazing is in conformance with the guidelines in some areas and not in conformance with the guidelines in other areas.

This determination is based on the evaluation of the RPS riparian/stream habitat objectives 2c(1), (2), and (3), and HMP objectives 3d presented in the evaluation and as modified above. The lotic areas in the mountain pastures have shown steady improvement in riparian conditions; however, the pastures on the east side of the allotment are not showing a similar level of improvement. This is due to a combination of livestock grazing and natural factors such as flood events and site potential. Bull Camp Creek is additionally impacted by irrigation of private fields it flows through, which causes most of the lower reaches to be dry in most years. Lentic riparian areas have shown dramatic improvements across the allotment, with the number of springs in Proper Functioning Condition increasing from zero in 2003 to 24 in 2007. There are still some places that are not improving (Hubbard Basin, Cold Springs Mountain, Coon Creek, and Middle Pastures), but on the whole riparian areas are improving on the allotment.

Water quality monitoring results on the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment tends to show that livestock grazing management is allowing for attainment of this standard. The South Fork of Salmon Falls Creek, which flows through a portion of the northern tip of the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment, is classified as an impaired water; however, the monitoring location where this determination is made is located approximately 20 miles downstream from the allotment. This creek drains a large area with many land uses, and as such it is impossible to determine what contributions livestock management in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment makes to this impairment. The BLM considers the impacts to be low to non-existent, however. Water quality standards are generally being met across the rest of the allotment, with livestock grazing playing a minor role in noted water quality impairment factors. Most of these factors appear to be due to natural causes.

c. Habitat: Habitats exhibit a healthy, productive, and diverse population of native and/or desirable plant species, appropriate to the site characteristics, to provide suitable feed, water, cover and living space for animal species and maintain ecological processes. Habitat conditions meet the life cycle requirements of threatened and endangered species.

Significant progress towards the attainment of this standard is being made. Livestock grazing is considered to be in conformance with the guidelines across most of the allotment.

This determination is based on evaluation of RPS Objectives a.1, 2 and 3; b. 1, 2 and 3 and c. 1, 2 and 3, and all Key Area Objectives presented within this evaluation for the Hubbard Vineyard

Allotment. Based on key area objectives, a.1., b.1., c.1., d.1., and e.1., the objectives established for average annual utilization was met at all key areas. Ecological condition objectives a.2., b.2., and c.2., were met for two of the three native key areas and production had significantly increased for the native areas. Frequency studies were established at three livestock key areas in 1986; all were reread in 1990 and 2004. All the studies areas exhibited a fair amount of decadence in the sagebrush component. This was offset by the majority exhibiting a good recruitment of young sagebrush plants; except at key area AW-1-T-02 which exhibited significant sagebrush die off with little recruitment. These studies showed no significant downward trends in key species with key species occurrence either being static or up. Wildlife specific objectives, b.1., b.2., and b.3, included maintaining or improving all big game habitat in good or excellent condition, modifying 35.1 miles of existing fence to Bureau standards to facilitate big game movement, and re-introducing big horn sheep in the Bad Lands; b.1. was partially met and b.2. and b.3. were met. The summarization of data analyzed to address RPS objectives c.1., c.2., and c.3., shows that in regard to stream survey data collected within the allotment significant progress is generally being made in the upper elevations on stream systems with less improvement on the lower elevation flats. Lotic PFC was conducted in conjunction with stream survey studies collected in 2006 on Jakes, Bull Camp and Dry Creek. Results showed improvement in functionality for Jakes and Bull Creek and decline on Dry Creek. Fifty one lentic springs and seeps were evaluated in 2007. The majority of these (53%) were rated as Proper Functioning Condition or Functioning at Risk with an Upward Trend.

The Columbia spotted frog (federally listed candidate species) is known to occur within the allotment. Attainment of riparian standards and objectives is expected to provide for the biological needs of the spotted frog and Interior redband trout. Improvement of quality pools, pool:riffle ratio, desirable stream bottom, streambank cover, and other parameters will continue to improve conditions for this species, and for Interior redband trout (BLM sensitive species). Most of the habitat for these two species occurs in the mountain pastures, which have the improving stream segments identified in the 2006 stream survey and lotic PFC analysis. Approximately 50 percent of the stream segments were rated PFC in 2006.

d. Cultural Resources: Land use plans will recognize cultural resources within the context of multiple use.

This standard for rangeland health is being Met, and livestock grazing management is considered to be in conformance with the guidelines.

Based on the evaluation of existing information pertaining to range improvements and grazing, cultural resources are being recognized within the context of multiple use management in the Hubbard Vineyard Allotment. Cultural resources inventories have been completed on all proposed ground disturbing activities, and additional surveys will be completed prior to the implementation of any future projects.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS REGARDING PROGRESS TOWARDS RANGELAND HEALTH STANDARDS AND ALLOTMENT SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The allotment evaluation resulted in conclusions regarding progress towards achievement of the standards for rangeland health and multiple use objectives**.** Those conclusions are summarized below:

1.	Standards for Rangeland Health	
	a. Upland Sites-	Met
	b. Riparian and Wetland Sites	
	Functioning Condition-	Significant Progress Towards Attainment
	Water Quality-	Partially Met/Undetermined
	c. Habitat-	Partially Met
	Special Status Species-	Significant Progress Towards Attainment
	d. Cultural Resources-	Met
2.	Allotment Specific Objectives	
	a. Improve Livestock Distribution-	Undetermined
	b. Improve Ecological Status-	Not Met/Unachievable
	c. Maintain Ecological Status-	Met
	d. Develop an AMP	Some Progress in Being Made
	e. Periodically Evaluate Carrying Capacity	Met
	f. Improve or Maintain Big Game Habitat	
	Deer-	Partially Met
	Antelope-	Partially Met
	g. Modification of fences to allow for Big Game Movement-	Met
	h. Re-introduce Bighorn Sheep	Met
	i. Improve ten springs	Met
	j. Improve riparian/stream habitat of Dry Creek	Some Progress is Being Made
	h. Improve riparian/stream habitat of Jakes Creek	Met in some areas, Not Met in others
	i. Improve riparian/stream habitat of Salmon Falls Creek	Met
	j. Prevent undue stream degradation from other uses	No Determination
	k. Do not exceed proper use levels of key forage species	Met for all sites except Not Met for one
	l. Maintain Ecological Seral Stages-	Met except for one Unachievable site
	m. Maintain Crested wheatgrass production	Progress is Not Being Made

_____ _____

Bryan K. Fuell Date
Acting Assistant Field Manager
Renewable Resources