

# .44 Range

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Range Management

Objective Number

RM-1

Objective: RM-1

To provide forage on a sustained yield basis through natural regeneration. Reverse downward deterioration of public grazing lands by improving 647,962 acres in poor ecological condition to fair ecological condition, and 331,681 acres in fair ecological condition to good and/or excellent ecological condition within 35 years.

Allocate all increases in forage to applicable licensees to change suspended to active preference grazing status.

Rationale:

The Bureau is committed by policy (IM-75-407, and Public Review Draft "Managing the Public Rangelands", November 1979) and directed by law (The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended and supplemented, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Section 102[a][7], and the Public Rangeland Improvement Act of 1978, Section 2(b)(2)), to manage forage on a sustained yield basis and to improve the condition of the public rangelands.

According to the Sonoma, Blue Wing, and Buffalo Hills URAs, the ecological range condition was estimated to be in an unsatisfactory condition and the overall estimated trend in the resource area is declining (68%). Compiled figures of the estimated ecological range condition for the resource area are shown below:

Estimated Ecological Range Condition

<u>Condition Class</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Excellent	229,103	5
Good	749,451	18
Fair	1,326,727	31
Poor	1,963,519	46

# PLAN CHANGE NO. -

Plan Name Sonoma-Gerlach MFP Area Sonoma-Gerlach

Page 1

Chapter Range Management

Heading RM-1

Component \_\_\_\_\_

(Describe exactly what is to be deleted, added, rewritten, etc.)

## CHANGE : Range Management RM-1 Objective.

Delete last sentence in the objective which is: Allocate all increases to applicable licenses to change suspended to active preference status.

(Describe exact rationale for above change, to include reference material i.e. EA, FMP, IM.)

**REASON :** MFP III states: Range Management 1.1 ... Sequence of action, #6  
After the 4<sup>th</sup> year adjustments, continue to monitor, and if adjustments in addition to the 6<sup>th</sup> year adjustments are required, adjust livestock, wild horses, and wildlife proportionately, based on forage availability.  
Since the decision is the controlling factor in the plan, the objective should have been modified to support the decision. For whatever reason, this didn't happen. Deleting the last sentence will bring the objective into conformance with the decision.

Requires Plan Amendment

Conforms with existing Plan

### SIGNATURE AS APPROPRIATE :

Initiator	<u>Gerald S. Mard</u>	Date	<u>6 November 89</u>
Program Leader	<u>Kendall W. Kay</u>	Date	<u>11-6-89</u>
Area Plan/Environ Coord	<u>Gerald S. Mard</u>	Date	<u>6 November 89</u>
Area Manager	<u>Paul Jancar</u>	Date	<u>11-6-89</u>
District Manager	<u>Jan Winters</u>	Date	<u>11-6-89</u>

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management
Objective Number	RM-1

Objective: RM-1 (continued)

If these unsatisfactory conditions are allowed to continue, the public lands in the resource area will not be managed on a sustained yield basis resulting in some short term benefits and long term losses in forage available for livestock use.

The Economic Profile Supplement (EPS) for the District was published in 1974. This document covered Humboldt and Pershing Counties. The EPS reported (page 17) that "BLM permittee dependence on public lands for their total livestock forage supply for the past eight years has been running between 40-50 percent dependency". The EPS also stated (page 17) that this dependence has been steadily decreasing since 1969.

It is self-evident from the above that if livestock are to continue grazing public lands, range condition and trend must improve. Forage from public lands is necessary to ensure continuing economic livestock units.

It is assumed that meeting this objective would be received favorably from the livestock industry, and from those individuals, groups, and institutions that would receive "spin-off" benefits from the action. The major benefits, as viewed by this segment(s), would be stabilization of livestock operations and the possibility to increase livestock use.

There are no conflicts between URA and MFP-1 data.

Sonoma-Gerlach MFP III  
Range Management 1.1

As Currently Written:

Grazing Decision For Livestock  
Wild Horses and Burros and Wildlife

Grazing will be managed in the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area with multiple uses fully considered. Emphasis will be placed on implementation of the Rangeland Management Policy through the CRMP process.

This decision establishes the base herbivore grazing levels by grazing allotment.

They are as follows:

Livestock - Active preference 1/ or negotiated adjustments.

Wildlife - Reasonable numbers as established by BLM and the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Wild Horses and Burros - Existing/current WH&B numbers (as of July 1, 1982) will be used as a starting point for monitoring purposes except where one of the following conditions exist:

- a. Numbers are established by adequate and supportable resource data.
- b. Numbers are established through the CRMP process as documented in CRMP recommendations and agreed to by the District Manager.
- c. Numbers are established by formal signed agreement between affected interests.
- d. Numbers are established through previously developed interim capture/management plans. Plans are still supportable by parties consulted in the original plan. EAs (EARs) were prepared and are still valid.
- e. Numbers are established by court order.

1/ Active preference is defined as: Total grazing preference minus suspended preference. Active preference as used in this planning document is synonymous with authorized grazing use.

The sequence of action will be as follows:

1. Establish priorities for action (categorize each allotment into selective management categories).
2. Negotiate any changes in allotment base grazing levels through CRMP. If there is no agreement, use the base level above as a starting point for the monitoring process.
3. Issue a grazing decision, establish a monitoring plan and studies for grazing and other uses, preferably through Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP). Begin (or continue) monitoring.
4. Develop and implement (as time and funding permit) allotment management plans and activity plans for other uses. All activity plan and acceptable CRMP recommendations will be coordinated. Implementation will include base herbivore grazing level adjustments.
5. At the end of the third and fifth year of grazing following issuance of the grazing decision make necessary use adjustment base upon monitoring results, and other data then available. Adjustments other than numbers may be required separately or in combination with numbers. For example, changes of seasons-of-use, additional water development, seeding or other land treatments may be required. If monitoring reveals that a particular use or practice is causing resource damage, that particular use may be adjusted separately.
6. After the fifth year adjustments, continue monitoring and if adjustments in addition to the fifth year adjustments are required, adjust livestock, wild horses, and wildlife proportionately based on forage availability. (Providing the wildlife reasonable numbers have been obtained; if not, wildlife reasonable numbers will be renegotiated prior to making the adjustments.)
7. A decision changing active preference will not be issued until monitoring, and/or CRMP group recommendations, and/or baseline inventory, or a combination of these has provided sufficient data to support a decision to that effect. This may occur at any time during this process.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION  
LIVESTOCK GRAZING

The long range objective of the grazing management program is to manage, maintain, and improve the rangeland conditions on the public lands. To assist in meeting this goal and also comply with the direction and intent of laws affecting the management of livestock grazing on the public rangelands, a selective management approach to livestock grazing will be implemented. To facilitate the selective management approach, lands will be grouped according to the management needs and potential for improvement following consultation with interested groups and individuals through the CRMP process.

Initially stocking levels will remain at current levels except where agreements are reached with the livestock operators. These accepted initial stocking levels are based on current data, but will not preclude the future establishment of intensive grazing systems or other management practices that may be necessary to obtain proper management of the rangeland resources. The following data represents the active preference for each allotment.

<u>Allotment Name by Allotment Operators</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Buffalo Hills	11,920
J. J. Casey	11,112
A. Jackson	739
J. Selmi	69
Calico	2,584
A. Jackson	2,584
Coyote	3,051
Bill Spoo	2,734
Wes Cook	317
Leadville	2,567
Fred Chez	2,567
Pole Canyon	540
Stark & Brooks	540
Rodeo Creek	6,631
Ceresola	6,462
Wes Cook	169
Soldier Meadows	16,070
Earp	16,070
Blue Wing	24,160
B. G. Bunyard	1,505
C-Punch Corporation	21,460
Wesley Cook	1,195

Allotment Name by Allotment OperatorsActive Preference

Desert Queen	3,355
W. J. Ceresola Estate	3,277
Marie Anderson Estate	78
Majuba	1,100
E. Tharalson and Lane Duncan	1,100
Ragged Top	155
Marie Anderson Estate	155
John Espil	0
Star Sheep Company	0
Seven Troughs	9,163
C-Punch Corporation	4,404
Dufurrena Sheep Company	1,492
John Espil	3,267
Clear Creek	3,111
Roaring Springs Associates	370
William H. Casey	2,741
Coal Canyon - Poker	3,144
Star Sheep	492
Abigah Duncan	2,588
Bingo Wesner	64
Cottonwood Canyon	60
Sheldon Lamb	60
Diamond S	1,158
Glen Tipton	1,158
Dolly Hayden	3,709
William H. Casey	3,709
Goldbanks	2,051
Roaring Springs	160
M. J. and J. F. Burke	1,891
Harmony	348
Pedroli	195
Aitken	189
Humboldt House	727
Cliff Campbell Estate	620
Star Sheep Company	107
Humboldt Sink	1,427
Anderson Estate	1,365
Belzarena	62

<u>Allotment Name by Allotment Operators</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Pleasant Valley	10,392
Paris Brothers	4,951
Gordon R. McCoy	1,456
Siard Brothers	2,677
Vesco	1,308
Prince Royal	153
Star Sheep	97
John Thacker	56
Pumpnickel	9,440
Hugh A. Tipton	840
<del>Clay &amp; Jean Tipton</del> <i>Gen S Cattle Co.</i>	582
Piquet Ranches, Inc.	1,212
Roaring Springs Associates	6,806
Rawhide	2,721
Fred Lynch	2,139
Gordon McCoy	220
Paris Brothers	362
Star Sheep	
Rochester	3,964
Star Sheep Company	1,400
Paris Brothers	400
Fred Lynch	1,386
Don Sims	778
Rock Creek	2,192
Piquet Ranches, Inc.	2,192
Rye Patch	1,981
Rye Patch, Inc.	1,816
Star Sheep	165
Sonoma	1,510
Piquet Ranches, Inc.	1,510
South Buffalo	9,035
Marvel Brothers	9,035
Star Peak	3,722
Gene Thacker	261
Star Sheep Company	2,426
Paul Knoop	385
Thomas Creek	482
Westmoreland	74
Garley Amos	202
R & J Aitken	206
White Horse	1,970
William H. Casey	1,970

<u>Allotment Name by Allotment Operators</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Jersey Valley	1,581
Demar & Nancy Dahl	1,035
M & L Sheep	546
Klondike	2,205
Coyote Creek Ranch	2,205
Licking	153
Venturacci	153
Melody	1,020
Aitken	1,020
North Buffalo	3,294
Ellison Ranching Co.	1,194
Roaring Springs	2,100

Change To:

The decision will remain as originally written.

Rationale:

The Sonoma-Gerlach EIS was written using the 1964 range survey as a base. This is the best available data for the resource area as no range inventories have been done since that time. It is current Bureau policy that grazing preference adjustments, either upward or downward, following the grazing EIS shall not be based solely on vegetation production surveys, but shall be based on monitoring or a combination of monitoring and range surveys. This does not preclude adjustments by mutual agreements.

The resource area has recently completed a monitoring plan which establishes a strategy for future studies implementation. The allotments in the resource area have been categorized into selective management categories. These have been approved by the State Director. If monitoring shows a need for grazing adjustments and there is sufficient data to support a decision to that effect, a decision will be issued adjusting the uses that are causing the resource damage. Monitoring has been addressed in the FY 83 annual work plan.

Persons-Organizations That Have Protested This Decision:

Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club, Reno, Nevada.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION  
LIVESTOCK GRAZING

The long range objective of the grazing management program is to manage, maintain, and improve the rangeland conditions on the public lands. To assist in meeting this goal and also comply with the direction and intent of laws affecting the management of livestock grazing on the public rangelands, a selective management approach to livestock grazing will be implemented. To facilitate the selective management approach, lands will be grouped according to the management needs and potential for improvement following consultation with interested groups and individuals through the CRMP process.

Initially stocking levels will remain at current levels except where agreements are reached with the livestock operators. These accepted initial stocking levels are based on current data, but will not preclude the future establishment of intensive grazing systems or other management practices that may be necessary to obtain proper management of the rangeland resources. The following data represents the active preference for each allotment.

<u>Allotment Name by Allotment Operators</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Buffalo Hills	11,920
<del>J. J. Casey</del> operation of Law	11,112
A. Jackson	739
J. Selmi	69
Calico	2,584
A. Jackson	2,584
Coyote	3,051
<del>Bill Spoo</del> Connecticut General - bankruptcy	2,734
Wes Cook	317
Leadville	2,567
<del>Fred Chez</del> Conn. General - Sale	2,567
Pole Canyon	540
Stark & Brooks	540
Rodeo Creek	6,631
Ceresola	6,462
Wes Cook	169
Soldier Meadows	16,070
Earp	16,070
Blue Wing	24,160
B. G. Bunyard	1,505
C-Punch Corporation	21,460
Wesley Cook	1,195

<u>Allotment Name by Allotment Operators</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Desert Queen	3,355
W. J. Ceresola Estate	3,277
Marie Anderson Estate	78
Majuba	1,100
E. Tharalson and Lane Duncan	1,100
Ragged Top	155
Marie Anderson Estate	155
John Espil	0
Star Sheep Company	0
Seven Troughs	9,163
C-Punch Corporation	4,404
Dufurrena Sheep Company	1,492
John Espil	3,267
<i>John DeLong</i>	
Clear Creek	3,111
Roaring Springs Associates	370
William H. Casey	2,741
Coal Canyon - Poker	3,144
Star Sheep	492
Abigah Duncan	2,588
Bingo Wesner	64
Cottonwood Canyon	60
Sheldon Lamb	60
Diamond S	1,158
<del>Glen Tipton</del> <i>SECO NEVADA, INC.</i>	1,158
Dolly Hayden	3,709
William H. Casey	3,709
Goldbanks	2,051
Roaring Springs	160
M. J. and J. F. Burke	1,891
Harmony	348
Pedrolli	195
Aitken	189
Humboldt House	727
Cliff Campbell Estate	620
Star Sheep Company	107
Humboldt Sink	1,427
Anderson Estate	1,365
Belzarena	62

<u>Allotment Name by Allotment Operators</u>	<u>Active Preference</u>
Pleasant Valley	10,392
Paris Brothers	4,951
<del>Gordon R. McCoy</del> JOHN DARRAH	1,456
Siard Brothers	2,677
Vesco	1,308
Prince Royal	153
Star Sheep	97
John Thacker	56
Pumpnickel	9,440
Hugh A. Tipton	840
<del>Clay &amp; Jean Tipton</del> G & J CATTLE Co.	582
Piquet Ranches, Inc.	1,212
Roaring Springs Associates	6,806
Rawhide	2,721
<del>Fred Lynch</del> SPRING VALLEY CATTLE Co.	2,139
<del>Gordon McCoy</del> JOHN DARRAH	220
Paris Brothers	362
Star Sheep	
Rochester	3,964
Star Sheep Company	1,400
Paris Brothers	400
<del>Fred Lynch</del> SPRING VALLEY CATTLE Co.	1,386
Don Sims	778
Rock Creek	2,192
Piquet Ranches, Inc.	2,192
Rye Patch	1,981
Rye Patch, Inc.	1,816
Star Sheep	165
Sonoma	1,510
Piquet Ranches, Inc.	1,510
South Buffalo	9,035
Marvel Brothers	9,035
Star Peak	3,722
<del>Gene Thacker</del> (FLORENCE THACKER)	261
Star Sheep Company	2,426
Paul Knoop	385
Thomas Creek	482
Westmoreland	74
Garley Amos	202
R & J Aitken	206
White Horse	1,970
William H. Casey	1,970

Grazing Decision For LivestockWild Horses and Burros and Wildlife

Grazing will be managed in the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area with multiple uses fully considered. Emphasis will be placed on implementation of the Rangeland Management Policy through the CRMP process.

This decision establishes the base herbivore grazing levels by grazing allotment.

They are as follows:

Livestock - Active preference 1/ or negotiated adjustments.

Wildlife - Reasonable numbers as established by BLM & the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Wild Horses and Burros - Existing/current WH&B numbers (as of July 1, 1982) will be used as a starting point for monitoring purposes except where one of the following conditions exist:

- a. Numbers are established by adequate and supportable resource data.
- b. Numbers are established through the CRMP process as documented in CRMP recommendations and agreed to by the District manager.
- c. Numbers are established by formal signed agreement between affected interests.
- d. Numbers are established through previously developed interim capture/management plans. Plans are still supportable by parties consulted in the original plan. EA's (EAR's) were prepared and are still valid.
- e. Numbers are established by court order.

The sequence of action will be as follows:

1. Establish priorities for action (categorize each allotment into selective management categories.)
2. Negotiate any changes in allotment base grazing levels through CRMP. If there is no agreement, use the base level above as a starting point for the monitoring process.
3. Issue a grazing decision, establish a monitoring plan and studies for grazing and other uses, preferably through Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP). Begin (or continue) monitoring.
4. Develop and implement (as time and funding permit) allotment management plans and activity plans for other uses. All activity plan and acceptable CRMP recommendations will be coordinated. Implementation will include base herbivore grazing level adjustments.
5. At the end of the third and fifth year of grazing following issuance of the grazing decision make necessary use adjustments based upon monitoring results, and other data then available. Adjustments other than numbers may be required separately or in combination with numbers. For example, changes of seasons of use, additional water

development, seedings or other land treatments may be required.

If monitoring reveals that a particular use or practice is causing resource damage, that particular use may be adjusted separately.

6. After the fifth year adjustments, continue monitoring and if adjustments in addition to the fifth year adjustments are required, adjust livestock, wild horses, and wildlife proportionately based on forage availability. (Providing the wildlife reasonable numbers have been obtained; If not, wildlife reasonable numbers will be renegotiated prior to making the adjustments).
  
7. A decision changing active preference will not be issued until monitoring, and/or CRMP group recommendations, and/or baseline inventory, or a combination of these has provided sufficient data to support a decision to that effect. This may occur at any time during this process.

1/ Active preference is defined as: Total grazing preference minus suspended preference. Active preference as used in this planning document is synonymous with authorized grazing use.

Allotment: Blue Wing

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 583 wild horses and 185 burros.

- Lava Beds Herd Use Area - 85 horses, 54 burros
- Seven Troughs Herd Use Area - 143 horses, 71 burros
- Selenite Range Herd Use Area - 12 horses, 1 burro
- Blue Wing Mountain Herd Use Area - 89 horses, 48 burros
- Shawave-Nightingale Herd Use Area - 254 horses, 11 burros

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 701 AUMs  
Antelope 49 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 106 AUMs

Antelope - 20 total reasonable number - no antelope present - potential introduction areas

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
E. of Seven Troughs Range AY-3(12)	1	1	
W. of Seven Troughs Range AY-2(12)	20	48	49

Mule Deer - 234 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Selenite Range DS-1(6)	79	119	
Selenite Range DY-1(12)	120	360	
Nightingale Range DY-2(12)	6	18	
Shawave Range DY-3(12)	27	81	
Lava Beds DY-4(12)	26	78	
Seven Troughs Range DY-5(12)	12	36	
Trinity Range DY-8a(12)	2	6	
Trinity Range DY-8b(12)	1	3	701

Bighorn Sheep - 44 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Selenite Range BY-1(12)	44	106	106

3. Graze 24,160 livestock AUMs (active preference)

B.G. Bunyard 1,505 AUMs  
C-Punch Corporation 21,460 AUMs  
Wesley Cook 1,195 AUMs

} COOK ACQUIRED BUNYARD'S PERMIT 2/87  
SEE UKA RELATION

Allotment: Blue Wing (continued)

Specific problems that have been identified on the Blue Wing Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 40% of the allotment is in poor condition  
38% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. A majority of the allotment is in a static or downward trend
3. Sage grouse brooding areas
4. Poor condition of riparian areas
5. Wild horses and burros
6. Land status
7. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
8. Existing range improvements are inadequate.
9. Livestock drift
10. Current herbivore grazing use
11. Season-of-use
12. Lack of regular maintenance of range projects
13. WSAs 200-201

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Wild horses and burros
8. Riparian habitat

# PLAN CHANGE NO. 1

Plan Name Economic Growth MFP/IL Area BUFFALO HILLS PLANNING UNIT

Page \_\_\_\_\_

Chapter \_\_\_\_\_

Heading \_\_\_\_\_

Component \_\_\_\_\_

(Describe exactly what is to be deleted, added, rewritten, etc.)

## CHANGE :

COMBINE THE CALICO AND BUFFALO HILLS ALLOTMENTS INTO THE BUFFALO HILLS ALLOTMENT WITH A CALICO PASTURE WITHIN THIS ALLOTMENT

(Describe exact rationale for above change, to include reference material i.e. EA, FMP, IM.)

## REASON :

THE TWO ALLOTMENTS ARE PRESENTLY BEING MANAGED AS ONE ALLOTMENT. THE GRASSING SYSTEM CONSIDERS THE CALICO ALLOTMENT AS A PASTURE RATHER THAN AN ALLOTMENT. THE AMP AND THE ALLOTMENT EVALUATION AND AGREEMENT ARE THE BASIS FOR THIS CHANGE IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE ALLOTMENTS

- Requires Plan Amendment
- Conforms with existing Plan

### SIGNATURE AS APPROPRIATE :

Initiator Paul Juncas Date 6/21/89  
 Program Leader Ronald W. Roy Date 6/21/89  
 Area Plan/Environ Coord Sherald M. [Signature] Date 21 June 89  
 Area Manager Sherald Brauders Date 6/21/89  
 District Manager \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Allotment: Buffalo Hills

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 555 wild horses and 0 burros.

Buffalo Hills Herd Use Area - 272 horses  
Granite Range Herd Use Area - 176 horses  
Calico Mountain Herd Use Area - 107 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 6,294 AUMs  
Antelope 1,106 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 1,142 AUMs

Antelope - 461 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
West Granites AW-1(6)	20	24	
S. Buffalo Hills AW-2(6)	46	55	
Duck Flat AY-3(12)	47	112	
E. Granite Range AY-4(12)	111	269	
Hog Ranch AY-6(12)	14	33	
Dolly Varden AY-7(12)	119	285	
Poodle Mtn. AY-8(12)	137	328	1,106

Mule Deer - 2,098 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Buffalo Hills DY-2(12)	394	1,181	
Hog Ranch Mt. DY-3(12)	3	10	
Calico Mts. DY-5(12)	21	64	
Granite Range DY-4(12)	928	2,785	
Granite Range DW-3(12)	50	150	
Granite Range DW-4(12)	59	176	
Granite Range DW-5(12)	442	1,326	
Granite Range DW-6(12)	6	19	
Buffalo Hills DW-1(5)	35	44	
Buffalo Hills DW-2(5)	92	115	
Granite Range DS-1(8)	125	251	
Granite Range DSP-1(3)	163	122	
Granite Range DSP-2(3)	68	51	6,294

Bighorn Sheep - 476 total reasonable number - 4 bighorns reintroduced to BY-1- rest are potential reintroduction

Allotment: Buffalo Hills (continued)

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u>		<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Number</u>			
South Granites BY-1(12)	180		432	
Buffalo-North Granites BY-2(12)	223		535	
Division Peak BY-5(12)	26		63	
Calico Mountains BY-6(12)	47		112	1,142

3. Graze 11,920 livestock AUMs (active preference)

J.J. Casey	11,112 AUMs	(Currently involved in litigation)
A. Jackson	739 AUMs	
J. Selmi	69 AUMs	

Specific problems that have been identified on the Buffalo Hills Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 65% of the allotment is in poor condition  
15% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. 50% of the allotment is in a downward trend (1982 estimate)
3. Riparian meadow aspen areas are in poor condition on northern portion of allotment
4. 5 identified sage grouse strutting grounds, 4 brooding areas, and critical winter areas
5. Competition from livestock and wild horses on critical deer spring and winter ranges
6. Red Mountain, Cottonwood, and Negro Creeks are in fair to poor condition
7. Privately-owned land and water rights
8. Water quality on streams
9. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
10. Existing range improvements are inadequate. Maintenance of existing range projects is inadequate.
11. Long and extensive history of grazing trespass
12. Livestock poisoning from greasewood
13. Livestock closure
14. Season-of-use
15. Current herbivore grazing use
16. Recreational use is heavy
17. Critical wildlife habitat in the Granite Range
18. Access to public land across private land
19. Sheep trailing
20. Class of livestock
21. WSAs 012 and 019

Allotment: Buffalo Hills (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Wild horses
8. Riparian and aspen habitat
9. Aquatic habitat
10. Water quality

Allotment: Calico

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 42 wild horses and 0 burros.

Calico Mountain Herd Use Area - 42 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer	46	AUMs
Antelope	44	AUMs
Bighorn Sheep	86	AUMs

Antelope - 18 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Calico Mountains AY-1 (12)	18	44	44

Mule Deer - 15 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMSs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Calico Mountains DY-5 (12)	15	46	46

Bighorn Sheep - 36 total reasonable number - no bighorns present -potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMSs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Calico Mountains BY-6 (12)	36	86	86

3. Graze 2,584 livestock AUMs (active preference)

A. Jackson - 2,584 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Calico Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 31% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
41% of the allotment is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. A majority of the allotment is in a downward trend.
3. Riparian condition is poor to fair throughout the allotment.

Calico Allotment: (continued)

4. Donnelly Creek is in fair condition
5. Wild horses
6. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
7. Erosion is a problem throughout the allotment
8. Season-of-use
9. Current herbivore grazing use
10. Range improvements are inadequate
11. WSA 019
12. Road maintenance
13. Size of allotment

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend.
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian habitat
7. Aquatic habitat
8. Wild horses
9. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Clear Creek

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer	176	AUMs
Antelope	0	AUMs
Bighorn Sheep	20	AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on allotment

Mule Deer - 59 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range DS-5(6)	53	79	
Sonoma Range DW-1(6)	65	97	176

Bighorn Sheep - 8 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range BS-3(6)	7	8	
Sonoma Range BW-2(6)	10	12	20

3. Graze 3,111 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Roaring Springs Associates	370 AUMs
William H. Casey	2,741 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Clear Creek Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 44% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
40% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 99% of the allotment is in a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Poor condition of riparian, aspen, and meadow areas
4. Mule deer winter concentration area
5. Clear Creek is in fair condition
6. Wild horses
7. 17% of the allotment is private land
8. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory

Allotment: Clear Creek (continued)

9. Existing range improvements are inadequate
10. There is a significant history of trespass
11. Current herbivore grazing use
12. Season-of-use
13. Livestock drift
14. Salting practices
15. Legal access

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wildlife habitat
8. Wild horses
9. Aquatic habitat

Allotment: Coal Canyon-Poker

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 97 AUMs  
Antelope 1 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 31 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on allotment - there is one AUM of potential antelope use on the allotment in AY-3

Mule Deer - 32 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt River Valley DY-1a(12)	2	5	
West Humboldt Range DY-1b(12)	1	1	
Humboldt Range DY-2(12)	15	45	
Humboldt Range DS-2(6)	15	22	
Trinity Range DY-8(12)	8	24	97

Bighorn Sheep - 13 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range BS-1A(6)	12	14	
Humboldt Range BW-1(6)	10	12	
West Humboldt Range BY-1A(12)	2	5	31

3. Graze 3,144 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Star Sheep Co. 492 AUMs  
Abigah Duncan 2,588 AUMs  
Bingo Wesner 64 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Coal Canyon-Poker Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 93% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
2% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 95% of the allotment is in a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Poor riparian and meadow condition
4. Sage grouse brooding area
5. Wild horses
6. Present grazing management is not meeting resource objectives
7. High percentage of private land in the allotment
8. Current herbivore grazing use
9. Lovelock city water wells
10. Livestock drift
11. Current AMP objectives are being met or are unrealistic

Allotment: Coal Canyon-Poker (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian habitat
7. Wildlife habitat
8. Wild horses

Allotment: Coyote

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

No horses existing on the allotment

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer                    35    AUMs  
Antelope                411   AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep         7     AUMs

Coyote Allotment

Antelope - 171 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Duck Flat AY-3 (12)	162	388	
Poodle Mountain AY-8 (12)	10	23	411

Mule Deer - 12 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Granite Range DW-3 (12)	9	27	
Granite Range DSP-1 (3)	11	8	35

Bighorn Sheep - 3 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Buffalo-North Granites BY-2 (12)	3	7	7

3. Graze 3,051 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Bill Spoo            2,734 AUMs  
Wes Cook            317 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Coyote Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 22% of the allotment is poor to fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. A majority of the allotment is in a static trend.
3. Sage grouse strutting grounds and wintering area.

Coyote Allotment (continued)

4. Antelope yearlong
5. John Casey owns water rights
6. Wet meadow areas are in fair condition
7. Current herbivore grazing use
8. Current AMP objectives are not being met or are unrealistic

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Desert Queen

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer	0	AUMs
Antelope	0	AUMs
Bighorn Sheep	0	AUMs

There are no big game animals on the allotment

3. Graze 3,355 livestock AUMs (active preference)

W.J. Ceresola Estate	3,277	AUMs
Marie Anderson Estate	78	AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Desert Queen Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 40% of the allotment is in poor condition  
35% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. A majority of the allotment is in a downward trend
3. Wild horses
4. Oryctes nevadensis and Penstemon arenarium Nevada State T&E plants are found on the allotment
5. 59% of the allotment is private land
6. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
7. Existing range improvements are inadequate
8. History of grazing trespass
9. Livestock drift
10. Season-of-use
11. Current herbivore grazing use
12. Lack of regular maintenance of range projects
13. Waterfowl habitat

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wild horses
7. T&E plants

Allotment: Diamond S

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 129 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 38 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 43 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range DS-5(6)	40	60	
Sonoma Range DW-1(6)	46	69	129

Bighorn Sheep - 16 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range BS-3(6)	14	17	
Sonoma Range BW-2(6)	18	21	38

Graze 1,158 livestock AUMs (active preference)

~~Glen-Tipton Seco~~ NEVADA, 1,158 AUMs  
Piquet Ranches INC. Exchange-of-use - Trailing only

Specific problems that have been identified on the Diamond S Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 48% of the allotment is in poor condition  
40% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. 98% of the allotment has a downward trend
3. Poor riparian, meadow, and aspen habitat
4. Wild horses
5. 45% of the allotment is private land
6. Present grazing management is not meeting resource objectives
7. Poor condition of the crested wheatgrass seedings
8. Significant amounts of halogeton on the allotment

Allotment: Diamond S (continued)

9. Pediocactus simpsonii var. robustior an endangered Nevada state plant occurs on the allotment
10. Current herbivore grazing use
11. Recreational use of the allotment
12. High ground squirrel populations
13. Season-of-use
14. Golconda watershed - Pole Creek
15. Residential encroachment

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wild horses
8. T&E plants
9. Wildlife and aquatic habitat

Allotment: Dolly Hayden

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 68 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 18 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 23 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
East Range DY-3a(12)	8	24	
East Range DY-3b(12)	6	18	
East Range DS-3a(6)	6	9	
East Range DS-3b(6)	7	10	
East Range DS-3c(6)	5	7	68

Bighorn Sheep - 8 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
East Range BS-2A(6)	8	9	
East Range BS-2B(6)	3	3	
East and Stillwater Ranges BY-1B(12)	3	6	18

3. Graze 3,709 livestock AUMs (active preference)

CECIL MARTIN

Ø AUMs (EXCHANGE-OF-USE ONLY)

William H. Casey

3,709 AUMs

COYOTE CREEK RANCH

Ø AUMs (EXCHANGE-OF-USE ONLY)

Specific problems that have been identified on the Dolly Hayden Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 34% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
34% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 98% of the allotment is in a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Deer summer range is in poor condition
4. Sage grouse brooding area

Allotment: Dolly Hayden (continued)

5. Riparian areas are in poor condition
6. Wild horses
7. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
8. Range improvements are inadequate
9. Significant history of trespass
10. 39% of the allotment is private land
11. Current herbivore grazing use
12. Season-of-use
13. Livestock drift
14. Urban development

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Riparian habitat
8. Wild horses

RM-1

District Manager's Decision

*Frank L. Sullivan 11/26/84*

Accept and implement, as funding becomes available, the coordinated management plan developed by the Lovelock CRMP committee for the Goldbanks Allotment.

Rationale

The Lovelock CRMP committee has developed a coordinated management plan for the Goldbanks Allotment. The plan has had input from environmental, wild horse and burro, livestock, wildlife, and other interests. The plan fully meets all of the Bureau's procedure and policy requirements and have developed a management scheme that appears to be the best that can be developed at this time.

The proposed range improvements described in the plan are necessary for full implementation of the plan. However, these improvements are based on need and have no standing with the budgeting process and the subsequent appropriation of funds by the Congress. Some contributed funds may be necessary for full implementation of the plan.

Allotment: Goldbanks

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Tobin Range Herd Use Area - 0 horses and burros

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 92 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 18 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 31 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
East Range DY-3b(12)	2	6	
Tobin Range DY-4a(12)	21	63	
Tobin Range DS-4a(6)	15	23	92

Bighorn Sheep - 7 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Tobin Range BS-4(6)	8	10	
Tobin Range BW-3(6)	7	8	18

3. Graze 2,051 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Roaring Springs 160 AUMs  
M.J. and J.F. Burke 1,891 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Goldbanks Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 41% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
38% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. A lack of water on the winter range
3. Sage grouse brooding area
4. Water for sheep is not adequately developed
5. Current AMP objectives are not being met or are unrealistic
6. Current herbivore grazing use
7. Wild horses
8. WSA 406P and 406Q
9. Aspen habitat

Allotment: Goldbanks (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Harmony

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 95 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 7 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 32 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range DS-5(6)	25	38	
Sonoma Range DW-1(6)	38	57	95

Bighorn Sheep - 3 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range BS-3(6)	2	2	
Sonoma Range BW-2(6)	4	5	7

3. Graze 348 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Pedroli 195 AUMs  
Aitken 189 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Harmony Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 34% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
11% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 34% of the allotment is in a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Riparian and aspen areas are in poor condition
4. Deer winter concentration area
5. Wild horses
6. 21% of the allotment is private land
7. Pediocactus simpsonii var. robustior an Nevada state endangered plant occurs on the allotment

Allotment: Harmony (continued)

8. Current herbivore grazing use
9. Livestock drift
10. Legal access to Harmony and Cluncy Canyons

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wildlife habitat
8. Wild horses
9. T & E plants

Allotment: Humboldt House

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 67 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 23 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 22 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range DY-2(12)	15	45	
Humboldt Range DS-2(6)	15	22	67

Bighorn Sheep - 10 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range BS-1A(6)	9	11	
Humboldt Range BW-1(6)	10	12	33

3. Graze 727 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Cliff Campbell estate 620 AUMs  
Star Sheep Company 107 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Humboldt House Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 90% of the allotment is in poor ecological condition  
2% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. High percentage of low production vegetation potential
3. Poor condition of some riparian areas
4. Wild horses
5. High percentage of the allotment is private land
6. Current herbivore grazing use
7. Season-of-use
8. Recreational access

Allotment: Humboldt House (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian habitat
7. Wild horses
8. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Pumpernickel

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 17 wild horses and 0 burros.

Tobin Range Herd Use Area - 17 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 222 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 38 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 74 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Edna Mountain DY-5(12)	20	60	
Buffalo Mountain DY-6(12)	20	60	
Tobin Range DY-4a(12)	10	30	
Tobin Range DS-4a(6)	10	15	
Sonoma Range DS-5(6)	10	15	
Sonoma Range DW-1(6)	28	42	222

Bighorn Sheep - 16 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range BS-3(6)	4	5	
Tobin Range BS-4(6)	8	10	
Sonoma Range BW-2(6)	13	15	
Tobin Range BW-3(6)	7	8	38

3. Graze 9,440 livestock AUMs (active preference)

*G&S Cattle Co.* Hugh A. Tipton 840 AUMs Ellison Ranching Inc. Exchange-  
~~Clay & Jean Tipton~~ 582 AUMs of-use only  
Piquet Ranches, Inc. 1,212 AUMs  
Roaring Springs Associates 6,806 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Pumpernickel Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

Allotment: Pumpernickel (continued)

1. 10% of the allotment is in poor ecological condition.  
50% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 98% of the allotment has a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Sage grouse strutting and brooding areas and key summer and winter areas
4. Wild horses
5. Riparian areas are in poor condition
6. Pediocactus simpsonii var. robustior a sensitive plant is found on the allotment.
7. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
8. Existing range improvements are inadequate
9. Season-of-use
10. Current herbivore grazing use
11. Sheep losses due to poisoning by halogeton
12. Salting practices
13. Livestock drift
14. Cattle operators do not have common on and off dates.
15. WSA 406P

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Riparian habitat
8. Wild horses
9. Aquatic habitat
10. T & E plants

Allotment: Ragged Top

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer                    72 AUMs  
Antelope                0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep        0 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 24 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Trinity Range DY-8(12)	24	72	72

Bighorn Sheep - no reintroduction planned

3. Graze 155 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Marie Anderson Estate 155 AUMs  
John Espil                0 (Exchange-of-use only)  
Star Sheep Company      0 (Temporary nonrenewable)

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Ragged Top Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 5% of the allotment is in poor condition  
40% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. Three sage grouse brooding areas
3. Wild horses
4. The level or intensity of present management is not satisfactory
5. Existing range improvements are inadequate
6. 47% of the allotment is private land
7. Current herbivore grazing use
8. Lack of water on the allotment
9. Riparian and meadow habitat
10. Livestock drift
11. Mining

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Wild horses
8. Riparian and meadow habitat

Allotment: Rawhide

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Stillwater Range Herd Use Area - no horses on the allotment

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer	84	AUMs
Antelope	0	AUMs
Bighorn Sheep	46	AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 28 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range DY-2(12)	10	30	
East Range DY-3c(12)	16	48	
Stillwater Range DY-3d(12)	2	6	84

Bighorn Sheep - 19 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range BS-1B(16)	9	11	
East Range BS-2C(6)	7	8	
Humboldt Range BW-1(6)	17	20	
East and Stillwater Ranges BY-1B(12)	3	7	46

3. Graze 2,721 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Co.

WING VALLEY CATTLE ~~Fred Lynch~~ 2,139 AUMs

JOHN DARRAH ~~Gordon McCoy~~ 220 AUMs

Paris Brothers 362

Star Sheep Company 0 All use exchange-of-use

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Rawhide Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 81% of the allotment is in poor ecological condition  
3% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 84% of the allotment is in a downward trend (1982 estimate)
3. Riparian and aspen areas are in poor condition

Rawhide (continued)

4. Sage grouse brooding areas
5. Wild horses
6. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
7. Existing range improvements are inadequate
8. Season-of-use
9. Current herbivore grazing use
10. Mining

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wildlife habitat
8. Wild horses

Allotment: Rock Creek

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer                    134 AUMs  
Antelope                0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep        43 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 45 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range DS-5(6)	56	84	
Sonoma Range DW-1(6)	33	50	134

Bighorn Sheep - 18 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range BS-3(6)	27	32	
Sonoma Range BW-2(6)	9	11	43

3. Graze 2,192 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Piquet Ranches, Inc.    2,192 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Rock Creek Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 6% of the allotment is in poor condition  
30% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. 6% of the allotment is in a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Sage grouse strutting ground
4. Mule deer summer and winter concentration areas
5. Wild horses
6. Legal access - road maintenance
7. Riparian, meadow, and aspen areas
8. Current herbivore grazing use
9. Current AMP/objectives are not being met or are unrealistic
10. Rock Creek and Clear Creek aquatic habitat is in poor to fair condition.

Allotment: Rock Creek (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Wild horses
8. Water quality
9. Aquatic habitat
10. Riparian and aspen habitat

Allotment: Rodeo Creek

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 334 wild horses and 1 burro.

Fox and Lake Range Herd Use Area - 334 horses, 1 burro

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 177 AUMs  
Antelope 137 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 150 AUMs

Antelope - 57 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fox Range AY-5 (12)	57	137	137

Mule Deer - 59 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fox Range DY-1 (12)	59	177	177

Bighorn Sheep - 63 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fox Range BY-3 (12)	62	150	150

3. Graze 6,462 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Ceresola - 6,462 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Rodeo Creek Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. The majority of the allotment is in poor to fair condition.
2. A majority of the allotment is in a downward trend.
3. Riparian and meadow condition is poor.

Rodeo Creek (continued)

4. Wild horses
5. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
6. Existing range improvements are inadequate
7. History of grazing trespass
8. Heavy use of bitterbrush
9. Season-of-use
10. Livestock drift
11. Current herbivore grazing use
12. Livestock on Highway 34
13. WSA 014
14. DLE applications
15. Mining
16. Erosion
17. Road maintenance
18. Recreation use
19. Antelope yearlong use
20. Sheep trailing

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wild horses
8. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Rye Patch

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer                    66    AUMs  
Antelope                0    AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep        24    AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 22 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt River Valley DY-1a(12)	1	4	
Humboldt Range DY-2(12)	15	45	
Humboldt Range DS-2(6)	11	17	66

Bighorn Sheep - 10 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range BS-1A(6)	11	13	
Humboldt Range BW-1(6)	9	11	24

3. Graze 1,981 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Rye Patch Ranch Inc.    1,816 AUMs  
Star Sheep Co.            165 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Rye Patch Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 33% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
33% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 67% of the allotment is in a downward trend.  
33% is in a static trend.
3. Poor riparian and meadow condition
4. Wild horses
5. Rocky Canyon Creek is in fair condition
6. Season-of-use
7. Current herbivore grazing use.
8. Recreational use
9. Current AMP objectives are not being met or are unrealistic

Allotment: Rye Patch (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian habitat
7. Wild horses
8. Aquatic habitat

Allotment: Seven Troughs

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 704 wild horses and 34 burros.

Lava Beds Herd Use Area - 47 horses, 0 burros  
Seven Troughs Herd Use Area - 619 horses, 34 burros  
Kamma Mountains Herd Use Area - 38 horses, 0 burros

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 495 AUMs  
Antelope 26 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 0 AUMs

Antelope - 12 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
West of Rye Patch AY-1(12)	2	4	
East of Seven Troughs Range AY-3*(12)	9	22	26

- \* Planned introduction - no antelope currently using this area

Mule Deer - 165 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Seven Troughs Range DS-2(6)	82	123	
Seven Troughs Range DY-5(12)	114	342	
Kamma Mountains DY-6(12)	5	15	
Antelope Range DY-7a(12)	3	10	
Majuba Mountains DY-7b(12)	2	5	495

Bighorn Sheep - no reintroductions planned

3. Graze 9,163 livestock AUMs (active preference)

C-Punch Corporation 4,404 AUMs  
Duffurena Sheep Company 1,492 AUMs  
John Espil 3,267 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Seven Troughs Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 45% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
35% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. A majority of the allotment is in a downward trend (1979 estimate)
3. Poor condition of riparian meadows

Allotment: Seven Troughs (continued)

4. Sage grouse brooding and wintering areas
5. Wild horses and burros
6. The level or intensity of present grazing management practices are not satisfactory
7. Existing range improvements are inadequate
8. There is a history of grazing trespass
9. Season-of-use
10. Current herbivore grazing use
11. Lack of regular maintenance of range improvements
12. Livestock drift
13. Railroad lessee is a non-preference permittee

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian habitat
7. Wild horses and burros
8. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Soldier Meadows

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 835 wild horses and 10 burros.

Warm Springs Canyon Herd Use Area - 294 horses, 10 burros  
Black Rock Range West Herd Use Area - 424 horses  
Calico Mountains Herd Use Area - 117 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 786 AUMs  
Antelope 429 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 264 AUMs

Antelope - 179 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black Rock Range AS-1(6)	75	90	
Summit Lake AS-2(7)	50	70	
Black Rock Range AS-3(6)	15	18	
Calico Mountains AY-1(12)	57	136	
Warm Springs Canyon AY-2(12)	48	115	429

Mule Deer - 262 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black Rock Range DS-2(6)	200	300	
Black Rock Range DS-3(6)	50	75	
Black Rock Range DW-7(6)	50	75	
West of Summit Lake DW-8(6)	130	195	
Calico Mountains DY-5(12)	12	36	
West of Summit Lake DY-7(12)	35	105	786

Bighorn Sheep - 110 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black Rock Range BY-4(12)	50	120	
Calico Mountains BY-6(12)	60	144	264

3. Graze 16,070 livestock AUMs (active preference)

~~Ken Earp~~ Willis J. Bland  
Ken Earp 16,070 AUMs

Specific problems issues or conflicts that have been identified on the Soldier Meadows Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

Allotment: Soldier Meadows (continued)

1. 15% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
40% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 55% of the allotment is in a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Sage grouse strutting and brooding areas
4. Poor deer reproduction
5. Critical summer antelope range
6. Lahontan cutthroat trout
7. Riparian areas on Summer Camp, Slungullion, Donnelly, and Snow Creeks are in poor condition. Other riparain areas are degrading
8. Poor aspen reproduction outside of the Mahogany Creek exclosure
9. Excessive use on riparian meadow areas
10. Wild horses and burros
11. Soldier meadows dace
12. Poor water quality summer camp Slungullion and Soldier creeks
13. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
14. Existing range improvements are inadequate
15. Season-of-use
16. Current herbivore grazing use
17. Livestock drift
18. WSAs 621-622

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife and aquatic habitat
7. Riparian & aspen habitat
8. Wild horses
9. Sensitive species
10. Water quality
11. Mountain Mahogany
12. Mountain browse

Allotment: Sonoma

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer                    141   AUMs  
Antelope                0     AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep        29   AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 234 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range DS-5(6)	56	84	
Sonoma Range DW-1(6)	38	57	141

Bighorn Sheep - 12 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range BS-3(6)	11	13	
Sonoma Range BW-2(6)	13	16	29

3. Graze 1,510 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Piquet Ranches, Inc.    1,510 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Sonoma Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. Key summer concentration area for mule deer.
2. Riparian and aspen areas along Sonoma Creek needs to be upgraded
3. Aquatic habitat along Sonoma Creek is in poor condition
4. Wild horses
5. Mixed land status
6. Current road alignment along Sonoma Creek
7. Current herbivore grazing use
8. Legal access
9. Current AMP objectives are not being met or are unrealistic

Allotment: Sonoma (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Riparian and aspen habitat
8. Aquatic habitat
9. Wild horses
10. Recreational use

Allotment: South Rochester

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 36 wild horses and 0 burros.

Stillwater Range Herd Use Area - 36 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 45 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 15 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 15 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ragged Top DY-1a(12)	1	4	
West Humboldt Range DY-1b(12)	1	2	
Stillwater Range DY-3d(12)	10	30	
Humboldt Range DY-2(12)	3	9	45

Bighorn Sheep - 6 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range BS-1B(6)	1	1	
Humboldt Range BW-1(6)	5	6	
West Humboldt Range BY-1A(12)	1	3	
Stillwater Range BY-1B(12)	3	5	15

3. Graze 3,964 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Star Sheep Company	1,400 AUMs	Safford & Safford
Paris Brothers	400 AUMs	exchange-of-use only
<del>Fred Lynch</del>	1,386 AUMs	
Don Sims	778 AUMs	

Specific problems that have been identified on the Rochester Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

Allotment: South Rochester (continued)

1. 81% of the allotment is in poor ecological condition.  
3% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 98% of the allotment is in downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Wild horses
4. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
5. Existing range improvements are inadequate
6. Sheep losses due to haloyeton poisoning
7. Season-of-use
8. Current herbivore grazing use
9. Salting practices
10. Livestock drift
11. Livestock distribution

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wild horses
7. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Star Peak

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 434 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 82 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 145 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range DY-2(12)	70	210	
Humboldt Range DS-2(6)	98	147	
East Range DY-3a(12)	11	32	
East Range DS-3b(6)	30	45	434

Bighorn Sheep - 34 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humboldt Range BS-1A(6)	35	42	
East Range BS-2B(6)	3	4	
Humboldt Range BW-1(6)	22	26	
East Range BY-1B(12)	4	10	82

3. Graze 3,722 livestock AUMs (active preference)

*PREFERENCE* - Gene Thacker 261 AUMs  
Star Sheep Company 2,426 AUMs  
Paul Knoop 385 AUMs

Specific problems that have been identified on the Star Peak Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 76% of the allotment is in poor ecological condition. 13% is in fair condtion. (1979 estimate)
2. 89% of the allotment is in a downward trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Poor condition in aspen stands
4. Riparian and meadow areas are in poor to fair condition

Allotment: Star Peak (continued)

5. Deer winter concentration areas
6. Sage grouse brooding areas
7. Star Creek and Coyote Creek are in poor condition.  
Buena Vista and Big Canyons are in fair condition.
8. Wild horses
9. 50% of the allotment is private land
10. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
11. Range improvements are inadequate
12. Poor water quality in Willow Creek
13. Season-of-use
14. Current herbivore grazing use
15. Livestock drift
16. Salting practices

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wildlife habitat
8. Wild horses
9. Aquatic habitat
10. Water quality

Allotment: Thomas Creek

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 90 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 35 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 30 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range DS-5(6)	42	63	
Sonoma Range DW-1(6)	18	27	90

Bighorn Sheep - 15 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sonoma Range BS-3(6)	16	19	
Sonoma Range BW-2(6)	13	16	35

3. Graze 629 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Westmoreland 97 AUMs  
Garley Amos 264 AUMs  
R. & J. Aitken 268 AUMs  
Malvin Pedroli 0 AUMs (Exchange-of-use only)

Specific problems that have been identified on the Thomas Creek Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 13% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
74% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 21% of the allotment has a downward trend.  
79% has a static trend. (1979 estimate)
3. Poor riparian and aspen condition
4. Wild horses
5. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory

Allotment: Thomas Creek (continued)

6. 58% of the allotment is private land
7. Recreation and wood cutting in Thomas and Water Canyons
8. Livestock drift
9. Current herbivore grazing use
10. Human-livestock conflicts
11. Winnemucca city watershed

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wild horses
8. Water quality
9. Wildlife and aquatic habitat

Allotment: White Horse

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer	35	AUMs
Antelope	0	AUMs
Bighorn Sheep	7	AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 12 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
East Range DY-3a(12)	6	18	
East Range DS-3a(6)	6	9	
East Range DS-3b(6)	5	8	35

Bighorn Sheep - 3 total reasonable numbers

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
East Range BS-2A ( 6)	4	5	
East Range BY-1B (12)	1	2	7

3. Graze 1,970 livestock AUMs (active preference)

William H. Casey - 1,970 AUMs

*REVERT BACK TO HUMBOLDT RANCHES, INC.*

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the White Horse Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 81% of the allotment is in poor condition.  
12% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 98% of the allotment is in a downward trend (1979 estimate)
3. Poor condition of riparian and meadow areas
4. Sage grouse brooding areas
5. Wild horses
6. 43% of the allotment is private land

Allotment: White Horse (continued)

7. Degradation of streams is resulting in soil erosion
8. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
9. History of trespass
10. Season-of-use
11. Current herbivore grazing use
12. Mining
13. Legal access to Raspberry Canyon

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian areas
7. Wildlife habitat
8. Wild horses

Allotment: Cottonwood Canyon

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Stillwater Range Herd Use Area - 0 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer	18	AUMs
Antelope	0	AUMs
Bighorn Sheep	0	AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 6 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater Range DY-3d(12)	6	18	18

Bighorn Sheep - no reintroduction planned

3. Graze 60 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Sheldon Lamb - 60 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Cottonwood Canyon Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. Riparian areas are in poor condition
2. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
3. Allotment size impedes effective management. Must be managed in conjunction with the Reville Allotment of the Carson City District
4. Season-of-use
5. Livestock drift

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian habitat
7. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Jersey Valley

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 261 wild horses and 0 burros.

Augusta Mountains Herd Use Area - 261 horses  
Stillwater Range Herd Use Area - 0 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 48 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 1 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 16 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater Range DY-3d(12)	6	18	
Augusta Mountains DY-4b(12)	10	30	48

Bighorn Sheep - 1 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater Range BY-1B(12)	1	1	1

3. Graze 1,581 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Demar & Nancy Dahl 1,035 AUMs  
M & L Sheep 546 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Jersey Valley Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 89% of the allotment is in poor condition  
1% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. A portion of the allotment is in a downward trend
3. Wild horses
4. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
5. Season-of-use
6. Current herbivore grazing use
7. WSA 030-108
8. Potential bighorn sheep introduction

Allotment: Jersey Valley (continued)

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: Licking

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer	45	AUMs
Antelope	0	AUMs
Bighorn Sheep	0	AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 15 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Battle Mtn. (North Peak) DS-6(6)	20	30	
Battle Mtn. (North Peak) DW-2(6)	10	15	45

Bighorn Sheep - no reintroduction planned

3. Graze 153 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Lou Venturacci - 153 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the Licking Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 26% of the allotment is in poor condition  
60% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. 100% of the allotment has a static or downward trend (1979 estimate)
3. Poor riparian and aspen condition
4. Sage grouse strutting ground
5. Implementation of an intensive grazing management system would not be cost effective because of the small size and land status
6. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
7. Livestock drift
8. Existing range improvements are inadequate

Allotment: Licking (continued)

9. Season-of-use
10. Legal access
11. Recreation use

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Riparian and aspen habitat
7. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: North Buffalo

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 0 wild horses and 0 burros.

Allotment is checkerboard land

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer                    15 AUMs  
Antelope                0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep         0 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 5 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u>		
<u>Area</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Battle Mtn. (North Peak)	10	15	15
DW-2 (6)			

Bighorn Sheep - no reintroduction planned

3. Graze 3,294 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Ellison Ranching Co 1,194 AUMs  
Roaring Springs     2,100 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the North Buffalo Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 32% of the allotment is in poor condition  
45% is in fair condition (1979 estimate)
2. 97% of the allotment is in a downward trend (1979 estimate)
3. Present range improvements are inadequate
4. Riparian areas are in poor condition
5. Season-of-use
6. Livestock drift
7. Recreational use

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat

Allotment: South Buffalo

Long-range Allotment Management Objectives:

1. Graze 18 wild horses and 0 burros.

Stillwater Range Herd Use Area - 16 horses  
Tobin Range Herd Use Area - 2 horses

2. Provide habitat for reasonable numbers of wildlife:

Deer 381 AUMs  
Antelope 0 AUMs  
Bighorn Sheep 135 AUMs

Antelope - no antelope on the allotment

Mule Deer - 127 total reasonable number

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater Range DY-3d(12)	6	18	
Tobin Range DY-4a(12)	75	225	
Tobin Range DS-4a(6)	80	120	
Tobin Range DS-4b(6)	12	18	381

Bighorn Sheep - 56 total reasonable number - no bighorns present - potential reintroduction area

<u>Seasonal Use</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Seasonal Reasonable</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>AUMs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Tobin Range BS-4(6)	63	76	
Tobin Range BW-3(6)	44	53	
Stillwater Range BY-1B(12)	1	1	
Tobin Range BY-2(12)	2	5	135

3. Graze 9,035 livestock AUMs (active preference)

Marvel Brothers - 9,035 AUMs

Specific problems, conflicts or issues that have been identified on the South Buffalo Allotment through the Bureau's planning system are listed below. CRMP and activity plans will consider these problems.

1. 58% of the allotment is poor condition.  
33% is in fair condition. (1979 estimate)
2. 91% of the allotment is in a downward trend (1979 estimate)
3. Critical sage grouse habitat

South Buffalo Allotment (continued)

4. Critical deer winter range
5. The level or intensity of present grazing management is not satisfactory
6. Existing range improvements are inadequate
7. Riparian habitat is in poor condition
8. Season-of-use
9. Current herbivore grazing use
10. WSA 406 P

Allotment monitoring plan will include:

1. Ecological site condition and trend
2. Actual use
3. Climate
4. Range utilization
5. Project maintenance
6. Wildlife habitat
7. Riparian habitat

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management 1.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

MFP 1

Recommendation: RM 1.1

Allocate all suitable livestock forage within the resource area to livestock. Make no forage allocations to wildlife on suitable livestock areas and make no allocations to wild horse and burros.

Use the recompiled range survey as the base for determining the forage available to livestock. This would amount to a total livestock allocation of 140,583 AUMs for the planning area.

Refer to Table RM-1.1 for the recommendation of forage allocation for livestock on an allotment basis.

Rationale:

The recommendation is technically feasible.

The resource area's URAs indicate that sufficient forage is not available to satisfy current demand being placed upon it by all grazing animals (i.e., livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife).

Wild horses and burros numbers have increased dramatically on most of the allotments in the resource area.

No formal adjudication of forage to wild horses and burros has been made in this planning area.

Few wildlife allocations for competitive livestock forage were made in previous adjudications.

The recompiled range survey shows that 140,583 AUMs of forage are suitable for livestock allocation.

Assuming that this total of 140,583 AUMs is allocated to livestock, an overall downward adjustment of 7.7 percent would be required from total active preference. This indicates that current livestock stocking rates are not solely responsible for the unacceptable ecological condition and general downward trend of the public rangeland.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management 1.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

RM 1.1 (continued)

There is a current estimated total demand of 73,812 AUMs being used by wild horses and burros, or 52 percent of the total suitable forage for livestock is currently being used by wild horses and burros. (Source Wild Horse and Burro URA).

In addition total competitive wildlife demand on the suitable livestock forage is 8,923 AUMs for deer, 2,185 AUMs for antelope and an estimated 1,869 AUMs for potential bighorn sheep forage. These wildlife demands upon the suitable livestock forage amount to 12,977 AUMs or 9.2 percent of the total available livestock forage.

Total demands upon the vegetative resource and mainly demands from wild horse and burros have caused the majority of the deteriorated range conditions noted in the URAs.

Available forage and consequently livestock grazing use, has been declining for a number of years. Concurrently, total demands upon the forage resource have been increasing as a result of combined livestock use, increased wild horse and burro use, and wildlife use.

Without adjustments in the number of grazing animals using the forage resource (specifically adjustment to the estimated carrying capacity), the deteriorated range conditions would be expected to continue. The end result of this process would be the economic collapse of the livestock industry.

If all suitable livestock forage is allocated to livestock a total reduction of 11,864 AUMs of active preference is necessary in order to properly stock the public range. The 1979 total active preference in the resource area was 152,447 AUMs.

Actual average active licensed use for three years was 115,562 AUMs, consequently the difference in active licensed use needed to reach the proper stocking rate of 140,583 AUMs is a plus 25,021 AUMs.

This level of allocation would eliminate livestock grazing on 7 allotments, 8 allotments would have an increase in livestock use and the remaining 23 allotments would receive a reduction in authorized livestock use.

Support Needs

Field Solicitor  
Public Affairs  
Wild Horse and Burro Roundup Crew

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Table RM 1.1  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

<u>Allotment Name</u>	<u>Proposed Allocation <sup>1/</sup> of AUMs</u>
1. Blue Wing	19,188
2. Buffalo Hills	22,141
3. Calico	1,706
4. Clear Creek	2,396
5. Coal Canyon-Poker	2,868
6. Cottonwood Canyon	155
7. Coyote	3,294
8. Desert Queen	730
9. Diamond-S	674
10. Dolly Hayden	3,935
11. Gold Banks	1,512
12. Harmony	233
13. Humboldt House	433
14. Humboldt Sink	297
15. Jersey Valley	552
16. Klondike	1,456
17. Leadville	2,584
18. Licking	48
19. Majuba	3,312
20. Melody	616
21. North Buffalo	1,640
22. Pleasant Valley	8,586
23. Pole Canyon	200
24. Prince Royal	150
25. Pumpernickel	5,979
26. Ragged Top	416
27. Rawhide	2,451
28. Rochester	2,383
29. Rock Creek	1,744
30. Rodeo Creek	5,539
31. Rye Patch	1,415
32. Seven Troughs	3,895
33. Soldier Meadows	25,237
34. Sonoma	787
35. South Buffalo	7,940
36. Star Peak	2,624
37. Thomas Creek	401
38. White Horse	1,066
Total AUMs	140,583

<sup>1/</sup> The AUM figure (by allotment) includes fenced federal range and is based upon total suitable AUMs available for livestock grazing.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Allocate the forage within the resource area to livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife as follows:

<u>Grazing Class</u>	<u>Non-Competitive</u>	<u>Competitive</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Livestock		113,705	113,705
Wild Horse and Burros		13,415	13,415
Deer	2,769	9,030	11,799
Antelope	273	2,096	2,369
Bighorn Sheep	687	2,014	2,701
TOTAL	3,729	140,260	143,989

See attached Multiple Use Recommendation Table RM 1.1, WL 1.1 and WH&B 1.1 - for specific allotment breakdown of AUMs.

Rationale

Balancing available forage among all grazing animals will help reverse the unsatisfactory ecological range condition. This should not only result in long term gains for the livestock industry but should benefit wildlife habitat and establish or recognize a wild horse and burro allocation for the first time.

Multiple Use AnalysisComplement

Wild Horse and Burro 1.3 - remove all wild horses and burros from checkerboard herd use areas in a three year time periods.

Watershed 1.1 - prevent Bureau and Bureau-authorized activities from degrading water quality beyond established standards as specified in the Nevada Water Pollution Control Regulations of 1978.

Employ feasible Best Management Practices, State of Nevada, in all public land activities (providing the HMPs do not conflict with BLM policy and procedure).

Multiple Use Recommendation for Lands 2.5, 2.6, and Watershed 1.2 - retain in public ownership or acquire into public ownership the following lands within the municipal hydrologic basins described as follows:

Winnemucca: hydrologic basin for Water Canyon Creek  
 Golconda: hydrologic basin for Pole Canyon  
 Inlay: hydrologic basin for Prince Royal Canyon.

Priority in management of these municipal watersheds will be for the protection of the surface water quality and quantity within these hydrologic basins. Uses identified as causing unacceptable water quality problems will not be permitted to continue.

Watershed 3.2 - encourage maximum vegetation cover by limiting the use of vegetation by livestock, wild horses and/or wildlife to proper use levels as recommended in the Proper Use Tables, referred to in NSO Memorandum 76-167.

Conflict

Multiple Use Recommendation for Lands 2.1 - retain the following listed lands in public ownership until or unless local community R&PP or urban-suburban expansions specific requests have been made by the affected communities. These requests must be identified through the local governmental planning documents.

Gerlach - - - - -  
Empire - - - - -

Multiple Use Recommendation for Forestry 1.1, 1.4, and Wildlife 1.9 - in the design, implementation or revision of grazing management systems, horse management areas or horse use areas, consider aspen and mahogany as "critical" management species.

Specific management objectives will be designed for these critical species and these objectives will be used in the coordinated resources plan developed on an areas.

Wild Horse and Burro 1.1 - designate four herd management areas (HMAs) for the protection and preservation of wild free-roaming horses and burros, and prepare a Herd Management Area Plan (HMAP) for each area.

These areas are:

<u>HMA</u>	<u>Max. Mgt. #s</u>	<u>Allotment</u>
Button Point HMA	56	Diamond S
Buffalo Hills HMA	790	Buffalo Hills
Granite Range HMA	636	Buffalo Hills
Fox and Lake Range HMA	477	Rodeo Creek and Pole Creek

This WH&B recommendation asks to have all livestock grazing on public lands within the HMAs eliminated.

RM 1.1

Wild Horse and Burros 1.2 - establish herd use areas (HUAs) in 11 areas for extensive management of wild horses and burros.

These areas and suggested management numbers and allotments are as follows:

<u>HUA</u>	<u>Max. Mgt. #s</u>		<u>Allotment</u>
	<u>Horse</u>	<u>Burro</u>	
Tobin Range	50		Pleasant Valley, Goldbanks, South Buffalo, Pumpernickle
Stillwater	50		South Rochester, Cottonwood, Jersey Valley, South Buffalo
Selenite Range	25	25	Blue Wing
Blue Wing Mountains	75	50	Blue Wing
Warm Spring Canyon	150	25	Soldier Meadows
Augusta Mountains	20		Jersey Valley
Calico Mountains	100		Leadville, Calico, Buffalo Hills, Soldier Meadows
Lava Beds	150	50	Blue Wing, Seven Troughs
Nightingale Mountains	100		Blue Wing

Wildlife 1.1 - reserve forage for full reasonable numbers of big game animals in the areas presently occupied by big game animals and in those areas potentially occupied by reintroduced species. Forage requirements by grazing allotments and species are as follows:

(see the recommendation for this listing.)

Wildlife 1.2 - following allocation of forage to full reasonable numbers of wildlife, adjust forage use by livestock and wild horses in the entire planning area to bring total forage use to that level estimated as proper by the recompilation of the latest range surveys for the planning area.

Wildlife 1.3 - reserve the majority of the forage in that part of the Granite Range which lies south of the Leadville Allotment for wildlife, and declare that area to be a Wildlife Management Area (WMA), Overlay No. WL-1 depicts the boundaries of the WMA. The reasonable numbers concept of big game numbers would not apply to the WMA, and big game populations would be permitted to expand beyond those levels. The WMA would be managed for the benefit of wildlife, and grazing use would be subservient to the needs of wildlife.

RM 1.1

Under this recommendation, wild horses would be completely eliminated, since none were present in 1971, and all livestock grazing preference would be cancelled. Livestock grazing would be permitted in the WMA on a temporary nonrenewable (TNR) basis as needed to manipulate the vegetation for the benefit of wildlife. Period-of-use for this TNR grazing, number of AUMs allowed, and area of use within the WMA, would vary from year to year depending on habitat management objectives. The only class of livestock permitted would be cattle.

Wildlife 1.4 - the portion of the Granite Range which lies south of the Leadville Allotment should be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern.

Wildlife 1.4a - this recommendation is to be considered only if recommendation WL 1.4 is rejected.

Designate the following areas within the Granite Range as ACECs.

- T. 36 N., R. 22 E., Secs. 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16
- T. 36 N., R. 23 E., Secs. 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 32

Wildlife 1.5 - the following areas should be designated as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

Public land areas in:

1. Riparian areas along major streams (see overlay)
2. Wetlands associated with upper Rye Patch Reservoir, Humboldt Sink and Carson Sink (see overlay).

The wetland areas described in number 2 are also being recommended for ACEC designation as endangered species habitat (Recommendation WL 1.6).

Watershed 4.1 - prevent any surface disturbing action or other management action which would result in the destruction of existing populations of Federally listed or State listed endangered, threatened or sensitive plant, any proposed for such status. Establish the locations of occurrence of any such plants as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1 - mark streams and other water sources for special management, designate the resource areas fishing streams as ACECs, and all streams in wildlife recommendation 1.5 as ACECs.

Designate the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout spawning habitat and the Soldier Meadows desert dace habitat as ACECs.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.2 - it is recommended that riparian/stream zones be identified as separate management units and removed from general management under grazing systems. This can best be done by fencing the

riparian/stream zone to prevent grazing use. The following streams would provide the most benefit per cost of fencing. This determination was made on the basis of percent public ownership and stream flow volume: Soldiers Creek, Bushee Creek, Clear Creek, Coyote Creek, Hoffman Canyon Creek, Rocky Canyon Creek, and Sonoma Creek. Priority should be given to Clear Creek and Sonoma Creek because of their proximity to a population center. Plans to fence those streams not found suitable at this time should be developed when agreements with private landowners are developed to allow fencing of the entire stream or private lands along the stream are acquired through sale or exchange.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.5 - initially rest each riparian/stream zone at least five years to allow aquatic habitat and riparian vegetation to develop and stabilize before the beginning of the first grazing cycle.

The URA information for range, wild horses and burros, and wildlife have indicated the undesirable effects of too many grazing animals on the ecological condition of the public land.

Overutilization of the forage resource has lead to unsatisfactory conditions on both the quantity and quality of the forage resource.

Earlier adjudications made little if any forage allocations for wildlife and no allocations for wild horses and burros.

It is apparent that the forage resource is being overutilized on the majority of the allotments in the resource area.

MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATION  
TABLE R4 1.1, WL1.1 and WR/B 1.1

Lotment	Deer		Antelope		Bighorn		Wild Horse & Burro	Livestock
	Competitive	Non-Competitive	Competitive	Non-Competitive	Competitive	Non-Competitive		
1. ... Wing	214	487	30	19	0	106	5,450	13,521
2. Buffalo Hills	5,427	867	960	146	976	166	7,415	7,363
3. Calico	36	10	33	11	72	14		1,565
4. Clear Creek	112	64			11	9		2,282
5. Coal Canyon-Poker	68	29		1	20	11		2,780
6. Cottonwood Canyon	7	11						148
7. Coyote	34	1	407	4	7			2,846
8. Desert Queen								730
9. Diamond S	101	28			23	15	550	
10. Dolly Hayden	54	14			14	4		3,867
11. Gold Banks	66	26			10	8		1,436
12. Harmony	72	23			5	2		156
13. Humboldt House		67				23		633
14. Humboldt Sink		2				3		297
15. Jersey Valley	1	47				1		551
16. Klondike	35	22			8	2		1,413
17. Leadville	163	16	61	6	153	23		2,287
18. Licking	5	40						43
19. ... Majuba	52	5	85	7				3,175
20. ... Melody								616
21. North Buffalo	15							1,625
22. Pleasant Valley	217	137			60	37		8,305
23. Pole Canyon	7	8	3	4	17	20		123
24. Prince Royal		47				13		150
25. Pumpernickel	152	70			23	15		5,900
26. Ragged Top	7	65						409
27. Rawhide	54	30			34	12		2,363
28. Rochester	9	36			5	10		2,369
29. Rock Creek	110	24			35	8		1,599
30. Sadeo Creek	135	42	105	32	115	35		5,184
31. Syc Patch	28	38			9	15		1,378
32. Seven Troughs	382	113	10	16				3,503
33. Soldier Meadows	742	44	402	27	238	26		23,856
34. Snocosa	81	60			13	16		693
35. South Buffalo	270	111			90	45		7,124
36. Star Peak	300	134			52	30		2,272
37. Thomas Creek	45	45			18	17		338
38. ... to Horse	29	6			6	1		1,031
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,030</b>	<b>2,769</b>	<b>2,096</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>2,014</b>	<b>687</b>	<b>13,415</b>	<b>113,705</b>

RM 1.1

Multiple Use Recommendation

Allocate the forage within the resource area to livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife as follows:

<u>Grazing Class</u>	<u>Non-Competitive</u>	<u>Competitive</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Livestock		113,705	113,705
Wild Horse and Burros		13,415	13,415
Deer	2,769	9,030	11,799
Antelope	273	2,096	2,369
Bighorn Sheep	687	2,014	2,701
TOTAL	3,729	140,260	143,989

See attached Multiple Use Recommendation Table RM 1.1, WL 1.1 and WH&B 1.1 - for specific allotment breakdown of AUMs.

Rationale

Balancing available forage among all grazing animals will help reverse the unsatisfactory ecological range condition. This should not only result in long term gains for the livestock industry but should benefit wildlife habitat and establish or recognize a wild horse and burro allocation for the first time.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Reject the recommendation.

Rationale

Forage will not be allocated within the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area. Future adjustments in grazing use will be based on monitoring as called for in the Bureau's new Rangeland Management Policy.

MFP III

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Sonoma-Gerlach	
Activity	
Range Management 1.2	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

MFP i

Recommendation: RM 1.2

Review and update the following existing grazing management systems as needed and identified on Table RM 1.2.

Rationale:

As identified in the planning areas URAs, the existing grazing systems are not meeting the objectives identified in the written AMPs, or grazing system plans.

Several kinds of problems found in current grazing system plans are:

- Unrealistic objectives
- Unequal pasture carrying capacity
- Overobligation of the forage resource
- Uneven distribution of livestock
- Inadequate evaluation systems
- Declining range trend
- Unsatisfactory ecological condition
- Systems designed that do not meet the phenological requirement of the key species.

Major expenditures have been made in the grazing systems identified in Table RM 1.2. These allotments are of a sufficient size that a proper and effective system could be designed (using current procedures) to reverse declining trends and provide forage on a sustained yield basis.

In addition the operators (or their predecessor) have entered into these management systems that have resulted in substantial cooperative efforts on their part. The revision of these grazing systems in these areas should be maintained as a management commitment on the part of the Bureau was made in the past and should be continued.

Support Needs:

District Office

1. Soil survey on all allotments
2. Archeology
3. Engineering support for preliminary layout and design, feasibility analysis, road maintenance, project installation, rehabilitation efforts, and contract preparation.
4. Cadestral

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management 1.2
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

RM 1.2 (continued)

State Office

1. Review
2. Technical Support

Table RM 1.2  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

1. Coal Canyon-Poker
2. Rye Patch
3. Coyote
4. Leadville
5. Rock Creek-Sonoma (combine and consider as one)
6. South Buffalo
7. Gold Banks

Multiple Use Recommendation

Review and update the following existing grazing management systems as needed and identified on Table RM 1.2.

TABLE RM 1.2  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

1. Coal Canyon-Poker
2. Rye Patch
3. Coyote
4. Leadville
5. Rock Creek-Sonoma (combine and consider as one)
6. South Buffalo
7. Goldbanks

Rationale

Properly designed grazing systems will reverse declining range conditions, benefit wildlife habitat, and ensure sustained yield of the forage resource.

Major expenditures and commitments on the part of the Bureau and livestock operators have been made on the identified grazing systems. These systems should be revised as needed as a management commitment was made in the past and the commitment should be continued.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Review and update the following grazing management systems and include considerations and objectives for wild horses and burros, watershed, wildlife, and other resources in their development. This should be done through the CRMP process whenever possible.

TABLE RM 1.2  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

1. Coal Canyon-Poker
2. Rye Patch
3. Coyote
4. Leadville
5. Rock Creek-Sonoma (combine and consider as one)
6. South Buffalo
7. Goldbanks

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Sonoma-Gerlach	
Activity	
Range Management 1.3	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

MFP 1

Recommendation: RM 1.3 ✓

Establish periods-of-use for each allotment and base management on the physiological requirements of key species in accordance with the attached list. Utilization of key species, should not exceed the Proper Use Factors established for the 1978 Paradise-Denio Ocular Range Survey.

Rationale:

The recommendation is technically feasible.

Past grazing use has been authorized during the critical growing period of the desirable forage species; primarily perennial grass species. This type of grazing use has continued for years and is one of the primary reasons for the present poor condition of grazing lands. Continued utilization of key forage plants during the critical growing stages does not allow these plants to store food reserves, reproduce and gain vigor.

There is extensive research on the subjects of the physiological requirements of plants and the degree of utilization that is acceptable on key forage plants. Postemergent growth depletes food reserves stored from the previous growing season. Repeated utilization depletes additional food reserves. If this is allowed to continue, a point is reached where the plant simply dies. The MFP area contains vast acreages with only remnants of perennial forage plants. In many cases, these remnants are grasses and are protected by shrubs, rocks, slopes, or other physical barriers. Also there is abundant research that demonstrates the negative effects of grazing "key" salt desert shrub species during the early growth stages of those species. Additionally repeated heavy utilization on these shrubby species (winterfat, budsage, hopsage) causes eventual plant death and replacement by less desirable species.

After proper periods-of-use are implemented, the more desirable forage species will be able to establish adequate food reserves, improve vigor, and reproduce. Periods-of-use can be modified upon implementation of a sound grazing management system.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management 1.3
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

RM 1.3 (continued)

There is considerable research available concerning the degree of utilization that can be made of key forage species before the use becomes detrimental. It is generally accepted that utilization in excess of 50 percent by weight of perennial grass species is harmful to the plant. The philosophy of "take half and leave half" has been around for a number of years. This concept is still valid for most grass species. The Proper Use Factors established for the 1978 Paradise Denio Range Survey in every case did not exceed 50 percent. A utilization degree of 50 percent or less would help to insure that the plant can perpetuate itself. The degree of utilization can be modified upon implementation of a sound grazing system.

There are no policy and legal constraints. The Code of Federal Regulations (43 CFR 4120.2-1) states in part, that "the authorized officer shall specify - the period(s)-of-use, and the amount of use, in animal unit months, that can be made in every grazing permit or lease".

The establishment of proper periods-of-use and utilization are two ways to improve range ecological condition and trend.

Until intensive grazing management systems are implemented, there are no alternatives. For those implemented, the periods-of-use and degree of utilization may vary, as long as the growth requirements of key plants receive adequate consideration.

The social and economic impact of this recommendation could be severe, especially for those licensees who do not have an operating AMP. Implementation of proper period-of-use would result in those operators being off the public lands for 3 to 4 months during the growing season. Utilization of key forage plants of 50 percent or less would result in less total use than is now customary.

Support Needs:

1. Solicitor's Office

Table RM 1.3  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED PERIODS-OF-USE

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Period-of-Use</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
1. Blue Wing	6-1 to 2-28	Key species in salt desert shrub: (1) ORHY, (2) SIHY, (3) GRSP, (4) EULA In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY, (4) PUTR
2. Buffalo Hills	6-1 to 2-28	Key species in salt desert shrub: (1) ORHY, (2) SIHY, (3) GRSP, (4) EULA In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY, (4) PUTR
3. Calico	6-1 to 2-28	Key species in salt desert shrub: (1) ORHY, (2) SIHY, (3) GRSP, (4) EULA In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY, (4) PUTR
4. Clear Creek	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sage brush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
5. Coal Canyon-Poker	5-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
6. Cottonwood Canyon	6-15 to 10-1	In P.J. sagebrush grass: (1) AGSP, (2) STTH
7. Coyote	5-1 to 12-1	(1) AGSP, (2) STTH
8. Desert Queen	7-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) ORHY, (2) EULA, (3) STCO In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY

Table RM 1.3 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED PERIODS-OF-USE

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Period-of-Use</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
9. Diamond-S	7-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY On seeding: (1) AGCR
10. Dolly Hayden	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
11. Gold Banks	5-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
12. Harmony	7-1 to 10-30	(1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) FEID
13. Humboldt House North of Freeway South of Freeway	10-1 to 2-28 6-1 to 9-30	(1) EULA, (2) ORHY, (3) STCO (1) ORHY, (2) STTH, (3) SIHY (4) FEID
14. Humboldt Sink	6-1 to 2-28	Adjacent to sink: (1) SPAR, (2) ELCI North of Freeway: (1) ORHY, (2) GRSP, (3) STCO
15. Jersey Valley	10-1 to 2-28	(1) SIHY, (2) EULA
16. Klondike	6-15 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
17. Leadville	5-1 to 11-30	(1) AGSP, (2) STTH, (3) FEID

Table RM 1.3 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED PERIODS-OF-USE

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Period-of-Use</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
18. Licking	7-15 to 9-30	(1) AGSP, (2) STTH, (3) FEID
19. Majuba	6-1 to 2-28	(1) ORHY, (2) STTH, (3) EULA, (4) STCO
20. Melody	5-1 to 9-30	(1) AGCR
21. North Buffalo	6-1 to 2-28	(1) ORHY, (2) EULA Trailing Permitted Year-Round
22. Pleasant Valley	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
23. Pole Canyon	6-15 to 9-30	(1) AGSP, (2) STTH
24. Prince Royal	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
25. Pumpnickel	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
26. Ragged Top	12-1 to 2-28	(1) ORHY, (2) GRSP, (3) EULA, (4) STCO
27. Rochester	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
28. Rawhide	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY

Table RM 1.3 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED PERIODS-OF-USE

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Period-of-Use</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
29. Rock Creek	6-15 to 11-30	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY, (4) FEID
30. Rodeo Creek	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (2) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY, (4) PUTR
31. Rye Patch	5-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) ORHY, (2) EULA, (3) STCO In sagebrush grass: (1) AGSP, (2) FEID, (3) STTH
32. Seven Troughs	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) ORHY, (2) SIHY, (3) GRSP, (4) EULA In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY, (4) PUTR, (5) FEID
33. Soldier Meadows	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY, (4) FEID
34. Sonoma	7-1 to 10-30	(1) AGSP, (2) STTH, (3) SIHY
35. South Buffalo	5-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY
35. Star Peak	6-1 to 2-28	In salt desert shrub: (1) SIHY, (2) EULA, (3) GRSP In sagebrush grass: (1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) SIHY

Table RM 1.3 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED PERIODS-OF-USE

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Period-of-Use</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
37. Thomas Creek	6-1 to 9-30	(1) STTH, (2) AGSP, (3) STCO
38. White Horse	5-1 to 11-30	On the seeding: (1) AGCR
	6-1 to 11-30	Native: (1) AGSP, (2) STTH, (3) FEID

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Make season-of-use data available to CRMP groups so that they can use this information in the development of plans using the CRMP process.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Range Management 1.4

Overlay Reference

Step 1 1.4 Step 3

Recommendation: RM 1.4

MFP I

- A. Develop and implement intensive grazing management systems on the following allotments or combination of allotments. All of the allotments or combination of allotments listed will be at a minimum a four pasture intensive grazing system.

- \*1. Diamond S-Melody-Harmony-Thomas Creek
- \*2. Rock Creek-Sonoma
3. Pumpnickel Allotment
- \*4. Clear Creek-Dolly Hayden
5. Pleasant Valley
- \*6. Prince Royal-Star Peak-Klondike
- \*7. Rawhide-South Rochester
- \*8. Blue Wing-Seven Troughs
9. Desert Queen
10. Soldier Meadows-Piaute Meadows
- \*11. Buffalo Hills-Calico
- \*12. Rodeo Creek-Pole Canyon
- \*13. North Buffalo-Licking-(Copper Canyon in Battle Mountain District)
14. Humboldt Sink

\* Consider as One

- B. Manage the following allotments on a non-intensive grazing system basis. At least two pasture differed system.

1. Humboldt House
2. White Horse

- C. Manage the following allotments on a non-intensive basis.

1. Cottonwood
2. Jersey Valley
3. Ragged Top

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Range Management 1.4

Overlay Reference

Step 1 1.4 Step 3

RM 1.4 (continued)

Rationale:

The Sonoma-Gerlach URAs identified significant problems that are presently resulting in an estimated downward trend and unsatisfactory ecological range conditions on the majority of the MFP area.

Implementation of intensive grazing systems on those allotments identified in part A above would reverse this situation. Intensive grazing systems as identified here would not necessarily result in extensive fencing programs on some allotments. Allotments were grouped or combined to take advantage of existing fences and or natural features that would result in a logical management units.

Group B allotments are partially fenced and therefore are considered as manageable units that would require minimal grazing system development to reverse the downward trend and unsatisfactory present ecological condition.

Two pasture deferred systems would result in the desired changes on these allotments.

In the group C category allotments, the establishment of a period-of-use proper stocking rate, and kind of livestock use would result in desired vegetative changes.

Expected increases in livestock forage as a result of this recommendation are shown on the attached Table RM 1.4.

It is expected that the resulting increase in forage for livestock would be welcomed by the permittees, however, it is anticipated that adverse recreations will result due to the fact that some permittees will have to gently increase their time spent in managing and controlling their livestock.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
  
MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management 1.4
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	1.4
Step 3	

RM 1.4 (continued)

Support Needs:

District Office

1. Complete the soils survey on the resource area and the SVIM procedures through the SWA stage.
2. Archeology
3. Engineering for contract preparation, preliminary design and layout, feasibility study, project installation and supervision, and road maintenance.
4. Economic analysis

State Office

1. Technical Review

Table RM 1, 4  
Sonoma-Geriach MFP

ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN FORAGE PRODUCTION (AUMs) THROUGH MANAGEMENT

Allotment	Reduction in Grazing Intensity (21%) 1/	Implementation of Grazing Systems (5%) 2/	Unsuitable with Potential to be Suitable 3/		Increase	Suitable by Recompiled Survey	Combined Total
			Water	Production			
Blue Wing	4,035	961	6,158	1,006	12,294	19,215	31,509
Buffalo Hills	0	1,107	0	816	1,923	22,141	24,064
Calico	358	85	0	0	443	1,706	2,149
Clear Creek	505	120	330	120	1,075	2,405	3,480
Coal Canyon-Poker	602	0	495	266	1,365	2,868	4,233
Cottonwood Canyon	0	0	34	0	34	155	189
Coyote	0	0	0	2	2	3,294	3,296
Desert Queen	153	36	883	500	1,823	730	2,553
Diamond-S	141	33	0	0	174	674	848
Dolly Hayden	0	196	215	0	417	3,935	4,352
Gold Banks	317	0	241	0	558	1,512	2,070
Harmony	48	11	0	8	67	233	300
Humboldt House	90	21	0	183	294	433	727
Humboldt Sink	62	14	0	61	145	297	442
Jersey Valley	115	0	69	883	1,067	552	1,619

Table RM 4.1 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach NFP

ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN FORAGE PRODUCTION (ADMS) THROUGH MANAGEMENT

Allotment	Reduction in	Implementation of	Unsuitable with Potential <sup>1</sup> to be Suitable <sup>3/</sup>			Increase	Suitable by	Combined
	Grazing Intensity (21%) 1/	Grazing Systems (5%) 2/	Water	Production	Water & Production			
Klondike	305	72	18	56	66	517	1,456	1,973
Leadville	0	0	0	41	0	41	2,584	2,625
Licking	10	2	0	66	0	78	48	126
Majuba	0	166	379	67	73	685	3,312	3,997
Melody	129	30	0	0	0	159	616	775
North Buffalo	344	82	1,219	0	0	1,645	1,640	3,285
Pleasant Valley	1,803	429	224	122	8	2,586	8,586	11,172
Pole Canyon	42	10	196	0	0	248	200	448
Prince Royal	31	7	0	146	0	184	150	334
Pumpernickel	1,256	299	199	42	0	1,796	6,075	7,871
Ragged Top	0	0	269	620	410	1,299	416	1,715
Rawhide	514	122	0	34	0	670	2,451	3,121
Rochester	500	119	393	943	101	2,056	2,383	4,439
Rock Creek	366	87	0	0	0	453	1,744	2,197
Rodeo Creek	1,163	276	380	20	0	1,839	5,539	7,378

Table RM 4.1 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN FORAGE PRODUCTION (AUMs) THROUGH MANAGEMENT

Allotment	Reduction in Grazing Intensity (21%) 1/	Implementation of Grazing Systems (5%) 2/	Unsuitable with Potential <sup>3/</sup> to be Suitable 3/		Increase	Suitable by Recompiled Survey	Combined Total
			Water	Production			
Rye Patch	297	0	0	0	297	1,415	1,712
Seven Troughs	817	194	521	3,998	6,222	3,895	10,117
Soldier Meadows	0	1,262	0	0	1,262	25,238	26,500
Sonoma	165	39	0	47	251	787	1,038
South Buffalo	1,572	0	185	377	0	2,134	9,618
Star Peak	551	131	0	14	18	714	3,338
Thomas Creek	84	20	0	0	0	104	505
White Horse	223	53	0	0	276	1,066	1,342
TOTAL	16,598	5,984	12,408	10,438	1,769	47,197	140,260

1/ Improvement through reduction in grazing intensity will result from reduction in livestock use to the estimated carrying capacity of the allotments.

2/ Improvement through management systems would be accomplished by implementing rest-rotation grazing systems.

3/ Areas that are currently unsuitable for grazing (application of suitability criteria) that will become suitable through management (grazing systems and reductions in grazing intensity) and development of water.

Multiple Use Recommendations

MFP II  
Intensive grazing management system will be implemented and developed as a result of coordinated, cooperated, planning on each proposed allotment management plan (AMP). This coordinated planning will be conducted with the cooperation of all concerned parties to the maximum extent possible.

A. Allotments identified for intensive AMPs are listed below:

- \*1. Melody-Harmony-Thomas Creek
2. Pumpernickel
3. Clear Creek-Dolly Hayden
4. Pleasant Valley
- \*5. Prince Royal-Star Peak-Klondike
- \*6. Rawhide-Rochester
- \*7. Blue Wing-Seven Troughs (exclude the Lava Beds HMA)
8. Desert Queen
- \*9. Soldier Meadows-Paiute Meadows
- \*10. Buffalo Hills-Calico (exclude the Buffalo Hills HMA)
- \*11. Rodeo Creek-Pole Canyon
- \*12. North Buffalo-Licking-Copper Canyon (in Battle Mountain District)
13. Humboldt Sink

\*Consider as one

B. Manage the following allotments or a non-intensive AMP basis.

1. Humboldt House
2. White Horse
3. Majuba

C. Manage the following allotments on a non-intensive basis.

1. Cottonwood
2. Jersey Valley
3. Ragged Top

Rationale

Allotments identified for AMP development would not necessarily result in extensive fencing programs on some allotments.

Allotments were grouped or combined to take advantage of existing fence and/or natural features that would result in logical management units.

Group B allotments are partially fenced and would require minimal grazing system development to reverse the downward trend and unsatisfactory present ecological conditions.

In group C allotments, the establishment of a period-of-use, proper stocking rate and kind of livestock would result in desired vegetative changes.

Intensive grazing systems development should reverse present downward trends and less than desirable ecological condition.

Intensive grazing systems should, over the long range (35 years), increase available forage and protect over resource values.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Reject the recommendation.

Rationale

The recommendation was rejected because the new Rangeland Management Policy calls for allotment categories in a different context than proposed in the MFP Step II recommendation. However, the data in the recommendation will be used to help designate the categories and when considering the combination of allotments.

ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN FORAGE PRODUCTION (ADMs) THROUGH MANAGEMENT

Allotment	Reduction in Grazing Intensity (21%) 1/	Implementation of Grazing Systems (5%) 2/	Unsuitable with Potential Water	to be Suitable 3/ Production	Suitable by Water & Production	Increase	Suitable by Recompiled Survey	Combined Total
Blue Wing	4,035	961	6,158	1,006	134	12,294	19,215	31,509
Buffalo Mills	4,650	1,107	0	816	0	6,573	22,141	28,714
Calico	358	85	0	0	0	443	1,706	2,149
Clear Creek	505	120	330	120	0	1,075	2,405	3,480
Coal Canyon-Poker	602	0	495	266	2	1,365	2,868	4,233
Cottonwood Canyon	0	0	34	0	0	34	155	189
Coyote	692	0	0	2	0	694	3,294	3,988
Desert Queen	153	36	883	500	251	1,823	730	2,553
Diamond S	141	0	0	0	0	141	674	815
Dolly Haden	0	196	215	0	6	417	3,935	4,352
Goldbanks	317	0	241	0	0	558	1,512	2,070
Harmony	48	11	0	8	0	67	233	300
Humboldt House	90	21	0	183	0	294	433	727
Humboldt Sink	62	14	5	61	8	145	287	443
Jersey Valley	115	0	68	883	0	1,067	552	1,619
Klondike	305	72	18	56	66	517	1,456	1,973
Madville	543	0	8	48	0	584	2,584	3,168
May	10	2	0	66	0	78	48	126
Mayuba	0	166	379	67	73	685	3,312	3,997
Melody	129	30	0	0	0	159	616	775
North Buffalo	344	82	1,219	0	0	1,645	1,640	3,285
Pleasant Valley	1,803	429	224	122	0	2,586	8,586	11,172
Pole Canyon	42	10	196	0	0	284	200	448
Prince Royal	31	7	0	146	0	184	150	334
Pumpnickel	1,256	299	199	42	0	1,796	6,075	7,871
Ragged Top	0	0	269	620	410	1,299	416	1,715
Rawhide	514	122	0	34	0	670	2,451	3,121
Rochester	500	119	393	943	101	2,056	2,383	4,439
Rock Creek	366	0	0	0	0	366	1,744	2,110
Rodeo Creek	1,163	276	388	20	0	1,839	5,539	7,378
Rye Patch	297	0	0	0	0	297	1,415	1,712
Seven Troughs	817	194	521	3,998	692	6,222	3,895	10,117
Soldier Meadows	0	1,262	0	0	0	1,262	25,238	26,500
Sonoma	165	0	0	47	0	212	787	999
South Buffalo	1,572	0	188	377	0	2,134	7,488	9,622
Star Peak	551	131	0	14	18	714	2,434	3,138
Thomas Creek	84	28	0	0	0	104	401	505
White Horse	223	53	0	0	0	276	1,066	1,342
TOTAL	22,483	5,825	12,408	10,438	1,769	52,923	140,260	193,183

Improvement through reduction in grazing intensity will result from reduction in livestock use to the estimated carrying capacity of the allotment.

2/ Improvement through management systems would be accomplished by implementing rest-rotation grazing systems.

3/ Areas that are currently unsuitable for grazing (application of suitability criteria) that will become suitable through management (grazing systems and reductions in grazing intensity) and development of water.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Sonoma-Gerlach	
Activity	
Range Management 1.5	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation: RM 1.5 .

MFP 1

Allow for conversion from cattle to sheep or for a combination of cattle and sheep on all allotments in the planning area.

Rationale:

A large portion of the MFP area is dominated by vegetative types that are suitable for sheep use even more so than for cattle use. These areas were historically used by sheep in the past and can be intensively managed under sheep use without the implementation or installation of extensive fencing programs.

Conversions to sheep use would also result in better utilization on the allotments as a whole by: (1) hauling water would make more forage available for livestock, (2) sheep can be herded onto steeper terrain thereby using slopes in excess of 50 percent without over using the less steep areas on an allotment, (3) on dual use areas the grazing pressure would be equally applied to both perennial grasses and shrubs, and (4) sheep could be herded so as to minimize damage to critical areas, i.e., aspen stands, riparian areas, and mountain brush.

The recommendation would allow permittees more flexibility and possibly would minimize economic effects of adjustments on some allotments.

Support Needs:

1. Increased monitoring system
2. Increased compliance & supervision program
3. Economic analysis

Multiple Use Recommendation

MFP II  
Allow for conversion from cattle to sheep or for a combination of cattle and sheep on portions of all allotments within the resource area. Sheep authorizations will not be allowed in areas where conflicts with bighorn sheep would occur.

Rationale

A large portion of the MFP area is dominated by vegetative types that are suitable for sheep use even more so than for cattle use. These areas were historically used by sheep in the past and can be intensively managed under sheep use without the implementation or installation of extensive fencing programs.

Conversions to sheep use would also result in better utilization on the allotments as a whole by: (1) hauling water would make more forage available for livestock, (2) sheep can be herded onto steeper terrain thereby using slopes in excess of 50 percent without over using the less steep areas on an allotment, (3) on dual use areas the grazing pressure would be equally applied to both perennial grasses and shrubs, and (4) sheep could be herded so as to minimize damage to critical areas, i.e., aspen stands, riparian areas, and mountain brush.

The recommendation would allow permittees more flexibility and possibly would minimize economic effects of adjustments on some allotments.

Domestic/bighorn sheep conflicts may be a serious problem in some areas. Many of the mountain ranges in the resource area have been identified as potential bighorn sheep habitat. Elimination of domestic sheep use in an area used by bighorns would avoid potential disease and forage competition problems.

Sonoma-Gerlach MFP III  
Range Management 1.5

As Currently Written:

1. Allow for conversion from cattle to sheep on all allotments within the resource area except where conflicts with bighorn sheep would occur.
2. Allow for conversion from sheep to cattle on a case-by-case basis. Conversion ratio and authorization will depend upon the suitability of the rangeland involved and will be made only where cattle can be adequately controlled and managed.

Change To:

1. Allow for conversion from cattle to sheep on all allotments within the resource areas except on those allotments or portions of allotments where conflicts with existing bighorn sheep (or imminent reintroductions) cannot be mitigated.
2. Allow for conversion from sheep to cattle on a case-by-case basis. Conversion ratio and authorization will depend upon the suitability of the rangeland involved and will be made only where cattle can be adequately controlled and managed.

Rationale:

The decision as originally written caused much concern among the sheep permittees of the resource area. They felt that if bighorn sheep were reintroduced into the resource area that the domestic sheep operations would be eliminated. This was never the intention of the original decision. In order to clarify the decision the matter was made an agenda item for the CRMP Local Number 1 meeting in Winnemucca on October 22, 1982. As a result several members of the CRMP group met with Winnemucca District personnel and worked out the clarification.

Persons-Organizations That Have Protested This Decision:

1. Ken Earp by Larry Hill, Orovada, Nevada.
2. CRMP Local Number 1, Winnemucca, Nevada.
3. Buster Dufurrena, Denio, Nevada.

MFP III  
RM 1.5

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

1. Allow for conversion from cattle to sheep on all allotments within the resource area except where conflicts with bighorn sheep would occur.
2. Allow for conversions from sheep to cattle on a case-by-case basis. Conversion ratio and authorization will depend upon the suitability of the rangeland involved and will be made only where cattle can be adequately controlled and managed.

Rationale

Same as MFP II.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Range Management 1.6

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: RM 1.6

MFP 1

Control economic insect infestations on public lands.

Rationale:

Certain allotments in the planning area have in the past experienced serious insect infestations that have resulted in control methods taken to contain abnormal insect populations.

The main threat of insect infestations is to loose valuable forage supplies that would be available to livestock. Through proper adjustments of livestock grazing pressure and control of insect (mainly grasshopper and mormon cricket) infestations serious damage to the vegetative resource can be avoided.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) is the responsible Federal agency in charge of control measures. It is the policy of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to cooperate on range pest control programs, when lands under jurisdiction of Interior are involved.

Certain insect populations, in particular grasshoppers, have reached economically serious levels in portions of the planning area, threatening destruction of agricultural crops. The grasshoppers hatch on rangelands and move onto adjacent droplands if forage runs short.

Through proper documentation (EA, EISs) and coordination efforts, other resource values will be noted and protected.

Control of insects would improve range condition, trend, and permit livestock to utilize forage that would normally be destroyed.

It is assumed that the social and economic effects would be positive.

Support Needs:

Coordination with APHIS and State Office personnel.

MFR II

Multiple Use Recommendation

Control economic insect infestations on public lands when proper range management procedures are ineffective, impractical, or unfeasible.

Rationale

Through control of economic insect infestations followed by proper adjustments of grazing pressures serious damage to the vegetative resource can be avoided.

The environmental analysis process allows for proper mitigation or identification of areas that should be avoided during control procedures. By adherence to stipulations developed in the EA process adverse impacts can be avoided or mitigated.

Economic insect infestation is defined by the U.S.D.A. APHIS as follows:

GRASSHOPPERS - eight or more per square yard.

For crickets, the basis is behavior patterns. Three phases of behavior are noted.

- a. solitary phase (crickets are single)
- b. intermediate phase - crickets are in high populations but in small areas. Normally greater than 4/yd<sup>2</sup>.
- c. gregarious phase - crickets land together and begin to march or migrate in large numbers normally numbers are greater than 4/yd<sup>2</sup>.

b and c above are considered economic infestation of crickets.

MFR III

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Sonoma-Gerlach	
Activity	
Range Management 1.7	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation: EM 1.7

MFP I

Provide an adequate quantity and quality of water sufficient to maintain livestock requirements by:

1. Following appropriate procedures and policies to notify the State Water Engineer of livestock requirements or through filings to the State Water Engineer where appropriate or by;
2. Purchase of adjudicated water rights where necessary.

Rationale:

Adequate quantity and quality of livestock water is a limiting factor in most allotments within the MFP area.

It is assumed that the demand by other resource uses for water will increase.

Adequate quantity and quality of water is needed for maintenance of animals, implementation of grazing systems, proper distribution of livestock, and for emergency purposes such as drought.

Adequate quantity and quality of water would enhance range condition and trend for reasons stated in the above paragraph.

No other alternatives were considered.

The recommendation would have both negative and positive social and economic effects. The licensee is, of course, highly concerned that livestock have adequate quantity and quality of water. Conversely, the licensee and other Nevadans may react to the recommendation as encroachment upon State's rights. Other resource users, such as wildlife and recreation, would probably react favorably to the recommendation.

Without water, the economics of grazing public land is very negative.

Support Needs:

1. District Water Rights Specialist

RM 1.7

Multiple Use Recommendation

MFP 11  
Appropriate sufficient water on public lands through permit, adjudication or purchase processes as provided by Federal and State Water Law or other appropriate direction to support the uses of the public lands for wild horses, wildlife, aquatic habitat, livestock and recreation.

Rationale

Water is an integral and necessary part of all resource activity requirements.

The legal right to water must be pursued in order to gain legal title to the needed quantities.

Demands upon existing waters on public lands will increase. The Bureau must insure that needed quantities of acquired by appropriation, purchase or by other appropriate direction.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Acquire sufficient water on public lands through permit, adjudication, or purchase processes as provided by Federal and State Water Law or other appropriate direction to support the uses of the public lands for wild horses, wildlife, aquatic habitat, livestock, and recreation.

Rationale

Water is an integral and necessary part of all resource activity requirements.

The legal right to water must be pursued in order to gain legal title to the needed quantities.

Demands upon existing waters on public lands will increase. The Bureau must insure that needed quantities of acquired by appropriation, purchase, or by other appropriate direction.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management
Objective Number	RM-2

Objective: RM-2

Increase existing allocatable livestock forage by artificial methods from 140,583 AUMs identified as suitable for livestock to 229,129 AUMs (88,546 AUM increase) within 5-7 years.

Rationale:

The Bureau is directed by law (The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended and supplemented by FLPMA Section 401(b)(1)) to arrest continuing deterioration by installation of additional range improvements. FLPMA further defines range improvements, rehabilitation and protection as including all forms of rangeland betterment including, but not limited to, seeding and reseeding, fence construction, weed control, water development, and fish and wildlife habitat enhancement as the respective Secretary may direct after consultation with user representatives.

Section 401(b)(1) of FLPMA further established a range betterment fund to be used in "all forms of rangeland betterment" as defined above.

In addition the Public Rangeland and Improvement Act of 1978 provided for additional Congressional appropriations to correct unsatisfactory conditions on the public rangelands by an intensive public rangeland maintenance, management and improvement program. Section 2(b)(2) of PRIA states that national policy and commitment to manage, maintain and improve the condition of the public rangeland.

The Bureau is further committed by policy to manage efficiently the basic resource of the public rangelands to improve and maintain their productive capability to serve the full range of natural, social, economic, and environmental needs. (Managing the Public Rangelands - November 1, 1979). This same document identified the following objective in implementation of the BLM's rangeland policy:

"Increase forage supplies for livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife as a principal output of improvement of the rangeland ecosystem." and to "Improve the condition of rangeland vegetation and maintain it at desired levels . . ."

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management
Objective Number	RM-2

Objective: RM-2 (continued)

The Sonoma-Gerlach URAs identified that a substantial portion of the resource area is in a less than satisfactory ecological condition.

Much of the vegetation occurring on the area in poor and fair ecological condition, will not be able to naturally increase in ecological condition; therefore, artificial methods must be used if reversals in these conditions are to be achieved.

Increased available forage for livestock would minimize the possibility of certain operators taking substantial livestock reductions and could mean the difference between an economic operation and going out of business.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach	
Activity	Range Management 2.1	
Overlay Reference		
Step 1	2.1	Step 3

Recommendation: RM 2.1

**MFP I** Increase existing allocatable forage by artificial methods by:

1. Seeding or reseeding 266,106 acres
2. Controlling brush composition on approximately 21,290 acres
3. Development of water sources

The brush control and seeded areas will be rested for two full growing seasons after treatment or until seedlings are firmly established.

After substantiated by studies, allocate all increases of forage to livestock.

Rationale:

It is assumed that without remedial action livestock grazing would be reduced on most allotments.

This recommendation is within the policy and legal constraints as identified in the objective rationale.

See attached Table RM 2.1 for the quantified total of AUM increase expected for each allotment.

Many vegetative types are in a poor ecological condition that improvement in available forage on these type cannot be accomplished by natural means.

Several seedings were identified as being in such poor condition as to require reseeding as the only choice to a monotypic halogeton stand.

The URAs identified 286,773 acres with an estimated stocking rate of 12,856 AUMs as unsuitable to livestock because of the lack of a reliable water source. See Table RM 1.4 for a specific breakdown of AUMs available to livestock if additional waters are developed in these areas.

Positive economic and social effects are to be expected upon adoption of this recommendation.

Support Needs:

1. Soils survey and site write-up inventory
2. Prescribed burning plans
3. Fire management
4. Operations

*Increase forage by artificial methods.*  
*Fire Rehab*

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Table RM 2.1  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED VEGETATIVE TREATMENT RM 2.1

Allotment	Treatment Method (Ref. #)	Acres to Be Treated	Anticipated Increase in AUMs	Estimated Cost (\$)		Current Production (Acres/AUM)	Estimated Production (Acres/AUM)
				Total	Per Acre		
Blue Wing	Plow & Seed (1)	15,296	4,621	917,760	60	199	32
	Plow & Seed (2)	2,041	663	170,460	60	257	10
	Plow & Seed (3)	16,892	5,049	1,013,520	60	201	29
	Plow & Seed (4)	3,580	1,030	214,800	60	209	22
	Plow & Seed (5)	17,554	5,015	1,053,240	60	210	21
	Plow & Seed (6)	58,110	17,495	3,486,600	60	199	31
	Plow & Seed (7)	6,072	1,879	364,320	60	194	42
Buffalo Hills	Plow & Seed (1)	1,557	459	93,420	60	204	26
	Reseed (2)	2,608	739	78,240	30	106	20
	Seed (3)	1,751	425	52,530	30	124	11
	Plow & Seed (4)	10,859	2,633	651,540	60	247	11
	Plow & Seed (5)	1,674	470	100,440	60	214	19
	Seed (6)	1,518	289	45,540	30	158	7
	Plow & Seed (7)	7,590	1,946	455,400	60	234	13
	Plow & Seed (8)	4,943	1,401	296,580	60	212	20
Clear Creek	Plow & Seed (1)	700	183	42,000	60	230	14
	Plow & Seed (2)	9,964	2,657	597,840	60	225	15
Coal Canyon-Foker	Plow & Seed	4,865	1,401	291,900	60	208	22
	Plow & Seed	4,204	1,233	252,240	60	205	25
Diamond-S	Plow & Seed (1)	1,920	527	115,200	60	219	17
	Reseed (2)	3,036	1,012	91,080	30	90	0
Dolly Hayden	Reseed (1)	2,102	539	63,060	30	117	13
	Plow & Seed (2)	960	280	57,600	60	206	24

Table RM 2.1 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED VEGETATIVE TREATMENT RM 2.1

Allotment	Treatment Method (Ref. #)	Acres to Be Treated	Anticipated Increase in AUMs	Estimated Cost (\$)			Current Production (Acres/AUM)	Estimated Production (Acres/AUM)
				Total	Per Acre	Per AUM		
Gold Banks	Plow & Seed	6,539	1,744	392,340	60	225	15	3
Harmony	Plow & Seed (1)	934	292	56,040	60	192	50	3
	Plow & Seed (2)	2,180	559	130,800	60	234	13	3
Leadville	Plow & Seed (1)	3,814	1,080	228,840	60	212	20	3
	Plow & Seed (2)	2,880	829	172,800	60	208	22	3
Majuba	Plow & Seed (1)	5,626	1,667	337,560	60	202	27	3
	Plow & Seed (2)	2,257	627	135,420	60	216	18	3
Melody	Reseed	3,737	623	112,110	30	180	6	3
North Buffalo	Plow & Seed (1)	2,919	801	175,140	60	219	17	3
	Plow & Seed (2)	2,257	501	135,420	60	270	9	3
Prince Royal	Plow & Seed	2,491	759	149,460	60	197	35	3
Rock Creek	Plow & Seed (1)	2,884	791	173,040	60	219	17	3
	Seed (2)	1,479	345	44,370	30	129	10	3
Rodeo Creek	Plow & Seed (1)	1,012	313	60,720	60	194	42	3
	Plow & Seed (2)	1,207	363	72,420	60	200	31	3
Rye Patch	Plow & Seed	6,072	1,748	364,320	60	208	22	3
Seven Troughs	Plow & Seed (1)	640	184	38,400	60	209	22	3
	Plow & Seed (2)	2,608	745	156,480	60	210	21	3

Table RM 2.1 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

RECOMMENDED VEGETATIVE TREATMENT RM 2.1

Allotment	Treatment Method (Ref. #)	Acres to Be Treated	Anticipated Increase in AUMs	Estimated Cost (\$)		Current Production (Acres/AUM)	Estimated Production (Acres/AUM)
				Total	Per Acre		
Soldier Meadows	Sagebrush control (1)	15,024	477	240,384	16	504	9
	Sagebrush control (2)	6,266	268	100,256	16	374	10
	Plow & Seed (3)	6,150	1,537	369,000	60	240	12
	Plow & Seed (4)	3,853	899	231,180	60	257	10
Sonoma	Plow & Seed	6,228	1,631	373,680	60	229	14
South Buffalo	Reseed (1)	1,790	398	53,700	30	135	9
	Plow & Seed (2)	5,254	1,459	315,240	60	216	18
	Plow & Seed (3)	1,479	415	88,740	60	214	19
Star Peak	Plow & Seed (1)	856	244	51,360	60	210	21
	Plow & Seed (2)	740	220	44,400	60	202	27
	Plow & Seed (3)	5,137	1,514	308,220	60	204	26
Thomas Creek	Plow & Seed	1,280	366	76,800	60	210	21
White Horse	Plow & Seed	1,207	345	72,420	60	210	21
TOTAL		287,396	75,690	15,766,379			3

Sonoma-Gerlach MFP III  
Range Management 2.1

As Currently Written:

Increase existing forage by artificial methods wherever appropriate:

1. The potential for land treatment has been identified on approximately 245,000 acres. Land treatment is defined as vegetation manipulation (i.e., plowing, burning, spraying, etc., and/or seeding).
2. Development of water sources.

All vegetation manipulations in sage grouse habitat will be done in accordance with the guidance supplied by the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Treated areas will be rested for two full grazing seasons after treatment or until seedlings are firmly established.

After substantiated by studies, allocate increases in forage among wildlife and livestock.

Vegetation manipulations will be approved in accordance with the rangeland management policy and only on those areas where management objectives cannot be met through proper grazing management practices.

Change To:

The decision will remain as originally written.

Rationale:

Many vegetative types in the resource area are in poor ecological condition and improvement on these types cannot be accomplished by natural means. It is the mandate of the Bureau under FLPMA, PRIA, and the Taylor Grazing Act to arrest deteriorating range conditions by the installation of range improvements. The FLPMA specifically directs the range betterment funds be expended for on-the-ground rehabilitation, protection, and improvement of rangelands which includes, but is not limited to, seeding, reseeding, fence construction, weed control, water development, and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat.

The above decision allows for seeding, spraying, on areas where natural means of improving vegetative condition is not feasible. This will be accomplished by programming these projects through the Bureau's budgeting process whenever it is appropriate to do so.

Range betterment funds are distributed to District Offices in proportion to grazing fees collected by each District. State Directors have latitude to redistribute portions of the range betterment funds in consideration of prior commitments, resource conditions, and investment economy. No limits are set on the percentage of funds that may be redistributed each year, but the amounts received by an office during a 5-year period must equal that District's entitlement for the five years. It is reasonable to assume that the funding will be available to do a certain number of land treatment projects each year.

The resource area has set up a monitoring plan based on the priorities established through the selective management criteria. The Bureau is actively seeking funding for range improvements and assistance with the monitoring program from private sources. The Bureau's range policy is to improve range condition and monitor. This is inconsistent with the protestants request.

Persons-Organizations That Have Protested This Decision:

Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club, Reno, Nevada.

RM 2.1

Multiple Use Recommendation

MFP II

Increase existing forage by artificial methods wherever appropriate:

1. The potential for land treatment has been identified on approximately 245,000 acres. Land treatment is defined as vegetation manipulation (i.e., plowing, burning, spraying, etc., and/or seeding).
2. Development of water sources.

All vegetation manipulations in sage grouse habitat will be done in accordance with the guidance supplied by the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Treated areas will be rested for two full grazing seasons after treatment or until seedlings are firmly established.

After substantiated by studies, allocate increases and livestock.

Vegetation manipulations will be approved in accord management policy and only on those areas where man cannot be met through proper grazing management pra

Rationale

Many vegetative types are in a poor ecological cond. these types cannot be accomplished by natural means

PRIA, FLPMA, and Taylor Grazing Act have directed the Bureau to "arrest" continuing deterioration by installation of range improvements.

Increased forage (estimated at 69,612 AUMs) made available by these means would help to minimize the adjustments required on most allotments. See Table #RM 2.1 MFP II.

The URAs identified acres with an estimated stocking rate of 12,408 AUMs as unsuitable to livestock because of the lack of a reliable water source. See Table #RM 1.4 MFP II.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

MFP III

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

RM 2.1 (continued)

Leadville Allotment:

640 acres deleted around the George Lund Petrified Forest (identified as Plow and Seed #2).

Rock Creek Allotment:

1,600 acres of new seeding out as identified sage grouse strutting ground is in the proposed seeding area.

Soldier Meadows Allotment:

22,290 acres of sagebrush control deleted as current production in this area is rated at 9 acres/AUM and treated production estimated at 7 acres/AUM. Economic cost of expected increase of 745 AUMs is \$340,640.00 or \$457/AUM.

ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN FORAGE PRODUCTION (ADMs) THROUGH MANAGEMENT

Allotment	Reduction in Grazing Intensity (21%) 1/	Implementation of Grazing Systems (5%) 2/	Unsuitable with Potential to be Suitable 3/		Increase	Suitable by Recompiled Survey	Combined Total	
			Water	Production				
Blue Wing	4,035	961	6,158	1,006	134	12,294	19,215	31,509
Buffalo Hills	4,650	1,107	0	816	0	6,573	22,141	28,714
Calico	358	85	0	0	0	443	1,706	2,149
Clear Creek	505	120	330	120	0	1,075	2,405	3,480
Coal-Canyon-Poker	602	0	495	266	2	1,365	2,868	4,233
Cottonwood Canyon	0	0	34	0	0	34	155	189
Coyote	692	0	0	2	0	694	3,294	3,988
Desert Queen	153	36	883	500	251	1,823	730	2,553
Diamond S	141	0	0	0	0	141	674	815
Dolly Haden	0	196	215	0	6	417	3,935	4,352
Goldbanks	317	0	241	0	0	558	1,312	2,070
Harmony	48	11	0	8	0	67	233	300
Humboldt House	90	21	0	183	0	294	433	727
Humboldt Sink	62	14	0	61	8	145	297	442
Jersey Valley	115	0	69	883	0	1,067	552	1,619
Klondike	305	72	18	56	66	517	1,456	1,973
Leadville	543	0	0	41	0	584	2,584	3,168
Locking	10	2	0	66	0	78	48	126
Luba	0	166	379	67	73	685	3,312	3,997
Melody	129	30	0	0	0	159	616	775
North Buffalo	344	82	1,219	0	0	1,643	1,640	3,285
Pleasant Valley	1,803	429	224	122	8	2,586	8,586	11,172
Pole Canyon	42	10	196	0	0	284	200	488
Prince Royal	31	7	0	146	0	184	150	334
Pumpernickel	1,256	299	199	42	0	1,796	6,075	7,871
Ragged Top	0	0	269	620	410	1,299	416	1,715
Rawhide	514	122	0	34	0	670	2,451	3,121
Rochester	500	119	393	943	101	2,056	2,383	4,439
Rock Creek	366	0	0	0	0	366	1,744	2,110
Rodeo Creek	1,163	276	380	20	0	1,839	5,539	7,378
Rye Patch	297	0	0	0	0	297	1,415	1,712
Seven Troughs	817	194	521	3,998	692	6,222	3,895	10,117
Soldier Meadows	0	1,262	0	0	0	1,262	25,238	26,500
Sonoma	165	0	0	47	0	212	787	999
South Buffalo	1,572	0	189	377	0	2,134	7,484	9,618
Star Peak	551	131	0	14	18	714	2,624	3,338
Thomas Creek	84	20	0	0	0	104	401	505
White Horse	223	53	0	0	0	276	1,066	1,342
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22,483</b>	<b>5,825</b>	<b>12,408</b>	<b>10,438</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>52,923</b>	<b>140,260</b>	<b>193,183</b>

Improvement through reduction in grazing intensity will result from reduction in livestock use to the estimated carrying capacity of the allotment.

2/ Improvement through management systems would be accomplished by implementing rest-rotation grazing systems.

3/ Areas that are currently unsuitable for grazing (application of suitability criteria) that will become suitable through management (grazing systems and reductions in grazing intensity) and development of water.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Increase existing forage by artificial methods wherever appropriate:

1. The potential for land treatment has been identified on approximately 245,000 acres. Land treatment is defined as vegetation manipulation (i.e., plowing, burning, spraying, etc., and/or seeding).
2. Development of water sources.

All vegetation manipulations in sage grouse habitat will be done in accordance with the guidance supplied by the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Treated areas will be rested for two full grazing seasons after treatment or until seedlings are firmly established.

After substantiated by studies, allocate increases in forage among wildlife and livestock.

Vegetation manipulations will be approved in accordance with the rangeland management policy and only on those areas where management objectives cannot be met through proper grazing management practices.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Increase existing forage by artificial methods by:

1. Seeding or reseeding 244,864 acres
2. Development of water sources

All vegetation manipulations in sage grouse habiyitat will be done in accordance with the guidance supplied by the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Brush control and seeded areas will be rested for two full grazing seasons after treatment or until seedlings are firmly established.

After substantiated by studies, allocate increases in forage among wildlife and livestock.

Rationale

Many vegetative types are in a poor ecological condition and improvement on these types cannot be accomplished by natural means.

PRIA, FLPMA, and Taylor Grazing Act have directed the Bureau to "arrest" continuing deterioration by installation of range improvements.

Increased forage (estimated at 69,612 AUMs) made available by these means would help to minimize the adjustments required on most allotments. See Table #RM 2.1 MFP II.

The URAs identified acres with an estimated stocking rate of 12,408 AUMs as unsuitable to livestock because of the lack of a reliable water source. See Table #RM 1.4 MFP II.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management
Objective Number	RM-3

Objective: RM-3

Improve range administrative efficiency.

Rationale:

The Bureau is committed by policy (Instruction Memorandum 75-407), and directed by law (The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended and supplemented), to manage the public lands in the most efficient manner consistent with the national interest.

Administrative procedures would be greatly improved, and the cost of implementing programs reduced by streamlining and improving allotment supervision methods.

Allotment supervision would be improved by improving range studies and land disposals, or exchanges.

Through enactment of new laws and implementation of new policies, it is becoming increasingly more difficult to spend the necessary time in "on the ground" supervision activities. The District spends considerable time in writing about management, but not in the actual execution. It is assumed this "paper work" will continue.

There are certain weaknesses in the administrative procedures that cause common infractions in grazing use. There are a number of administrative procedures available that would strengthen administrative procedures. These items are listed below.

There is no conflict between URA and MFP data.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Range Management 3.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	3.1
Step 3	

Recommendation: RM 3.1

MFP I

Through land disposal or exchange transfer the title of the public lands shown on Table RM 3.1 to private individuals.

Rationale:

Isolated public land parcels often are difficult if not impossible to administer an effective grazing program on.

The result of such situation becomes a no man's land with near impossible or difficult supervision problems from a grazing administration standpoint.

Earlier adjudications included these scattered public lands in allotment boundaries and portions of an operator's active qualification were based upon the carrying capacity of such tracts.

FLPMA, Section 203(a) authorizes the Secretary to sale public lands if "such tract because of its location or other characteristics is difficult and uneconomic to manage as part of the public lands . . . ."

As the URAs have identified in effect, we have little or no control from a grazing standpoint on these parcels.

The blocking up of land ownership patterns would have a positive social impact from both a public and a private standpoint.

Support Needs:

1. Lands
2. Appraisal

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed  
(Instructions on reverse)

Table RM 3.1  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

SONOMA PLANNING UNIT

THOMAS CREEK

T. 35 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 4, W1/2, S1/2 SE1/4  
Sec. 6, S1/2  
Sec. 8, All Public Portions  
Sec. 10, All Public Portions  
Sec. 16, W1/2  
Sec. 20, All Public Portions  
Sec. 32, NW1/4

DOLLY HAYDEN ALLOTMENT

T. 34 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 2, W1/2  
Sec. 12, All Public Portions  
Sec. 14, All Public Portions  
Sec. 24, N1/2

T. 35 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 26, S1/2 S1/2

T. 35 N., R. 37 E., Sec. 30, SE1/4 SE1/4  
Sec. 16, All Public Portions  
Sec. 10, All Public Portions

SONOMA

T. 34 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 6, Portions West of County Road  
Sec. 20, All Public Portions

T. 33 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 4, Public Portions West of County Road

HUMBOLDT VALLEY ALLOTMENT (Adm. Paradise-Denio)

T. 35 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 12, All Public Portions  
Sec. 14, All Public Portions  
Sec. 20, All Public Portions  
Sec. 22, All Public Portions  
Sec. 24, All Public Portions  
Sec. 28, All Public Portions  
Sec. 32, All Public Portions

Table RM 3.1 (continued)  
Sonoma-Gerlach MFP

SONOMA PLANNING UNIT

HUMBOLDT VALLEY ALLOTMENT (continued)

- T. 34 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 6, All Public Portions  
Sec. 16, Public Portions West of Freeway
- T. 34 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 24, Public Portions West of Freeway
- T. 34 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 12, All Public Portions  
Sec. 10, All Public Portions  
Sec. 14, All Public Portions  
Sec. 22, All Public Portions  
Sec. 28, All Public Portions  
Sec. 34, All Public Portions
- T. 33 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 2, Public Portions West of Freeway  
Sec. 4, All Public Portions  
Sec. 16, All Public Portions  
Sec. 20, All Public Portions  
Sec. 28, All Public Portions
- T. 33 N., R. 34 E., Sec. 36, All Public Portions  
Sec. 25, SEL/4 SEL/4  
Sec. 30, All Public Portions
- T. 32 N., R. 34 E., Sec. 5, All Public Portions

MAJUBA ALLOTMENT

- T. 32 N., R. 33 E., Sec. 1, All Public Portions

Multiple Use Recommendation

Through land disposal or exchange transfer the title of the public lands shown below:

T. 35 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 16 W1/2	320 acres
Sec. 20,	640 acres
T. 35 N., R. 37 E., Sec. 30, SE1/4SE1/4	40 acres
T. 35 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 24, N1/2	320 acres
Sec. 26, S1/2S1/2	160 acres
Sec. 28,	640 acres
Sec. 32,	640 acres
T. 34 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 6, portion west of county road	90 acres
Sec. 20, W1/2, N1/2SE1/4, S1/2NE1/4, NW1/4NE1/4	520 acres
T. 34 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 2, W1/2	320 acres
Sec. 6,	640 acres
Sec. 12, N1/2, SE1/4, SE1/4SW1/4, N1/2SW1/4	600 acres
Sec. 14	640 acres
Sec. 24, N1/2	320 acres
T. 34 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 12, W1/2	320 acres
Sec. 14, W1/2	320 acres
<del>Sec. 16, All public portions west of freeway</del>	<del>100 acres</del>
Sec. 22, W1/2W1/2, NE1/4NE1/4, SE1/4SE1/4	240 acres
Sec. 24, Public portions west of freeway	160 acres
Sec. 34, SE1/4SW1/4, SW1/4SE1/4	80 acres
T. 33 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 4, public portions west of county road	100 acres
T. 33 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 2, public portions west of freeway	320 acres
T. 33 N., R. 34 E., Sec. 30, N1/2N1/2	320 acres
T. 32 N., R. 34 E., Sec. 5, E1/2, N1/2NW1/4, S1/2SW1/4	<u>480 acres</u>

TOTAL 8,170 acres

WFP II

Sec. 13  
All public portions  
west of freeway  
100 acres

Typo  
3-12-81  
SMT

Sonoma-Gerlach MFP III  
Range Management 3.1

As Currently Written:

Through land disposal or exchange transfer the title of the public lands shown below:

T. 35 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 16 W1/2	320 acres
Sec. 20,	640 acres
T. 35 N., R. 37 E., Sec. 30, SE1/4SE1/4	40 acres
T. 35 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 24, N1/2	320 acres
Sec. 26, S1/2S1/2	160 acres
Sec. 28,	640 acres
Sec. 32,	640 acres
T. 34 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 6, portion west of county road	90 acres
Sec. 20, W1/2, N1/2SE1/4, S1/2NE1/4, NW1/4NE1/4	520 acres
T. 34 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 2, W1/2	320 acres
Sec. 6,	640 acres
Sec. 12, N1/2, SE1/4, SE1/4SW1/4, N1/2SW1/4	600 acres
Sec. 14	640 acres
Sec. 24, N1/2	320 acres
T. 34 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 12, W1/2	320 acres
Sec. 14, W1/2	320 acres
Sec. 16, All public portions west of freeway	100 acres
Sec. 22, W1/2W1/2, NE1/4NE1/4, SE1/4SEW1/4	240 acres
Sec. 24, Public portions west of freeway	160 acres
Sec. 34, SE1/4SW1/4, SW1/4SE1/4	80 acres
T. 33 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 4, public portions west of county road	100 acres
T. 33 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 2, public portions west of freeway	320 acres
T. 33 N., R. 34 E., Sec. 30, N1/2N1/2	320 acres
T. 32 N., R. 34 E., Sec. 5, E1/2, N1/2NW1/4, S1/2SW1/4	<u>480 acres</u>

TOTAL 8,170 acres