

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Hickey
Vice Chairman Price
Mr. Fielding
Mr. Mann
Mr. Tanner

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Mr. Chaney
Mr. Dini
Mr. Getto
Mr. Marvel

OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT

Senator Glaser
Senator Jacobsen
Mr. Rhoads
Mr. Glover

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Robert Stewart, Chief of Public Affairs
John Boyles, Manager of Las Vegas District
Ed Ciliberti, Public Affairs Officer, Las Vegas
Phil Range, Manager, Caliente-Virgin Valley Resource Area
William Calkins, Chief, Branch of Planning

Chairman Hickey called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. for the purpose of hearing a presentation by the Bureau of Land Management on the Caliente Management Framework Plan. Mr. Stewart introduced BLM staff present to the audience.

Mr. Boyles was the first speaker and a copy of his statement is attached as Exhibit A. Second was Mr. Calkins, and his statement is attached as Exhibit B. Mr. Range made the presentation of the planning program for Caliente. A copy of Mr. Range's presentation is attached as Exhibit C. During the presentation, the committee was shown slides covering various items discussed by Mr. Range.

A copy of the proposed Nevada Planning and Grazing ES Schedule is attached as Exhibit D.

Following the presentation, Chairman Hickey opened the meeting to a question and answer session.

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: You are going out into the public and make this particular presentation?

MR. BOYLES: This identical briefing has been presented yesterday to the Congressional Delegation in Las Vegas, today to the Governor's Planning Coordination Office, and here this evening. Tomorrow we will present the briefing to the Lincoln County Conservation District in Caliente.

We have sent individual letters out to all of the operators in the planning unit specifying the effect of this proposal on their individual allotment and we will be scheduling individual meetings with each of the operators on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of next week. Beyond that there will be public work shops open to the public, both in Caliente and in Las Vegas.

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: As the process goes down, what about the protest on some of the details? How will you accept that--in writing or public protest?

MR. BOYLES: If anyone would care to make comments on the proposals, we would prefer to have them in writing if we could get them. At the workshops, of course, we'll try to explain in detail and try to answer their questions. If they want to formulate a comment from there, that's fine. This will take us through the M-F-P 2 public involvement stage. There will be a stage of public involvement again which will be a public hearing, but that will come in the environmental statement phase. Then, the decisions regarding this proposal will be made after the environmental impact statement.

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: What range area will you select next?

MR. BOYLES: After the Caliente we have started on an inventory now of Clark County.

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: You're working on the southern part of the state versus the eastern?

MR. BOYLES: No, Las Vegas is one of six districts. We are working all of the Las Vegas districts simultaneously. The other five districts are also working portions of their districts. Tonopah area and Battle Mountain district will be the next after Caliente.

MR. RHOADS: You made a statement that because of your study you found some areas of wildlife was driven off by man, something that man did. What do you mean by that? Do you have statements to back that up? It's a pretty broad statement.

MR. RANGE: Well, the biggest problem, and a lot of this information has come from Fish and Game, but like in bighorn

sheep areas, domestic sheep also grazed there in the past. From what I understand, disease problems carry from one species to another, and that has had an impact on it. Other than that, livestock pressures have helped force deer out.

MR. RHOADS: What about wild horses?

MR. RANGE: Wild horses, you bet.

MR. RHOADS: It seemed like you particularly pointed out that it was man and livestock that did it and I didn't see anything about wild horses in there.

MR. BOYLES: I think we acknowledged that, Dean, when we said there were several operators that weren't using their allotments by the fact they were being overrun by wild horses.

MR. RHOADS: Are you taking the information Fish and Game is supplying you as the gospel?

MR. RANGE: We're taking it as reasonable numbers. As you can see here, we couldn't satisfy all the reasonable numbers they gave us. What we're trying to get out of the public is some sort of a mix between what is reasonably owned wild life and wild horses and burros.

MR. TANNER: What is the purpose in keeping the wild horses?

MR. RANGE: I'm afraid the Bureau is mandated by Congress to provide for some wild horses as a symbol of our national heritage. It becomes a question of how many. There are no specified numbers.

SENATOR GLASER: Did I understand you to say that you are cutting off at the pockets six ranchers in the Lincoln County area?

MR. RANGE: There are six allotments that will not have grazing on them, correct. Three of them that have not been used for a number of years; two of them are being grazed at the present time but because of highway problems and future highway problems, we think we're going to have a public safety problem. We think we're talking about 14 to 20 miles of fence in order to fence off the highway. There's only 43 AUMs in one, and I don't think there are any AUMs as far as our new survey goes in the second allotment. But there is grazing occurring in them right now, yes.

MR. RHOADS: You mentioned in '77, I guess, I didn't write all your figures down, but I think you mentioned that there are 78,000 active AUMs out there in '77.

MR. RANGE: That's what is being grazed at the present time.

MR. RHOADS: How come you picked that one year? I'm sure in this area some years you have tremendous rain and other years you don't have any. I am sure in some years it could have come up to 118,000.

MR. RANGE: No, that's fairly stable. There's a fluctuation, you know. But in talking to our economists who has played with these figures over and over in preparation for the environmental statement, he says there is very little fluctuation on a year around basis. There were 20 allotments that had not been grazed and the bulk of those 20 have not been grazed since I've been in the resource area. I've been in there 4 years.

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: I have a question which has to do with your allotment on agricultural land and it isn't presently being used. Is that correct? You're talking about reserving that for growing?

MR. RANGE: The 3000 acres? This was land that was identified--

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: It could be used for growing?

MR. RANGE: Right.

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: You're withdrawing that from grazing?

MR. RANGE: No, at the present time we'll continue to graze it.

MR. BOYLES: We're recommending disposal of that for agricultural purposes.

MR. RANGE: If it has the water--

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: Into a growing field rather than grazing?

MR. RANGE: Right. Our preliminary reports show that the soils are--and we think water is available, but until we get down and really inventory the situation we won't know. The first thing will be the state water engineer--what he shows as waters in the basis and how much he could go with.

MR. MATT BENSON, CARSON VALLEY: Somewhere in your chart was some statistics on the employees in industry and government, farming, etc. I remember there was something like 130 or 160 government people at the beginning of the survey and now there are 380. How many people does the BLM have working in this unit right now?

MR. RANGE: There are 15 of us in the resource area. Total for the district is about 65. There are only 2 that live in Caliente.

MR. BENSON: I'm talking about working in the area that you are talking about.

MR. RANGE: Fourteen others besides myself plus--

MR. JIM WRIGHT: On your proposed rules, will this hold up any of the water developments so that a man who has an allotment out there--would that hold up his water developments for several years?

MR. BOYLES: I think we'd have to look at that on a case by case basis, Jim. I can't give you a blanket answer. It depends on the type of development that is being proposed. At the present time we have to analyze it and we have to be able to say that the project that is proposed does not substantially alter the wilderness characteristics.

MR. PAUL BOTTARI, NEVADA CATTLEMEN'S ASSN: You refer to being able to return AUMs once there is water developed. What time period are we in there? When can these developments start appearing?

MR. BOYLES (?): Well, I think there is something we need to say that maybe wasn't brought out in our presentation. What Phil is proposing to allocate forage from are Bureau authorized waters. We recognize that there may be water on a public range right now which the Bureau has no record of and we have not allocated AUMs around those particular waters. If the individual comes in and files the necessary paper and so forth, there is no reason why the allocation of AUMs around those waters, once they are allocated, can't begin immediately.

MR. RANGE: I have a man in the field right now working with a number of livestock operators just trying to get ahead of the game here so that we can have this figured out by the end of the year. There are a number of allotments, and a lot of those AUMs will move from one column to another shortly.

MR. RHOADS: You mentioned that you could increase the AUMs almost over 25,000 with water belt. But you didn't go into any range improvements for other types of improvements on the ground. How many AUMs do you think you can increase that or, after this is final, is that it?

MR. RANGE: The other thing we did mention was that there is something like almost 400,000 acres that have potential for revegetation.

MR. RHOADS: Do you have plans mapped out on that?

MR. RANGE: When we went through the planning system, we worked from published soil surveys and off of that we worked

from soil types and slopes and those soil types that we could go in and reseed. It had all the indications that reseeding would be possible.

MR. RHOADS: How many AUMs?

MR. RANGE: There is no way you can determine that. We were working strictly from maps and soil information. Until you get out in the field and actually find out that you have some drainages and other--

MR. BOYLES: This plan is not that detailed. There is another level of activity that is planning--

MR. RHOADS: Then 99,000 AUMs isn't the top figure?

MR. BOYLES: No.

MR. RANGE: One thing that was mentioned was that we would be going into allotment management plans. When we do allotment management plans, then it gets down to details on specific range improvements--the fencing, the water developments, where those developments should go. We'll also be talking about the chaining, seedings, burnings, whatever it would take to balance out pastures or increase AUMs.

MR. RHOADS: You realize you have two big problems. Number one, you can't get rid of the horses. You've been trying to manage them now for several years and you've been very unsuccessful. They're increasing. You said 10 percent, but a lot of authorities say 20 percent, so that's a problem you can't whip. Your second item is on these water developments which is going to cost thousands of dollars. There's no money available--or not much money--and how can you accomplish any of these things other than reduction of livestock.

MR. BOYLES: Well, the two possible sources of money, of course, is the percentage that comes back from the grazing fee which should be used in the counties the fee is derived from. The other possibility would be funds that may be appropriated from Congress. An example of that would be the Roncalio bill, although it has been authorized there has been no money appropriated.

MR. RHOADS: President Carter stopped that.

CHAIRMAN HICKEY: I think that's a point well taken. You're coming and asking for reductions, yet you say that you don't have the funds to provide controls on the wild horses. You don't have the funds to provide better forage out on grazing. Is that correct?

MR. BOYLES: To some extent, I'd agree.

SENATOR GLASER: Supposing the money is forthcoming from the Roncalio bill, how are you going to interface that range improvement program that the Congress has mandated over the next 20 years with this MFP program? How are you going to pump money into resource improvement, or have you even talked about that?

MR. BOYLES: What he has identified in this plan is several different--well, first of all, he has identified some vegetative treatment. Secondly, the plan recommends different intensities of livestock grazing. A & P areas in the plan would call for improvements. This was an activity plan on beyond this. We're going to have to determine how many wild life we want out there, how many wild horses we want, how many livestock. We've got to get that into balance with the capability of the resources.

SENATOR GLASER: I understand that, but what are you going to do with that money when it is forthcoming?

MR. BOYLES: The money would be used to build facilities or develop water or vegetative treatment.

SENATOR GLASER: I understand the Congress appropriated \$300 million over the next 20 years. Now what does the BLM intend to do with that?

MR. BOYLES: This particular area we're talking about, Las Vegas District, that would go into fences, water developments, vegetative treatments and this type of thing.

SENATOR GLASER: Have you considered plowing and seeding?

MR. RANGE: That is the vegetative manipulation we're talking about--400,000 acres of it.

MR. BOTTARI: How soon can you start using those funds to put improvements on there? Now if you've got an MFP process before the ES comes out, you can't really start putting in new improvements, can you? You can develop on your improvements already on ground, but you can't start putting new improvements on the ground, can you?

MR. BOYLES: Two points, Paul. First of all the funds are not available. It has been authorized by Congress but not appropriated. So, actually we have no funds. The second point is that the Environmental Statement takes this allocation into account. It is to be filed with the Council on Environmental Quality by September 30. Our decision relative to this type of resource proposal or modification, depending on the comments, may come as early as January of 1980.



CONNIE SIMPKINS: I'm a land owner and a lifetime resident of the area. I'm interested in knowing where the 3800 acres you're going to give to the state parks is.

MR. RANGE: Adjacent to the existing parks.

MS. SIMPKINS: Where?

MR. RANGE: Beaver Dam, Echo Canyon, Cathedral Gorge, all four state parks that they have. They have applications on file with us at the present time and we've had them for several years.

MS. SIMPKINS: And you're recommending giving this to them?

MR. RANGE: Right.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Hickey at 6:15 p.m. A copy of the draft of Land Use Recommendations for Caliente Planning Unit is available in the files of the Assembly Agriculture Committee, Room 336 Legislative Building.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Dunne
Assembly Attache

CALIENTE PLANNING UNIT MFP 2

John Boyles

INTRODUCTION: GOOD AFTERNOON. I AM JOHN BOYLES, MANAGER OF THE LAS VEGAS DISTRICT, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT. WITH ME TODAY FROM THE DISTRICT ARE ED CILIBERTI, THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER, AND PHIL RANGE, MANAGER OF THE CALIENTE-VIRGIN VALLEY RESOURCE AREA, WHICH WE WILL BE DISCUSSING IN THIS BRIEFING..

PHIL HAS JUST COMPLETED HIS WORK ON THE CALIENTE PLANNING UNIT MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN--CALLED AN M-F-P FOR SHORT. PHIL HAS DEVELOPED MANY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC LAND USE IN THE SOUTH HALF ON LINCOLN COUNTY. IF THEY ARE APPROVED, THESE RECOMMENDATIONS WILL GUIDE OUR LAND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES WELL INTO THE 1980'S.

WE ARE BEGINNING OUR FINAL PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THIS M-F-P. THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE BEFORE ME NOW. I, IN PARTICULAR, AM SEEKING A THOROUGH PUBLIC REVIEW OF THESE PROPOSALS TO GUIDE ME IN APPROVING, MODIFYING, OR DISAPPROVING THE RECOMMENDATIONS.

AS A RESULT OF THE SUCCESSFUL COURT SUIT BY THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, THE EFFECT OF GRAZING ON THIS PLANNING UNIT WILL BE CONSIDERED IN AN ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT. PHIL'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FORAGE ALLOCATION WILL SERVE AS THE PROPOSED ACTION IN THE STATEMENT. THE FINAL CALIENTE GRAZING ES MUST BE FILED WITH THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AT THE END OF SEPTEMBER, THIS YEAR.

I. MY NAME IS WILLIAM CALKINS. I AM CHIEF OF THE BRANCH OF PLANNING FOR THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN NEVADA. I AM GOING TO TRY TO EXPLAIN BRIEFLY FOUR THINGS ABOUT THE BUREAU'S PLANNING SYSTEM WHICH WILL PERTAIN TO THE PRESENTATION BY THE LAS VEGAS DISTRICT OFFICE.

A. FIRST, WHAT IS AN MFP?

THE LETTERS, "MFP", STAND FOR MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN.

IT IS A LAND USE PLAN FOR A SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC UNIT. IT IS DEVELOPED BASED ON RESOURCE INVENTORY DATA, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INFORMATION AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES DEVELOPED IN AN EARLIER PLANNING STEP CALLED THE UNIT RESOURCE ANALYSIS (URA). THE MFP IS A 3 STEP PROCESS.

THE FIRST STEP OF THE MFP IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCE OBJECTIVES AND ACTION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EACH OF 7 RESOURCES, (I.E., LANDS, MINERALS, RANGE WHICH INCLUDES WILD HORSE AND BURROS, TIMBER, WATERSHED, WILDLIFE AND RECREATION). THE RESOURCE ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATIONS IN MFP STEP 1 ARE PREPARED BY EACH RESOURCE SPECIALIST INDEPENDENTLY, DISREGARDING CONFLICTING RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY OTHER RESOURCE SPECIALISTS. WE CALL THIS "TUNNEL VISION" AND IT WAS DESIGNED INTO OUR PLANNING SYSTEM, CONSTRAINED ONLY BY LAW AND FEASIBILITY, TO PROVIDE OPTIMIZATION FOR EACH RESOURCE BEFORE APPLICATION TO ON-THE-GROUND LAND USE.

EXHIBIT B (4 pgs.)

B. SECOND, WHAT IS MFP STEP 2?

THIS IS THE HEART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS AND IS THE STEP WE ARE COMPLETING FOR THE CALIENTE RESOURCE AREA IN THE LAS VEGAS DISTRICT. THIS IS WHAT WILL BE THE SUBJECT OF THE BRIEFING TO YOU BY PHIL RANGE, THE CALIENTE AREA MANAGER. BEFORE I TURN THIS OVER TO PHIL, I WANT TO EXPLAIN WHAT MFP STEP 2 IS ALL ABOUT.

IN THE SECOND STEP OF THE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN, THE AREA MANAGER MUST REVIEW THE RESOURCE ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY THE SPECIALISTS, IDENTIFY AND ANALYZE ANY CONFLICTING SITUATIONS, AND MAKE TRADE-OFFS WHERE NECESSARY. THIS ANALYSIS RESULTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MULTIPLE-USE RECOMMENDATIONS.

THIS PROCEDURE IS REALLY THE HEART OF THE WHOLE SYSTEM -- WHERE CONSIDERATIONS FOR MULTIPLE USE ARE FULLY TREATED. THE "TUNNEL VISION" RECOMMENDATIONS ARE COMPARED AND WEIGHED IN RELATION TO EACH OTHER. CLEARLY, RESOURCE USE CONFLICTS WILL EMERGE AND MUST BE RESOLVED. AREAS OF COMPATIBLE USES ARE DEFINED, AND DIRECTION FOR COORDINATION ARE PROVIDED. THE DIFFICULTY OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION MAY VARY CONSIDERABLY. IF RESOURCE VALUES ARE LOW, IF THE EFFECT OF DECISIONS ARE EASILY REVERSIBLE, AND IF ONE ALTERNATIVE IS OBVIOUSLY BEST, A RELATIVELY UNSOPHISTICATED ANALYSIS WILL SUFFICE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, IF VALUES ARE HIGH, THE EFFECT OF DECISIONS IRREVERSIBLE, PUBLIC INTEREST HIGH AND PERHAPS DIVIDED, AND THE ALTERNATIVES APPARENTLY CLOSE TO BEING EQUAL, A RELATIVELY HIGHER LEVEL OF ANALYSIS WILL BE NECESSARY. IN EVERY CASE, EACH ALTERNATIVE MUST BE CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF PHYSICAL, SOCIAL, POLITICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS, AND THE OTHER RESOURCES AFFECTED.

THIS STEP RESULTS IN A SET OF MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PLANNING AREA IN WHICH ALL MAJOR RESOURCE USE CONFLICTS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED AND FINALLY, AFTER PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, FROM WHICH LAND USE DECISIONS CAN BE REACHED.

C. THIRD, WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP OF MFP-2 TO ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENTS?

AS A RESULT OF A COURT CASE, THE BLM WAS DIRECTED TO PREPARE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENTS ON LIVESTOCK GRAZING. BECAUSE THE MFP-STEP 2 CONTAINS RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO THE ALLOCATION OF FORAGE TO LIVESTOCK, WILD HORSES AND BURROS, AND WILDLIFE, THESE RECOMMENDATIONS WILL SERVE AS THE BASIS, OR PROPOSED ACTION, FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT.

D. FOURTH, WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT IS ISSUED?

AFTER THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT IS ISSUED, THE DISTRICT MANAGER ISSUES DECISIONS BASED ON THE DATA OF MFP STEP 2, THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT AND OBTAINED THROUGH PUBLIC REVIEW AND PARTICIPATION IN THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS. THE THIRD AND FINAL STEP OF THE MFP CONTAINS THESE DECISIONS. IN MFP STEP 3, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ARE SUMMARIZED, MAP OVERLAYS FOR THE MANAGEMENT DECISIONS ARE PREPARED AND THE DECISIONS ARE PUBLICIZED.

THIS, THEN, IS THE MFP PROCESS. ONCE AGAIN, STEP ONE CONTAINS RESOURCE-BY-RESOURCE RECOMMENDATIONS; STEP TWO RESULTS IN A SET OF MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONTAINS AN ANALYSIS OF RESOURCE USE CONFLICTS; THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT WILL ANALYZE THE FORAGE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN MFP STEP TWO; AND MFP STEP THREE IS THE LAND USE DECISIONS.

WITH THAT INTRODUCTION, I WILL TURN THE FLOOR OVER TO PHIL TO GIVE YOU AN OVERVIEW OF HIS RECOMMENDATIONS.

Phil Range

1 ON OBJECTIVE: THIS IS AN INFORMATION BRIEFING. ITS PURPOSE IS TO FAMILIARIZE YOU WITH OUR M-F-P 2 RECOMMENDATIONS, PARTICULARLY
1 OFF THOSE REGARDING FORAGE ALLOCATION.

2 ON BRIEFING OUTLINE: DURING THE NEXT HALF HOUR I WILL DISCUSS THESE TOPICS ,

2 OFF (PAUSE)

3 ON PLANNING UNIT OVERVIEW: THE CALIENTE PLANNING UNIT COVERS SOME 3.4 MILLION ACRES IN THE SOUTH HALF OF LINCOLN Co., NEVADA, IN THE SOUTHEASTERN PART OF THE STATE. THE CENTER OF THE PLANNING UNIT IS ABOUT 95 MILES NORTHEAST OF LAS VEGAS.

TEMPERATURES VARY WIDELY IN THE UNIT. GENERALLY, THE WINTERS TEND TO BE MILD AND THE SUMMERS TEND TO BE VERY HOT.

ANNUAL PRECIPITATION IS GENERALLY LOW. IT FLUCTUATES WITH BOTH SEASON AND ELEVATION. THE ENTIRE UNIT IS SUBJECT TO DROUGHTS.

3 OFF THE CALIENTE PLANNING UNIT CONTAINS ABOUT 98 PERCENT OF THE RESIDENTS OF LINCOLN COUNTY. POPULATION OF THE COUNTY IN 1977 WAS 2,647 PERSONS.

EXHIBIT C (16 pgs.)

4 ON THE PLANNING UNIT INCLUDES PORTIONS OF BOTH THE GREAT BASIN AND THE MOJAVE DESERT BIOMES. THE VEGETATION IS TYPICAL OF THE TRANSITION ZONES BETWEEN THE TWO. THE MAJOR VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES OF THE PLANNING UNIT ARE SHOWN ON THIS CHART. YOU MIGHT NOTE THAT MORE THAN TWO-THIRDS OF THE UNIT IS TAKEN UP BY THE SOUTHERN DESERT AND PINYON-JUNIPER COMMUNITIES.

4 OFF (PAUSE)

NEXT I'D LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT IN THE COUNTY. I DON'T INTEND TO GIVE AN IN-DEPTH PICTURE, BUT RATHER A BRIEF LOOK AT THE RELATIVE ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF CERTAIN SELECTED INDUSTRIES.

5 ON FROM 1973 TO 1977, THE LAST YEAR FOR WHICH WE HAVE DATA, TOTAL COUNTY INCOME ROSE FROM 6.1 TO 11 MILLION DOLLARS. THE CONSTANT LEADER AS AN INCOME PRODUCER WAS GOVERNMENT-- LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL. TRADES ALSO PROVED TO BE A STABLE SOURCE OF INCOME. WHILE MINING IS A SIGNIFICANT INCOME PRODUCER, IT IS ERATIC BECAUSE IT DEPENDS ON THE EVER-CHANGING STATE OF THE MINERAL MARKET. AGRICULTURE, WHICH IS PRIMARILY RANCHING, HAS NOT BEEN A SIGNIFICANT INCOME PRODUCER. THE AGRICULTURAL LOSSES IN 1975, 1976, AND 1977 WERE DUE PRIMARILY TO LOW CATTLE PRICES.

FLIP THE SAME INDUSTRIES THAT ARE THE TOP INCOME PRODUCERS ALSO TEND TO BE THE BIG EMPLOYERS IN THE COUNTY. GOVERNMENT AND TRADE SHOW A PROGRESSIVE PATTERN OF GROWTH. WORK IN THE MINING INDUSTRY IS ERATIC. AGRICULTURE IS STATIC, WITH

EMPLOYMENT MOVING UP AND DOWN WITHIN A RANGE OF ONLY 20 PERSONS OVER A FOUR-YEAR PERIOD.

5 OFF THE INCOME FIGURES ARE FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, THE EMPLOYMENT DATA IS FROM THE NEVADA EMPLOYMENT SECURITY OFFICE. (PAUSE)

FOR THE NEXT SEVERAL MINUTES, I'D LIKE TO TOUCH ON A FEW OF THE MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE M-F-P. I'D LIKE TO EMPHASIZE HERE THAT THIS IS A MULTIPLE-USE PLAN. WHILE THE FORAGE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS ARE LIKELY TO COMMAND MUCH OF THE ATTENTION, THE PLAN REMAINS AN INTEGRATED EFFORT TO GUIDE THE LAND MANAGER IN PLANNING ACTIVITIES WELL INTO THE 1980's.
(PAUSE)

6 ON LET'S BEGIN WITH RECREATION.

WE WERE, OF COURSE, AWARE OF WILDERNESS IMPLICATIONS AS WE WENT THROUGH THE EARLY UNIT RESOURCE ANALYSIS AND M-F-P STEPS. WE CONSIDERED INCLUDING SOME SORT OF WILDERNESS INVENTORY IN THIS M-F-P CYCLE SIMPLY TO EXPEDITE THE PROCESS. THIS WOULD HAVE ALLOWED US TO IDENTIFY AREAS OF CONFLICT--IF NOT TO ENTIRELY RESOLVE THEM--IN THIS CYCLE. HOWEVER, IT WAS APPARENT FROM OUR PUBLIC MEETINGS AND FROM WASHINGTON OFFICE REACTION TO OTHER EARLY WILDERNESS PROJECTS, THAT THIS WOULD NOT WORK.

WE HAVE, INSTEAD, IDENTIFIED THOSE TYPES OF PROJECTS WHICH

WOULD LIKELY DAMAGE WILDERNESS VALUES AND REDTAGGED THEM FOR FURTHER STUDY BEFORE THEY CAN BE PLACED ON THE GROUND.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE, PARTICULARLY ORGANIZED EVENTS, IS MINOR IN THE PLANNING UNIT. WE HAVE, HOWEVER, IDENTIFIED SEVERAL VALLEYS WHICH HAVE POTENTIAL FOR COMPETITIVE USE. WE'VE ALSO SUGGESTED DEVELOPMENT OF O-R-V PLAY AREAS NEAR COMMUNITIES, BUT SPECIFIED THAT THEY BE CONSTRUCTED ONLY WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE LIMITATIONS ON O-R-V USE WOULD BE APPROPRIATE, SUCH AS BIGHORN SHEEP LAMBING AREAS OR IN THE VICINITY OF QUAIL GUZZLERS.

TWO SITES HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED AS CANDIDATES FOR THE REGISTER OF NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS: THE PANACA CHARCOAL KILNS, AND THE OLD SPANISH TRAIL. THERE ARE ALSO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MORE PATROLING AND FOR INTERPERTIVE, AND PROTECTIVE ACTIONS TO GUARD CULTURAL RESOURCE SITES FROM DAMAGE.

A NUMBER OF SITES IN THE PLANNING UNIT HAVE BEEN PROPOSED FOR PROTECTIVE WITHDRAWALS, IF WARRANTED, AFTER RECREATION MANAGEMENT PLANS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED. HIGHLAND PEAK, WITH ITS STAND OF BRISTLECONE PINES, IS ONE SUCH AREA. MORMON PEAK CAVES IS ANOTHER.

6 OFF

7 ON

IN MANAGING WILDLIFE HABITAT, WE WORK CLOSELY WITH THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME. THEY HAVE PROPOSED

REINTRODUCTIONS OF ANIMALS IN SEVERAL LOCATIONS WHICH HAD BEEN THEIR HISTORIC RANGES. IN MOST CASES, THE ANIMALS WERE DRIVEN FROM THEIR HABITAT BY MAN-CAUSED PRESSURES. THE REINTRODUCTIONS RANGE FROM THE POPULAR BIGHORN SHEEP, TO THE SMALL SPINE DACE, A FISH THAT FORMERLY INHABITED A SPRING NEAR PANACA. NEEDLESS TO SAY, EACH REINTRODUCTION WOULD PLACE INCREASED HABITAT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS ON B-L-M TO INSURE THAT THESE ANIMALS SURVIVE AND PROSPER.

A NUMBER OF CREATURES IN THE PLANNING UNIT ARE CLASSIFIED ENDANGERED OR THREATENED, OR HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED BY THE STATE AS RARE OR CRITICAL, THE SPECIES SHOWN ON THE CHART ARE THOSE FOR WHICH WE WILL BE TAKING SOME SORT OF PROTECTIVE ACTION OR CONDUCTING STUDIES TO GUIDE FUTURE PROTECTIVE ACTIONS.

(PAUSE)

7 OFF

8 ON

LAND ACQUISITION FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS WAS A PRINCIPAL CONCERN OF SEVERAL COUNTY OFFICIALS WE SPOKE WITH IN PREPARING OUR RECOMMENDATIONS. STUDIES SHOW THAT THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 3,000 ACRES WITHIN THE PLANNING UNIT WHICH HAVE AGRICULTURAL POTENTIAL. THESE ARE MAINLY IN THE PAHARANAGAT AND DELAMAR VALLEYS. WE PROPOSE TO REVIEW THESE AREAS TO DETERMINE IF THEY ARE IN FACT, ECONOMICALLY FARMABLE. IF WATERS ARE AVAILABLE, WE WOULD ~~DISPOSE~~ DISPOSE OF THE LAND AS APPROPRIATE REGULATIONS ARE PREPARED. SOME OF THE LAND COULD WELL FALL WITHIN THE PURVIEW OF THE DESERT LAND ENTRY ACT OR THE CAREY ACT WHICH ARE AGAIN ACTIVE IN NEVADA.

THE COMMUNITY OF ALAMO HAS IDENTIFIED A REQUIREMENT FOR SOME 100 ACRES OF LAND TO ACCOMODATE ANTICIPATED RESIDENTIAL AND RECREATIONAL EXPANSION. THE KEY GROWTH FACTOR HERE IS THE STEP UP IN OPERATIONS AT THE UNION CARBIDE TUNGSTEN MINE AT TEMPIUTE, NORTHWEST OF THE TOWN. WE PROPOSE TO SATISFY THAT REQUIREMENT.

THE NEVADA DIVISION OF STATE PARKS IDENTIFIED SOME 3,800 ACRES IN LINCOLN COUNTY WHICH THE AGENCY FELT WAS NEEDED TO EXPAND THE PARKS IT NOW OPERATES IN THE PLANNING UNIT. OUR RECOMMENDATION IS TO TRANSFER THE LAND TO THE STATE UNDER THE RECREATION AND PUBLIC PURPOSES ACT.

LINCOLN COUNTY'S MAIN AIRFIELD IS LOCATED JUST WEST OF PANACA. THE COUNTY COMMISSION IDENTIFIED ADDITIONAL LAND NEEDED AT THE FACILITY TO UPGRADE THE FIELD AND PROVIDE BETTER SERVICE TO THE COUNTY. OUR RECOMMENDATION IS TO MEET THAT REQUIREMENT.

8 OFF

9 ON

WHEN WE DID OUR FORESTRY PLANNING WE FOUND WE NEEDED MUCH MORE DATA THAN WE HAD ON HAND TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT THE RESOURCE. CONSEQUENTLY, MANY OF OUR RECOMMENDATIONS HERE ARE FOR FURTHER STUDY.

WE DID RECOMMEND LEASING LAND IN TWO LOCATIONS FOR COMMERCIAL CHRISTMAS TREE OPERATIONS. WE'VE FOUND IN RECENT YEARS THERE IS A READY MARKET IN LAS VEGAS FOR TREES THAT PROBABLY

WOULD MAKE SUCH AN OPERATION WORTH WHILE. WE WILL CONTINUE TO SELL FIREWOOD, JUNIPER POSTS AND INDIVIDUAL CHRISTMAS TREES.

9 Off LAS VEGAS IS ALSO THE MAIN REASON FOR THE RECOMMENDATION TO STUDY DESERT VEGETATION TO DETERMINE A SUSTAINED YIELD FOR HARVEST. IN TIME, WATER WILL BECOME A CRITICAL LIMITING FACTOR IN THE GROWTH OF THE VALLEY. COMMUNITIES WILL UNDOUBTEDLY TURN TO DESERT LANDSCAPING AS AN EARLY CONSERVATION TOOL. THEY WILL PROBABLY LOOK TO THE PUBLIC LANDS AS THE SOURCE OF THE PLANTS. OUR INTENTION IS TO HAVE A FIRM DATA BASE TO RESPOND TO THE DEMAND WHEN IT DEVELOPES.

10 On MINERALS HAVE TRADITIONALLY BEEN A KEY RESOURCE IN THE STATE. IN THE PAST, GOLD AND SILVER HAVE BEEN THE TOUCHSTONES THAT MADE THE STATE ITS FORTUNE. AS OUR ENERGY PROBLEMS WORSEN, AND AS THE "EASY OIL" IS FOUND, GEOLOGISTS WILL LOOK TO THE MORE UNLIKELY GROUND FORMATIONS TO DISCOVER THESE ESSENTIAL RESOURCES.

WE HAVE SEVERAL LOW-TEMPERATURE GEOTHERMAL AREAS IN THE DISTRICT, WITH PROBABLY THE MOST PROMISING ONE BEING IN CALIENTE.

AS FOR OIL AND GAS, LEASING ACTIVITY IS VERY HEAVY THROUGHOUT THE PLANNING UNIT. EAGLE VALLEY, THE STATE'S ONLY PRODUCING

OIL FIELD, IS JUST NORTHWEST OF THE PLANNING UNIT. WE ARE EXPERIENCING STRONG EXPLORATION PRESSURE IN THE VIRGIN RIVER VALLEY, JUST SOUTH OF THE UNIT. WITHIN THE CONSTRAINTS OF PROTECTING THE OTHER RESOURCE VALUES PRESENT, WE PROPOSE TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS RESOURCE.

THERE ARE ONLY A SMALL NUMBER OF WATERSHED RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT THEY ARE AIMED AT THE IMPORTANT GOALS OF REDUCING SOIL EROSION AND IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF WATER.

IN PURSUIT OF THE FIRST GOAL, WE HAVE RECOMMENDED MANAGEMENT OF LIVESTOCK GRAZING AND THE USE OF VEGETATIVE MANIPULATION SO THAT SOIL SURFACE FACTORS ARE IMPROVED ON SPECIFIC AREAS OF THE PLANNING UNIT. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY INVOLVE SUCH ACTIONS AS PROTECTING SPRING AND WATER SOURCES FROM DEGRADATION BY ANIMALS AND A STEPPED-UP PROGRAM OF WATER PROJECT MAINTENANCE.

WE ARE ALSO RECOMMENDING THAT SMALL SCALE WATER CONTROL STRUCTURES BE PLACED IN SPECIFIC PORTIONS OF CLOVER CREEK, MEADOW VALLEY WASH, AND PAHRANAGAT VALLEY TO PROTECT PRIVATE LAND FROM DEBRIS AND SILT CARRIED OFF PUBLIC LANDS BY FLOOD WATERS.

BEFORE GETTING INTO THE FORAGE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS, LET'S LOOK BRIEFLY AT THE UNIT-WIDE GRAZING PICTURE.

12 ON

THE PLANNING UNIT IS DIVIDED INTO 86 ALLOTMENTS WHICH ARE GRAZED BY 74 OPERATORS. MANY OF THE ALLOTMENTS ARE USED BY MORE THAN ONE OPERATOR. CONVERSELY, MANY OPERATORS HAVE PRIVILEGES IN MORE THAN ONE ALLOTMENT.

DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK GRAZED IN THE PLANNING UNIT ARE SHEEP, CATTLE, AND HORSES. SEVERAL ALLOTMENTS ARE CURRENTLY TAGGED FOR DUAL-USE, BOTH SHEEP AND CATTLE.

ACTIVE QUALIFICATIONS IN THE PLANNING UNIT TOTAL 118,580 ANIMAL UNIT MONTHS. AN ANIMAL UNIT MONTH, OR AUM, IS THE AMOUNT OF FORAGE NECESSARY TO FEED ONE COW OR HORSE FOR ONE MONTH. SINCE WE WILL BE USING THE TERM "ACTIVE QUALIFICATIONS" FREQUENTLY, LET ME EXPLAIN THAT IT IS THE NUMBER OF AUMS WHICH ARE CURRENTLY AUTHORIZED TO BE GRAZED IN AN ALLOTMENT.

LICENSED USE IN GRAZING YEAR 1977 TOTALED 78,235 AUMS. WHILE THAT FIGURE IS A FAIRLY ACCURATE INDICATION OF FORAGE TAKEN UP BY DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK EACH YEAR, IT SHOULD BE USED CAUTIOUSLY. THERE ARE MANY REASONS WHY OPERATORS CHOOSE NOT TO EXERCISE THEIR ENTIRE ACTIVE QUALIFICATIONS. IN SOME CASES IT REFLECTS A LACK OF FORAGE BROUGHT ABOUT BY EXCESSIVE WILD HORSE USE, DROUGHT CONDITIONS, OR OTHER REASONS. THERE ARE A FEW INSTANCES OF OPERATORS BEING UNABLE TO USE THEIR PRIVILEGES BECAUSE OF LAWSUITS OR OTHER LEGAL BARRIERS.

FOR OTHERS, IT IS SIMPLY A MATTER OF THE CURRENT UNPROFITABILITY OF THEIR LIVESTOCK OPERATIONS.

WILD HORSES AND BURROS ARE, OF COURSE, AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE GRAZING PICTURE. BASED ON AERIAL SURVEYS GOING BACK SEVERAL YEARS--THE MOST RECENT ONE BEING 1977--WE DEVELOPED THE POPULATION FIGURES SHOWN HERE. IN ADDITION, WE ESTIMATE THE HORSE POPULATION IN THE PLANNING UNIT INCREASES ABOUT 10 PERCENT A YEAR. IN OTHER WORDS, THERE MAY BE ABOUT 1,150 ANIMALS OUT THERE RIGHT NOW.

12 OFF (PAUSE)

13 ON A FINAL ASPECT OF THE GRAZING PICTURE IS WHERE THE OPERATORS COME FROM. THIS GRAPH SHOWS THAT THE LARGEST BLOCK OF OPERATORS IN THE PLANNING UNIT RESIDE IN UTAH. MOST OF THEM LIVE IN ST. GEORGE OR CEDAR CITY. AREA. MOST OF THE NEVADA OPERATORS LIVING OUTSIDE THE UNIT ARE CLARK COUNTY RESIDENTS.

13 OFF (PAUSE)

THE CRUNCH QUESTION OF FORAGE ALLOCATION IS HOW MUCH DO YOU HAVE TO SPREAD AROUND.

14 ON THIS GRAPH SHOWS THE SUITABLE AUMS WHICH WERE DEVELOPED FROM OUR RANGE SURVEY. POINT OUT THAT THESE ARE PLANNING-UNIT-WIDE FIGURES. IF IT APPEARS LATER ON THAT ALL OF THESE AUMS WERE NOT ALLOCATED, REMEMBER THAT SOMETIMES THE ANIMALS AND THEIR FORAGE ARE NOT IN THE SAME PLACE.

14 OFF

15 ON WE PROPOSE TO ALLOCATE FORAGE TO DEER, ANTELOPE AND BIGHORN SHEEP BASED ON "REASONABLE NUMBERS" OF THESE ANIMALS PROVIDED US BY THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME. IN ALL CASES WE WENT AS FAR AS POSSIBLE TO SATISFY THESE "REASONABLE NUMBERS." THE SHORTFALLS IN THE DEER AND BIGHORN SHEEP ALLOCATIONS RESULT FROM THE LACK OF ANY

15 OFF ADDITIONAL WILDLIFE FORAGE IN THE IDENTIFIED HABITAT AREAS

16 ON OUR 1977 INVENTORY OF WILD HORSES AND BURROS SHOWED THE ANIMALS WERE GENERALLY LOCATED IN THE EIGHT AREAS SHOWN ON THIS MAP. YOU'LL RECALL THAT OUR ESTIMATED POPULATION THAT YEAR WAS 1,052 ANIMALS.

16 OFF (PAUSE)

17 ON WE ARE RECOMMENDING THAT THE SIX LOCATIONS SHOWN HERE BECOME OUR HORSE MANAGEMENT AREAS. MOST WOULD HAVE A MIXED POPULATION OF LIVESTOCK AND WILD HORSES.

17 OFF (PAUSE)

18 ON IN THESE SIX AREAS WE PROPOSED TO MANAGE A MAXIMUM OF 497 WILD HORSES. WE WOULD ALLOCATE 5,956 AUMS TO PROVIDE YEAR-ROUND FORAGE FOR THEM. AS YOU CAN SEE, WE PROPOSE TO REMOVE AN ESTIMATED 555 ANIMALS, A REDUCTION OF 52 PERCENT IN WILD HORSE NUMBERS.

18 OFF (PAUSE)

WE COME THEN TO LIVESTOCK. WE ARE USING A TWO-TEIRED

ALLOCATION SYSTEM. IN THE FIRST PLACE, WE HAVE AUMs WHICH ARE SUITABLE FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING IN EVERY RESPECT AND IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION. IN THE SECOND PLACE WE HAVE AUMs WHICH ARE SUITABLE IN EVERY RESPECT EXCEPT FOR AVAILABLE WATER. WITH WATER DEVELOPMENTS THESE AUM WOULD BE IMMEDIATELY USEABLE.

19 ON THIS CHART SHOWS OUR PROPOSED ALLOCATION OF AUMs TO DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK

GRAZING YEAR AS A STARTING POINT BECAUSE WE ANTICIPATE HAVING BOTH THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT AND THE MFP 3 DECISIONS COMPLETED BY THAT TIME

WE PROPOSE, THEN, TO ALLOCATE 74,293 AUMs TO LIVESTOCK IMMEDIATELY. AS WATERS ARE DEVELOPED OR AUTHORIZED, THAT TOTAL COULD RAISE TO 99,399 AUMs.

19 OFF (PAUSE)

20 ON THIS CHART RECAPS OUR FORAGE ALLOCATION PROPOSALS AND COMPARES THEM WITH THE LEVEL OF USEAGE OF RANGE FORAGE DURING GRAZING YEAR 1977. THIS IS THE INITIAL ALLOCATION, WITHOUT THE ADDITIONAL FORAGE MADE AVAILABLE WITH WATER DEVELOPMENTS. NOTICE THAT IN 1977 WE HAD BOTH ACTIVE QUALIFICATIONS AND LICENSED USE. UNDER THE PROPOSAL THERE ~~WOULD~~ ONLY BE ONE FIGURE--THE FORAGE ALLOCATED TO LIVESTOCK. THE 1977 WILDLIFE USE COLUMN IS BLANK BECAUSE WE HAVE NO DATA ON ACTUAL NUMBERS.

20 OFF (PAUSE)

21 ON LET'S COMPARE OUR 1980 GRAZING PROPOSALS VERY SPECIFICALLY WITH

1977 USAGE AND THE CURRENT ACTIVE QUALIFICATIONS. COMPARED WITH 1977 USE LEVELS THERE IS A SIX PERCENT SHORTFALL IN IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE AUMS. COMPARED WITH ACTIVE QUALIFICATIONS, THE SHORTFALL IS 37 PERCENT.
(PAUSE)

FLIP

WHEN SUITABLE AUMS ARE ACTIVATED THROUGH WATER DEVELOPMENTS THERE IS AN ACTUAL INCREASE--26 PERCENT--OVER THE USAGE EXPERIENCE IN 1977. AT THE SAME TIME, THE SHORTFALL FROM ACTIVE QUALIFICATIONS DROPS TO 16 PERCENT.

21 OFF

(PAUSE)

22 ON

ON THE LAST CHART WE WERE SPEAKING OF THE UNIT WIDE EFFECT OF THE FORAGE ALLOCATION ON LIVESTOCK. THIS GRAPH SHOWS THE EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL ALLOTMENTS. WE ARE COMPARING HERE THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION OF AUMS WITHOUT WATER DEVELOPMENTS WITH THE 1977 GRAZING USE.

34 OF THE 86 ALLOTMENTS WILL EXPERIENCE REDUCTION, 21 OF THEM TAKING CUTS GREATER THAN 50 PERCENT.

OF THESE 21 ALLOTMENTS, 10 ARE BEING RECLASSIFIED AS EPHEMERAL OR EPHEMERAL-PERENNIAL RANGE. THIS MEANS THE AMOUNT OF FORAGE AVAILABLE IN A GIVEN YEAR DEPENDS ON THE CLIMATIC CONDITIONS. WE CANNOT PREDICT AN AMOUNT. SINCE WE FORMERLY ALLOCATED AUMS THERE, AND NOW WE DON'T, WE SHOW IT AS A 100 PERCENT REDUCTION. HOWEVER, THAT DOES NOT MEAN IT CANNOT BE GRAZED WHEN RAINS BRING IN ANNUAL FORAGE.

18 OF THE 86 ALLOTMENTS GET INCREASES IN THIS INITIAL ALLOCATION.

IN 5 ALLOTMENTS THERE IS NO CHANGE. THESE WERE ADJUDICATED IN 1974 AND WE MADE NO ADJUSTMENTS IN THEM IN THIS PLAN.

ON ONLY 9 ALLOTMENTS IS LIVESTOCK BEING ELIMINATED. ON TWO OF THESE, OUR RANGE SURVEY INDICATED THERE IS NO SUITABLE LIVESTOCK OR WILD HORSE FORAGE. ON ONE OTHER THERE ARE 43 AUMs, BUT FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY REASONS, WE RECOMMENDED NO LIVESTOCK GRAZING. ON THE SIX OTHERS, THERE ARE SUITABLE AUMs AND THEY ARE BEING GIVEN TO WILD HORSES FOR ONE OR BOTH OF THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. THE OPERATORS VOLUNTARILY ASKED US TO DO SO, OR
2. WE HAVE AN ESTABLISHED HORSE POPULATION THERE AND THE OPERATORS HAVE NOT MADE BENEFICIAL USE OF THEIR PRIVILEGES FOR SEVERAL YEARS.

THE 20 ALLOTMENTS SHOWN AS NON-USE ARE ONES IN WHICH THE OPERATORS GRAZED NO LIVESTOCK IN 1977. SINCE THERE WAS NO USE, WE CAN'T CALCULATE A PERCENTAGE OF CHANGE.

FLIP

LET'S LOOK AT THE SAME PICTURE, BUT WITH THE ASSUMPTION THAT ALL WATER DEVELOPMENTS NEEDED TO ACTIVATE AUMs HAVE BEEN CONSTRUCTED.

THE NUMBER OF ALLOTMENTS TAKING CUTS NOW DROPS TO 25. BUT THE NUMBER GETTING INCREASES GOES UP TO 27. MORE ALLOTMENTS

GET INCREASES THAN ARE REDUCED.

22 OFF MOREOVER, OF THOSE 10 ALLOTMENTS THAT ARE REDUCED GREATER THAN 50 PERCENT, 6 ARE BEING RECLASSIFIED EPHEMERAL OR EPHEMERAL-PERENNIAL RANGE. THEREFORE, GRAZING CAN CONTINUE IN YEARS WHEN THERE IS ANNUAL FORAGE PRODUCED.

23 ON THIS CHART TELLS WHERE THE OPERATORS LIVE WHO HAVE PRIVILEGES IN THE 13 ALLOTMENTS WE JUST REVIEWED--THE ONES BEING REDUCED 50 PERCENT OR GREATER WHEN ALL WATERS ARE DEVELOPED. THESE WOULD BE THE OPERATORS MOST SEVERELY AFFECTED BY OUR MFP FORAGE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS.

23 OFF (PAUSE)

24 ON WATER DEVELOPMENTS ARE NOT THE ONLY SOURCE OF ADDITIONAL AUMS. IN OUR PLANNING SYSTEM WE IDENTIFIED NUMEROUS AREAS WHERE IT SEEMED LIKELY THAT VEGETATIVE MANIPULATION WAS POSSIBLE. THE TOTAL AREA AMOUNTS TO ALMOST 400,000 ACRES. BECAUSE OF THE MANY FACTORS INVOLVED IN PREPARING A VEGETATION TREATMENT PLAN, WE WERE UNABLE TO EITHER PROJECT THE NUMBER OF AUMS WHICH MIGHT BE REALIZED, OR TO ALLOCATE THEM.

25 ON THERE ARE, OF COURSE, MORE RANGE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE MFP THAN JUST FORAGE ALLOCATION.

SEASONS OF USE IN DIFFERENT ALLOTMENTS HAVE NEEDED ADJUSTMENT

FOR SOME TIME. OUR RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS AREA ARE GUIDED BY PLAN PENOLOGY AND SHOULD PROVIDE THE VEGETATION ON THE RANGE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR VIGOROUS GROWTH AND SEED RIPENING PRIOR TO BEING GRAZED. THIS SHOULD INSURE BOTH A HEALTHY AND PRODUCTIVE RANGE.

MUCH OF THE MOJAVE DESERT CAN ONLY SUPPORT GRAZING BASED ON EPHEMERAL PLANTS WHICH RESPOND TO SEASONAL MOISTURE. THE TULE DESERT IN THE SOUTHEAST PORTION OF THE PLANNING UNIT IS A PRIME EXAMPLE OF THIS. IT HAS, HOWEVER, BEEN TREATED AS PERENNIAL RANGE FOR MANY YEARS. UNDER THE MFP RECOMMENDATIONS, THE TULE DESERT, ALONG WITH OTHER APPROPRIATE AREAS, WOULD BE DESIGNATED EITHER EPHEMERAL OR EPHEMERAL-PERENNIAL RANGE AND GRAZING ON THEM MANAGED ACCORDINGLY.

25 OFF WE HAVE ALSO RECOMMENDED A LEVEL OF MANAGMENT INTENSITY FOR EACH OF THE 86 ALLOTMENTS: ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN, NO PLAN, OR NO GRAZING.

AS I SAID AT THE START OF THE BRIEFING, WE ARE BEGINNING THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PHASE OF THE MFP STEP 2. THIS PHASE WILL CONTINUE UNTIL APRIL 30. WE HAVE PLANNED SEVERAL PUBLIC SESSIONS TO ALLOW INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS TO GIVE US THEIR IDEAS ABOUT THE MFP RECOMMENDATIONS. WE INVITE YOUR COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSALS.

THAT CONCLUDES THE BRIEFING. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

PROPOSED
Nevada Planning & Grazing ES Schedule

ES area	Total acres (thousands)	Inventory Acres	Public acres (thousands)	Inventories	URA	Completion dates		ES	MFP-3
						PAA	MFP-2		
Caliente	3,480		3,413				6/78	9/79	6/80
Tonopah	3,848		3,750		9/78	10/78	3/79	9/80	6/81
Paradise-Denio	4,847		3,642	12/78	9/79	10/79	3/80	9/81	6/82
Sonoma-Gerlach	5,816		4,563	12/78	9/79	10/79	3/80	9/81	6/82
Las Vegas	4,896		3,314	12/79	9/80	10/80	3/81	9/82	6/83
Schell	4,306		4,182	12/79	9/80	10/80	3/81	9/82	6/83
Renov	1,611		681	12/79	9/80	10/80	3/81	9/82	6/83
Wells	5,478	4,978	4,141	9/81	3/82	4/82	9/82	9/83	6/84
Egan	4,010	4,010	3,826	9/82	3/83	4/83	9/83	9/84	6/85
Shoshone-Eureka	5,860	4,729	4,399	9/82	3/83	4/83	9/83	9/84	6/85
Fallon	3,370	2,600	2,422	12/82	9/83	10/83	3/84	9/85	6/86
Elko	5,371	4,371	3,260	12/83	9/84	10/84	3/85	9/86	6/87
Esmeralda	3,703	3,703	3,373	12/83	9/84	10/84	3/85	9/86	6/87
Walker	2,197	2,197	1,946	12/85	9/86	10/86	3/87	9/88	6/89

* New planning regulations apply to all ESs after 1983.
Resource Management Plans (RMPs) will be integrated with ES.

January 1979