

DISCLAIMER

Electronic versions of the exhibits in these minutes may not be complete.

This information is supplied as an informational service only and should not be relied upon as an official record.

Original exhibits are on file at the Legislative Counsel Bureau Research Library in Carson City.

Contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or library@lcb.state.nv.us.

ENC. 1 Exb 6
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Tonopah Resource Area
P.O. Box 911
Tonopah, Nevada 89049

In Reply Refer To:
GR# 6132
4120
(NV065.11)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ted Angle, Area Manager
FROM: Charles Wright, Range Conservationist
SUBJECT: Fallini's Proposed Range Improvements

Char Wright 7/21/93

Mr. Fallini has applied for several Section 4 Range Improvement Permits as a result of the Allotment Evaluation tour held in November of 1991.

In a letter dated February 4, 1993, William F. Schroeder responded on behalf of Mr. Fallini. In his letter, Mr. Schroeder stated that the "vegetation is not being overused" and that the only intent of these projects was to sustain domestic livestock. This is a departure from the discussions of the evaluation tour where these improvements were suggested as an alternative to a reduction in stock numbers. Each range improvement has been evaluated in terms of meeting allotment objectives and potential rangeland improvement. Mr. Fallini has provided little information as to how these projects would address his specific livestock management needs. Where information of this type has been given, it is noted in the analysis. The result of the analysis follows:

Charlie's Pipeline Extension

This project as proposed would place a trough midway along a pipeline between Charlie's well and Joe's well. These two water wells are approximately 7 miles apart. The trough would provide water in an area in which on all six years of use pattern mapping has received heavy use. Corrals are available at both Joe's Well and Charlie's Well for livestock handling. This project could possibly reinforce a base water in the event that Joe's well goes dry. This project should not be permitted because it does not address the concerns documented in the allotment evaluation.

New Reveille Well

This project would be beneficial in reducing impacts to vegetation through improved livestock distribution. This project is located within the Reveille Herd Management Area (HMA) and therefore has

potential problems. First, It would have to be approved under a cooperative agreement, according to NSO IM NV-93-087. Second, it may draw horses out of the HMA and cause undue expense, workload increases and hardship to the horses. Third it would have to be carefully stipulated as when and how water would be available to horses. If this project is applied for as a cooperative agreement it should be considered for approval.

Pyramid Spring Pipeline

This project does not address the problems in grazing management as documented in the allotment evaluation and subsequent tour. The need for this project as expressed by Mr. Fallini was that mountain lions are harassing the cattle at the existing water (lower pyramid Spring). The proposal is to pipe water to the east into an area of increased livestock use (in most years mapped as moderate use). This project would decrease beneficial effects of livestock use at the current water location and increase use in an area already at moderate use levels. It could also reduce water available for wildlife at the existing location. This project should not be approved.

Ned's Cache P/L Extension

This project was originally permitted in 1984. It proposes to take water from Ned's Cache Spring/Well to the west to Deep Well. Conflict over the stipulations regarding availability for water for horses caused the improvement not to be installed. A trough has been proposed midway along the pipeline's length which is a modification of the original proposal. In 6 years of use pattern mapping the proposed trough location has fallen in moderate use four times, once in light and once in heavy. The potential for improvement in forage utilization patterns as a result of this project is low. Other possible benefits for the permitted include, reinforcing an unreliable base water which has 1,532 AUMs of forage attached to it. The permittee has also stated that it would relieve the burden of having to constantly pump Deep Well which is costly and labor intensive. The questionable and limited advantages of this project from a range improvement standpoint do not warrant the disturbance which would occur from this project as proposed.

Rawhide Spring Pipeline

This project was originally proposed in the Experimental Stewardship AMP. The proposal involves five miles of pipeline all within Rawhide Mountain WSA. An alternative route has been suggested which would take the pipeline along a cherry-stemmed road to a point just outside the WSA. This alternate location would be approximately 1 and 1/2 miles from Milk Spring, an area of heavy use. This project is similar to Pyramid Spring P/L in that it would take water from a remote less used area and pipe it into areas of moderate and heavy use. It may also act to reduce the amount of water available to wildlife in the Rawhide Spring area.

The amount of water produced at Rawhide Spring is minimal. No environmental assessment exists for this project. From the preliminary evaluation this project should not be approved and environmental assessment work does not need to be initiated.

Theodore J. Ang 7/21/9
Area Manager Concurrence