

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Nevada State Office
P.O. Box 12000
Reno, Nevada 89520-0006

IN REPLY REFER TO:
4000 (NV-930) P

March 19, 2002

EMS TRANSMISSION 3-20-2002
Instruction Memorandum No. NV-2002-034
Expires: 9/30/2003

To: Field Managers, Nevada

From: State Director, Nevada

Subject: Great Basin Restoration Initiative (GBRI) - Achieving Healthy Rangelands
Throughout Nevada's Great Basin: Next Steps DDs: 04/01/02, 4/30/02

A key goal of Nevada's Legacy Plan is to implement the Great Basin Restoration Initiative (GBRI) by treating a minimum of one million acres by 2006. A focal point of our November 14-15, 2001, GBRI meeting was to provide Nevada Field Offices with an opportunity to share the steps each office is taking to achieve healthy rangelands throughout Nevada's Great Basin. What we learned from our discussions is that while resource needs, planning approaches, and types of projects may differ somewhat from field office to field office, every field office has a major role to play in ensuring that a significant and lasting contribution to achieving Healthy Rangelands in the Great Basin is made over the next five-year period.

Completing timely allotment evaluations; making appropriate grazing management changes; noxious weed inventory and treatment; implementation of Fire Management Plans; establishing appropriate management levels (AMLs) for our Herd Management Areas; and gathering excess wild horses and burros to reach AML are common themes across all field offices. But resource needs differ in some locations as well. The Winnemucca, Battle Mountain and Elko Field Offices are facing the need to aggressively protect remaining intact sagebrush stands, while working to restore the large acreages burned each year. The Carson City Field Office is working hard to cooperatively manage noxious weeds and preserve open space, especially along the Carson River drainage. The Ely Field Office is faced with pinyon-juniper conversion which is threatening watersheds, wildlife and vegetation diversity across a large expanse of the field office's jurisdiction. Less than desirable riparian conditions occur in many locations with differing management needs or approaches required.

The Great Basin Restoration Initiative provides us with a unique opportunity to focus our many efforts to make a lasting and tangible change in the conditions of the on-the-ground resources we manage. There is a need to look at the ways in which we can work together more effectively and efficiently as a team in Nevada by focusing our various activities/efforts to make a significant contribution to achieving Healthy Rangelands throughout Nevada's Great Basin during the next five-year period. Each office's greatest contributions may be unique; yet all contribute together to our common goal.

The purpose of this Instruction Memorandum is as a follow-up to our November 14-15, 2001 meeting. As you can see below, our meeting resulted in several accomplishments and identified additional steps which need to be taken to move the effort forward. Of utmost importance for FY2002 is reaching agreement about terms and conditions (for example, what does "treatment" mean), completing mapping of priority areas /landscape planning units, exploring opportunities for completing appropriate NEPA analysis/project planning as efficiently as possible, and completing several significant on-the-ground restoration projects.

Accomplishments -

Reaffirmation of General Priorities

- #1. Protection of remaining healthy functioning plant communities
- #2. Restoration of communities which lack some perennial component(s) but which have the potential for recovery with changes in management
- #3. Restoration of communities which lack some perennial component(s) and will require physical treatments to re-establish fully functioning perennial plant communities
- #4. Restoration of communities which have lost essentially all of the perennial components and will require extensive physical treatments to re-establish functioning perennial plant communities

Approach to Restoration Planning

Consensus was reached by the group that planning for restoration efforts will be most effectively and efficiently done on a **Landscape/Watershed Basis**.

Measurements of Progress

The following measurements were agreed to by the group:

Actual Physical Treatment Acres - Counts once regardless of number of times the area is treated in a given FY.

Total Treatment Acres - Counts each time an area receives treatment in a given FY

Total Affected/Protected Acres - Acres affected by changes in management actions, protected by greenstrips and fuelbreaks, changes in livestock or wild horse numbers, etc.

Total Acres at Desired Plant Community (DPC) - Cumulative total acres which have reached the identified DPC objective.

Acres w/ Trend Toward DPC - Cumulative acres where the plant community is moving toward the identified DPC objective.

Acres Reaching DPC - Acres which are identified as having reached DPC in that particular FY.

Acres w/ DPC Objectives Established - Cumulative total of acres for which a DPC objective has been identified. This will generally be accomplished through the Evaluation/Multiple Use Decision process.

Attachment 1 is a list developed by the National GBRI Committee of what they considered to be Restoration Projects/Activities for your information.

Next Steps -

Complete Vegetation Condition/Priority Maps for Each District by 4/30/02.

Each office will complete a map with the following themes and specifications:

1. Scale of 1:250,000
2. GIS Format
3. HUC 5 Watersheds
4. Sage grouse Habitat Condition Themes (Erick Campbell Process)
5. Specific Treatment Projects Identified
6. Specific Treatment Projects Implemented
7. Noxious Weed Locations - Species Identified
8. HMA Boundaries
9. Other Areas With Identified Resource Concerns, i.e. ACECs, T&E species, Aspen Stands, Riparian Areas, etc.
10. Undisturbed/Relic Areas Which Could Serve As Examples Or Priority #1

This map will be used by the State Leadership Team to identify priority watersheds for restoration as part of the Legacy Plan.

Estimates of Measurements of Success by 4/30/02

Complete the following table estimating accomplishments using Level Funding, -25%, +25%, +50% budget scenarios. The end result will be four tables.

Measurement	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Actual Physical Treatment ¹						
Total Treatment ²						
Total Affected/Protected ³						
Total Acres at DPC ⁴						
Acres w/ Trend Toward DPC						
Acres Reaching DPC (this FY)						
Acres w/ DPC Obj's Established						

¹ Counts once regardless of number of times going over the area in a FY.

² Counts each time an area receives treatment in any FY.

³ Acres affected by changes in management/protected by greenstrip/fuelbreaks, etc.

⁴ DPC in this case includes any kind of quantified vegetation objective.

Specific monitoring techniques/strategies need to be identified during the restoration planning process and implemented on the ground in order to ensure that accomplishments can be documented. A robust monitoring program is also critical in order to fully utilize the adaptive management process.

Reporting of actual accomplishments will become a part of the year end closeout process.

A No Net Loss of Sagebrush@ Definition Committee Nominations by 04/01/02

The GBRI group determined that further refinement of exactly what A No Net Loss of Sagebrush@ means is needed. Toward that end, I am asking each Field Office to nominate three individuals to participate on a committee to flesh out this objective. Provide your nominees by 04/01/02.

If you have any questions or need any help in completing these tasks, feel free to contact Duane Wilson at 775-861-6587.

Signed By:
Jean Rivers-Council
Associate State Director, Nevada

Authenticated By:
Debbie Spitale
Staff Assistant

What Is and Isn't Restoration

RESTORATION - YES

- Greenstrip, fuelbreaks, etc.
 - Fences (livestock, wildlife, OHV etc.) Permanent or Temporary
 - Prescribe Fire
 - Grazing modifications for fuels management
 - OHV closure for restoration goals
 - Road removal/rehab for restoration plans
 - Riparian - structures (gabions, in-stream structures, protective fences, etc.)

 - Woodland (PJ-juniper) Restore sites where PJ is not in site potential or exceeds that expected in Potential Natural Community
 - Protection or restoration of habitat that supports potential of special status species eventual natural recovery.
 - Applied research - Protect and restore (need criteria)
 - Native seed and storage increase (emphasis on state crop association NRCS, etc.)
 - Treatment of private/state and tribal lands with benefit to government and with cost share agreement
- Sensitive/T&E plant population protection/re-establishment
 - Management actions implemented to further restoration/protection objectives (i.e., grazing changes, reaching AML, etc.)

RESTORATION - NO

- Fire suppression equipment and people, fire planning
- Equipment used less than 75% of time on restoration
- Training - non restoration related.
- Woodland (PJ-Juniper) eradication on sites where trees are in site potential
- Land exchanges, purchase lands, abandoned mine land (AML) reclamation, hazmat remediation.
- Pure research - research indirect costs not to exceed 15%
- Recreation facilities
- Enhancement or study of cultural sites
- Private land treatment without benefit to public or that doesn't meet restoration objectives

Attachment 1