

LAS VEGAS FIELD OFFICE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
NV-052-2006-433
NEVADA

Route Designations
for
Selected ACECs Located in the
Northeast Portion of the
Las Vegas BLM District

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Las Vegas Field Office

U.S.D.I. Bureau of Land Management
Environmental Assessment
EA Number:2006-433
Date: 07/20/07

TITLE / PROJECT TYPE: Route Designations for Selected ACECs Located in the North East Portion of Clark County within the Las Vegas BLM District

BLM OFFICE: Las Vegas Field Office
4701 N. Torrey Pines Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89130

LOCATION OF PROPOSED ACTION: -----Refer to Appendix 1-----

USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS: The project area is located either completely or partially within the following USGS 7.5 min. Quadrangle maps, Mesquite AZ-NV, Hen Spring AZ-NV, Virgin Peak AZ-NV, Saint Thomas Gap AZ-NV, Azure Ridge AZ-NV, Iceberg Canyon AZ-NV, Jumbo Peak NV, Gold Butte NV, Devils Throat NV, Whitney Pocket NV, Riverside NV, Overton NE NV, Overton SE NV, Overton Beach NV, Lime Wash NV, Garrett Butte NV, Flat Top Mesa NV, Moapa Peak SE NV, Moapa Peak NV, Rox SE NV, Farrier NV, Wildcat Wash SE NV, Wildcat Wash SW NV, Arrow Canyon NW NV, Arrow Canyon SW NV, Dry Lake NW NV, Apex NV.

APPLICANT / PROPONENT: Bureau of Land Management, Las Vegas BLM District

INTRODUCTION

The 11 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) covered under this analysis comprise 552,554 acres. They were designated in the Las Vegas Resource Management Plan (RMP) and final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of 1998 as ACECs for their biological, cultural, scenic, and geological values. Three of them, Coyote Springs, Mormon Mesa, and Gold Butte Part A, are critical habitat for the threatened desert tortoise. The proper management of these areas is closely tied to the recovery of this species. One of the most important conservation actions identified in the RMP for these ACECs was for motorized travel to be limited to designated routes. The word, route, is used in this document to cover all types of motorized paths that would be designated through this document, including single track trails, two-track roads, bladed roads, etc.

With funding provided through the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, the BLM, assisted by the Partners in Conservation, compiled an extensive inventory of routes. The routes were recorded using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology, classified (single track, all-

terrain vehicle trails, two-track roads, and bladed roads), and evaluated as to whether they existed pre- or post-1998¹. As a result of this inventory, a total 904 miles of routes was documented.

BLM held 4 public scoping meetings in Las Vegas, Moapa Valley, Mesquite, and Bunkerville, so that the public could provide input on road designation alternatives. Based on input received, BLM developed a preliminary EA. The BLM initially invited public comment of the preliminary EA for this action for 30 days. As a result of comments received, and upon further consideration, BLM made modifications to the analysis, and invited public comment on the revised EA for an additional 21 days. BLM added to the analysis an additional alternative, Alternative D, which was consistent with BLM regulations regarding route designations under 43 CFR 8342. Four alternatives are considered in the EA, as revised: Alternative A (interim designation alternative), Alternative B (environmental alternative), Alternative D (proposed action), and No Action (no route identifications or restrictions alternative). The EA, as revised, also incorporates input from stakeholders, including the Moapa Valley and Bunkerville Town Advisory Boards and the Nevada Division of Wildlife, including a detailed discussion of the No Action alternative and a discussion on sociological impacts to different groups of stakeholders. The title was changed from “A Transportation Plan for Selected ACECs Located in the Northeast Portion of the Las Vegas District” (in the preliminary EA) to “Route Designations for Selected ACECs Located in the Northeast Portion of the Las Vegas District” (in the revised EA).

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION

The Bureau of Land Management Las Vegas Field Office (BLM) is analyzing the action of road designations in 11 ACECs in Clark County, Nevada (see Appendix 1). The 11 ACECs at issue here were established as part of the planning process which culminated in the signing of the Record of Decision for the Las Vegas RMP and final EIS in 1998. As part of that planning process, the ACECs were designated as areas where use of off-road vehicles is to be limited to identified roads and trails. This EA analyzes the action of route designation (i.e. identification of routes as open or closed, in an area designated as limited, pursuant to 43 CFR 8342.2) for 906 miles of routes on 552,554 acres in these 11 ACECs.

The purpose of this action is to (1) prevent the proliferation of user-created routes, (2) reduce road density, (3) improve habitat for wildlife and special status species, (4) control the spread of noxious and invasive weeds, (5) protect cultural resources, (6) reduce desert tortoise habitat loss and fragmentation, (7) provide for consistent management between agencies, and (8) provide a reasonable route network to allow public lands users motorized access to remote areas of the Mohave desert in northeast Clark County.

Due to population growth in the Las Vegas valley and surrounding communities and the growing popularity of off highway and all terrain vehicles (OHV and ATV), use within these ACECs has increased. As a result, route proliferation is occurring. In fact, 53 miles of additional routes have proliferated in the target ACECs between 1998 and 2005. Because of this route proliferation, habitat for sensitive and endangered plant and animal species is being fragmented and destroyed,

¹ Pursuant to the Las Vegas RMP and final EIS, Record of Decision, 1998, routes created after this date are not considered “existing routes”.

historic and prehistoric cultural resource sites are being damaged by increased use and vandalism, and noxious and invasive weeds are being spread throughout the desert. Pursuant to the RMP, motorized use is limited to designated roads and trails in the three desert tortoise ACECs (Coyote Springs, Mormon Mesa, Gold Butte Part A) and to existing roads, trails, and dry washes in Gold Butte Parts B and C and Virgin River. The Gold Butte Townsite, Red Rock Spring, Whitney Pocket, Devils Throat, and Arrow Canyon ACECs are managed in a manner that is consistent with the surrounding area management objectives.

Within the 11 ACECs, 906 miles of routes were documented². Through this route designation, routes would be identified as open, closed, or administrative access. No specific type of recreation would be prohibited in this route designation, except that motorized recreation would be limited to routes designated as open. Currently motorized recreation is limited to existing roads, trails, and dry washes, which continually increases as new routes are proliferated. In the past ten years there has been a marked increase in routes resulting from motorized vehicles driving off of existing routes.

CONFORMANCE WITH LAND USE PLANS

The proposed action is in conformance with federal regulations pursuant to 43 CFR Subpart 8342 and BLM policies. The action is tiered off of the RMP and final EIS (October 1998) and is consistent with the RMP. The action is in conformance with the Clark County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and with the Desert Tortoise (Mohave Population) Recovery Plan (USFWS 1994).

ROAD DESIGNATION STRATEGY FOR ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND D

Under Alternatives A, B, and D, routes identified as open would be labeled by a unique number fixed to a fiberglass post. Routes identified to be closed would be marked by a *route closed* sticker fixed to a fiberglass post. Informational material on route designations would be posted at all entrance points to the ACECs. For routes designated as open, the fiberglass post would be placed at the disturbed edge of the roadbed. For routes designated as closed, the fiberglass post would be placed in the center of the roadbed. While the official policy towards route designation is that “routes are closed unless designated and posted open” [43 CFR 8340], for this project closed routes would initially be posted as closed and the signage would be maintained. This policy would be used to deal with cases of extreme or frequent vandalism, and for cases of new routes that may proliferate after the designation. This strategy will provide additional clarity to the public and may reduce confusion as to the status of the routes (i.e. routes without signs are *de facto* closed).

Closed routes will be restored with highest priority given to protecting extremely sensitive resources. Rehabilitation of the closed routes would involve raking out the tracks along with a process called vertical mulching and possibly planting live vegetation. In the event of a wildfire or another type of emergency, emergency personnel would be authorized to drive on any closed route if it would facilitate or expedite response to the emergency. Firefighting and emergency personnel would be exempt from these restrictions and any disturbance resulting would be

² Note: the total mileage number has changed from the preliminary EA because there was some duplication of route coverage that was discovered in the inventory.

restored.

To provide information to the public on route designations, kiosks may be installed at strategic areas in the ACECs.³

Once routes identified as open or closed have been signed, a monitoring program would be implemented. The monitoring program would include, but not be limited to, sign monitoring and maintenance, monitoring route use through strategically placed traffic counters, and documentation of new off route trespasses. BLM would continue to invite input from the public on the monitoring process. Results from the monitoring program along with associated data of sensitive habitat areas would be used in justifying modifications to designation of routes.⁴

In Wilderness Areas, motor vehicles are prohibited. No routes would be proposed for OHV designation within wilderness in any alternative. Consistent with BLM policy for management of Wilderness Study Areas (WSA), all alternatives (except the no action alternative) would close routes to motor vehicles within WSAs if they were not documented as motor vehicle routes (ways or roads) during the 1980 wilderness inventory. In the Virgin Mountain Instant Study Area (ISA) (ISAs are managed as WSAs), this would include closure of routes marked AA1 thru AA7. These routes would be closed at the closest point outside the Virgin Mountain ISA that would most easily facilitate a vehicle turnaround with minimum impact to adjacent resources. Use or maintenance by the grazing permittee may be authorized as needed to facilitate livestock movement. In the Million Hills WSA, routes marked HH1 thru HH6, and HH9 would be closed. Routes marked BB1 thru BB10, CC1 thru CC5, DD1 thru DD6, EE1, FF1, GG1 thru GG3, HH7, HH8, II1, and JJ1 thru JJ9 would be closed. Routes marked A thru Z, A1 thru Z1, A2 thru Z2, A3 thru Z3, A4 thru Z4 and A5 thru C5 within Gold Butte A, B, C ACECs, Mormon Mesa ACEC, Coyote Springs ACEC, and Virgin River ACEC would be closed. See accompanying maps for identified routes.

North and east of the junction of US 93 and SR 168 there is a community called Coyote Springs that is currently under development. The land that the Coyote Springs development is building on was originally conveyed to Aerojet General Corporation in the Nevada-Florida Land Exchange Authorization Act of 1988. Within these private lands was a reserve of public land that was to be leased to Aerojet General Corporation. The current lessee under the lease is

³ Up to 8 kiosks may be installed to be used in conjunction with one previously existing kiosk. The kiosk areas would consist of a small pullout and an interpretive board with a map of the area (ACEC) where the kiosk is located. There would also be brochures available at each kiosk. The brochures would contain a map of the transportation plan so that area users would be able to navigate the ACECs without becoming lost and/or deviating from the designated route system. Kiosk placement would be analyzed in a separate EA.

⁴ BLM may decide to use a resource evaluation program such as Ecosystem Management Decision Support (EMDS). This program and its associated programs (Netweaver and Criteium Decision Plus) allow the user to build a model that applies to a specific project. Pertinent data is then entered into the model and the program then returns a range of alternatives or suggestions to choose from. In the following two to three years after the designation, data would be collected on route use, biologically sensitive areas, culturally sensitive areas, and socio-economic values of areas. This data would then be used to make decisions as to which routes that pass through sensitive habitat or cultural areas would be designated closed, open, or for limited use.

Coyote Springs Investment LLC (CSI). The lands subject to the lease are closed to general public access pursuant to the terms of the lease. CSI has designated a total of approximately 13,767 acres of property (primarily leased land) to be set aside to preserve natural resource values. This land includes approximately 7,548 acres in Lincoln County and 6,219 acres in Clark County contiguous to the Mormon Mesa ACEC. There were no reservations by the United States for the Old US 93 segment located on the leased lands. Nevada Department of Transportation relinquished its interest in the Old US 93 segment in 1971. Clark County relinquished its RS2477 claim to the Old US 93 segment in 1990. Pursuant to terms of the lease, the lessee is obligated to prohibit the use of any recreational off-road and all terrain vehicles. At the request of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service CSI has agreed to (1) establish a resource management area encompassing all of the leased lands in Clark County; (2) close the resource management area to motorized traffic; and (3) close and rehabilitate the lands impacted by the Old US 93/SR 168 intersection. As a result of the terms of the lease and the resulting agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service the short branch routes that lead into the western portion of the Mormon Mesa ACEC would be designated as closed to avoid management conflicts on the leased lands. For connectivity purposes, Old US 93 is shown on the maps. Old US 93 would be closed to motorized vehicles in the future as a result of the previously described process. The following routes would be closed under Alternatives A ,B, and D: routes labeled KK1 through KK7. Appendix 2 lists the routes proposed as closed as common to Alternatives A, B, and D and the reasons for closure.

The maps of this route designation may show routes outside of the boundaries of the ACECs. This project is only designating routes within the boundaries of the ACECs. Additional routes are shown for connectivity purposes only and would not be designated through this process.

ALTERNATIVE A (INTERIM DESIGNATIONS)

Under Alternative A, the route designations would be completed in a two-part process. The first part would be an interim designation, the second part would be a final designation. The final designation would be approximately three years after the interim designation is put into effect. The entire route designation process would follow an adaptive management strategy, where problems could be addressed as they arise. The adaptive management strategy would incorporate data collected from monitoring route use in the interim designation. If detrimental impacts are discovered to be occurring in any specific area then they could be addressed in a more timely fashion.

Any modifications to the route designations (open, closed, limited) would be preceded by a public process and public review.

Alternative A would initially designate 812 miles of routes that existed prior to 1998 as open, except for the 41 miles of routes represented on the maps as a double-letter prefix followed by a number, including routes AA1-AA7; BB1-BB10; CC1-CC5; DD1-DD6; EE1; FF1; GG1; HH1-HH9; II1; JJ1-JJ9; and KK1-KK7. A total of 53 miles of these post-1998 routes would be identified as closed. These routes were selected for closure because either there was an extremely pressing resource concern that warranted the closure or because of policy that is in place that would prevent the BLM from designating these routes as open. Appendix 2 provides a

list of all roads proposed for closure and the rationale for closure. All route proliferated since 1998 would be identified as designated closed. This designation would be an interim step to provide protection to the ACECs, while waiting for monitoring results to determine if changes to route designations are needed. Alternative A would close approximately 94 miles of routes. See Table 1 for a summary of routes identified under Alternative A.

Table 1 Summary of Routes Identified as Open and Closed Under Alternative A

Area	Open Routes for all ACECs: 812 miles	Pre-1998 roads identified as closed (miles)	Post-1998 roads identified as closed (miles)	Total miles of roads identified as closed
Coyote Springs		0	19	19
Mormon Mesa		1	12	13
Gold Butte (incl. Virgin River ACEC)		40	22	62
Total	812	41	53	94

ALTERNATIVE B (ENVIRONMENTAL ALTERNATIVE)

Under Alternative B, the route designations are proposed to be completed in a two-part process. The first part would be an interim designation, the second part would be a final designation. The final designation would be approximately three years after the interim designation is put into effect. The entire route designation process would follow an adaptive management strategy, where problems could be addressed as they arise. The adaptive management strategy would incorporate data collected from monitoring route use in the interim designation. If detrimental impacts are discovered to be occurring in any specific area then they could be addressed in a more timely fashion.

Alternative B would initially designate 754 miles of routes that existed prior to 1998 as open, except for the 41 miles routes represented on the maps as a double-letter prefix followed by a number, including routes AA1-AA7; BB1-BB10; CC1-CC5; DD1-DD6; EE1; FF1; GG1; HH1-HH9; II1; JJ1-JJ9; and KK1-KK7 (see Appendix 2). The routes with a double letter prefix were selected for closure because either there was an extremely pressing resource concern that warranted the closure or because of policy that is in place that would prevent the BLM from designating these routes as open. A total of 53 miles of these post-1998 routes would be identified as closed. Additional routes, labeled 1-33, would be identified as closed in alternative B (see Table 2 below). The additional route closures would be located in the desert tortoise ACECs for the purpose of defragmenting desert tortoise habitat and effectively creating larger blocks of contiguous habitat for desert tortoise as well as other MSHCP covered species. Alternative B would identify a total of approximately 152 miles of routes as closed.

Table 2 Summary of Routes Identified as Open and Closed Under Alternatives B

Area	Open Routes for all ACECs: 754 miles	Pre-1998 routes identified as closed (miles)	Post-1998 Routes identified as closed (miles)	Additional routes identified as closed (miles)	Total miles of routes identified as closed
Coyote Springs		0	19	7 (Roads 1-5)	26
Mormon Mesa		1	12	14 (Roads 6,7,8,9)	27
Gold Butte (incl. Virgin River ACEC)		40	22	37 (Roads 10-33)	99
Total	754	41	53	58	152

ALTERNATIVE D – PROPOSED ACTION

Alternative D is consistent with BLM’s route designation regulations pursuant to 43 CFR 8342.2 and 43 CFR 8342.3. Alternative D identifies 906 miles of routes, which would be designated as either open or closed to motorized vehicle use. There would be no interim or final route designations.

Alternative D would designate 812 miles of routes that existed prior to 1998 as open and would identify approximately 94 miles of routes as designated closed. The following pre-1998 identified routes (41 miles) would be designated as closed and indicated on the maps by the double-letter prefix followed by a number: AA1-AA7; BB1-BB10; CC1-CC5; DD1-DD6; EE1; FF1; GG1; HH1-HH9; II1; JJ1-JJ9; and KK1-KK7 (see Appendix 2). A total of 53 miles of the post-1998 routes would be identified as closed. The routes with a double letter prefix were selected for closure because either there was an extremely pressing resource concern that warranted the closure or because of policy that is in place that would prevent the BLM from designating these routes as open. The routes identified for designation as open and closed are identical to Alternative A (see Appendix 2). This designation would protect the characteristics of the ACECs. Any future change to these route designations would be based on the results of monitoring and would require a new environmental analysis, public scoping, and a new decision record.

Table 3 Summary of Routes Identified as Open and Closed Under Alternatives D

Area	Open Routes for all ACECs: 812 miles	Pre-1998 Roads identified as closed (miles)	Post-1998 Roads identified as closed (miles)	Total Miles of Roads
Coyote Springs		0	19	19
Mormon Mesa		1	12	13
Gold Butte (incl. Virgin River ACEC)		40	22	62
Total	812	41	53	94

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action alternative, there would be no routes identified to be designated as open or closed and, thus, no restrictions of route use. As of 2005, there are 904 miles of roads documented from inventories, 54 miles of which were created since the RMP Record of Decision in 1998.

ALTERNATIVES DROPPED FROM CONSIDERATION

During the public meetings held in June and July of 2006 there was an additional alternative being considered named Alternative C. Alternative C has been dropped from consideration because it was found to be not in conformance with the Las Vegas RMP and final EIS.

DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Critical Element	Affected?		Critical Element	Affected?	
	Yes	No		Yes	No
ACECs	X		Noxious Weeds	X	
Air Quality		X	Threatened & Endangered Species	X	
Cultural Resources	X		Wastes Hazardous / Solid		X
Environmental Justice		X	Water Quality		X
Farm Lands,		X	Wetlands and Riparian	X	

Prime / Unique					
Floodplains	X		Wildland Fires	X	
Nat. Amer. Religious Concerns		X	Wilderness	X	
			Migratory Birds		X

Affected Environment

Wilderness

Four wilderness areas are located in the project area: Jumbo Springs, Lime Canyon, Arrow Canyon, and Mormon Mountains Wilderness areas. Motor vehicles are prohibited in wilderness areas (with limited exceptions). Two Wilderness Study Areas are located in the project area: Million Hills, and Virgin Mountain (Virgin Mountain is an Instant Study Area which is managed as a WSA). WSAs are managed so that their suitability for designation, by Congress, as Wilderness is not impaired. BLM's *Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review* guides the management of those areas. Motorized and mechanized vehicles are only allowed within WSAs on existing ways. BLM does not establish new discretionary uses in WSAs that are incompatible with possible wilderness designation.

Several routes existing prior to 1998 were identified in the 1980 WSA inventory; however, several other routes existing prior to 1998 were not identified as roads or ways. All these routes are experiencing increasing motor vehicle use with the development and expanding popularity of the ATV. In the Virgin Mountains, routes marked AA1 thru AA7 were originally established as several livestock routes; a range improvement to facilitate cattle moving through a steep and heavily vegetated area that was restrictive to grazing by cattle. These livestock routes were not constructed or maintained for the purpose of motorized vehicle traffic. At the time of the wilderness inventory of 1980, these routes were recognized as range improvements, not as vehicle ways or roads.

ACEC

A total of 11 ACECs on 552,554 acres are encompassed by this project, including six large ACECs, including Gold Butte A, B, and C, Mormon Mesa, Virgin River, and Coyote Springs. Contained within these larger ACECs there are five smaller ACECs, including Gold Butte Townsites, Red Rock Spring, Whitney Pocket, Devil's Throat, and Arrow Canyon (see Appendix 1). Pursuant to the RMP, these smaller ACECs would be managed in a manner that is consistent with the surrounding areas. These areas have been designated as ACECs to protect cultural sites, biological and scenic values, natural hazards, and desert tortoise. These ACECs provide excellent opportunities for recreation in some of the more remote areas of the Mojave Desert. A wide variety of casual recreational activities are engaged by the public in these ACECs. The recreational activities that occur in these ACECs include but are not limited to the following, hiking, photography, ATV use, four wheeled drive vehicle use, off road motorcycle use, bird and nature watching, hunting, exploration of historic areas, and camping.

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are the tangible remains of past human activities, identifiable through inventory, historical documentation, or oral history. Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic-period sites, features, and artifacts that can range in complexity from a single stone tool or bottle fragment to a large prehistoric village or historic period town site. The Las Vegas BLM District encompasses a unique region, being located at the interface of three distinct geographical zones: Colorado Plateau, Mojave Desert, and the Great Basin.

All prehistoric Native Americans employed hunting and gathering methods to acquire at least some of their foods; these resource collection practices are reflected in the archeological record. Seeds, nuts, roots, and pods were collected from a variety of plants, including cacti, agave, yucca, grasses, mesquite, and pinyon pine. Stone tools such as manos and metates used to grind the seeds and nuts, knives, sharpened stone flakes, and chopping tools are found in archeological sites that record these plant procurement and processing activities.

Other types of prehistoric archeological sites include stone features such as rock rings and rock art locales. Rock art is defined as the modification of a rock face by pecking (petroglyphs) or painting (pictographs) figures or designs. Rock art panels are common in certain areas, generally near water sources, along game trails, or near resource procurement locations.

Historic use of southern Nevada began with exploration along routes such as the Old Spanish Trail (1829 to 1848), later known as the Mormon Road. Ranching was well underway by the late 1800s; completion of railroad construction in 1905 established Las Vegas as a vital Nevada community.

Historic foundations from mining sites, ranches, and quarries are found within the project area. These site types are often difficult to identify and interpret; a trash heap and fragments of tent platforms are the only remains of the mining tent town at Gold Butte. These historic remnants have the potential to document adaptations and technological changes not often recorded in the archival record of this region.

Cultural resources may be found within any of the ACECs that are incorporated into this EA even though only one ACEC (Gold Butte part B) has been designated as such to protect historic and prehistoric archeological sites. Archeological resources that may be found in these areas are rock shelters and caves, roasting pits, campsites (historic and prehistoric), stone tools, projectile points, rock art, lithic scatters, pottery fragments, historic mining artifacts, historic mining towns, and historic mines.

There are two known historic routes that traverse these ACECs, they are the Old Spanish Trail and the Arrowhead Trail. Throughout these ACECs there are historic mining townsites and camps.

Native American Resources

The objective of tribal consultation is to ensure that tribal issues and concerns are given legally adequate consideration during the decision-making process. The BLM has responsibilities to consult with tribes to identify cultural values, religious beliefs, and traditional practices that may be affected by a federal action. Areas of concern may include physical locations that are

important historically or have religious or traditional significance. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are areas of traditional importance that are listed in or have been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

The Moapa Band of Paiutes is a federally recognized tribe that has a documented history of occupation and utilization of the ACECs. In a letter dated October, 22, 1990, the Moapa Band of Paiutes identifies seven areas in Gold Butte as “traditional lifeways areas.” These areas are used to gather traditional plants for medicinal purposes and as basket making materials. The petroglyphs in the area are claimed as “a vital part of our religious heritage and culture.” The letter continues, “These sensitive areas are necessary for us to continue our ceremonial and religious traditions and our lifestyle as Paiutes.” Further evaluation of these areas as a cultural landscape is warranted.

Wetlands and Riparian

The routes leading to many springs and seeps located within the ACECs that are identified as open. Within the Virgin River ACEC the Virgin River flows out to Lake Mead. The Virgin River supports an extensive wetland/riparian area. This area provides habitat for many species including some species that are listed under the Endangered Species Act. Another extensive riparian is the Meadow Valley Wash. The water flows through this area are not as large as the Virgin River, but the riparian area associated with it provides habitat for many different species of wildlife. During dry years some springs may become noticeably smaller or may even be considered a seep. During wet years some springs may accommodate unusually high flows and seeps may swell with enough water to be considered springs. Also during wet years, areas that were previously dry may become wet or even flow with water and become seasonal riparian areas that can only be seen during extremely wet years. The winter rains of 2005 provided so much precipitation that the BLM and the public were able to see these seasonal riparian areas appear in unexpected areas.

Riparian areas and wetlands are very productive and valuable parts of the ecosystem. They act as transition zones between the aquatic and upland areas increasing benefits such as fish and wildlife habitat, erosion control, forage, late season stream flow, and water quality. Wetlands and riparian areas provide benefits by acting as reservoirs within the watershed regulating late season stream flow and increasing groundwater recharge. Since these areas generally have saturated soils, they are more vulnerable to soil compaction, making re-vegetation a difficult task.

The riparian area is the section of land and water forming a transition from aquatic to terrestrial ecosystems along streams and lakes, including wetlands, springs, seeps and floodplains. Riparian areas support high soil moisture and a diverse assemblage of vegetation and performs important ecological functions. They also act as a filtering system, stabilize banks, and regulate water quality. Riparian vegetation provides a buffer by slowing down water and settling out sediment and nutrients. Strong root masses decrease surface erosion by stabilizing stream banks and absorbing floodwater without degrading during high stream flows. The vegetative cover in riparian areas provides a thermal break from radiant sunlight reaching the water surface. This keeps the water from increasing in temperature and reducing dissolved oxygen levels. Management activities within riparian areas directly impact stability, soil compaction and increasing sedimentation.

Minerals

Mining has occurred in the past within the ACECs that would be impacted by this EA. Currently there is one active mine located to the south and east of the historic Gold Butte townsite.

The RMP states the following regarding minerals and mining within these ACECs: Coyote Springs, Mormon Mesa, Gold Butte Part A- Closed to locatable minerals and solid leasables. Open to fluid mineral leasing subject to no surface occupancy stipulations. Allow mineral site ROW only within ½ mile of the centerline of Federal Aid Highways. Allow Free Use Permit (FUP) only within ½ mile of the centerline of federal and state highways and specified county roads. Issue FUP to government entities only. Gold Butte Part B- Closed to locatable minerals (a mineral subject to location under the 1872 mining laws such as gold, silver, copper), salables (such as rock, sand, and gravel), and solid leasables (minerals that may be acquired under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 such as coal, oil, gas, and geothermal resources). Open to fluid minerals subject to timing and special use constraints. Gold Butte Part C- Closed to locatable minerals, salables, and solid leasables. Virgin River- Close to locatable minerals, salables, and solid leasables. Open to fluid minerals subject to no surface occupancy stipulations.

Floodplains

Between the major banks of the Virgin River would be considered floodplains. The Virgin River seasonally may overflow its smaller banks and scour the surrounding landscape. This scouring can also occur any time of year during periods of high rainfall. The Virgin River is constantly changing within the wider banks of its large floodplains. These floodplain areas provide a very unique habitat with a very nutrient rich soil resulting from the organic material that gets deposited during high water events. The only area that floodplains would be affected by this route designation is where the Virgin River runs through or adjacent to the Virgin River ACEC.

Threatened and Endangered Species

This project encompasses six ACECs; Gold Butte A, B, and C, Mormon Mesa, Virgin River, and Coyote Springs. Gold Butte Part A, Mormon Mesa, and Coyote Springs ACECs are for the purpose of protecting desert tortoise habitat. Desert tortoise habitat elements are present in all of these ACECs, but to a lesser extent in the ACECs named Gold Butte Part B, and C, and Virgin River.

When basic habitat requirements are met the desert tortoise can survive and reproduce within the varied vegetation communities of the Mojave region. These habitat requirements include sufficient suitable plants for forage and cover, suitable substrate for burrow and nest sites, and freedom from disturbance. Throughout most of the Mojave region, the desert tortoise occurs primarily on flats and bajadas with soils ranging from sand to sandy-gravel characterized by scattered shrubs and abundant inter-shrub space for herbaceous plant growth. Desert tortoise may also be found on rocky terrain and side slopes.

Factors causing the decline of desert tortoise are primarily human related and are listed as follows: Collection for pets, food, or commercial trade, vehicle collisions along roadways, increased predation by ravens, and habitat loss, fragmentation, and degradation resulting from development, cross country OHV travel, unauthorized dump areas, and an increase in raven perch sites to name a few reasons of habitat decline issues (Berry and Nicholson 1984).

In the Virgin River and Mormon Mesa ACECs there is a potential for southwestern willow flycatchers to occur. If present, these birds would be found in the riparian areas of the Virgin River or the Meadow Valley wash. Route closures and restoration activities would not be occurring directly within the riparian areas of these systems.

Within the Virgin River, which borders the Virgin River ACEC there is an endangered fish species called the Virgin River chub. The Virgin River chub is native to both the Virgin River and the Muddy River, but is only considered endangered within the Virgin River. Route closures and restoration activities would not be occurring directly within the riparian or watercourse areas of the Virgin River.

Noxious Weeds

Noxious weeds, including saltcedar (*Tamarix* spp.) and Sahara mustard (*Brassica tournefortii*), are found in many sites in Clark County. These weeds tend to out compete and displace native vegetation. Weeds are dispersed through a variety of methods such as cattle, wild animals, and humans moving through the landscape as well as wind and water. Weeds tend to establish along the disturbed edges of roadways and are very easily distributed further along the roadways by vehicle, and animal movement through these weed source population areas (Davidson and Fox, 1974; Brooks, 1999). Wind and water further distribute weed seeds away from source populations into areas that humans visit less often. As weeds displace native vegetation, both cover and food are lost to native animals found in those areas.

Wildland Fires

Historically, fire occurrence in the Mojave has been low. When fires did occur they were generally small. Small fire size was a result of large interstitial spaces between shrubs. In the past few years the Mojave region has seen an increase in both fire frequency and fire size (Brown and Minnich, 1986). The year 2005 was a particularly destructive fire year for the Mojave region, over 1 million acres were burned in fires throughout southern Nevada alone. This increase in fire frequency and size has been primarily attributed to the proliferation of invasive annual grasses. These grasses provide a continuous fuel bed within the interstitial spaces between shrubs as well as growing very thickly within and immediately around shrubs. Red brome (*Bromus madritensis*) and Mediterranean grass (*Schismus* spp.) grasses are the primary species that are contributing to the increase in fires.

Social and Economic Environment

BLM is required to integrate social science information in the preparation of informed, sustainable land use planning decisions. Section 102 of NEPA requires federal agencies to “insure the integrated use of natural and social sciences . . . in planning and decision making.” BLM has recently developed an instructional memo (IM) that contains guidance for social and economic analysis in land use planning (IM No. 2003-167).

The first section describes the existing population, economic, social conditions, financial resources, and facilities and services in the socioeconomic study area to help analyze potential impacts from the proposed project on social or economic conditions. The second section discusses some of the social trends and changing attitudes that may have an impact on public land management, as well as some of the entities who could be affected by the different

alternatives.

The study area for this analysis includes the stakeholders most likely to be affected by the proposed project. These include Clark County, urban centers, rural communities, Coyote Springs LLC, resource protection groups, Nevada Division of Wildlife, recreation groups, Native Americans, and governmental agencies.

Social Trends and Changing Attitudes

Rapid growth in southern Nevada is a driving force in the social and economic setting. Increased growth has also exerted environmental pressures on surrounding areas as development moves closer to the urban centers. Development also creates an increased demand for open spaces, which will likely translate into more visitors to southern Nevada and surrounding areas. It also means that more rural and remote communities might experience other pressures, such as increased growth as people relocate to nearby communities, or possibly declining growth as people move away for increased economic opportunities.

This discussion describes the social and economic conditions of Clark County in southern Nevada and, when appropriate, communities near the ACECs that may either have an impact on or be affected by the project area.

The most significant factors affecting the character and economy of southern Nevada are the tourism and gaming industries. Gaming has been an integral part of the development of Las Vegas; by the end of World War II, the area had become a desert oasis and gaming resort town. southern Nevada has become an entertainment, gaming, and recreation mecca, with 150 casinos and roughly 60 golf courses in Clark County, as well as access to thousands of acres of state and federal lands (World Casino Directory 2006). There are numerous recreation opportunities, such as the nearby Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, and Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument.

Nevada has consistently been one of the fastest-growing states in the country, with Clark County being one of the fastest-growing counties in the U.S. According to the CCDCP and the Nevada State Health Division, the net migration to Clark County in 2005 was 4,480 people per month, and the average monthly natural increase (births minus deaths) was 1,243 people (CCDCP 2005). Rapid growth is a driving force in a dynamic social and economic setting. In 2006, Clark County had a population density of 225.6 people per square mile (Census Bureau 2007b). Clark County is the thirty-fifth fastest-growing county in the U.S. in terms of housing (Census Bureau 2007a). Migration to Clark County continues to be the greatest contributor to population growth. According to CCDCP and the Nevada State Health Division, the net migration to Clark County in 2005 was 4,480 people per month. In contrast, the average monthly natural increase (births minus deaths) was 1,243 people (CCDCP 2005). Common social trends in the western U.S. include rapidly growing urban populations, increasing concern over loss of open space, increasingly transformed landscapes, continued and increasing loss of biodiversity, increasing pressures for uses of all types (particularly strong trends in recreational uses, such as hiking, biking, OHV, sport-utility vehicle use, camping, picnicking, etc.), increasing pressures for preservation and conservation, and increasing feelings of loss associated with public and private lands, including: 1) fees instead of free admission; 2) lost landscapes and loss of relatively uncongested use of special areas; 3) loss of favored species and sometimes of

biological diversity; and 4) lost access to special places.

Increased growth in southern Nevada exerts environmental pressures on surrounding areas as development moves closer to the ACECs. As growth continues and development increases, the demand for open spaces will also increase, which will likely result in more visitors to southern Nevada and surrounding areas. As the population in Clark County continues to grow, rural and remote communities may also experience other pressures, such as increased growth as people relocate to some nearby communities, or possibly declining growth as people move away for increased economic opportunities.

Nevada, once characterized by its mining, agriculture, and ranching culture, has in recent decades moved toward gaming, entertainment, tourism, construction, and recreation industries to accommodate its exponential growth. This is particularly true of Clark County, where the gaming-related industries and employment have continued to grow, while forestry, mining, and agricultural employment have declined in recent years.

The growing concern for the environment has sparked debate about placing a monetary value on preserving natural resources. For almost a decade, Roper Starch Worldwide (Roper), in conjunction with the National Environmental Education and Training Foundation (NEETF), has conducted an annual nationwide survey that offers insight into American perceptions of the environment. In 2001, NEETF published the *Ninth Annual Report on Environmental Attitudes, Knowledge, and Behavior*, which summarized their findings (NEETF and Roper 2001). Over 63 percent of Americans believe that environmental protection and economic development go hand in hand, whereas only 25 percent believe we must choose between the two. When forced to choose between the environment and the economy, 71 percent of Americans would choose the environment. In general, when support for the nationwide economy is strong, so is support for the environment. These data are relatively consistent over time (NEETF and Roper 2001). The survey also concluded that the public overwhelmingly (89 percent) agrees that the condition of the environment will play an important role in the nation's economic future. Many also believe (66 percent) that technology will play a role in solving environmental problems, indicating that the public is relying on technology rather than on individual solutions to environmental problems (NEETF and Roper 2001). The study also concluded that 46 percent of Americans believe that environmental laws and regulations have not gone far enough, compared with 32 percent who believe there is a good balance, 15 percent who believe regulations have gone too far, and 7 percent who were uncertain. These numbers have shifted slightly since 1992, when 63 percent of Americans believed regulations had not gone far enough, 17 percent believed there was a good balance, and 10 percent thought the government had gone too far. This increase in satisfaction over time may reflect the environmental gains of the 1990s (NEETF and Roper 2001).

Stakeholders and Affected Groups

Following is a discussion of the values and attitudes of various stakeholders who will be affected by the proposed project; the stakeholder groups include Clark County, Las Vegas metropolitan area, City of Mesquite, rural towns, environmental, recreation groups, and Native Americans. It should be noted that these discussions generalize from and simplify the members' actual values and attitudes. In addition, this format is not meant to imply that these groups are mutually exclusive, and examples of individuals fitting into all categories are likely to be present. For

instance, recreationists may engage in motorized and non-motorized types of recreation and may have high levels of concern about the environment. In addition, people's attitudes and interests may change over time.

Clark County

Clark County's vision is for a dynamic, vibrant community that values diversity, opportunity, and partnerships, fostering a healthy environment where individuals and families choose to live, work, and play. Clark County recognizes the environmental sensitivity of the ACECs and their valuable recreational opportunities. Through the Desert Conservation Program, Clark County uses development fees to implement conservation projects pursuant to the MSHCP. One such project funded by Clark County was the roads inventory completed by the BLM and Partners in Conservation in 2005. The MSHCP classifies ACECs as "Intensively Managed Areas" and the proper management of the ACECs assists Clark County in maintaining its Section 10(a) permit to develop private lands.

Urban Centers (Las Vegas metropolitan area and City of Mesquite)

The Las Vegas metropolitan area is a diverse community comprised of the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson. A growing population of 2 million, the metropolitan area enjoys a moderate cost of living, which has stimulated economic growth over the past decade. According to the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, over 6,000 people per month relocate to the Las Vegas Valley, in large part because of substantial job growth in the area. Additionally, the cost of living is lower in the LVV than in comparable U.S. cities, such as Albuquerque, Houston, Phoenix, and San Jose (Applied Analysis 2007). Increased population growth and housing development have brought new challenges with respect to transportation and public services. For the most part, these challenges are being adequately addressed or planned for; there are many plans for new facilities, including medical facilities, public schools, and roads.

The City of Mesquite is the fastest growing urban center in southern Nevada. With a current population of 20,000, the City of Mesquite is projected to double in size in another decade (City of Mesquite, 2007). Major employment is overwhelmingly from the gaming industry, however retail and government sectors are important sources of jobs. The City of Mesquite is currently developing a Habitat Conservation Plan to address impacts to listed species that are not currently covered in the Clark County MSHCP.

Rural Communities

The collective population of the rural communities of the Moapa Valley (Logandale-Overton), Moapa-Glendale, and Bunkerville totals approximately 9,000 people. These communities are experiencing rapid growth. Though employment opportunities are now largely retail and small businesses, the communities strongly identify with the historic rural lifestyle of ranching and farming. Many of the residents are fourth and fifth generation of the original settlers in the region. The vision of many residents is for government to play a minor role in the management of public lands and for few restrictions in accessing public lands. This viewpoint does not imply that the communities do not care about wildlife and sensitive resources, but that the protection of resources should be through education of users and not through limiting uses on public land. Partners in Conservation is a rural community group that promotes the viewpoint of the rural communities through its participation in the public lands planning process.

Coyote Springs, LLC

Coyote Spring Investments, LLC (CSI) proposes to develop a new town in Lincoln and Clark counties, NV. It would consist of a planned community including residential housing, mixed-use urban villages, public buildings, other public facilities, commercial and light industrial development, and resorts, hotels and casinos. The development would provide up to 111,000 residential dwellings to meet the housing needs of southern NV. Economic growth in Lincoln County would result from commercial development components of the planned community. CSI has designated a total of approximately 13,767 acres of property (primarily leased land) to be set aside to preserve natural resource values. This land includes approximately 7,548 acres in Lincoln County and 6,219 acres in Clark County contiguous to the Mormon Mesa ACEC. A total of 21,454 acres would be developed over the next 40 years

Under the proposed development plan, no all terrain vehicles (ATVs) or off-highway vehicles (OHVs) would be allowed in the CSI development area except within areas expressly designated for such use, if any. No ATVs or OHVs would be allowed in the area set aside to preserve natural resource values. Ordinances related to the CSI Development would be used to enforce these avoidance measures. In the MSHCP under development, CSI states it will encourage the BLM to prohibit use of OHVs on those lands adjacent to the CSI Development.

Resource Protection Groups

These groups include, but are not limited to, the Friends of Gold Butte, Southwest Center for Biological Diversity, Sierra Club, Friends of Nevada Wilderness, and Cultural Resource Site Stewards. The general view of these groups is to explore, enjoy, and protect the wild places of the earth and to practice and promote responsible use of the earth's ecosystems and resources. They are interested in protecting a variety of resources in the ACECs, including archaeological resources, unique plants and animals, and wilderness values. They envision a future which would protect the ecosystems and provide a retreat from urban areas, provide hiking trails, bicycle paths, and provide informational signs highlighting the rare and endemic resources. The viewpoint of this group is that limiting uses and enforcing restrictions is a practical way to achieve protection of the resources. Many of these groups have been actively engaged in the planning process.

Nevada Division of Wildlife

The Nevada Division of Wildlife (NDOW) is mandated to manage and protect wildlife species for conservation and hunting opportunities. The ACECs included in the project area provide habitat for Desert bighorn sheep, deer, small game animals, and sensitive species. Of particular interest are the numerous natural springs and developed guzzlers that offer critical watering sources for wildlife. NDOW has expressed concern about habitat degradation along the Virgin River, Arrow Canyon, and Gold Butte caused by the proliferation of user-created trails. They have further concerns about impacts of road proliferation to Desert bighorn sheep, Peregrine falcon, desert tortoise, Virgin River fishes, Southwestern Willow flycatcher, Burrowing owl, Phainopepla, Gila monster and other species of special management concern.

Recreation Groups

Recreation is a component of most lifestyles in the project area. The substantial recreation opportunities for hunting, hiking, biking, horseback riding, OHV use, and sightseeing are an important element of the overall quality of life for residents. Recreationists represent diverse

groups of people, and changes in recreation management can affect recreationists quite differently. They tend to organize into interest groups; most recreation activities have at least one group that advocates for their activity. Comments received on recreation during the scoping period included the following concerns: maintaining or increasing access to BLM lands for hiking, biking, horseback riding, education, and research; and restricting or maintaining OHV use, the negative effects of OHV use and motorized travel on resources, and enforcing OHV regulations. There can be much overlap between recreation users and resource protection users. This category also includes permitted tour operators.

Native Americans

The Moapa Band of Southern Paiutes regard the project area as part of their ancestral lands. The cultural sites within the project area are considered sacred. Tribal Council members expressed their desire to have the project area open to them for traditional tribal uses. The Tribe's desire is to *limit the access that ATVs have on specific lands such as Logandale Trails, Arrowhead Canyon, Gold Butte, and other lands in the surrounding areas...if we do not limit the areas that ATVs are allowed to go into now, then the land itself will be ruined permanently, not to mention the wildlife who reside on these lands.*

Governmental Agencies

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is tasked with enforcing the provisions of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Gold Butte Part A, Mormon Mesa, and Coyote Springs ACECs are designated as critical habitat for the threatened desert tortoise and the Virgin River ACEC is designated as critical habitat for the endangered Southwestern Willow flycatcher. Road designations and restoration of roads identified as closed in the desert tortoise critical habitat are identified in the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan as necessary to ensure their recovery to healthy population levels and move toward a delisting of the species under ESA. The National Park Service's Lake Mead National Recreation Area (NPS) lies west and adjacent to the Gold Butte area. Illegal routes into NPS-administered lands from the Gold Butte area is a great concern to NPS. Their view is that BLM route designations need to be coordinated with NPS to provide seamless management between the agencies.

Environmental Impacts for the Alternative A (Interim Designations) and Alternative D (Proposed Action)

Note: The impacts for both Alternatives A and D are identical, irrespective of whether the routes are identified through "interim/final" designations (Alternative A) or whether routes are identified to be designated open or closed (Alternative D).

Wilderness

The Proposed Action and Alternative A are consistent with management of Wilderness and WSAs. Those routes proposed for designation for continued OHV use in the WSAs were identified in the 1980 wilderness inventory. The proposal is consistent with BLM policy which allows designations of existing ways. In the Virgin Mountains, certain routes were originally established as a series of livestock routes, and were recognized as continuing to serve that purpose in the 1980 wilderness inventory. The closure of these routes to vehicle use is consistent with BLM policy of restricting vehicle use to ways identified in the wilderness inventory, and would prevent the impairment of the area's suitability for Congressional designation as Wilderness. This proposal would be consistent with, and not affect Wilderness areas.

ACEC

The purpose of this EA is not to restrict specific recreational activities conducted within these ACEC's; however, the purpose is to limit motorized travel to routes identified as open in order to protect the resources found in these areas from route proliferation. The route designations should have a positive impact on the ACECs by decreasing route density therefore decreasing impacts to threatened, endangered, or sensitive species that occupy these areas. With restoration, disturbance would be reduced by approximately 94 acres.⁵ This proposal would have a beneficial effect to the protection of the ACECs.

Cultural Resources

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) states that federal agencies will take into account the affects of their undertaking on historic properties, that is, those cultural resource properties that are listed in or determined eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Any action that alters the characteristics of a significant property that qualify it for listing in the NRHP is considered an "effect." An "adverse effect" diminishes the integrity of a significant property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. "Adverse effects" include but are not limited to the physical destruction or alteration of the character of the property's setting such as the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or its setting. Any action or undertaking that does not affect a property either directly or indirectly, or if the property is determined not eligible for nomination to the National Register, than the action may be determined to have "no effect."

Route designations would provide protection to cultural resources by closing an additional number of roads that have proliferated since the 1998 inventory. With the exponential growth in southern Nevada, the location of significant cultural sites has spread by word of mouth. Many difficult to reach and rarely visited sites now have roads leading directly to them. These roads would be designated as closed and provide law enforcement with ability to enforce the closure.

In contrast, route designation would alter traffic patterns, which may affect cultural resources by increasing the amount of traffic on any particular road. Prior to the implementation of designation status, all section 106 requirements will be met unless otherwise stated in an agreement between the Nevada State BLM and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Following implementation, an extensive monitoring program would be initiated to analyzed the effects of the transportation plan in the ACECs and determine where additional enforcement or signage is needed. This project should have a beneficial effect to cultural sites.

Native American Resources

Efforts to involve Native Americans began early in the roads designation process, including the Moapa Band of Southern Paiutes. The BLM presented an overview of the proposed project at a Moapa Tribal Council meeting on October 8, 2002. In conjunction with public scoping and outreach efforts, BLM also sent a notification letter to the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe. The BLM attended a second Moapa Tribal Council meeting on June 13, 2006. Council members and others

⁵ One mile of road, 8-feet in width, is approximately 1acre.

expressed their concerns about the project's goals and how the closures would be implemented. Concerns were raised about limiting vehicle access to traditional use areas. The tribe was then asked to view the supplied maps and identify areas that could be affected by any closures. No information was forthcoming. The tribe then sent a letter to the BLM dated June 11, 2007 requesting the BLM to *limit the access that ATVs have on specific lands such as Logandale Trails, Arrowhead Canyon, Gold Butte, and other lands in the surrounding areas...if we do not limit the areas that ATVs are allowed to go into now, then the land itself will be ruined permanently, not to mention the wildlife who reside on these lands.*

Wetlands and Riparian

Route designations in areas of wetlands or riparian systems would have a beneficial effect to these sensitive areas. Wetlands and riparian systems are relatively fragile systems in the Mojave Desert. They are small islands of relief and habitat for a wide variety of animal and plant species. For other animal species they are the only means to obtain water and survive in an otherwise inhospitable environment. Route designation would prevent further degradation of wetland and riparian resources by ensuring that vehicle users stay on designated routes and helping to prevent the creation of new routes within these areas.

Minerals

Currently there is one active mine located within these ACECs. The area within these ACECs are closed to future mineral claims. Any claims filed prior to the segregation of the ACECs has the ability to be validated. If there is a valid mineral claim in an area of the ACEC that is not accessible, either as a direct result of the route designation or because there was never access to the specific area, BLM could authorize construction of a new road to the claim pending validation of the claim. The previous sentence is not to say that all claims will eventually have a road to them, but that if it is a valid claim and all of the proper channels have been followed and everything is approved that the possibility exists of access being provided to the claim.

Access to a valid unpatented mining claim is a non-discretionary right of the miner and is not subject to a right of way permit. Under the mining regulations, the BLM has the authority to approve the route and method of access so as to minimize surface disturbance. A mineral patent issued under the mining laws does not invest the owners with a "legal right of way" to the patented mining claim across federal lands. Ingress and egress across public lands to a patented mining claim or other patented property does require a right of way permit.

There are currently 117 unpatented mining claims within the six ACECs. The breakdown of where these claims are located is as follows: Mormon Mesa ACEC – 6, Gold Butte ACEC Part A – 5, and Gold Butte ACEC Part B – 106. A review of the proposed route closures does not appear to conflict with any access issues at this time.

Floodplains

As there are no new roads being proposed within the floodplain, this plan should not have any adverse affect on the floodplains.

Threatened and Endangered Species

The impacts on threatened and endangered species that are associated with this project are expected to be positive ones. Closures of routes within these ACECs would defragment desert

tortoise habitat. This should reduce the amount of desert tortoise that would be taken through either death, harassment, or taken for pets. Route closure and the associated informational sites should make people more aware of the desert tortoise which should help to lessen impacts on tortoise along routes that are designated as open. During rehabilitation activities a desert tortoise monitor would be on site to ensure that any possible negative effects to tortoise are mitigated. During rehabilitation activities tortoise mitigation would primarily involve avoidance of any desert tortoise encountered. With restoration, disturbance will be reduced by approximately 94 acres. Route designation and closures should improve desert tortoise habitat and have a beneficial effect on individual tortoises and desert tortoise population levels.

The Southwestern Willow flycatcher and the Virgin River chub should not be negatively impacted by this proposal. Because the route designation is intended to benefit habitat if there are any impacts to these species they would most likely be positive ones. Some beneficial impacts to the Virgin River chub that may result from this proposal are decreased sediment loads in runoff that flows into the Virgin River. Some beneficial impacts to the Southwestern willow flycatcher that may result from this proposal are decreased harassment during the nesting and breeding season due to the fact that no off route travel would be permitted through this route designation. If any impacts were anticipated during the rehabilitation phase of this project they would be completely mitigated through timing restraints or other means. No impacts are expected to these species at this time because restoration activities are not expected to occur within critical habitat of either of these species.

Noxious Weeds

This route designation plan should reduce the spread of noxious weeds throughout the area by restricting vehicular access to designated routes. This should have a beneficial impact on the area by slowing habitat degradation resulting from the spread of noxious weeds throughout the landscape. It may also have an impact on the BLM budget by reducing the amount of money that needs to be spent on weed suppression because there should be fewer new outbreaks of noxious weeds.

Wildland Fires

Fire and emergency personnel are exempt from travel restrictions and all resulting disturbance would be rehabilitated. Disturbances will be rehabilitated to reduce the spread of weeds.

Social and Economic Impacts

The 94 miles of roads identified for closure to motorized vehicles will be viewed positively by resource protection groups, NDOW, Coyote Springs LLC, Clark County DCP, NPS, and FWS that want a managed system of roads established to protect resources and reduce habitat fragmentation for sensitive species. It will be viewed negatively for the individuals and groups that want fewer access restrictions and less government intervention. This alternative would have little impact to permitted tour operators, as permits from BLM would still be required and BLM would need to evaluate the impacts tours on sensitive resources. Some hunters and recreational users may be somewhat reduced in their ability in accessing some sites within the project area.

Environmental Impacts for Alternative B

Wilderness

Alternative B is consistent with management of Wilderness and WSAs. Those routes proposed for designation for continued OHV use in the WSAs were identified in the 1980 wilderness inventory. The proposal is consistent with BLM policy which allows designations of existing ways. In the Virgin Mountains, certain routes were originally established as a series of livestock routes, and were recognized as continuing to serve that purpose in the 1980 wilderness inventory. The closure of these routes to vehicle use is consistent with BLM policy of restricting vehicle use to ways identified in the wilderness inventory, and would prevent the impairment of the area's suitability for Congressional designation as Wilderness. This proposal would be consistent with, and not affect Wilderness areas.

ACEC

Under this alternative, approximately 152 miles of roads would be identified as closed. With restoration, disturbance would be reduced by approximately 152 acres. The route designations should have a positive impact on the ACECs by decreasing route density therefore decreasing impacts to threatened, endangered, or sensitive species that occupy these areas. This proposal would have a beneficial effect to the preservation of the ACECs.

Cultural Resources

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) states that federal agencies will take into account the affects of their undertaking on historic properties, that is, those cultural resource properties that are listed in or determined eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Any action that alters the characteristics of a significant property that qualify it for listing in the NRHP is considered an "effect." An "adverse effect" diminishes the integrity of a significant property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. "Adverse effects" include but are not limited to the physical destruction or alteration of the character of the property's setting such as the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or its setting. Any action or undertaking that does not affect a property either directly or indirectly, or if the property is determined not eligible for nomination to the National Register, than the action may be determined to have "no effect."

Interim designations would provide protection to cultural resources by closing an additional number of roads that have proliferated since the 1998 inventory. With the exponential growth in southern Nevada, the location of significant cultural sites has spread by word of mouth. Many difficult to reach and rarely visited sites now have roads leading directly to them. These roads would be designated closed and provide law enforcement with ability to enforce the closure.

In contrast, interim designation would alter traffic patterns, which may affect cultural resources by increasing the amount of traffic on any particular road. Prior to the implementation of the final designation status, all section 106 requirements will be met unless otherwise stated in an agreement between the Nevada State BLM and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Following implementation, an extensive monitoring program would be initiated to analyzed the effects of the transportation plan in the ACECs and determine where additional

enforcement or signage is needed. This project should have a beneficial effect to cultural sites.

Native American Resources

Efforts to involve Native Americans began early in the roads designation process. The BLM presented an overview of the proposed project at a Moapa Tribal Council meeting on October 8, 2002. In conjunction with public scoping and outreach efforts, BLM also sent a notification letter to the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe. The BLM attended a second Moapa Tribal Council meeting on June 13, 2006. Council members and others expressed their concerns about the project's goals and how the closures would be implemented. Concerns were raised about limiting vehicle access to traditional use areas. The tribe was then asked to view the supplied maps and identify areas that could be affected by any closures. No information was forthcoming. The tribe then sent a letter to the BLM dated June 11, 2007 requesting the BLM *limit the access that ATVs have on specific lands such as Logandale Trails, Arrowhead Canyon, Gold Butte, and other lands in the surrounding areas...if we do not limit the areas that ATVs are allowed to go into now, then the land itself will be ruined permanently, not to mention the wildlife who reside on these lands.*

Wetlands and Riparian

Route designations in areas of wetlands or riparian systems would have a beneficial effect to these sensitive areas. Wetlands and riparian systems are relatively fragile systems in the Mojave Desert. They are small islands of relief and habitat for a wide variety of animal and plant species. For other animal species they are the only means to obtain water and survive in an otherwise inhospitable environment. Route designation would prevent further degradation of wetland and riparian resources by ensuring that vehicle users stay on designated routes and helping to prevent the creation of new routes within these areas.

Minerals

Currently there is one active mine located within these ACECs. The areas within these ACECs are closed to future mineral claims. Any claims filed prior to the segregation of the ACECs have the potential to be validated. If there is a valid mineral claim in an area of the ACEC that is not accessible, either as a direct result of the route designation or because there was never access to the specific area, BLM could authorize construction of a new road to the claim pending validation of the claim.

Access to a valid unpatented mining claim is a non-discretionary right of the miner and is not subject to a right of way permit. Under the mining regulations, the BLM has the authority to approve the route and method of access so as to minimize surface disturbance. A mineral patent issued under the mining laws does not invest the owners with a "legal right of way" to the patented mining claim across federal lands. Ingress and egress across public lands to a patented mining claim or other patented property does require a right of way permit.

There are currently 117 unpatented mining claims within the six ACECs. The breakdown of where these claims are located is as follows: Mormon Mesa ACEC – 6, Gold Butte ACEC Part A – 5, and Gold Butte ACEC Part B – 106. A review of the proposed route closures does not appear to conflict with any access issues at this time.

Floodplains

As there are no new roads being proposed within the floodplain, this plan should not have any

adverse affect on the floodplains.

Threatened and Endangered Species

The impacts on threatened and endangered species that are associated with Alternative B are expected to be beneficial. Closures and restoration of routes within these ACECs would defragment desert tortoise habitat. This should reduce the amount of desert tortoise that would be taken through either death, harassment, or taken for pets. Route closure and the associated informational sites should make people more aware of the desert tortoise which should help to lessen impacts on tortoise along routes that are designated as open. During rehabilitation activities a desert tortoise monitor would be on site to ensure that any possible negative effects to tortoise are mitigated. During rehabilitation activities tortoise mitigation would primarily involve avoidance of any desert tortoise encountered. Route designation and closures should have a beneficial effect on individual tortoises and desert tortoise population levels.

The Southwestern Willow flycatcher and the Virgin River chub should not be negatively impacted by this proposal. Because the route designation is intended to benefit habitat if there are any impacts to these species, they would most likely be positive ones. Some beneficial impacts to the Virgin River chub that may result from this proposal are decreased sediment loads in runoff that flows into the Virgin River. Some beneficial impacts to the Southwestern willow flycatcher that may result from this proposal are decreased harassment during the nesting and breeding season due to the fact that no off route travel would be permitted through this route designation. If any impacts were anticipated during the rehabilitation phase of this project they would be completely mitigated through timing restraints or other means. No impacts are expected to these species at this time because restoration activities are not expected to occur within critical habitat of either of these species.

Noxious Weeds

This route designation plan should reduce the spread of noxious weeds throughout the area by restricting vehicular access to designated routes. This should have a positive impact on the area by slowing habitat degradation resulting from the spread of noxious weeds throughout the landscape.

Wildland Fires

Fire and emergency personnel are exempt from travel restrictions and all resulting disturbance would be rehabilitated. Disturbances will be rehabilitated to reduce the spread of weeds.

Social and Economic Impacts

The 152 miles of roads identified to be designated as closed will be viewed positively by NDOW, resource protection groups, Coyote Springs LLC, Clark County DCP, NPS, and FWS that want a managed system of roads established to protect resources and reduce habitat fragmentation for sensitive species. It will be viewed as negative for the individuals and groups that want fewer access restrictions and less government intervention. This alternative would have little impact to permitted tour operators, as permits from BLM would still be required and BLM would need to evaluate the impacts tours on sensitive resources. Some hunters and recreational users may be slightly reduced in their ability in accessing some sites within the project area, as 750 miles of routes would still be available.

Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative

Wilderness

Roads into wilderness and WSAs are not permitted under any alternative. However, motorized travel in the Virgin Mountain ISA along paths previously used to manage cattle has occurred. In the Virgin Mountains, routes marked AA1 thru AA7 were originally established as several livestock routes; a range improvement to facilitate cattle moving through a steep and heavily vegetated area that was restrictive to grazing by cattle. These livestock routes were not constructed or maintained for the purpose of motorized vehicle traffic. At the time of the wilderness inventory of 1980, these routes were recognized as range improvements, not as vehicle ways or roads. Additional routes and ways have developed in the Million Hills WSA. Continued impacts from route proliferation has and would continue to impact wilderness values under the No Action alternative.

ACEC

Between 1998 to 2005, approximately 53 miles of new user-created roads have proliferated. New road incursions are continuing to occur every year; several miles of new incursion have been documented since the conclusion of the roads inventory in 2005. The No Action alternative would continue to have a negative impact on the ACECs by increasing route density therefore increasing impacts to threatened, endangered, or sensitive species that occupy these areas. The No Action alternative would have a negative effect on the ACECs. Road proliferation has and would continue to increase with increasing visitor use under the No Action alternative.

Cultural Resources

Cultural resource site stewards have been documenting sensitive cultural sites in Clark County, many of which are in the project area. Regular reports indicate that numerous user-created roads have been proliferating into the cultural sites, particularly in Gold Butte Parts A and B. Reports of damage to agave roasting pit sites by off-road vehicles are common. The No Action alternative would increasingly place these non-renewable resources at risk of damage and would impede law enforcement in its ability to enforce regulations. The No Action would have negative impact on cultural resources.

Native American Resources

The Moapa tribe members requested the BLM *limit the access that ATVs have on specific lands such as Logandale Trails, Arrowhead Canyon, Gold Butte, and other lands in the surrounding areas...if we do not limit the areas that ATVs are allowed to go into now, then the land itself will be ruined permanently, not to mention the wildlife who reside on these lands.* As stated above, damage to cultural resources and to the ACECs from road proliferation is occurring. Such damage, which would increase under the No Action alternative, would have a negative impact to the interests of the Native Americans.

Wetlands and Riparian

Proliferation of routes has been documented in the Virgin River ACEC (e.g. I2, J2, and K2). Proliferation of routes into wetlands or riparian systems would have a negative effect to these sensitive areas by causing soil loss, disruption of breeding sites by birds, and fragmentation of habitat. Wetlands and riparian systems are fragile systems in the Mojave Desert. They are small

islands of relief and habitat for a wide variety of animal and plant species. For other animal species they are the only means to obtain water and survive in an otherwise inhospitable environment. The No Action alternative would thus have a negative impact on these resources because new routes would continue to proliferate.

Minerals

Currently there is one active mine located within these ACECs. ACECs are closed to future mineral claims. Any claims filed prior to the segregation of the ACECs to mineral entry has the ability to be validated. If there is a valid mineral claim in an area of the ACEC that is not accessible, BLM could authorize construction of a new road to the claim pending validation of the claim. Ingress and egress across public lands to a patented mining claim or other patented property does require a right of way permit. The No Action alternative would have no impact to the mineral program.

There are currently 117 unpatented mining claims within the six ACECs. The breakdown of where these claims are located is as follows: Mormon Mesa ACEC – 6, Gold Butte ACEC Part A – 5, and Gold Butte ACEC Part B – 106. A review of the proposed route closures does not appear to conflict with any access issues at this time.

Floodplains

Impacts of roads into floodplains is similar to Wetlands and Riparian, relative to impacts on soil stability, vegetation, and habitat. Route incursions into the floodplains will have a negative impact to these resources through soil erosion, loss of soil productivity, and loss of vegetation.

Threatened and Endangered Species

The No Action alternative would cause impacts on threatened and endangered species. Route proliferation within these ACECs has been increasing and would continue to fragment desert tortoise habitat. This would increase the amount of desert tortoise that would be taken through either death, harassment, or taken for pets (Boarman 2002). The Southwestern willow flycatcher and the Virgin River chub may also be negatively impacted by the No Action alternative. Increased harassment during the nesting and breeding season due to unmanaged motorized vehicle activity would decrease successful breeding of this listed species.

Noxious Weeds

Noxious weeds commonly spread along linear corridors. Seeds stick to tires and can be deposited in disturbed soils far from the infestation sites. Proliferation of routes is known to spread non native plants species, such as Sahara mustard. Thus the No Action alternative would increase the spread of noxious weeds in the project area by increasing the density of routes in the ACECs. This would have a negative impact on the area by increasing habitat degradation and increasing the risk of fire.

Wildland Fires

The No Action alternative would cause greater risk to wildland fires in the project area, mainly due to increased disturbances which favor weed invasion. Fire and emergency personnel are exempt from travel restrictions and all resulting disturbance would be rehabilitated. Disturbances would be rehabilitated to reduce the spread of weeds.

Social and Economic Impacts

The 904 miles of roads would be unmanaged by BLM. User-created roads will continue to proliferate. This action would be viewed extremely negatively by NDOW, Clark County DCP, NPS, FWS, Coyote Springs LLC, and the environmental community that want a managed system of roads established to protect resources and reduce habitat fragmentation for sensitive species. It may be viewed as positive for those who wish to have few to no federal restrictions and minimal government intervention. This alternative would have little benefit to permitted tour operators, as permits from BLM would still be required and BLM would need to evaluate the impacts tours on sensitive resources. Hunters and recreational users would have increased access to some sites within the project area. The National Park Service would be negatively impacted by this alternative, as continued encroachment onto the Lake Mead National Recreation Area would occur. The Division of Wildlife would be negatively impacted in their management of wildlife.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The ACECs that are incorporated into this route designation cover a large area in some extremely remote regions within the Mojave Desert. In the past mining and ranching were the primary activities within these areas. There are hundreds of abandoned mine sites that can be found within these ACECs. These sites are primarily concentrated in Gold Butte Parts B and C, but may be found scattered throughout the rest of the ACECs. Many of the historic roads in these areas were created to facilitate access to these mine sites. In certain areas, impacts from mining were large and evidence of these impacts can still be seen today in the form of open mining shafts, historic townsites, mine tailing piles, and historical trash dumps. There is currently one active mining operation located within Gold Butte ACEC Part B in Cedar Basin. There are numerous existing mine claims located primarily within the Gold Butte ACECs. These mining claims have the potential to be validated upon request and review and could lead to further mining impacts to the area in the future.

Ranching occurred throughout these ACECs in the past. Within the ACECs ranching took the form of cattle grazing with the agricultural side of ranching occurring primarily in the lowland floodplains of the Virgin River, outside of the current boundaries of the ACECs and this projects scope. After the completion of the desert tortoise recovery plan the grazing permits for these areas were bought by Clark County. The buyout of the grazing permits occurred in the mid 1990's as a result of proposed conservation measures recommended for the recovery of the desert tortoise. Even though all of the grazing permits were bought by Clark County and relinquished, grazing continues to occur within these ACECs (Mormon Mesa and Gold Butte Parts A, B, and C). All of the grazing that is occurring currently within these ACECs is in trespass except for a small strip of land along the Arizona/Nevada border located in Gold Butte Part C. This permit is administered out of the Arizona Strip BLM office and is a winter grazing allotment with little to no impacts to tortoise on the Nevada side of the allotment. Evidence of past grazing and current grazing in trespass can be seen in the form of old barbed wire fences crossing the landscape, historic corrals, and water improvements for cattle watering. Areas that are immediately surrounding water improvements are usually severely denuded of vegetation and/or the vegetation community is altered from many years of heavy use by cattle.

There are some current gas, power, and fiber optic Rights of Way (ROW) that bisect these ACECs along with planned future developments within ROW corridors. Currently there is an underground gas pipeline that bisects the Mormon Mesa ACEC in a general east to west direction. The vegetation that was disturbed in association with this gas line project has just begun to come back and is of a very different composition from the surrounding desert landscape. There is a planned development of another gas pipeline that would run parallel to the existing pipeline and disturb an additional swath of vegetation. There is also a large power line ROW that bisects the Mormon Mesa in a general east to west direction parallel to the gas pipeline. Within the Coyote Springs ACEC there is currently a power line, gas line, and fiber optic line bisecting the ACEC and running in a general north to south direction along the sides of highway 93. Congress has recently designated a half mile wide energy corridor that runs in the same north to south direction within the Coyote Springs ACEC. This corridor is expected to accommodate numerous power lines, fiber optic lines, and a water pipeline within the boundaries of the ACEC. Within the next 10 to 15 years this corridor will probably be full to capacity. There is also a railroad ROW that passes through the Mormon Mesa ACEC, it runs in a north to south direction in the Meadow Valley Wash.

There are many different forms of recreation that people engage in while using these ACECs. A majority of the recreation that is occurring is in the form of casual use although there are a few permitted recreational events. When permitted events happen within these ACECs they are subject to time of year and vehicle capacity restraints. Some of the recreational activities that people engage in are hiking, photography, ATV use, four wheeled drive vehicle use, off road motorcycle use, bird and nature watching, hunting, exploration of historic areas, target shooting, and camping. Out of all of these activities motorized recreation is having the largest impact on the landscape. A majority of people using motorized vehicles stay on existing roads, trails, and dry washes. The largest impact from motorized vehicles occurs when users stray from existing routes and drive across country and create new routes or push routes past the current route endpoints. Once these new paths have been driven on a few times they become well established and are considered routes that may be followed by even the most responsible motorized vehicle users. When motorized vehicles travel at fast speeds or travel off of an existing route there is a higher potential for a collision with desert tortoise due to the decreased visibility of the desert tortoise. On some weekends there may be more than 300 people that visit the Gold Butte ACEC. While visiting the Gold Butte area these people engage primarily in motorized recreational activities.

There are numerous areas within these ACECs that are being impacted by recreational target shooters. Specifically within Coyote Springs ACEC there are large areas that are denuded of vegetation, are littered with bullet casings, and have a large amount of trash left behind by the target shooters.

Cultural resources are impacted through heavy visitor use in these ACECs. Many sites have routes that lead directly to them. These sites are being looted, vandalized (spray painted and shooting), and overused as campsites. This abuse is occurring primarily within the Gold Butte ACEC. Roads that lead directly to these cultural sites are the main vector for the overuse and abuse that these sites are receiving. More than 30 prehistoric sites are currently being impacted within these ACECs in addition to numerous historic-period sites.

Fires have caused a major impact in the past few years within all of the ACECs. With the introduction and spread of non-native annual grasses fuel loads have increased and fires have been able to increase in size due to the increased fuel loading between shrubs. This has resulted in the loss of thousands of acres of desert habitat within the past few years in the ACECs that are included in this proposal alone. Fire damage to desert tortoise habitat throughout the entire Las Vegas Field Office and adjacent BLM field offices is much greater.

This route designation is designed to positively impact and mitigate some of the damage that is occurring within these ACECs. Through route closures the BLM will hopefully reduce the amount of vandalism that is occurring at sensitive cultural sites, improve desert tortoise habitat, and prevent recreational users from creating new routes.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- (1) Desert Tortoise: During informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM has added the following stipulation to the implementation of route designations: *“Routes that are impassable, and where crews are not able to restore the route to its previous condition without the use of heavy equipment, will have a tortoise monitor on site prior to the use of heavy equipment to ensure no desert tortoises will be harmed and that no new habitat is disturbed.”*
- (2) Road Signing: Immediately after the decision become effective, all roads will be signed as open or closed. Newly proliferated roads not included in the EA will be closed and restored without further public review.
- (3) Restoration: BLM will implement restoration on any road designated as closed which is causing harm to resources. Newly proliferated roads will be restored (see mitigation measure 2 above).
- (4) Road Monitoring Strategy: All roads will be regularly monitored. BLM will develop a monitoring program with metrics to evaluate road use and impacts to surrounding resources. The roads will be regularly monitored and results compiled. Roads monitoring may include, but is not limited to, sign replacement, traffic counts, damage assessments to cultural and biological resources, Site Stewardship reports, sign vandalism, and Law Enforcement contacts. BLM will continue to involve the public in road monitoring efforts.
- (5) Changes to Route Designations: Decisions to change route designations will be pursuant to 43 CFR 8342.3 and based on results of information (metrics) collected over time. A separate analysis, public scoping, and decision record will be completed.

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

List of Preparers: (40 CFR 1502.6)

Marc Maynard, Wildlife Biologist / Project Lead
James Sippel, Wilderness Planner
Michael Johnson, Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Susanne Rowe, Archaeologist
Christina Lund, Botanist
Lisa Christianson, Air Quality Specialist
David Fanning, Geologist
Robert Wandel, Recreation Planner

Kevin Oliver, Fire Management Officer
Gayle Marrs-Smith, Gold Butte Project Manager
Carrie Ronning, MSHCP Coordinator
Elizabeth Carls, Department of Interior Solicitor

Coordination:

Nevada Department of Wildlife
Lake Mead National Recreation Area
Ely BLM
Arizona Strip BLM
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Clark County

REFERENCES

- Applied Analysis. 2007. *2007 Las Vegas Perspective*. Las Vegas.
- Belnap, J., J.H. Kaltenecker, R. Rosentreter, J. Williams, S. Leonard, and D. Eldridge. 2001. *Biological Soil Crusts: Ecology and Management*. Technical Reference No. 1730-2. Prepared for the Bureau of Land Management; U.S. Geological Survey.
- Berry, K.H. and L.L. Nicholson. 1984. A summary of human activities and their impacts on desert tortoise populations and habitat in California. In Berry, K.H., ed. *The status of the desert tortoise (Gopherus agassizii) in the United States*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Riverside, California.
- Boarman, W.I. 2002. Threats to desert tortoise population: a critical review of the literature. U.S. Geological Survey, Western Ecological Research Center. Sacramento, California.
- Brooks, M.L. 1999. Habitat invisibility and dominance by alien annual plants in the western Mojave Desert. *Biol. Invasions* 1:325-337.
- Brown, D.E. and R.A. Minnich. 1986. Fire and changes in creosote bush scrub of the western Sonoran desert, California. *American Naturalist* 116(2):411-422.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1998. *Proposed Las Vegas Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Las Vegas: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Las Vegas Field Office. May.
- Clark County Department of Comprehensive Planning (CCDCP). 2005. 2005 migration. Available: <http://www.co.clark.nv.us/comprehensive_planning/Advanced/Demographics/Migration/2005MigrationTable.pdf>.
- Clark County Department of Comprehensive Planning (CCDCP) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2000. *Clark County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan*. San Diego: Recon. September.
- City of Mesquite. 2007. <http://www.mesquitenv.com/GeneralInfo/PopulationProjections>.
- Davidson, E. and M. Fox. 1974. Effects of off-road motorcycle activity on Mojave Desert vegetation and soil. *Madrono* 22:381-412.
- National Environmental Education and Training Foundation (NEETF) and Roper Starch Worldwide (Roper). 2001. *Lessons from the Environment: The Ninth Annual Report Card on Environmental Attitudes, Knowledge, and Behavior*. Available: <<http://www.neefusa.org/pdf/roper/Roper2000.pdf>>.
- U.S. Census Bureau (Census Bureau). 1990. Census 1990 Summary File (SF 1) 100 Percent Data. Available: <<http://factfinder.census.gov>>.
- U.S. Census Bureau (Census Bureau). 2000. Census 2000 Summary File (SF 1) 100 percent data. Available: <<http://factfinder.census.gov>>.
- U.S. Census Bureau (Census Bureau) 2007. 100 fastest growing counties. Available: <<http://www.census.gov/popest/housing/HU-EST2006-top100.html>>.

U.S Census Bureau (Census Bureau). 2007b. Cumulative estimates of population change for the United States, states and counties, and for Puerto Rico: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006. Available: <http://www.census.gov/popest/gallery/maps/Maps_StCty2006.xls>.

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994. Desert tortoise (Mojave population) Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland OR.

World Casino Directory. 2006. Nevada casino information and gambling guide. Available: <<http://www.worldcasinodirectory.com/nevada-casinos.asp>>. .

Appendix 1

1. Arrow Canyon

Total Acreage = 2,083.68
(Clark County)
(NVN 076867)

T. 14 S., R. 64 E.,

sec. 10,
sec. 11,
sec. 13,
sec. 14,
sec. 15,

NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼, unsurveyed;
SW¼, unsurveyed;
All, unsurveyed;
N½, SE¼, unsurveyed;
NE¼, E½NW¼, unsurveyed.

T. 14 S., R. 65 E.,

sec. 7,

lots 3, 4, E½SW¼, SE¼.

2. Coyote Springs Tortoise*

Approx. Total Acreage = 50,824.18
(Clark County)
(NVN 076871)

T. 13 S., R. 63 E.,

sec. 5,

700 Feet West of Right-of-Way Nev060729 (Hwy 93) Centerline to Fish & Wildlife (F&W) Management Boundary;

sec. 8,

700 Feet West of Right-of-Way Nev060729 (Hwy 93) Centerline to F&W Management Boundary;

sec. 17,

700 Feet West of Right-of-Way Nev060729 (Hwy 93) Centerline to F&W Management Boundary;

sec. 20,

700 Feet West of Right-of-Way Nev060729 (Hwy 93) Centerline and All South of Right-of-Way Nev065185 (Hwy 168) Centerline;

sec. 21,

All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065185 (NV Hwy 168) Centerline;

sec. 22,

All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065185 (NV Hwy 168) Centerline;

sec. 23,

All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065185 (NV Hwy 168) Centerline;

sec. 26,

NW¼NE¼, S½NE¼, W½, SE¼, All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065185 (NV Hwy 168) Centerline;

sec. 27,

All;

sec. 28,

NE¼, E½NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼, All, East of F&W Management

Boundary;

sec. 29,

All, East of F&W Management Boundary;

sec. 33,

NE¼, E½NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼, All, East of F&W Management

Boundary;

sec. 34,

All;

sec. 35,

All.

T. 13½ S., R. 63 E.,

sec. 33,

NE¼, NE¼NW¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 34,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 35,

All, unsurveyed.

T. 14 S., R. 63.,

sec. 2,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 3,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 4,

NE¼, E½NW¼, SE¼, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 9,

E½, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 10,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 11,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 14,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 15,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 16,

NE¼, E½SE¼, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 21,

E½E½, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 22,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 23,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 26,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 27,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 28,

E½NE¼, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 33,

E½E½NE¼, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 34,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 35,

All, unsurveyed.

T. 15 S., R. 63 E.,

sec. 2,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 3,

NE¼, E½NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼, All, East of F&W Management

Boundary,

unsurveyed;

sec. 4,

All, East of F&W Management Boundary;

sec. 10,

NE¼, E½NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼, All, East of F&W Management

Boundary,

unsurveyed;

sec. 11,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 14,

All, unsurveyed;

sec. 15, NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$, All, East of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 18, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, All, South of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 19, NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$, All, South of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 20, S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$, All, South of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 21, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, All, South of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed;

sec. 22, NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$, All, East and South of F&W Management Boundary, unsurveyed.

secs. 27 to 34, inclusive, unsurveyed.

T. 16 S., R. 63 E.,
secs. 3 to 10, inclusive;
secs. 15 to 22, inclusive;
secs. 28 to 33, inclusive.

T. 17 S., R. 63 E.,
secs. 7 to 9, inclusive;
secs. 16 to 21, inclusive;
secs. 28 to 31, inclusive;

sec. 32, lots 1, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, NW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline.

T. 18 S., R. 63 E.,
sec. 5, lots 4, 8, 9, 16, 17, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline;

sec. 6, All;

sec. 7, All;

sec. 8, lots 3, 5, 6, 13, 14, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline;

sec. 17, lots 4, 5, 12, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline;

sec. 18, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, 6, 7, NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline;

sec. 19, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, 6, 7, 10, 11, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline;

sec. 29, lots 4, 22, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline;

sec. 30, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, 6 to 8, inclusive, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline;

sec. 31, lots 7, 8, 9, 15, 18, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline.

T. 19 S., R. 63 E.,
sec. 6, lots 9, All, West of Powerline Right-of-Way N53399 Centerline.

* The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Management Boundary that parallels Right-of-Way Nev060729 (Hwy 93) is 500 feet west of the right-of-way boundary, or 700 feet from centerline. This land was transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under P.L. 107-282.

3. Devil's Throat

Total Acreage = 640.00
(Clark County)
(NVN 076874)

T. 17 S., R. 70 E.,
sec. 26, All.

4. Gold Butte, Part A

Approx. Total Acreage = 185,670.52
(Clark County)
(NVN 076875)

T. 14 S., R. 69 E.,
secs. 24 to 26, inclusive;
secs. 34 to 36, inclusive.

T. 15 S., R. 69 E.,
secs. 1 to 3, inclusive,
sec. 9, All;
sec. 10, All;
sec. 11, N $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$;
sec. 12, All;
sec. 13, All;
sec. 14, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$;
sec. 15, All;
sec. 16, All;
secs. 21 to 28, inclusive;
secs. 33 to 36, inclusive.

T. 16 S., R. 69 E.,
secs. 1 to 5, inclusive;
secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
sec. 18, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$;

sec. 19, E½;
 secs. 20 to 28, inclusive;
 secs. 33 to 36, inclusive.
T. 17 S., R. 69 E.
 secs. 1 to 3, inclusive;
 secs. 11 to 14, inclusive;
 sec. 24, All;
 sec. 25, All, Except Mineral Survey 4709 Patent;
 sec. 36, All, Except Mineral Surveys 4709 and 4710 Patents;
T. 18 S., R. 69 E.
 sec. 1, lots, 1,2, partial lots 3, 4, S½NE¼, S½NW¼, S½, Except Mineral Survey 4710 Patent.
T. 14 S., R. 70 E.
 sec. 1, All;
 secs. 10 to 36, inclusive.
T. 15 S., R. 70 E.
 secs. 2 to 11, inclusive;
 secs. 15 to 20, inclusive;
 sec. 21, All, Except Mineral Survey 1988 Patent;
 sec. 22, All, Except Mineral Survey 1988 Patent;
 secs. 28 to 33, inclusive.
T. 16 S., R. 70 E.
 secs. 4 to 11, inclusive;
 secs. 13 to 36, inclusive.
T. 17 S., R. 70 E.
 secs. 1 to 36, inclusive.
T. 18 S., R. 70 E.
 secs. 1 to 6, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 10 to 15, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 22 to 27, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 34 to 36, inclusive, unsurveyed.
T. 13 S., R. 71 E.
 sec. 32, All;
 sec. 33, W½NE¼, W½, W½SE¼, All, West of Range Improvement (Fence) 0101.
T. 14 S., R. 71 E.
 sec. 4, lots 2, 3, 4, partial lot 1, SW¼NE¼, S½NW¼, SW¼, W½SE¼, All, West
 Range Improvement (Fence) 0101;
 secs. 5 to 8, inclusive;
 sec. 9, W½NE¼, W½, W½SE¼, All, West of Range Improvement (Fence) 0101;
 sec. 10, W½W½, All, West of Range Improvement (Fence) 0101;
 sec. 15, W½, All, West of Range Improvement (Fence) 0101;
 secs. 16 to 20, inclusive;
 sec. 21, N½, SW¼, N½SE¼, SW¼SE¼, All, West of Range Improvement (Fence) 0101 (and CC 022455 Pipeline);
 sec. 22, W½W½, All, West of Range Improvement (Fence) 0101;
 sec. 28, W½NE¼, W½, All, West of Range Improvement (Fence) 0101 (and CC 022455 Pipeline);
 secs. 29 to 31, inclusive.
T. 16 S., R. 71 E.
 sec. 19, All;
 secs. 29 to 32, inclusive.
T. 17 S., R. 71 E.
 secs. 4 to 10, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 15 to 22, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 27 to 34, inclusive, unsurveyed.
T. 18 S., R. 71 E.
 secs. 3 to 10, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 15 to 22, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 27 to 34, inclusive, unsurveyed.
T. 19 S., R. 71 E.
 sec. 3, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 4, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 9, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 10, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 15, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 16, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 21, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 22, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 27, All, unsurveyed;

of

sec. 28, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 33, All, unsurveyed;
 sec. 34, All, unsurveyed.

5. Gold Butte, Part B

Approx. Total Acreage = 122,270.42
 (Clark County)
 (NVN 076876)

T. 17 S., R. 69 E.,

sec. 22, All;
 sec. 23, All;
 sec. 26, All, Except Mineral Survey 4709 Patent;
 sec. 27, All;
 sec. 34, All;
 sec. 35, All, Except Mineral Survey 4709 Patent.

T. 18 S., R. 69 E.,

sec. 2, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, All, Except Mineral Survey 4709 Patent;
 sec. 3, All;
 sec. 9, All;
 sec. 10, All;
 sec. 11, All, Except Mineral Survey 4710 Patent;
 sec. 12, All, Except Mineral Survey 4710 Patent;
 sec. 13, All;
 sec. 14, All, except MS 4710 patent;
 secs. 15 to 17, inclusive;
 secs. 20 to 29, inclusive;
 secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 19 S., R. 69 E.,

sec. 1, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, All, Except Mineral Survey 4707 Patent;
 sec. 2, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, All, Except Mineral Survey 4707 Patent;
 secs. 3 to 10, inclusive;
 sec. 11, All, Except Mineral Survey 4707 Patent;
 secs. 12 to 36, inclusive.

T. 20 S., R. 69 E.,

secs. 1 to 29, inclusive;
 secs. 33 to 36, inclusive.

T. 18 S., R. 70 E.,

secs. 7 to 9, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 16 to 21, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 28 to 33, inclusive, unsurveyed.

T. 19 S., R. 70 E.,

secs. 1 to 36, inclusive, unsurveyed.

T. 20 S., R. 70 E.,

secs. 1 to 11, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 14 to 22, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 27 to 34, inclusive, unsurveyed.

T. 19 S., R. 71 E.,

secs. 5 to 8, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 17 to 20, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 29 to 32, inclusive, unsurveyed.

6. Gold Butte Townsite

Total Acreage = 160.00
 (Clark County)
 (NVN 076877)

T. 19 S., R. 70 E.,

sec. 17, S½NW¼, N½SW¼, unsurveyed.

7. Mormon Mesa Tortoise

Approx. Total Acreage = 146,702.28
 (Clark County)
 (NVN 076880)

T. 13 S., R. 63 E.,

sec. 25, SW¼NW¼, S½, All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065186 (NV Hwy 168)
 Centerline;
 sec. 36, All.

T. 13½ S., R. 63 E.,

sec. 36, All, unsurveyed.

T. 14 S., R. 63 E.,

sec. 1, All, unsurveyed.

T. 13 S., R. 64 E.,

secs. 1 to 5, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 sec. 6, E½, unsurveyed;
 sec. 7, NE¼, E½SE¼, unsurveyed;
 secs. 8 to 17, inclusive, unsurveyed;
 secs. 20 to 29, inclusive, unsurveyed;

sec. 30, S½NE¼, S½SW¼NW¼, SE¼NW¼, S½, All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065015 (NV Hwy 168) Centerline, unsurveyed;

secs. 31 to 36, inclusive, unsurveyed.

T. 13½ S., R. 64 E.

secs. 31 to 35, inclusive, unsurveyed;

sec. 36, W½NE¼, NE¼NW¼, N½NW¼NW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev060130 (NV Hwy 168), Centerline, unsurveyed.

T. 14 S., R. 64 E.

secs. 2 to 6, inclusive, unsurveyed;

secs. 8 to 11, inclusive, unsurveyed;

sec. 15, All, unsurveyed;

sec. 16, All, unsurveyed.

T. 13 S., R. 65 E.

sec. 1, lots 2 to 4, inclusive, SW¼NE¼, S½NW¼, SW¼, W½SE¼;

secs. 2 to 24, inclusive;

sec. 26, N½;

sec. 27, N½;

sec. 28, N½, SW¼;

sec. 29, All;

sec. 30, All;

sec. 31, lots 1 to 3, inclusive, partial lot 4, NE¼, E½NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev060130 (NV Hwy 168) Centerline;

sec. 32, All;

sec. 33, W½.

T. 13 S., R. 66 E.

secs. 1 to 5, inclusive;

sec. 6, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼;

sec. 7 to 18, inclusive;

sec. 19, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼, SW¼SE¼;

secs. 20 to 24, inclusive.

T. 13 S., R. 67 E.

secs. 1 to 36, inclusive.

T. 14 S., R. 67 E.

secs. 1 to 5, inclusive;

sec. 6, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼, SE¼;

sec. 7, NE¼;

secs. 8 to 11, inclusive;

sec. 12, N½NE¼, SW¼NE¼, NW¼, N½SW¼, SW¼SW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 13, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 14, NW¼NE¼, NW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 15, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 16, All;

sec. 17, N½, SE¼;

sec. 20, E½;

sec. 21, N½, SW¼, N½SE¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 22, NW¼NW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline.

T. 13 S., R. 68 E.

secs. 1 to 32, inclusive;

sec. 33, N½, SW¼, N½SE¼, SW¼SE¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 34, N½, N½SW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev 06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 35, N½N½, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 36, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline.

T. 14 S., R. 68 E.

sec. 4, partial lots 2, 3, 4, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 5, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, SW¼NW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline;

sec. 7, partial lots 1, 2, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate-15) Centerline.

T. 13 S., R. 69 E.

secs. 1 to 24, inclusive;

sec. 25, lots 1, 3, 12, 15, partial lots 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, N½, N½SE¼, All, North of

sec. 26,	Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline; lots 1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, partial lots 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, N½NE¼, SE¼NE¼, NE¼NW¼ All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 27,	lots 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, partial lots 2, 4, 6, 10, 12, 16, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 28,	lots 1, 3, 5, 8, partial lots 2, 4, 6, 9, 14, 16, N½N½, All, North of Right-of- Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 29,	lots 1, 5, 8, 11, 13, partial lots 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, N½NE¼, SW¼NE¼, NW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 30,	lots 5 to 10, inclusive, 12 to 16, inclusive, 18, 20, 23, 26, partial lots 11, 17, 19, 21, 24, 27, NE¼, NW¼SE¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 31,	partial lots 8, 10, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline.
<u>T. 13 S., R. 70 E.,</u>	
sec. 4,	SW¼NW¼, W½SW¼, All, West of Boundary Line;
sec. 5,	lots 7, 8, 9, 10, partial lots 5, 6, 11, 12, S½NE¼, S½NW¼, S½, All, West of Boundary Line;
sec. 6,	All;
sec. 7,	All;
sec. 8,	All, West of Boundary Line;
sec. 9,	NW¼NW¼, NW¼, SW¼SW¼NW¼, W½NW¼SW¼, All, West of Boundary Line;
sec. 17,	W½NE¼, W½, W½SE¼, All, West of Boundary Line;
sec. 18,	All;
sec. 19,	All;
sec. 20,	W½NE¼, W½, W½SE¼, All, West of Boundary Line;
sec. 29,	NW¼NE¼, NW¼, W½SW¼, All West of Boundary Line;
sec. 30,	lots 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, partial lots 10, 13, NE¼, E½NW¼, NE¼SW¼, N½SE¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 31,	partial lots 9, 11, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 32,	lots 6, 9, partial lots 3, 4, 7, 10, All North of Right-of-Way Nev06475 (Interstate 15) Centerline and Boundary Line.

* * The “Boundary Line” as denoted in the above legal descriptions for the Mormon Mesa ACEC refers to the Eastern Boundary line of the ACEC, which follows closely the edge of the Mesa and Toquop Wash. However, the line is NOT the Mesa edge, nor Toquop Wash, but follows closely between the two. The “Boundary Line” denoted for the eastern boundary edge of the ACEC is shown on the 7.5” USGS Flat Top Mesa Topographic Map. This map is in the casefile.

8. Red Rock Spring

Total Acreage = 640.00
(Clark County)
(NVN 076883)

<u>T. 17 S., R. 70 E.,</u>	
sec. 7,	SE¼;
sec. 8,	SW¼;
sec. 17,	NW¼;
sec. 18,	NE¼;

9. Virgin Mountain (Gold Butte, Part C)

Total Acreage = 37,090.18
(Clark County)
(NVN 076887)

<u>T. 15 S., R. 70 E.,</u>	
sec. 1,	All;
secs. 12 to 14, inclusive;	
secs. 23 to 27, inclusive;	
secs. 34 to 36, inclusive.	
<u>T. 16 S., 70 E.,</u>	
secs. 1 to 3, inclusive;	
sec. 12,	All.
<u>T. 14 S., 71 E.,</u>	
secs. 32 to 34, inclusive.	
<u>T. 15 S., 71 E.,</u>	
secs. 3 to 10, inclusive, unsurveyed;	
secs. 15 to 22, inclusive, unsurveyed;	
secs. 27 to 34, inclusive, unsurveyed.	
<u>T. 16 S., 71 E.,</u>	

secs. 3 to 10, inclusive;
secs. 15 to 18, inclusive;
sec. 20, All;
sec. 21, All;
sec. 22, lots 1,2, E½NW¼, NE¼SW¼;
sec. 27, lots 2, 3, 4, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼;
sec. 28, All;
sec. 33, All;
sec. 34, All.
T. 17 S., 71 E.
sec. 3, All, unsurveyed.

10. Virgin River

Approx. Total Acreage = 6,312.82
(Clark County)
(NVN 076888)

T. 14 S., R. 69 E.
sec. 11, SE¼;
sec. 12, W½NE¼, NW¼, NW¼SW¼;
sec. 13, All Federal Land North of Gold Butte Back Country Byway Road;
sec. 14, N½NE¼, NW¼, N½SW½, SE¼SW¼;
sec. 15, SE¼;
sec. 22, NE¼, S½;
sec. 23, All Federal Land North of Gold Butte Back Country Byway Road;
sec. 26, All Federal Land North of Gold Butte Back Country Byway Road;
sec. 27, All Federal Land North of Gold Butte Back Country Byway Road;
sec. 28, N½, SW¼, S½SE¼, All Federal Land North of Gold Butte Back Country Byway Road;
sec. 29, S½;
sec. 32, N½, SW¼, SE¼SE¼;
sec. 33, All Federal Land North of Gold Butte Back Country Byway Road.
T. 13 S., R. 70 E.
sec. 27, lots 8, 10, 17, 19, 20, 21, partial lots 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065014 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 33, lots 1, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, partial lots 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, SW¼, N½SE¼, SW¼SE¼, All, South of Right-of-Way Nev065014 (Interstate 15) Centerline;
sec. 34, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, 6, 11, NW¼NW¼, All Federal Land South of Right-of-Way Nev065014 (Interstate-15) Centerline and North of Right-of-Way Nev07490 (NV Hwy 170) Centerline.
T. 14 S., R. 70 E.
sec. 3, partial lot 4, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev07490 (NV Hwy 170) Centerline;
sec. 4, lots 2, 3, 4, partial lot 1, S½NW¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev07490 (NV Hwy 170) Centerline;
sec. 5, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, S½NE¼, S½NW¼, SW¼, N½SE¼, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev07490 (NV Hwy 170) Centerline;
sec. 6, lots, 1, 2, 6, 7, S½NE¼, E½SW¼, SE¼;
sec. 7, partial lot 2, 3, N½NE¼, NE¼NW¼, All Federal Land North of Right-of-Way Nev07490 (NV Hwy 170) Centerline and North of Gold Butte Back Country Byway Road;
sec. 8, All, North of Right-of-Way Nev07490 (NV Hwy 170) Centerline.

* The Gold Butte Back Country Byway is an RS2477 road authorization.

11. Whitney Pocket

Total Acreage = 160.00
(Clark County)
(NVN 076889)

T. 16 S., R. 70 E.
sec. 23, SE¼.

Appendix 2. Alternatives A, B, and D. Route Closure Justifications for 41 Miles of Routes Existing Prior to 1998. [Also see BLM Regulations under 43 CFR 8342.1 for designation criteria].

- AA1 This route was not identified as a motorized vehicle route in the wilderness inventory. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
- AA2 This route was not identified as a motorized vehicle route in the wilderness inventory. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
- AA3 This route was not identified as a motorized vehicle route in the wilderness inventory. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
- AA4 This route was not identified as a motorized vehicle route in the wilderness inventory. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
- AA5 This route was not identified as a motorized vehicle route in the wilderness inventory. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
- AA6 This route was not identified as a motorized vehicle route in the wilderness inventory. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
- AA7 This route was not identified as a motorized vehicle route in the wilderness inventory. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
- BB1 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB2 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB3 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d)..
- BB4 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB5 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB6 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB7 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB8 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43

- CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB9 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- BB10 This route leads into sensitive biological and cultural areas, protected under BLM Manual 6840, the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- CC1 This route leads into sensitive cultural areas, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- CC2 This route leads into sensitive cultural areas, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- CC3 This route leads into sensitive cultural areas, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- CC4 This route leads into sensitive cultural areas, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d). Additionally the fires of 2005 burned through this area and left virtually no vegetation. OHVs are currently going back into this area and driving off of established routes.
- CC5 This route leads into sensitive cultural areas, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- DD1 This route leads to a sensitive archeological site, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- DD2 This route leads to a sensitive archeological site, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- DD3 This route leads to a sensitive archeological site, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- DD4 This route leads to a sensitive archeological site, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- DD5 This route is a wash that is very narrow. Vehicle traffic in this wash is breaking down the sides of the wash and creating news routes off of the wash where OHVs are playing in areas where route do not occur; requires protection under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC 1701, *et seq.*). This wash also travels by a sensitive archeological site, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- DD6 This route leads to a sensitive archeological site, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- EE1 This route has very recently proliferated and travels through very sensitive archeological areas, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- FF1 This route has very recently proliferated and travels through very sensitive archeological areas, protected under the American Antiquities Act, 1906, Executive Order of Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (EO 11593), the Archaeological Resources Protection

- Act of 1979, and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
- GG1 This route is beginning to enter a wilderness area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - HH1 This route is proliferating into a wilderness study area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - HH2 This route is proliferating into a wilderness study area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - HH3 This route is proliferating into a wilderness study area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - HH4 This route is proliferating into a wilderness study area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - HH5 This route is proliferating into a wilderness study area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - HH6 This route is proliferating into a wilderness study area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - HH7 This route is proliferating into a sensitive area. The area was burned in the 2005 fires and OHVs are not restricted by vegetation anymore and are driving all over in this area; protection under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, as amended (43 USC 1701, *et seq.*) and 43 CFR 8342.1 (a).
 - HH8 This route is proliferating into a sensitive area. The area was burned in the 2005 fires and OHVs are not restricted by vegetation anymore and are driving all over in this area; protection under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, as amended (43 USC 1701, *et seq.*) and 43 CFR 8342.1 (a).
 - HH9 This route is proliferating into a wilderness study area. According to our interim wilderness management plan we cannot designate this as a motorized vehicle route.
 - II1 This route was created in trespass by a bulldozer during the fires of 2005; protection under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, as amended (43 USC 1701, *et seq.*), and 43 CFR 8342.1 (a).
 - JJ1 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary; authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
 - JJ2 This route travels directly through a very sensitive spring, protected under BLM Manual 6840 and 43 CFR 8342.1 (d).
 - JJ3 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary. This route is being closed to avoid conflicts between these two land management agencies policies for motorized vehicles, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
 - JJ4 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary. This route is being closed to avoid conflicts between these two land management agencies policies for motorized vehicles, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
 - JJ5 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary. This route is being closed to avoid conflicts between these two land management agencies policies for motorized vehicles, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
 - JJ6 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary. This route is being closed to avoid conflicts between these two land management agencies policies for motorized vehicles, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
 - JJ7 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary. This route is being closed to avoid conflicts between these two land management agencies policies for motorized vehicles, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
 - JJ8 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary. This route

- is being closed to avoid conflicts between these two land management agencies policies for motorized vehicles, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- JJ9 This route leads to the boundary of Lake Mead NRA and BLM lands. Where the route meets the boundary there is no approved route on the Lake Mead managed side of the boundary. This route is being closed to avoid conflicts between these two land management agencies policies for motorized vehicles, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- KK1 The only access to this route is through an area leased by Coyote Springs Investments (CSI). CSI has an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to keep the leased area as non-motorized. Therefore there would be no way to access this route by a motorized vehicle. This route is being designated as closed to avoid conflicts with the leased area adjacent to the ACEC, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- KK2 The only access to this route is through an area leased by Coyote Springs Investments (CSI). CSI has an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to keep the leased area as non-motorized. Therefore there would be no way to access this route by a motorized vehicle. This route is being designated as closed to avoid conflicts with the leased area adjacent to the ACEC, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- KK3 The only access to this route is through an area leased by Coyote Springs Investments (CSI). CSI has an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to keep the leased area as non-motorized. Therefore there would be no way to access this route by a motorized vehicle. This route is being designated as closed to avoid conflicts with the leased area adjacent to the ACEC, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- KK4 The only access to this route is through an area leased by Coyote Springs Investments (CSI). CSI has an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to keep the leased area as non-motorized. Therefore there would be no way to access this route by a motorized vehicle. This route is being designated as closed to avoid conflicts with the leased area adjacent to the ACEC, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- KK5 The only access to this route is through an area leased by Coyote Springs Investments (CSI). CSI has an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to keep the leased area as non-motorized. Therefore there would be no way to access this route by a motorized vehicle. This route is being designated as closed to avoid conflicts with the leased area adjacent to the ACEC, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- KK6 The only access to this route is through an area leased by Coyote Springs Investments (CSI). CSI has an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to keep the leased area as non-motorized. Therefore there would be no way to access this route by a motorized vehicle. This route is being designated as closed to avoid conflicts with the leased area adjacent to the ACEC, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).
- KK7 The only access to this route is through an area leased by Coyote Springs Investments (CSI). CSI has an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to keep the leased area as non-motorized. Therefore there would be no way to access this route by a motorized vehicle. This route is being designated as closed to avoid conflicts with the leased area adjacent to the ACEC, authorized under BLM regulations 43 CFR 8342.1 (c).