

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION..... 1-1**

**PURPOSE AND NEED ..... 1-1**

**PLANNING AREA AND MAP..... 1-2**

**ISSUES ADDRESSED..... 1-4**

ISSUES USED TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES ..... 1-4

Issue 1: How will transportation and access be managed? ..... 1-4

Issue 2: How will areas with wilderness characteristics be managed? ..... 1-5

Issue 3: How will Monument resources be protected? ..... 1-6

Issue 4: How will livestock grazing on the Monument be addressed? ..... 1-6

Issue 5: How will people’s recreation activities be managed? ..... 1-7

ISSUES ADDRESSED IN OTHER PARTS OF THE EIS ..... 1-8

Management concern 1: How will degraded ecosystems be restored?..... 1-8

Management concern 2: How will the human factors in the Monument be considered?... 1-8

ISSUES CONSIDERED BUT NOT FURTHER ANALYZED..... 1-8

Issues Beyond the Scope of the EIS ..... 1-9

**PLANNING CRITERIA/LEGISLATIVE CONSTRAINTS..... 1-10**

**PLANNING PROCESS..... 1-13**

RELATIONSHIP TO BLM AND NPS POLICIES, PLANS, AND PROGRAMS ..... 1-14

National Park Service Carrying Capacity ..... 1-16

NPS Boundary Adjustments ..... 1-17

COLLABORATION..... 1-17

Intergovernmental, interagency, and Tribal relationships ..... 1-17

Other Stakeholder Relationships..... 1-19

**RELATED PLANS ..... 1-20**

**OVERALL VISION..... 1-20**

PURPOSE, SIGNIFICANCE AND MISSION STATEMENTS ..... 1-21

Purpose..... 1-21

Significance..... 1-22

Mission..... 1-23

**LIST OF MAPS**

Map 1.1. Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument Location Map ..... 1-3

## **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

### **PURPOSE AND NEED**

Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument (referred to as the "Monument" throughout this document) was established on January 11, 2000, when President William J. Clinton issued Presidential Proclamation 7265 (Appendix A) under the Antiquities Act of 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S. Code [USC] 431). The Monument was created to protect an array of scientific, biological, geological, hydrological, cultural, and historical objects. These objects, both individually and collectively, in the context of the natural environments that support and protect them, are referred to as "Monument objects," "Monument resources," or "Monument values" throughout this document.

Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument is located on public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the National Park Service (NPS). Local jurisdiction for BLM lands in the Monument resides with the Arizona Strip District of the BLM, while local jurisdiction for the NPS portion of the Monument resides with Lake Mead National Recreation Area (NRA). The proclamation keeps the Monument under existing BLM and NPS management and authorities, but subjects them to the primary purpose of protecting the Monument objects as described in the proclamations.

The designation of Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument changed much of the management direction of the existing Arizona Strip District Resource Management Plan (RMP; BLM 1992) and the Shivwits Plateau portion of the Lake Mead General Management Plan (GMP; NPS 1986). An individual management plan was needed to protect Monument objects and the context that supports them, in a way that was consistent with Presidential Proclamation 7265. This management plan, the Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument RMP and GMP (Approved Plan), is necessary to guide management actions for the Monument by providing a set of decisions outlining management and creating a framework for future planning and decision making. Due to Presidential Proclamation 7265's cooperative administration mandate, this Approved Plan has been developed under a joint effort by the Arizona Strip District (BLM) and Lake Mead NRA (NPS).

Presidential Proclamation 7265 is the principal direction for management of the Monument. It clearly dictates that the BLM and NPS manage the Monument for "the purposes of protecting the objects identified." All other considerations are secondary to that edict.

The Monument proclamation governs how the provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 and the Organic Act of 1916 will be applied within the Monument. The proclamation, FLPMA, the Organic Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, and other mandates provide direction for the preparation of a management

plan for the Monument. Within this guidance, many decisions remain about how best to protect Monument resources and address the major issues surrounding Monument management. Presidential Proclamation 7265 directed the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a plan in order to begin making those decisions. This Approved Plan fulfills that directive by guiding management activities within the Monument and providing for the protection of Monument resources. It proposes to do so in a manner that creates opportunities for public discovery and education, sets a precedent for progressive public land stewardship, incorporates input from the scientific community and the public at large, and reflects the national significance of these resources.

As mentioned above, the purpose of this Approved Plan is to provide both a set of decisions outlining management direction and to create a framework for future planning and decision making. Its scope is necessarily broad since it is a general framework document that will guide the overall management of activities within the Monument, as well as the use and protection of Monument resources. As in the case of any management plan, it is expected that there will be a future need for subsequent and more detailed planning, which will focus on specific geographic areas or management issues. Further NEPA documents will be written to analyze and implement decisions that are not fully addressed in this Approved Plan. In each subsequent activity plan and NEPA document, the BLM and NPS will include a description of the desired future conditions of the land, resources involved, analysis of potential impacts, and an explanation regarding how the proposed activities, as well as reasonable alternatives, would contribute to attaining those conditions.

## **PLANNING AREA AND MAP**

Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument encompasses 1,048,316 acres in Mohave County: 808,744 acres of BLM-administered lands, 208,447 acres of NPS-administered lands, 23,205 acres of Arizona State Trust lands, and 7,920 acres of private lands. This Approved Plan includes decisions only for BLM- and NPS-administered lands in the Monument, which are depicted on Map 1.1. There are no communities within the Monument, with the nearest being Littlefield, Beaver Dam, Scenic, Fredonia, Colorado City, and Centennial, Arizona; Mesquite and Bunkerville, Nevada; and St. George, Utah.

The vast chasm of the Grand Canyon essentially prevents travel to the Monument from the south, and only unpaved roads provide entry from the north, west, and northeast. The Monument offers spectacular scenic vistas, numerous rough canyons, isolated stands of ponderosa pines, expanses of pinyon/juniper woodlands, and Mojave Desert. Within these environs, visitors can participate in a wide array of dispersed recreation activities that offer opportunities for experiencing remoteness and solitude, a sense of discovery, learning, and adventure.

Congress designated 95,109 acres of BLM lands within the Monument as wilderness in 1984. In addition, 190,479 acres of NPS lands are proposed as wilderness areas. Most of Grand Canyon

National Park and contiguous portions of Lake Mead NRA outside the Monument are also proposed or suitable for wilderness designation.

## **ISSUES ADDRESSED**

Publication in the *Federal Register* of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare a management plan and environmental impact statement (EIS) for Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument on April 24, 2002, initiated a 90-day public scoping and comment period. Following this, the BLM and NPS published a newsletter and held 11 open houses in 2002 to encourage public input on the future management of the Monument. Ten cooperating agencies and a dozen other Federal and state agencies provided information and input into development of this Approved Plan. From all this input, the BLM and NPS developed four conceptual alternatives that were presented to the public via newsletters and five open houses. These public meetings for the preliminary alternative were held in 2003. A 90-day public comment period on the Draft Plan/EIS was initiated on December 16, 2005, followed by release of the Proposed Plan/Final EIS (FEIS) on March 2, 2007. Information from these meetings, the Cooperating Agencies and interested state and Federal agencies, and the public was then used to develop this Approved Plan.

## **ISSUES USED TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES**

One of the most important outcomes of the scoping process was the identification of significant issues addressed in the Approved Plan. For planning purposes, an “issue” is defined as a matter of controversy, dispute, or general concern over resource management activities, the environment, or land uses. In essence, issues help determine what decisions were made and analyzed in the Proposed Plan/FEIS.

Based on the scoping comments received and their subsequent analysis and evaluation, five major planning issues were identified as being within the scope of this planning effort, which were then addressed and analyzed in the associated EIS. All of these issues centered on the larger question of just how much human activity should be allowed while still providing the mandated level of resource protection. The five issues are presented below, followed by a short description of why each is significant and the management decisions that they required.

### **Issue 1: How will transportation and access be managed?**

Transportation and access (i.e., travel management) emerged from the scoping process as the primary issue for the public, and is closely tied to the other issues addressed. Some people believed closing a number of routes and limiting vehicular access would provide the best protection of Monument values. Others thought all existing routes should remain open for recreational and resource uses.

While Proclamation 7265 did not specifically call for a transportation plan to address road and needed travel management to protect Monument resources, the information on travel management presented in this Approved Plan will be used to develop a transportation plan for the Monument within three to five years after the Record of Decision (ROD) accompanying this Approved Plan has been signed. An authorized road system for NPS lands in the Monument was designated in the Lake Mead NRA GMP (NPS 1986) and is not readdressed in this Approved Plan, except to attend to inconsistencies in existing plans and to provide for resource protection. Route inventories of the Monument were completed and used as baseline data for trail and travel management planning.

Decisions about restricting or improving access are addressed in Chapter 2. Travel management implementation decisions and associated maps are also detailed in Chapter 2.

## **Issue 2: How will areas with wilderness characteristics be managed?**

A number of individuals and groups voiced their concern for protecting areas with wilderness characteristics in the Monument. Many brought up the concept of additional wilderness designations during the public scoping period. Some felt that additional wilderness designations in the Monument would be the best way to protect resources, particularly those identified in the Monument proclamations. Others were not in favor of additional wilderness designations because they felt such actions would prevent the majority of visitors from accessing the remote sections of the Monument, especially those that enjoy motorized forms of recreation. Such arguments, however, are outside the scope of the EIS for this Approved Plan as only Congress has the authority to designate new wilderness areas.

The BLM historically has had the authority to inventory, assess, and recommend suitable public lands as wilderness study areas (WSAs); however, recent guidance clarified that this authority expired in 1991. With the passage of FLPMA in 1976, the BLM had 15 years to inventory and identify lands suitable for designation as wilderness by Congress. That inventory and review was completed in 1991 and submitted to Congress in 1993. Many of the WSAs identified Bureau-wide are still managed today under an Interim Management Policy (IMP). With the passage of the Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984, any WSAs in Arizona not included as part of a statutory wilderness by Congress were “released” by Congress from the IMP. The Monument contains no WSAs from that 15-year period.

In 2001, the BLM issued new policies in the Wilderness Inventory and Study Procedure Handbook (H-6310-1). The handbook reiterated the BLM’s authority to inventory, assess, and designate public lands as WSAs. These lands would then be available at any time for Congress to consider for designation as wilderness areas. The state of Utah and others challenged the authority of the Department of the Interior (DOI)/BLM to designate and manage new (post 1993)

WSAs as wildernesses, arguing that the BLM completed the wilderness suitability process for public lands with the submission of recommendations to Congress in 1993. In the ensuing Utah Wilderness Settlement (April 2003), the DOI/BLM agreed that FLPMA does not allow identification or protection of new WSAs after 1993. In 2003, the BLM formally rescinded the Wilderness Inventory and Study Procedures Handbook. Therefore, in this planning process, additional BLM lands cannot be considered or recommended for designation as WSAs.

In September 2003, the BLM provided new guidance in Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2003-274 and IM 2003-275, Change 1. Specifically, IM 2003-274, Implementation of the Settlement of Utah v. Norton Regarding Wilderness Study, applied the terms of the Utah Wilderness Settlement Bureau-wide. Additionally, IM 2003-275, Change 1, Consideration of Wilderness Characteristics in Land Use Plans, provides guidance for planners and the public for assessing areas that may exist in essentially natural condition, or landscapes where the opportunities to experience solitude or engage in primitive and unconfined recreation may be outstanding. IM 2003-275, Change 1, also provides guidance for making decisions about maintaining these values where they are reasonably present or have sufficient value and need, and are practical to manage. The “non-impairment standard” of FLPMA Section 603 and the BLM IMP for WSAs are not applied as measures to protect naturalness, solitude, and primitive recreation. Such decisions are discussed under the management alternatives in Chapter 2.

This new guidance for BLM wilderness does not affect NPS proposed wilderness within the Monument. For those lands, the 1979 Lake Mead NRA wilderness proposal was brought forward as the decision of record and was not readdressed in the EIS. However, NPS has adopted the BLM’s approach to assess additional areas on NPS lands within the Monument that exist in essentially natural condition and provide outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation (outside of proposed wilderness).

### **Issue 3: How will Monument resources be protected?**

The proclamation designating the Monument identified an array of scientific, natural, and historic objects to be protected. There are various ways of achieving this mandate, including maintenance of acceptable existing conditions, educating visitors, restricting access, setting research priorities, and restoring degraded environmental conditions. Decisions about which approaches were used are detailed in Chapter 2.

### **Issue 4: How will livestock grazing on the Monument be addressed?**

The Monument proclamation states that laws, regulations, and policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering livestock grazing permits or leases on all lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply with regard to the lands in the Monument. Presidential Proclamation

7265 also states that BLM shall continue to issue and administer grazing leases within the NPS portion of the Monument, consistent with the Lake Mead NRA enabling legislation.

The scoping process identified livestock grazing as an issue for a number of people. Comments ranged from eliminating all livestock grazing in the Monument to supporting all grazing activities. Those in the middle supported eliminating livestock grazing only in environmentally sensitive areas.

All land uses, including livestock grazing, were incorporated into the concept of overall environmental health. Modifications to current grazing systems, including forage reserves, are detailed in Chapter 2.

### **Issue 5: How will people's recreation activities be managed?**

Lands in the Monument are used for a variety of recreational activities, including exploring, sightseeing, hiking, backpacking, camping, hunting, off-highway vehicle use on designated routes, and mountain bike riding. Given growth projections for communities in the southwestern U.S. and the increased participation of people in recreation pursuits on public lands over time, ineffective management of visitor activities is recognized as potentially having profound environmental effects on Monument lands. These possible effects, along with potential user conflicts, make appropriate management of these activities crucial to protecting Monument resources.

During the scoping process, the public frequently referred to the important relationship between the remoteness of the Monument and the quality of visitor experiences. The Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) and Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) in Chapter 2 of the Approved Plan detail how land managers decided where and what types of recreation-tourism markets should be targeted for more structured types of recreation opportunities. They also decided what kinds of custodial management are needed for unstructured, dispersed recreation found in the Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs).

Decisions, such as where and what kind of interpretation and signage to provide, how to minimize potential user conflicts, and what types of recreation settings should be maintained in specific areas, are important elements addressed in Chapter 2. For identified markets, Chapter 2 includes more specific decisions for various recreation management zones that address maintaining or enhancing the public benefits, experiences, and activities and settings each zone provides.

## **ISSUES ADDRESSED IN OTHER PARTS OF THE EIS**

In addition to the five issues identified during public scoping, the planning team identified two management concerns that also need to be addressed regarding restoration of degraded ecosystems and consideration of the local communities and human use in the Monument. These concerns are presented below, followed by a short description of why each is significant and the management decisions that support them.

### **Management concern 1: How will degraded ecosystems be restored?**

Restoration of degraded ecosystems is an important management concern. Disruption of the natural fire regime has caused the degradation of ecosystems within the Monument (e.g., grasslands are being overrun by shrubs and ponderosa pine forests are unnaturally dense). The use of such techniques as mechanized thinning and prescribed fire can help restore degraded ecosystems. The actions to assist in restoring these degraded ecosystems are detailed in Chapter 2 and the possible vegetation treatment tools and methods are described in Appendix F.

### **Management concern 2: How will the human factors in the Monument be considered?**

While the focus of management plans is on the area's natural and cultural resources and on the uses of these resources, the human or social factors must also be considered. While there are no communities within the Monument, some small communities close to the Monument are dependent upon public lands for deriving certain economic, personal, family, community, and environmental benefits. These communities include Littlefield, Beaver Dam, Scenic, Fredonia, Colorado City, and Centennial, Arizona; Mesquite and Bunkerville, Nevada; and St. George, Utah.

Public safety is also a concern. Sections in Chapter 2 on health and safety; recreation; and air, soil, and water detail proposed management approaches to assist with public safety.

Rapid population growth on private lands in the region will also affect the natural and cultural resources and future uses of the Monument. Decisions in Chapter 2 address actions necessary to maintain or protect the resources and uses in the Monument. Monitoring and adaptive management will assist the BLM and NPS in modifying some uses, if conditions exceed acceptable levels. Decisions about which management approaches will be used in the Monument are detailed in Chapter 2.

## **ISSUES CONSIDERED BUT NOT FURTHER ANALYZED**

While all issues identified during the public scoping process were considered by the BLM and NPS, not all were further analyzed. These include issues that were beyond the scope of the EIS, mainly because they did not meet the purpose and need of the Approved Plan. Other issues are

not further analyzed in this Approved Plan because they are addressed through administrative or policy action.

### **Issues Beyond the Scope of the EIS**

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines for implementing NEPA require Federal agencies to analyze all “reasonable” alternatives that substantially meet the purpose and need for this Approved Plan. The purpose of the Approved Plan is to provide for management of Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument within the provisions of the proclamation and to meet the requirements of FLPMA, the NPS Organic Act, and other laws and regulations. Because the Monument proclamation states that certain uses will not continue and other uses will continue, consistent with Federal laws and regulations, actions not complying with the proclamation do not meet the purpose and need for this Approved Plan and were, therefore, not included in alternatives that were analyzed during the planning process.

The following specific alternatives, or actions that could be components of alternatives, were suggested but not analyzed or carried forward because they did not fulfill the requirements and needs of this Approved Plan.

### ***Recommendations for BLM Wilderness Study Areas***

The Arizona Wilderness Coalition and members of the public provided recommendations on WSAs in the Monument. In addition, the planning team was working toward making recommendations for WSAs early in the planning process. However, guidance clarified that the BLM’s authority to designate WSAs expired in 1993, resulting in the termination in any attempts to designate new WSAs. The BLM and NPS have, however, assessed wilderness characteristics (naturalness, solitude, and primitive recreation) on BLM and NPS lands in the Monument and proposed management actions regarding where, how, and to what extent these characteristics may be managed under Alternatives B, C, D, and E in the Proposed Plan/FEIS.

The Arizona Wilderness Coalition also provided comments and proposed management prescriptions on areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. Including this information for these prescriptions would be contrary to BLM policy as outlined in BLM IM 2003-274 and IM 2003-275 and more recent guidance in IM AZ-2005-007 (guidelines for achieving consistency in ongoing and future Arizona Land Use Planning efforts).

National Park Service proposed wilderness within the Monument is not affected by the recent BLM guidance regarding WSAs, and no additional NPS lands have been proposed for wilderness in this document (see Chapter 2). However, as stated above, the NPS has assessed its remaining lands in the Monument for wilderness characteristics.

### ***No Livestock Grazing in the Monument***

Presidential Proclamation 7265 states:

The BLM shall continue to issue and administer grazing leases within the portion of the Monument within the Lake Mead NRA, consistent with the Lake Mead NRA authorizing legislation. Laws, regulations, and policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering grazing leases on all lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply to the remaining portion of the monument.

Based on this proclamation provisions, a no-livestock grazing alternative would not meet the purpose and need of this Approved Plan, nor would it meet BLM's principle of multiple use and sustained yield (FLPMA Sec. 302 (a), see also FLPMA Sec. 102(7)) or provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act.

### ***No Routes in the Monument***

Some public comments proposed closing all routes in the Monument to protect Monument objects. The Monument proclamation noted that "outstanding biological objects have been preserved by remoteness and limited travel corridors," and recognized that "because of [archaeological sites'] remoteness and lack of easy road access, the sites have experienced relatively little vandalism." The Secretary of Interior was thus able to recommend these areas for Monument designation because of the remoteness, lack of easy road access, and condition of the resources to be protected. Closing all routes in the Monument is thus not vital to protect Monument resources. The need for access by the public and those holding valid existing rights and other existing authorizations further made the decision to close all roads unreasonable.

## **PLANNING CRITERIA/LEGISLATIVE CONSTRAINTS**

Bureau of Land Management planning regulations (43 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1610) require preparation of planning criteria to guide development of all RMPs. Planning criteria provide the principles that guide and direct the development of the Approved Plan and influence all aspects of the planning process, including inventory and data collection, alternative development, and impact analysis, as well as the selection of a preferred alternative, followed by the selection of the Proposed Plan and the final selection of the Approved Plan. In effect, planning criteria ensure the tailoring of plans to the identified issues and the avoidance of unnecessary data collection and analysis. The basis of determining planning criteria includes applicable laws, agency guidance, public comment, data analysis, professional judgment, and coordination with other Federal, state, and local governments and American Indian tribes.

The planning criteria used in developing the Approved Plan for the Monument are as follows:

- The Approved Plan was completed in compliance with FLPMA, the Lake Mead Enabling Legislation, and with the NPS Organic Act requirements and NPS policies. Provisions of the Endangered Species Act, NEPA, National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water Act, and other Federal laws and executive orders and management policy requirements were also met.
- The Approved Plan is consistent with Presidential Proclamation 7265, meeting the Monument's purpose, preserving its significance, and complimenting its mission.
- This joint BLM/NPS Approved Plan and its associated RODs include data and maps that provide information on the Monument.
- Valid existing management decisions from previous plans, if appropriate, were carried forward into this Approved Plan or will be carried forward into subsequent activity and/or implementation plans. Decisions from the following plans were considered and have been modified or amended, as appropriate: Arizona Strip RMP (BLM 1992) as amended, Mojave Desert Plan Amendment (BLM 1998), Lake Mead NRA GMP (NPS 1986), Lake Mead NRA RMP (NPS 1999), Lake Mead Burro Management Plan (NPS 1995), Lake Management Plan (NPS 2003), Parashant and Mt. Trumbull Resource Conservation Area Plans (BLM 1997 and 1995, respectively), Mt. Trumbull and Mt. Logan Wilderness Management Plan (BLM 1990), Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness Management Plan (BLM 1990), Habitat Management Plans, and the Arizona Strip Bighorn Sheep Management Plan (BLM and Arizona Game and Fish Department [AGFD] 2001).
- The Approved Plan is consistent with officially approved or adopted resource-related plans, policies, and programs of other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes so long as such plans, policies, and programs are consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of Federal laws and regulations.
- Terms and conditions and reasonable and prudent alternatives from the Final Biological Opinion (2007) for this Approved Plan will be implemented. Conservation measures are included.
- Cooperating agency status was encouraged for affected Federal, state, and local governments and Indian tribes. The environmental analysis input and proposals of Cooperating Agencies was used to the maximum extent possible consistent with BLM and NPS responsibilities (43 CFR 1501.6 (a) (2)).

- An adaptive management approach will be followed to achieve desired outcomes. Monitoring outlined in the Approved Plan will be used to determine if desired outcomes at the land use plan level are being achieved. If not, implementation actions and/or allowable uses will be modified to achieve land use plan objectives.
- The Approved Plan emphasizes ecological restoration and preservation of natural and cultural resources. It identifies opportunities and priorities for research and monitoring related to the key resource values of the Monument.
- The statewide land health standards, established by the Arizona Resource Advisory Council and approved by the Secretary of Interior, will be used to evaluate all surface disturbing activities on BLM-administered lands and on Lake Mead NRA lands where BLM administers grazing privileges. For NPS lands on the Monument, policies and procedures by which the NPS carries out its responsibilities under NEPA will be followed (Directors Order 12 and Directors Order 55), including identification of thresholds and impairment.
- The Approved Plan does not identify any public lands for designation as WSAs. However, the BLM has identified lands that will be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics so that such lands remain in a natural condition and provide outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined types of recreation activities. The 1979 Lake Mead NRA wilderness proposal was brought forward as the decision of record. Minor, non-controversial changes were made, as necessary for resource protection concerns. National Park Service Reference Manual # 41 was followed for guidance on wilderness preservation and management on NPS land within the Monument.
- Route inventories were completed for the Monument and were used as baseline data for travel management planning. All lands within the Monument were designated as either “limited” or “closed” to motorized and mechanized vehicle uses. Decisions concerning specific routes in “limited” areas resulted in a designated travel management network for the Monument. An authorized road system for NPS lands in the Monument was designated in 1986 and is not readdressed in this Approved Plan, except for minor adjustments necessary for resource protection.
- This Approved Plan directly involved American Indian tribal governments by providing strategies for the protection of recognized sacred and traditional uses and sites.
- The lifestyles of area residents including the activities of grazing, hunting, other resource uses, and recreation are recognized in the Approved Plan. Much of the Monument's historic value is connected with ranching operations, both past and present. Vintage

ranching structures and facilities that hold great historical and social significance were incorporated into the Approved Plan.

- The Approved Plan does not address Monument or statutory wilderness boundary adjustments.
- Any new visitor centers considered will be located outside the Monument and generally within existing communities.
- This Approved Plan sets forth a framework for managing recreation and commercial activities in order to produce a variety of beneficial outcomes gained through safe and enjoyable visitor experiences and activities that require appropriate natural and community landscapes.
- The Approved Plan used the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management to ensure appropriate grazing practices are followed to protect Monument values, watershed integrity, and habitats for plant and wildlife species on both BLM and NPS lands.
- The Approved Plan considered public input, interests, and values; past and present uses of public land and adjacent land; public benefits of providing goods and services; environmental impacts; social and economic values; public safety; and ecosystem restoration.

## **PLANNING PROCESS**

This Approved Plan was developed in conjunction with the Approved Plan for Vermilion Cliffs National Monument and the Approved RMP for the Arizona Strip Field Office. The overall planning process began in February 2001 when the BLM and NPS formed an interdisciplinary/interagency planning team, based in St. George, Utah (see Appendix P for the list of preparers). While the history of the planning process involves the other two planning areas (Vermilion Cliffs National Monument and the Arizona Strip Field Office), the discussion here focuses solely on the development of the Approved Plan for Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument.

The planning team for the creation of this Approved Plan was comprised of BLM and NPS staff, resource specialists, and Monument managers. The planning team met numerous times beginning in 2001 to gather background information, identify goals and objectives, examine resource issues, develop alternatives, and write/review the Draft Plan/EIS and Proposed Plan/FEIS for this Approved Plan. In addition, a series of Community Based Partnership and Stewardship courses were held in northern Arizona and southern Utah in which the public provided early information and communication regarding the Monument. The NOI to prepare an

EIS on the management plan for the Monument (as well as the other two planning areas) was published in the *Federal Register* on April 24, 2002. Following this, the BLM and NPS hosted a series of public open houses in 2002 and 2003 to solicit public comment on the scoping issues and preliminary alternatives for the Draft Plan/EIS.

The Draft Plan/EIS presented a No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and four action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D, and E). Alternative E was the agencies' (BLM and NPS) Preferred Alternative because it balanced human use/influence with resource protection. The Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft Plan/EIS was published on November 16, 2005, initiating a 90-day public review. The agencies also held a series of open house meetings to solicit public comment on the Draft Plan/EIS in January of 2006.

The Proposed Plan/FEIS, published in January 2007, responded to public comment and cooperative agency review of the Draft Plan/EIS through numerous revisions and modifications, as well as provided direct responses to comments. In this fashion, the agencies' Preferred Alternative in the Draft Plan/EIS was modified and presented as the Proposed Plan (Alternative E) in the Proposed Plan/FEIS. The NOA for the Proposed Plan/FEIS was published in the *Federal Register* on March 2, 2007, which opened the 30-day public protest period in accordance with 43 CFR Part 1610.5-2. The BLM received seven protest letters during this period. The BLM Director addressed all protests without making significant changes to the Proposed Plan; however, the protests received did lead to minor adjustments, corrections, and clarifications. This Approved Plan is one of three management plans that were developed from the Proposed Plan/FEIS that guides future management actions in their respective units. The NPS does not have a formal process for protesting NPS decisions in the Proposed Plan/FEIS.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO BLM AND NPS POLICIES, PLANS, AND PROGRAMS**

This section describes the relationship of this Approved Plan to other BLM and NPS policies and programs, the role of collaboration efforts in the planning process, the consideration of related plans (state, local, and tribal), and policies and decisions that have affected the planning process.

Under NEPA, Federal agencies are mandated to prepare EISs for major Federal actions. This Approved Plan conforms to CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA requirements (40 CFR 1500-1508).

The BLM planning process is guided by NEPA, FLPMA, and the planning guidance contained in 43 CFR 1600. The Organic Act of 1916, as amended, directs the NPS to manage units "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 is the legal authority requiring each national park unit to complete a GMP in conformance with park

enabling legislation and the Organic Act of 1916. Director's Order 2 (NPS 2000) provides planning guidance. The planning process for both agencies involves an interdisciplinary approach and provides opportunities for public involvement and interagency coordination.

Management plans ensure that the BLM manages public lands in accordance with the intent of Congress as stated in FLPMA, under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. As required by FLPMA, public lands must be managed in a manner that:

- a) Protects the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water, and cultural resources and values
- b) Where appropriate, preserves and protects certain public lands in their natural condition and provides food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals
- c) Provides for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and use by encouraging collaboration and public participation through the planning process

In addition, public lands must be managed in a manner that recognizes the Nation's need for domestic sources for minerals, food, timber, and fiber from public lands.

In addition to the Federal mandates and guidelines mentioned above, the planning team considered a number of existing management plans, programmatic documents, and standards and guidelines in the preparation of this Approved Plan. These include the following:

#### Land Use Plans and Amendments

- Arizona Strip District RMP (BLM 1992)
- Lake Mead GMP and FEIS (NPS 1986)
- Arizona Strip RMP Mojave Desert Amendment (BLM 1998)
- Arizona Statewide Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire, Fuels, and Air Quality Management Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment (BLM 2004)

#### Activity (Implementation) Level Plans

- Shivwits Resource Area Implementation Plan for the Arizona Strip District Approved RMP (BLM 1992)
- Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument Interdisciplinary Management Plan (BLM and NPS 1997)
- Mt. Trumbull Resource Conservation Area Plan (BLM 1995)
- Land Protection Plan for Lake Mead NRA (NPS 1987)
- Lake Mead NRA Burro Management Plan and Final EIS (NPS 1995)
- Lake Mead NRA Minerals Management Plan (NPS 1986)
- Lake Mead NRA Wilderness Proposal (NPS 1979)
- Lake Management Plan: Lake Mead NRA (NPS 2003)

- Mt. Trumbull and Mt. Logan Wilderness Management Plan (BLM 1990)
- Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness Management Plan (BLM 1990)
- Arizona Strip Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan (BLM and AGFD 2001)
- Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*) Final Recovery Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] 2002)
- Biological Opinion for the Arizona Strip RMP-Mojave Amendment (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] 1998)
- Recovery Plan for the California Condor (USFWS 1996)
- Desert Tortoise (Mojave Population) Recovery Plan (USFWS 1994)

#### Programmatic NEPA Documents

- BLM Vegetation Treatment FEIS (BLM 1991)

#### Policy and Rules

- Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (BLM 1997)
- NPS Management Policies (NPS 2006)

These documents were examined not only to assure appropriate integration and compliance, but also to identify information still appropriate for inclusion in the Approved Plan and/or decisions that are still valid and could be carried forward. Activity plans that have been tiered off these plans have also been considered in this planning effort.

#### **National Park Service Carrying Capacity**

The NPS identified implementation commitments for visitor carrying capacities for NPS lands within the Monument (NPS Management Policies, National Historic Preservation Act, NPS Organic Act, Director's Order 22, Title 36 of the CFR, and the 1978 National Parks and Recreation Act).

The laws, regulations, and policies leave considerable room for judgment about the best mix of types and levels of visitor use activities. For this reason, most decisions relating to visitor experience and use are addressed in the Recreation and Travel Management sections of this Approved Plan.

The NPS took the following kinds of actions to meet legal and policy requirements related to visitor experience and use of the NPS portion of the Monument:

- Visitors will be provided the opportunity to understand, appreciate, and enjoy the Monument. (Management directions within this broad policy are discussed in Chapter 2 decisions.)

- Regulations governing visitor use and activities in 36 CFR will continue to be enforced.
- As future conditions warrant, the NPS will undertake detailed planning to establish carrying capacities, as part of the development of the Undeveloped Special Recreation Management Area Plan and the Wilderness Management Plan.

### **NPS Boundary Adjustments**

The NPS does not address boundary adjustments in this Approved Plan. The NPS portion of the Monument is bounded on the south and east by Grand Canyon National Park, on the west by Lake Mead NRA, and on the north by the BLM portion of the Monument.

### **COLLABORATION**

A variety of Federal, state, county, local, and tribal groups played a vital role in this planning process by attending meetings, providing databases and general information, conducting peer reviews, and assisting with the development of the management alternatives presented in this Approved Plan.

### **Intergovernmental, interagency, and Tribal relationships**

The CEQ requirements contained in 40 CFR 1501.6 and 1508.5 mandate that Federal agencies responsible for preparing NEPA analysis and documentation do so “in cooperation with state and local governments” and other agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise (42 USC 4331(a), 4332(2)). In support of this mandate, the BLM and NPS planning team invited a broad range of local, county, state, tribal, and Federal agencies to attend a series of meetings to develop Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that would establish cooperating agency status with the BLM and NPS. Cooperating agency status offers the opportunity for interested agencies to assume additional roles and responsibilities beyond the collaborative planning processes of attending public meetings and reviewing and commenting on Approved Plan documents. Although they are time-limited documents, MOUs describe the roles and responsibilities of the BLM, NPS, and the cooperating agencies during the planning process. Invitations to become formal cooperators were sent to more than 200 agencies, communities, and tribes.

Ten cooperating agencies worked with the BLM and NPS to provide verbal and/or written comments during the planning process, which helped to develop this Approved Plan. The following ten cooperating agencies were concerned with the management of the resources and uses in this Monument and provided planning information on various planning topics, including Geographic Information System data. The following counties, communities, tribe, and state agencies signed MOUs to be cooperating agencies with the BLM and NPS for this planning effort:

- Coconino County, Arizona
- Mohave County, Arizona
- Kane County, Utah
- Washington County, Utah
- Fredonia, Arizona
- Colorado City, Arizona
- Kaibab Paiute Tribe
- Arizona Game and Fish Department
- U.S. Federal Highway Administration
- Arizona Department of Transportation

In addition, representatives from other interested Federal and state agencies and one tribe were provided planning information and were given the opportunity to comment on preliminary drafts of the FEIS and Approved Plan. Some attended the cooperating agency meetings and provided verbal and/or written comments. These entities were as follows:

- Arizona State Land Department
- NPS: Grand Canyon National Park, Glen Canyon NRA, Pipe Spring National Monument
- BLM: St. George Field Office, Las Vegas Field Office
- Department of Defense, Air Force Regional Environmental Office, San Francisco, California
- USFWS, Arizona Ecological Services Field Office, Flagstaff and Phoenix, Arizona
- U.S. Forest Service (USFS); North Kaibab Ranger District, Kaibab National Forest
- Hopi Tribe

The planning team also initiated consultation with American Indian tribes and bands who have oral traditions and historical or cultural concerns relating to the Monument, or who are documented as having occupied or used portions of the Monument during prehistoric or historic times. In January 2002, the BLM (also on behalf of the NPS) initiated consultation with 14 tribes or bands, including five bands within the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah. Of these, three Tribes (Southern Paiute, Hopi, and Hualapai tribes) expressed concerns regarding the resources of this Monument and contributed information either as a cooperating agency (Kaibab Paiute Tribe) or as interested parties (Hopi and Hualapai tribes). In addition, most of these tribes were interested in the planning effort, some participated on field trips to the Monument, and some gave information at tribal meetings to staff involved in planning. All of the consulted tribes or bands currently live on or near the Monument or have historic ties to the area. Some continue to use the resources in the Monument. These tribes include:

- Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
- Havasupai Indian Tribe
- Hopi Tribe
- Hualapai Indian Tribe
- Kaibab Band of Paiutes
- Las Vegas Indian Center
- Las Vegas Paiute Tribe
- Moapa Band of Paiutes
- Pahrump Band of Paiutes
- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Indian Peak, Cedar, Shivwits, Koosharem, and Kanosh Band of Paiutes)
- Pueblo of Zuni
- San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe

Tribal members expressed concern for the natural and cultural resources on the Monument, access to and use of these resources, and management of these resources on public lands.

The Bureau of Applied Research and Anthropology at the University of Arizona in Tucson conducted a Southern Paiute ethnographic and place name study on the Arizona Strip, including the Monument, in conjunction with this planning effort (Stoffle et al. 2004).

### **Other Stakeholder Relationships**

Various other groups also played a vital role in the planning process. Their participation was informal and infrequent. One of these groups, the Arizona Strip Alliance, was formed in the late 1990s in response to the early discussions regarding the establishment of the Monument on the Arizona Strip. Local communities, counties, and agency representatives from southern Utah and northern Arizona united in order to plan on a regional scale. Employees from BLM's planning team attended Alliance meetings and kept members up-to-date on current planning efforts.

The Arizona Wilderness Coalition, Grand Canyon Chapter of the Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, and Grand Canyon Trust are other groups that played an important role in the planning process. These groups all provided major contributions in the development of this Approved Plan including public scoping comments recommending a transportation plan, additional WSAs, information on the effects of transportation systems on wildlife, and other planning and resource information and recommendations.

In order to address the specific needs of wildlife, fish, and special status plants and animals, a group of biologists and botanists met to develop specific guidance and direction to meet those needs for this Approved Plan. Team participants included staff from the AGFD, USFWS, Lake

Mead NRA, North Kaibab Ranger District of the USFS, and Arizona Strip District BLM. Major contributions from this team included the development of a comprehensive resource assessment for wildlife and special status species, background information on the biology of a variety of species affected by the Approved Plan, and a set of proactive decisions appropriate to each of the alternatives. The team also provided comments and recommendations on the route designations, vegetation management, and other sections of the Approved Plan.

## **RELATED PLANS**

Title II, Section 202 of FLPMA provides guidance for the BLM's planning process to coordinate planning efforts with American Indian tribes, other Federal departments and agencies, and agencies of state and local governments. The NPS is also guided to do the same under NPS Management Policies (NPS 2006). To accomplish these directives, the BLM and NPS have kept abreast of state and local plans, assured that consideration is given to such plans, and worked with these other entities to avoid inconsistencies among their various plans. Section 202 of FLPMA goes on to state in Subsection (c)(9) that "[L]and use plans of the Secretary under this section shall be consistent with state and local plans to the maximum extent he [sic] finds consistent with Federal law and the purposes of this Act."

In keeping with the above mandates, members of the planning team reviewed the Federal, county, and municipal plans listed below for consistency:

- Mohave County, Arizona, Comprehensive Plan (Mohave County 2003)
- Grand Canyon National Park GMP (NPS 1995)
- Colorado River Management Plan (NPS 2006)
- Las Vegas BLM RMP (BLM 1998)
- Mesquite, Nevada, Master Plan (1994) and Updates (2007)
- AGFD Strategic Plan (AGFD 2006)

## **OVERALL VISION**

A vision, as used in this context, is an ideal to strive for which is not quantifiable or set to a specific time frame. A goal is a statement of a desired outcome that often has quantifiable measures and established time frames for achievement.

The vision for the Monument is to retain, where it currently exists, the present natural and socially remote nature of the Monument while still allowing compatible human use to occur within "the place where the West stays wild."

## **PURPOSE, SIGNIFICANCE AND MISSION STATEMENTS**

Purpose, significance, and mission statements clarify the intent of the Monument proclamation and are used to shape the development of this Approved Plan. Purpose statements clarify why the Monument was set aside for special management. Significance statements address what makes the area unique, and mission statements reflect ideal conditions that managers should strive to attain.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this Monument is to retain, for public interest (scientific inquiry, long-term preservation, and public use and enjoyment for present and future generations), well-preserved examples of scientific and historic objects of interest and to protect those objects from unauthorized location or settlement and from unauthorized appropriation, injury, destruction, or removal of any features. These objects include:

- The exposed Paleozoic and Mesozoic sedimentary strata on the boundary between two major geologic provinces: the Basin and Range and the Colorado Plateau
- The abundant fossil record
- The ecological diversity resulting from the junction of two physiographic ecoregions (the Basin and Range and Colorado Plateau) and three floristic provinces (the Mojave Desert, Great Basin, and Colorado Plateau), including a diversity of wildlife
- The undisturbed archaeological evidence, displaying the long and rich human history of the Monument and spanning more than 12,000 years
- Areas of importance to existing Indian tribes
- The colorful and engaging scenery, natural splendor, and a setting that provides for rugged recreation opportunities
- The historic resources, including evidence of early European exploration, Mormon settlements, historic ranches, sawmills, and old mining sites
- Remote and unspoiled landscapes with limited travel corridors

## **Significance**

The Monument contains relatively intact ecosystems and spring/water sources in public ownership that can provide sites for restoration and re-introduction of species.

The Monument's engaging scenery and inspirational landscape provides for rugged recreation opportunities.

The ponderosa pine ecosystem in the Mt. Trumbull area is a biological resource of scientific interest, which has been studied to gain important insights regarding tree-ring climatic reconstruction, fire history, forest structure change, and the long-term persistence and stability of pine communities.

The vastness and isolated location of the Monument provides for solitude, natural quiet, dark night skies, and wilderness characteristics.

The Monument is one of the larger sparsely developed, isolated land areas in the contiguous 48 states.

The exposed rock layers from the Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic eras provide an unobscured view of the geology of the Colorado Plateau and Basin and Range physiographic provinces.

The Monument is an important watershed for the Colorado River.

Historic remnants of Euro-American exploration and settlement exist in nearly their original context, relatively undisturbed by vandalism and development, and are connected with contemporary uses.

The Monument has irreplaceable archaeological resources primarily of the Archaic, Ancestral Puebloan, and Southern Paiute occupations. These resources are significant because of their good condition, their connection with contemporary American Indians, and their location adjacent to the Grand Canyon – a place sacred to past and present peoples.

A dramatic elevation change (1,200 – 8,000 feet) in a relatively compact area creates rich ecological diversity where the Colorado Plateau and Mojave Desert merge.

The vastness of the Monument allows for large-scale ecological processes, combined with low levels of resource conflicts providing unprecedented opportunity for ecological research.

## **Mission**

Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument is a model of land management for the BLM and NPS that conserves the natural, scientific, and historic resources and includes ecological restoration and protection in a broad ecosystem context, while honoring the history and living traditions of the people who came before us: “The place where the West stays wild.” The goal of Monument management is to achieve the following:

1. Natural and cultural resources and associated values of the Monument are protected, restored, and maintained in good condition and managed within their broader ecosystem and cultural context. The protection of cultural, biological, and physical resources and human values for which the Monument was created receives the highest priority in planning and management.
2. Management decisions about resources and visitors are based on scientific information. The Monument is a model of scientifically based ecological restoration, research, and investigative studies that guide the restoration of healthy native ecosystems, natural fire regimes, and cultural landscapes.
3. The variety of natural and social settings are managed to preserve the remote and essentially unspoiled landscape character while providing opportunities for people, communities, and the environment to benefit from visitors experiencing adventure, beautiful vistas, a retreat from the pressures of modern life, and a sense of discovery through a variety of appropriate and sustainable backcountry activities. The public receives the information they need to have a safe and enjoyable experience.
4. New planning direction (developed through a collaborative process) and an accumulation of valid existing decisions provide clear direction for the management of the Monument.
5. The infrastructure footprint is the minimum necessary and is of consistent quality to provide for visual enjoyment, public safety, and protection of Monument values.
6. Sustainable, traditional ranching operations and associated interpretive activities showcase the Monument's historical lifestyles and enhance visitor experience.
7. Conservation and restoration of habitats that support sustainable populations of a full range of native species, including predators, are emphasized. Recovery and protection of special status species are a primary focus.

8. A variety of backcountry driving experiences are provided to key destinations and features via a system of designated roads while protecting Monument objects, the context that supports them, and other natural and cultural resources.
9. The preservation of natural quiet is emphasized in wilderness areas and other remote settings.
10. The public understands and appreciates the purposes and significance of the Monument and its resources for this and future generations.
11. Contemporary management practices, systems, and technologies are used to effectively accomplish the joint mission.
12. The Monument serves as a model of efficient interagency coordination, incorporating the strengths of each agency. The Monument increases its managerial resources through initiatives and support from other agencies, organizations, and individuals.