



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
CALIFORNIA DESERT DISTRICT



## ***DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT***

# **DRAFT CALIFORNIA DESERT CONSERVATION AREA PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR THE NORTHERN AND EASTERN MOJAVE PLANNING AREA**



**JANUARY 2001**

# **BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

## **MISSION STATEMENT**

**It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.**



United States Department of the Interior  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT



CALIFORNIA DESERT DISTRICT  
6221 BOX SPRINGS BOULEVARD  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92507-0714  
(909) 697-5200  
[www.ca.blm.gov](http://www.ca.blm.gov)

**DEAR READER:**

Enclosed for your review and comment is the Draft California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendments and Environmental Impact Statement for Bureau-managed public lands in the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Area (NEMO). The Draft NEMO plan addresses the management of 2.4 million acres of public lands in southeastern California. This document analyzes several management alternatives. The Draft NEMO Plan will provide management guidance to maintain and enhance the public land health, provide recovery efforts for Threatened and Endangered species, comply with the California Desert Protection Act, designate routes of travel in desert tortoise Category I and critical habitat and adopt a desert-wide strategy for off-highway vehicle competitive events.

The decision to accept or reject these draft amendments will be based on a number of factors including the effect on the natural environment, meeting our statutory and policy requirements, input from the public, and recommendations from the Desert District Advisory Council. Public meetings are planned in the following locations for the purpose receiving oral and/or written comments: Barstow, Baker, Las Vegas, Lone Pine, Pahrump, Ridgecrest, Primm, Needles, Tecopa, Pasadena, and San Bernadino. A time limit may be placed on oral comments, depending on the number of people who wish to make a statement. A written copy of the presentation is requested, but not required, to accompany oral comments.

A website ([www.ca.blm.gov](http://www.ca.blm.gov)) is available with the following information; a PDF downloadable copy of the Draft Plan and Environmental Impact Statement; locations and times for public meetings, when scheduled; comment period timeframe and an address to send written comments. Notice of public meetings will also be published in your local newspaper. Publication of the Federal Register Notice of Availability, anticipated in March of 2001, begins the 90-day comment period for this document. Comments received during the 90 day period within the scope of this draft, will be considered and evaluated in preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Comments, by name, will be shared with the general public unless a specific request to withhold your name is received with your comments. Written comments should be marked "**NEMO Comments**" and sent to the **Bureau of Land Management, Attn: NEMO Plan Amendment Team, Barstow Field Office, 2601 Barstow Road, Barstow, CA. 92311**. For further information contact: Edythe Seehafer at the above address or telephone **(760) 252-6021**.

Sincerely,

Tim Salt  
District Manager

## **ABSTRACT**

The Draft 2000 California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendments for the Northern and Eastern Mojave (NEMO) Planning Area address: (1) the adoption of standards of public land health with specific guidelines for livestock grazing; (2) the protection of threatened and endangered species, as well as species that may be considered for listing in the reasonably foreseeable future by evaluating the habitat requirements and necessary management actions for each such species; (3) multiple-use class of lands released from wilderness consideration and the changes necessary to conform the California Desert Conservation Area Plan to the California Desert Protection Act passed by Congress in 1994; (4) the adoption of an appropriate long-term strategy for motorized competitive speed events outside of Off-Highway-Vehicle open areas in the planning area; (5) the designation of routes of travel within the planning area; (6) elimination of permitted solid waste landfills from public lands in the planning area; and (7) the identification of rivers eligible for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System in the planning area . The preparation of this document was coordinated with numerous individuals, Federal and State agencies, special interest groups and County governments.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Dear Reader</b>	<b>I</b>
Abstract	II
Table of Contents	III
Executive Summary	XII
Preferred Alternative	XIV
Summary List of Preferred Alternatives	XVI

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Purpose and Need</b>	<b>1-1</b>
------------	-------------------------	------------

1.0	Introduction	1-1
1.1	Purpose and Need	1-1
1.2	Planning Process Overview	1-3
1.3	Major Issues	1-4
1.3.1	Adoption of Standards and Guidelines	1-4
1.3.2	T&E Conservation and Protection - Desert Tortoise	1-5
1.3.3	T&E Conservation and Protection - Amargosa Vole	1-7
1.3.4	T&E Conservation and Protection - Carson Slough Plants	1-8
1.3.5	T&E Conservation and Protection - Silurian Hills Bats	1-9
1.3.6	CDCA Plan Changes resulting from the California Desert Protection Act - Released Lands	1-10
1.3.7	CDCA Plan Changes resulting from the California Desert Protection Act - ACECs Considered for Deletion	1-11
1.3.8	Organized Competitive Vehicle Events	1-12
1.3.9	Motorized Routes of Travel Designations	1-12
1.3.10	Inyo County Landfills	1-14
1.3.11	Wild and Scenic River Eligibility: Amargosa River	1-14
1.4.	Relationship to Laws, Regulations and Policies	1-15
1.5	Framework of the CDCA Plan, 1980	1-15
1.6	Relationship to Other Plans	1-16
1.7	Plan Goals	1-18

<b>2.0</b>	<b>Proposed Actions and Alternatives</b>	<b>2-1</b>
------------	--	------------

Table 2-1	Summary List of Proposed Amendments	2-1
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Standards and Guidelines</b>	<b>2-2</b>
2.1.1	Alternative 1 (No Action)	2-4
2.1.1.1	Standards for Rangeland Health in the NEMO Planning Area	2-4
2.1.1.2	Rangeland Guidelines For Grazing Uses In The NEMO Planning Area	2-4
2.1.2	Alternative 2 (Preferred)	2-6
2.1.2.1	Standards for Public Land Health in the NEMO Planning Area	2-6
2.1.2.2	Rangeland Guidelines For Grazing Uses In The NEMO Planning Area	2-8

Northern & Eastern Mojave Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Table 2-2	Utilization Guidelines for different range types in the CDD	2-10
Summary	Proposed Standards and Grazing Management Guidelines	2-11
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Desert Tortoise Conservation and Recovery</b>	<b>2-12</b>
2.2.1	Alternative 1 (No Action) Desert Tortoise Recovery	2-13
2.2.1.1	Desert Wildlife Management Areas	2-13
Table 2-3	Category I Habitat within Proposed DWMA Units	2-14
2.2.1.2	General Management Strategy	2-14
2.2.1.3	Vehicle Management	2-15
2.2.1.4	Grazing Management	2-15
2.2.1.5	Burro Management	2-15
2.2.1.6	Land Tenure	2-16
2.2.2	Alternative 2: Desert Tortoise Recovery	2-16
2.2.2.1	Identify Wildlife Management Area Boundaries & MUC	2-16
Table 2-4a	Desert Tortoise Conservation and Recovery - Identify Area MUC	2-16
2.2.2.2	General Management Strategy	2-16
2.2.2.3	Vehicle Management	2-17
2.2.2.4	Grazing Management	2-18
2.2.2.5	Burro Management	2-18
2.2.2.6	Land Tenure	2-18
2.2.3	Alternative 3: Desert Tortoise Recovery	2-18
2.2.3.1	Identify Wildlife Management Area Boundaries & MUC	2-18
Table 2-4b	Desert Tortoise Conservation and Recovery - Identify Area MUC	2-19
2.2.3.2	General Management Strategy	2-19
2.2.3.3	Vehicle Management	2-19
2.2.3.4	Grazing Management	2-19
2.2.3.5	Burro Management	2-20
2.2.3.6	Land Tenure	2-20
2.2.4	Alternative 4: Desert Tortoise Recovery	2-20
2.2.4.1	Identify Wildlife Management Area Boundaries & MUC	2-20
Table 2-4c	Desert Tortoise Conservation and Recovery - Identify Area MUC	2-21
2.2.4.2	General Management Strategy	2-21
2.2.4.3	Vehicle Management	2-21
2.2.4.4	Grazing Management	2-21
2.2.4.5	Burro Management	2-22
2.2.4.6	Land Tenure	2-22
2.2.5	Alternative 5- Preferred: Desert Tortoise Recovery	2-22
2.2.5.1	Identify Wildlife Management Area Boundaries & MUC	2-22
Table 2-4d	Desert Tortoise Conservation and Recovery - Identify Area MUC	2-22
2.2.5.2	General Management Strategy	2-23
2.2.5.3	Vehicle Management	2-23
2.2.5.4	Grazing Management	2-23
2.2.5.5	Burro Management	2-23
2.2.5.6	Land Tenure	2-23
2.2.6	Implementation Strategy for the Conservation of the Desert Tortoise	2-23
Summary	Summary of alternatives: Desert Tortoise Recovery	2-24

Table 2-5	Summary of Grazing Alternatives	2-27
Table 2-6	Statistics for BLM and NPS Administered Allotments (acres)	2-28
Table 2-7	Area of Desert Tortoise Wildlife Management Area within BLM Allotments	2-28
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Amargosa Vole Conservation and Recovery</b>	<b>2-29</b>
2.3.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Amargosa Vole Recovery	2-29
2.3.1.1	Amargosa Vole Management Area Options	2-29
2.3.1.2	Amargosa Vole Proposed Management Prescriptions	2-30
2.3.2	Alternative 2: Amargosa Vole Recovery	2-30
2.3.2.1	Amargosa Vole Management Area Options	2-30
2.3.2.2	Amargosa Vole Proposed Management Prescriptions	2-31
2.3.3	Alternative 3: Amargosa Vole Recovery (Preferred)	2-32
2.3.3.1	Amargosa Vole Management Area Options	2-32
2.3.3.2	Amargosa Vole Proposed Management Prescriptions	2-32
2.3.4	Alternative 4: Amargosa Vole Recovery	2-32
2.3.4.1	Amargosa Vole Management Area Options	2-32
2.3.4.2	Amargosa Vole Proposed Management Prescriptions	2-33
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: Amargosa Vole Recovery	2-34
<b>2.4</b>	<b>T&amp;E Plants in the Lower Carson Slough</b>	<b>2-36</b>
2.4.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): T&E Plants	2-37
2.4.1.1	Lower Carson Slough T&E Plant Conservation Area Options	2-37
2.4.1.2	Carson Slough T & E Management Direction and Strategies	2-37
2.4.2	Alternative 2: T&E Plants	2-37
2.4.2.1	Lower Carson Slough T&E Plant Conservation Area Options	2-37
2.4.2.2	Carson Slough T & E Management Direction and Strategies	2-37
2.4.3	Alternative 3: T&E Plants	2-38
2.4.3.1	Lower Carson Slough T&E Plant Conservation Area Options	2-38
2.4.3.2	Carson Slough T & E Management Direction and Strategies	2-38
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: Lower Carson Slough T&E Plants	2-39
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Bat Conservation in the Silurian Hills</b>	<b>2-40</b>
2.5.1	Alternative 1 (No Action) Silurian Hills Bat Conservation Area Options	2-40
2.5.2	Alternative 2: Silurian Hills Bat Conservation Area Options	2-40
2.5.3	Alternative 3: Silurian Hills Bat Conservation Area Options	2-40
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: Silurian Hills Bat Conservation Area Options	2-41
<b>2.6</b>	<b>CDCA Plan Maintenance Actions</b>	<b>2-42</b>
<b>2.7</b>	<b>California Desert Protection Act Implementation: MUC of Released WSA's</b>	<b>2-42</b>
2.7.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Released Lands	2-43
2.7.2	Alternative 2: Released Lands	2-43
2.7.3	Preferred Alternative	2-44
Table 2-8	Released Lands: MUC of Released WSAs Identified Less than 500 ac	2-45
Table 2-9	Released Lands: Summary of Alternatives	2-45
Table 2-10	Released Lands: Multiple-Use Class of Released WSA's	2-46
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: Released Lands	2-47
<b>2.8</b>	<b>Greenwater Canyon ACEC Deletion</b>	<b>2-48</b>
2.8.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Greenwater Canyon ACEC Deletion	2-48

2.8.2	Alternative 2: Greenwater Canyon ACEC Deletion (Preferred)	2-48
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: : Greenwater Canyon ACEC Deletion	2-48
<b>2.9</b>	<b>Organized Competitive Vehicle Events</b>	<b>2-49</b>
2.9.1	Alternative 1 (No Action)	2-49
2.9.2	Alternative 2:	2-50
2.9.3	Alternative 3:	2-51
2.9.4	Alternative 4	2-52
2.9.5	Alternative 5-Perferred:	2-52
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: Competitive Sport Speed Events	2-53
<b>2.10</b>	<b>Motor Vehicle Access: Routes of Travel Designation</b>	<b>2-54</b>
2.10.1	Alternative 1 (No Action)	2-59
2.10.2	Alternative 2	2-59
2.10.3	Alternative 3	2-61
2.10.4	Alternative 4	2-61
2.10.5	Alternative 5 (Preferred)	2-62
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: Routes of Travel Designations	2-63
<b>2.11</b>	<b>Landfills</b>	<b>2-65</b>
2.11.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Landfill Disposal	2-65
2.11.2	Alternative 2: Landfill Disposal	2-65
Summary	Summary of Alternatives: Landfill Disposal	2-65
<b>2.12</b>	<b>Wild and Scenic River Eligibility</b>	<b>2-66</b>
<b>2.13</b>	<b>Considered but Dismissed from Further Analysis</b>	<b>2-67</b>
Summary	Summary Of Impacts Table	2-69

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Affected Environment</b>	<b>3-1</b>
------------	-----------------------------	------------

3.1	Vegetation	3-2
3.1.1	General Vegetation	3-2
Table 3-1	Vegetation	3-2
3.1.2	Special Status Plants	3-3
3.1.3	Biological Soil Crusts	3-3
3.1.4	Riparian and Wetland	3-4
3.1.5	Non-Native Invasive Plants	3-5
3.2	Wildlife	3-6
3.2.1	General Wildlife	3-6
3.2.2	Special Status Animals	3-7
3.2.3	Desert Tortoise	3-8
3.2.4	Amargosa Vole	3-9
3.2.5	North Mojave Desert Bats	3-9
3.2.6	Inyo Mountain Slender Salamander	3-10
3.2.7	Inyo California Towhee	3-10
3.2.7	Leasts Bell's Vireo	3-11
3.2.8	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher	3-12
3.2.9	Swainson's hawk	3-12
3.2.10	Western Yellow Billed Cuckoo	3-13

Northern & Eastern Mojave Draft Environmental Impact Statement

3.3	Soil, Air and Water Resources	3-14
3.3.1	Soil	3-14
3.3.2	Water	3-15
3.3.3	Air Quality	3-16
3.4	Cultural and Native American Resources	3-17
3.5	Wild Horse and Burro	3-18
3.6	Cattle Grazing	3-19
Table 3-2	Grazing Allotment Resource Information	3-24
3.7	Wilderness	3-25
3.8	Recreation	3-25
3.8.1	Organized Competitive Vehicle Events	3-26
3.8.2	Dumont Dunes Open Areas	3-26
3.8.3	Dual-Sport Events	3-27
3.8.4	Vehicle Touring	3-27
3.8.5	Historic Trail Touring	3-27
Table 3-3	Major Historical Trails in the NEMO Planning Area	3-28
3.8.6	Nature Study	3-28
Table 3-4	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).	3-29
Table 3-5	Historic Hiking Trails	3-30
3.8.7	Camping	3-30
3.8.8	Lakebed Activities	3-30
Table 3-6	Dry Lakes	3-30
3.8.9	Rockhounding	3-31
Table 3-7	Rockhounding Sites	3-31
3.8.10	Shooting and Hunting	3-31
3.9	Vehicle Access	3-32
3.10	Mineral and Mining	3-33
3.11	Land Tenure	3-34
3.12	Regional Economy	3-34
3.13	Amendment Specific Affected Environment	3-35
Table 3-8	Affected Resources In The NEMO Planning Area	3-36
3.13.1	Standards and Guidelines	3-38
3.13.2	Desert Tortoise Management Area Boundary & Zoning Proposals	3-38
3.13.3	Amargosa Vole ACEC Proposal	3-48
3.13.4	Lower Carson Slough ACEC Proposal	3-53
3.13.5	Silurian Hills Bat Habitat Management Plan Proposal	3-54
3.13.6	Released WSA MUC Proposals	3-56
3.13.7	Greenwater Canyon Proposed ACEC Deletion	3-58
3.13.8	Competitive Speed Events Proposal	3-58
3.13.9	Motor Vehicle Access: Routes of Travel	3-62
3.13.10	Tecopa Landfill Proposed MUC Change	3-64
3.13.11	Shoshone Landfill Proposed MUC Change	3-64
3.13.12	Wild and Scenic Rivers	3-65

<b>4.0</b>	<b>Environmental Consequences</b>	<b>4-1</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Standards and Guidelines</b>	<b>4-2</b>
4.1.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Standards and Guidelines	4-3
4.1.2	Alternative 2: Standards and Guidelines	4-11
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Threatened and Endangered Species: Desert Tortoise</b>	<b>4-15</b>
4.2.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Desert Tortoise	4-15
4.2.2	Alternative 2: Desert Tortoise	4-21
Table 4-1	Impacts to Grazing Allotments From Alternative 2	4-24
4.2.3	Alternative 3: Desert Tortoise	4-26
4.2.4	Alternative 4: Desert Tortoise	4-29
4.2.5	Preferred Alternative : Desert Tortoise	4-31
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Amargosa Vole Recovery</b>	<b>4-34</b>
4.3.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Amargosa Vole	4-34
4.3.2	Alternative 2: Amargosa Vole	4-39
4.3.3	Alternative 3: Amargosa Vole	4-43
4.3.4	Alternative 4: Amargosa Vole	4-45
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Threatened and Endangered Plants</b>	<b>4-48</b>
4.4.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Threatened and Endangered Plants	4-48
4.4.2	Alternative 2: Threatened and Endangered Plants	4-51
4.4.3	Alternative 3: Threatened and Endangered Plants	4-53
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Bat Conservation in the Silurian Hills</b>	<b>4-56</b>
4.5.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Bat Conservation in the Silurian Hills	4-56
4.5.2	Alternative 2: Bat Conservation in the Silurian Hills	4-57
4.5.3	Alternative 3: Bat Conservation in the Silurian Hills	4-58
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Released Lands: MUC of Released WSAs</b>	<b>4-60</b>
4.6.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Released Lands: MUC of Released WSAs	4-60
4.6.2	Alternative 2: Released Lands: MUC of Released WSAs	4-61
4.6.3	Preferred Alternative: Released Lands: MUC of Released WSAs	4-63
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Greenwater Canyon ACEC Deletion Proposal</b>	<b>4-65</b>
4.7.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Greenwater Canyon	4-65
4.7.2	Alternative 2: Greenwater Canyon	4-65
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Organized Competitive Vehicle Events</b>	<b>4-67</b>
4.8.1	Alternative 1 (No Action)	4-67
4.8.2	Alternative 2	4-77
4.8.3	Alternative 3	4-79
4.8.4	Alternative 4	4-82
4.8.5	Alternative 5	4-84
<b>4.9</b>	<b>Motor Vehicle Access: Routes of Travel Designation</b>	<b>4-85</b>
4.9.1	Alternative 1 (No Action)	4-85
4.9.2	Alternative 2	4-88
4.9.3	Alternative 3	4-90
4.9.4	Alternative 4	4-92
4.9.5	Alternative 5	4-92

<b>4.10</b>	<b>Bureau Policy on Landfills: Proposed Landfill MUC Change for disposal - Tecopa and Shoshone</b>	<b>4-93</b>
4.10.1	Alternative 1 (No Action): Landfills	4-93
4.10.2	Alternative 2 (Preferred): Landfills	4-94
<b>4.11</b>	<b>Wild and Scenic River Eligibility</b>	<b>4-95</b>
<b>4.12</b>	<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>	<b>4-95</b>
4.12.1	Vegetation and Wildlife	4-97
4.12.2	Soil, Water and Air	4-101
4.12.3	Wilderness	4-102
4.12.4	Cultural and Native American Values	4-103
4.12.5	Wild Horse and Burro	4-103
4.12.6	Cattle Grazing	4-103
4.12.7	Utilities	4-104
4.12.8	Recreation	4-105
4.12.9	Minerals and Mining	4-105
4.12.10	Vehicle Access	4-105
4.12.11	Land Tenure	4-106
4.12.12	Socioeconomic	4-106
<b>4.13</b>	<b>Irretrievable and Irreversible Commitments</b>	<b>4-107</b>
4.13.1	Vegetation and Wildlife	4-107
4.13.2	Soil, Water and Air Resources	4-107
4.13.3	Cultural and Native American Values	4-107
4.13.4	Wild Horse and Burro	4-108
4.13.5	Cattle Grazing (and Allotments)	4-108
<b>4.14</b>	<b>Long-Term Verses Short-Term Use</b>	<b>4-108</b>
<b>4.15</b>	<b>Environmental Justice</b>	<b>4-109</b>

<b>5.0</b>	<b>Consultation and Coordination</b>	<b>5-1</b>
------------	--------------------------------------	------------

5.1	Public Involvement	5-1
5.1.1	Planning Process	5-1
5.1.2	Issue Summary	5-2
5.2	Interagency Coordination and Consultation	5-3
5.2.1	National Park Service	5-3
5.2.2	United States Fish and Wildlife Service	5-3
5.2.3	SHPO/CA-SHPO	5-5
5.2.4	Other Bioregional Planning Teams	5-6
5.3	Native American Consultation	5-6
List	Persons/Agencies Receiving Document	5-7
Table 5-1	NEMO Scoping Comments	5-16

<b>6.0</b>	<b>Document Support</b>	<b>6-1</b>
------------	-------------------------	------------

6.1	List of Preparers	6-1
6.2	Literature Sited	6-2

6.3	Glossary	6-7
6.4	Acronyms and Abbreviations	6-29

<b>7.0</b>	<b>Geographic Information Index (MAPS)</b>	<b>7-1</b>
------------	--	------------

<b>1</b>	The Northern & Eastern Mojave Planning Vicinity
<b>2</b>	Grazing Allotments in the Planning Area
<b>3</b>	NEMO Active Mines and Mineral Potential
<b>3b</b>	Inactive Mines in the NEMO Planning Area
<b>4a</b>	Route Network- Piute-Fenner
<b>4b</b>	Route Network- Ivanpah Valley
<b>4c</b>	Route Network- Shadow Valley
<b>5a</b>	NEMO Released Lands - Alternative 1 (No Action)
<b>5b</b>	NEMO Released Lands - Alternative 2
<b>5c</b>	NEMO Released Lands - Alternative 3
<b>6a</b>	Desert Tortoise Recovery - Alternative 1 (No Action)
<b>6b</b>	Desert Tortoise Recovery - Alternative 2
<b>6c</b>	Desert Tortoise Recovery - Alternative 3
<b>6d</b>	Desert Tortoise Recovery - Alternative 4
<b>6e</b>	Desert Tortoise Recovery - Preferred Alternative
<b>7a</b>	Grazing Management - Alternative 1 (No Action) & 4
<b>7b</b>	Grazing Management - Alternative 2
<b>7c</b>	Grazing Management - Alternative 3 & 5
<b>8a</b>	BLM Herd Areas and Herd Management Areas
<b>8b</b>	Extent of Burro Range in the NEMO Planning Area
<b>8c</b>	Burro Management for Desert Tortoise Recovery - Alternatives
<b>9a</b>	Alternative 1: Vole Recovery in the Central Amargosa
<b>9b</b>	Alternative 2 - Vole Recovery in the Central Amargosa
<b>9c</b>	Alternative 3 - Vole Recovery in the Central Amargosa
<b>9d</b>	Alternative 4 - Vole Recovery in the Central Amargosa
<b>9e</b>	Alternatives 2&3 - Vole Recovery in the Upper Amargosa
<b>10</b>	Carson Slough Threatened and Endangered Plant Conservation Alternatives
<b>11</b>	Silurian Hills Bat Conservation Alternatives
<b>12</b>	Greenwater ACEC Deletion Proposal
<b>13a</b>	NEMO Proposed Land Tenure
<b>13b</b>	NEMO Proposed Land Tenure, Tecopa - Shoshone Area
<b>13c</b>	NEMO Proposed Land Tenure - Mesquite Lake Area
<b>13d</b>	NEMO Proposed Land Tenure - Baker Area
<b>14</b>	Barstow-To-Vegas Corridor Alternatives

## APPENDICES

- A** Proposed Desert Tortoise Conservation Strategy
- B** NEMO Implementation Strategy
- C** Description and Strategy for Addressing Major Desert Tortoise Issues
- D** Desert Tortoise Monitoring
- E** Cattle, Wild Horse and Burro Grazing Use Guidelines in NEMO  
Desert Tortoise Habitat
- F** New Surface Disturbances and Rehabilitation Strategies
- G** Recommended Special Management Actions for T&E Plant Recovery
- H** Recommended Special Management Actions for the Recovery of the  
Amargosa Vole
- I** Species of Special Consideration in NEMO
- J** Upland Public Lands Assessment Criteria / Proper Functioning Condition
- K** Current Management Situation
- L** Planning Criteria for the NEMO Planning Effort
- M** Summary of CDCA Plan Maintenance Actions Resulting From the CDPA
- N** Land Tenure Strategy for the NEMO Planning Area
- O** Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Report for the Amargosa River
- P** Development of Standards for Public Land Health and Grazing  
Management Guidelines
- Q** Route Designation Process and Methodology
- R** List of G-E-M Resource Areas
- S** Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Report for Cottonwood Creek
- T** Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Report for Surprise Canyon

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Northern and Eastern Mojave (NEMO) Planning effort addresses nine events which have changed the current management situation for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the California Desert Conservation Area:

- (1) adoption of a National BLM policy, initiated in 1993, directing the development of standards for public land health, and guidelines for grazing management on public lands;
- (2) listing of the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) as threatened under the State and Federal Endangered Species Act (s)(ESAs), designation of critical habitat for this species, and publication of a recovery plan;
- (3) listing of the Amargosa vole (*Microtus californicus scirpensis*) as endangered under the State and Federal ESAs, designation of critical habitat for this species, and publication of a recovery plan;
- (4) listing of the Amargosa niterwort (*Nitrophila mohavensis*) as endangered under the State and Federal ESAs, and the Ash Meadows gumplant (*Grindelia fraxino-pratensis*) and spring-loving centaury (*Centaureum namophilum var. namophilum*) as threatened under the Federal ESA, and designation of critical habitat for the former two plant species;
- (5) increasing concern for population status and the possible need for the listing of several bat species as threatened or endangered under the State and Federal ESAs;
- (6) passage of the California Desert Protection Act of 1994 (CDPA) and the need to conform the CDCA Plan to it: including the need to address competitive speed events now that a portion of the Barstow-to-Vegas OHV Race Course is in the Mojave National Preserve;
- (7) implementation of BLM policy to provide for designation of specific routes of travel through the land-use planning process.
- (8) adoption of new BLM policies directing the elimination of landfills on public lands; and
- (9) implementation of BLM policy to identify potentially eligible rivers on BLM-managed lands for the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The proposed plan amendments and alternatives discussed in Chapter Two identify a range of alternatives to address each of the purpose and need statements in Chapter One. Some actions require amendment of the California Desert Conservation Area Plan in order to implement them, while others do not; and amendment of the CDCA Plan is to occur as part of this planning effort. A summary list of proposed Plan Amendments and a summary of impacts to the "No Action" and "Action" alternatives are provided at the end of this Executive Summary.

The Affected Environment section of this document describes the environment affected by these plan decisions on BLM-administered public lands within the NEMO Planning Area. A complete description of the resources can be found in the CDCA Plan and EIS and is incorporated by reference. (40CFR 1502.21). The existing management situation for the Planning Area is summarized in Appendix K. A separate, more detailed, existing management situation for the desert tortoise and the resource values and uses of its habitat in the NEMO Planning Area was prepared in April, 1998, and is available for review at local BLM offices in Needles, Barstow, Ridgecrest and Riverside, California. This document is also posted on the NEMO web site at [www.ca.blm.gov](http://www.ca.blm.gov)

Alternative proposals presented in Chapter 2 of this document were screened and evaluated with regard to the critical elements and other major land-use planning elements of the human environment. Elements, which are present and affected, are described in further detail, focussing on potentially affected resources.

The analysis of environmental consequences in Chapter Four is organized, first, by plan amendment type, where plan amendments are involved. These are discussed in the following order:

- 1) Adoption of Standards and Guidelines,
- 2) Threatened and Endangered Species conservation and protection,
- 3) CDCA changes proposed as a result of the California Desert Protection Act,
- 4) Competitive Speed Events,
- 5) Motor vehicle Routes of Travel designation
- 6) Strategies to eliminate landfills, and
- 7) Wild & Scenic River Eligibility addressed within Amargosa vole conservation strategies analysis,

Secondly, Chapter 4 is organized by resource element or use that may be affected. Elements of the human environment that were identified as likely to be affected by one or more of the alternatives are T&E species, vegetation, wildlife, air quality, soils, areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC), cultural resources, Motor vehicle access, Native American values, recreation, socioeconomic values, mining, water quality and quantity, Wild & Scenic Rivers, wild horses and burros, cattle grazing, general land uses, wetlands and riparian habitat, and invasive species.

Impacts for each amendment/proposal are organized so that Alternative 1 “No Action” is discussed first. When there are multiple alternatives, Alternative 2 and any other alternatives are arranged in descending order of relative conservation emphasis and increasing order of use or access emphasis, as with Chapter 2. The agency preferred alternative is identified as such. The preferred alternative may change as a result of other agency and public review.

### **Summary Of Actions requiring CDCA Plan Amendment**

The following actions may require an amendment to the California Desert Conservation Plan and are evaluated in this document. These proposals would result in amendment of the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, if one or more alternatives are selected. Some alternatives may not result in amendment of the CDCA Plan.

- Adopt standards of public land health and modify guidelines for grazing management;
- Establish Desert Tortoise Wildlife Management Areas (DWMAs) and adopt management strategies within DWMA boundaries;
- Change Wildlife Habitat Management Planning (WHMP) designation to Area of Critical Environmental Concern designation for desert tortoise and modify boundaries to implement management strategies in DWMAs;
- Assign MUC L (change some MUC M to L) to all public lands within DWMAs;
- Assign (modify) desert tortoise Category boundaries to coincide with DWMA boundaries, with Category I habitat inside DWMAs and Category III habitat outside of DWMAs;

- Designate routes of travel within the Planning Area;
- Modify parking, stopping and camping guidelines for DWMAs;
- Modify grazing management to recover the desert tortoise;
- Modify burro management to recover the desert tortoise;
- Expand the Amargosa Natural Area (Vole) ACEC, adopt management strategies (Upper and Central Amargosa) and adjust MUC to recover vole and facilitate land tenure and watershed management;
- Establish the Carson Slough ACEC and adopt management strategies to protect threatened and endangered plants;
- Modify the MUC of the Silurian Hills to conserve sensitive bats;
- Establish MUC for 475,000 acres of released Wilderness Study Area (WSA);
- Evaluate the remnant Greenwater Canyon ACEC (820 acres) for possible deletion based on importance and relevance criteria;
- Develop a strategy for organized competitive events outside of OHV open areas, considering possible elimination of the Barstow-to-Vegas race course and alternative strategies in the planning area;
- Change the Tecopa Landfill MUC L to U making it available for disposal;
- Change the Shoshone Landfill MUC L to U making it available for disposal; and
- Determine segments of three rivers as suitable in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This amendment would be triggered by Congressional and/or State action, after follow-up suitability analyses and EIS are submitted to Congress and/or California, if followed up by their designation action

### **Preferred Alternative**

The CDCA Plan framework provided for and anticipated changes that the BLM addresses in this document for the NEMO planning area. These include: (1) changes in status to sensitive species, including potential future threatened and endangered species listings and mechanisms to deal with these threats; (2) designation of wilderness (i.e. the California Desert Protection Act) and a mechanism to return lands that are not designated as wilderness, wilderness study areas, or other special areas to multiple-use management; and (3) designation of specific routes of travel in the various Multiple-Use Classes. New policies on landfills and Wild and Scenic Rivers were not anticipated at the time of CDCA Plan development.

The preferred alternative utilizes the existing CDCA Plan framework and supplements that framework as needed to provide for a regional solution to issues. In the East Mojave, population density is the lowest of the large bioregions identified in the CDCA, approximately 50% of the public lands are managed for wilderness or are in wilderness study area status, and adjacent large units are managed by the National Park Service or the Department of Defense, providing a rural economic picture in the NEMO planning area. On the other hand, one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the United States of the 1990's, Las Vegas, is located within 50 miles of the planning area, which serves as a great through-point between Las Vegas and Los Angeles. A change in direction may be on the horizon, with increased pressures from adjacent urbanization and the

populations that this urbanization will bring to an area that has not had to deal with such pressures in the past.

The preferred alternative proposes to put in place measures to assure that the pace of development will not accelerate on public lands in the NEMO planning area in sensitive areas, and where acceleration of development is already a threat, proactive measures are proposed to assure adequate protection of sensitive public lands and resources, including T&E species, and the Wild and Scenic River resources of the planning area. A large portion of the landbase of the NEMO planning area already has motorized access restrictions as a result of expansion of park lands and designation of wilderness, and more restrictions may occur as a result of Fort Irwin expansion and Timbisha Indian reservation designation in the reasonably foreseeable future. Therefore, to the extent feasible, the preferred alternative provides a public access network to the remaining public lands in the East Mojave where it does not jeopardize T&E conservation and recovery. The following table provides a summary of the proposed access designations.

<b>MILES OF ROUTES DESIGNATED IN DWMA's</b>		
<b>Access</b>	<b>Total Miles</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Open</b>	<b>7,490</b>	<b>87%</b>
<b>Limited</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Closed</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>6%</b>

Future route designation in the Planning Area will occur with this same general goal in mind, consistent with the criteria set forth in 43 CFR8342.1. The preferred alternative, and the various issues addressed, is summarized in the following table.

Northern & Eastern Mojave Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Issue	NEMO Preferred Alternative
<b>Public Land Health</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt a set of regional standards of public land health in the NEMO Planning. These regional standards would replace the fallback standards currently in effect. Regional standards of public land health address all resource and uses on all public lands and cover five environmental components to be applied in the context of public land management.</li> <li>• Adopt a set of regional guidelines in the NEMO Planning Area for grazing management. These regional guidelines would replace the current fallback guidelines and include additional tools (e.g. wildfire) and a more comprehensive set of guidelines. They would identify grazing management practices to achieve the regional standards and would address the principles of grazing management practices as identified in 43 CFR 4180.2.</li> </ul>
<b>T&amp;E &amp; Special Status Species Protection</b>	
<b>Desert Tortoise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designate 2 DWMA's consisting of 3 ACECs totaling 312,485 acres</li> <li>• Management units (CAT 1) 279,195 – MUC L or C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piute-Fenner 173,850 30,010 – MUC M to L (Change)</li> <li>Ivanpah Valley 37,280 312,485 – CAT I - DWMA</li> <li>Shadow Valley 101,355</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Utilize a Programmatic consultation in all DT habitat to cover activities of 100 acres or less. Proposals that require separate consultations include: Any proposal that would disturb more than 100 acres except in the following instance: a proposal for an electrical transmission line or pipeline within an existing CDCA Plan utility corridor for which the NEPA mechanism is an EA and not an EIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are 3 triggers for consultations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any proposal that would disturb more than 100 acres.</li> <li>2. Any project for which the NEPA mechanism is an EIS, regardless of the size of the project</li> <li>3. Any project which can only be considered through a plan amendment process, regardless of the size of the project. This requirement applies to all areas of tortoise habitat- both inside and outside DWMA's. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Cumulative new surface disturbance limits 1%;</li> <li>-Project specific disturbance limits 100 acres.</li> <li>-Adopt DT strategy prescriptions &amp; Mitigation (APP A)</li> <li>-A cooperative phased raven mgt. Program</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Designate routes of travel in the three proposed units of the identified DWMA, consistent with Federal regulation and the existing route inventory. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rules for parking and camping would be modified as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Parking and camping will be allowed within 100 feet of route centerline within the proposed DWMA.</li> <li>-All navigable washes would be designated as Closed.</li> <li>-Interpretive signing and informational kiosks will be installed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Utilize Regional Standards and Guidelines for Grazing Management, CDCA Plan, allotment management plans, and terms and conditions from the existing USFWS biological opinions. For allotments within the DWMA's:</li> <li>• Allow voluntary relinquishment of grazing leases, and related authorizations.</li> <li>• Temporary nonrenewable grazing use (perennial) will not be authorized.</li> <li>• Cattle shall be removed from the DWMA as per the grazing strategy from 3/15 to 11/1 during years when ephemeral forage production is less than 230 pounds per acre. The grazing strategy will be developed within a year and implemented within two years. The Strategy shall be a written plan detailing the area of removal, natural cattle movements, existing and potential improvements, and other constraints of cattle management.</li> <li>• Terminate ephemeral allotments and terminate ephemeral authorization for ephemeral/perennial allotments.</li> <li>• Modify the Clark Mountain HMA to exclude that area located within the proposed DWMA's. The reestablished HMA boundary would be adjacent to the Nevada border north of I-15, in northern Ivanpah Valley. The AML would be 60 burros, per existing CDCA recommendations, pending the outcome of a revised 5-year carrying capacity analysis.</li> <li>• Acquire all lands in the DWMA's from willing sellers</li> </ul>

Northern & Eastern Mojave Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Issue	NEMO Preferred Alternative
<p><b>Amargosa Vole</b></p>	<p>Designate the Amargosa River ACEC. This alternative would affect 8,050 acres of public lands in addition to the existing ACEC acreages, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• suitable riparian habitat located east of the current Amargosa Canyon ACEC (2,400 acres in the China Ranch Wash area);</li> <li>• other suitable riparian habitat located upstream from these areas to a point located one mile south of Shoshone (3,520 acres);</li> <li>• Upper Amargosa Mesquite Bosque WHMA (950 acres);</li> <li>• designated Amargosa vole critical habitat not in the existing ACECs (1,180 acres of public lands); and</li> </ul> <p>Would identify State (1,280 acres) and private (760 acres in addition to the 630 acres already identified in the existing ACEC Plans) lands for possible Federal exchange or acquisition from willing landowners and inclusion in the Amargosa River ACEC. This would include the same areas for acquisition as Alternative 2 except lands in the Shoshone/Tecopa area (approximately 600 acres).</p> <p>Immediately integrate strategies and measures prescribed in the existing Amargosa Canyon and Grimshaw Lake Natural Area ACEC Management Plans, as modified by recommended strategies and actions specified in the Amargosa Vole Recovery Plan, into a single coordinated management plan, focused on riparian ephemeral wetland and mesquite bosque resource protection and monitoring along the entire length of the proposed Amargosa River ACEC. (Refer to Appendix H for an outline of these recommended strategies and actions). The management plan for this ACEC would be augmented and adjusted to address additional issues of concern for long-term management of the vole and other sensitive, threatened and endangered species occurring along this riverine system, within three years. This ACEC Management Plan would also include a programmatic consultation with the USFWS, should the scope of actions and activities detailed in that plan warrant such consultation. Issues, strategies and measures to be addressed in this proposed ACEC Management Plan would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintain viable populations of Amargosa vole;</li> <li>• develop monitoring, and in general, additional information about Amargosa vole populations and habitat use;</li> <li>• conduct additional plant and wildlife inventory work to identify all locations of special status species in the affected management unit, and develop appropriate measures to protect those found;</li> <li>• develop strategies for riparian resource protection and monitoring in cooperation with private landowners and other Federal, State, and local agencies;</li> <li>• identify mechanisms to track progress in reaching the goals specified in the Amargosa Vole Recovery Plan;</li> <li>• conserve and protect Amargosa watershed, riparian, ephemeral wetland and mesquite bosque resources;</li> <li>• conduct route designation in conjunction with the ACEC Management Plan.</li> <li>• implement a land tenure strategy, targeting suitable Amargosa vole habitat within the expanded ACEC (Refer to Appendix N). Where land acquisition or exchange is not identified, conservation easements, cooperative riparian management strategies, and other measures would be utilized. BLM would work with interested landowners to maximize the potential for recovery of the Amargosa vole;</li> <li>• protect riparian habitat utilized by four listed neotropical migratory bird species;</li> <li>• conserve other natural area values; and</li> <li>• develop a suitability determination for Wild and Scenic River designation in areas determined eligible in this planning effort. (Refer to Appendix O)</li> </ul>
<p><b>T&amp;E Plants</b></p>	<p>Combine the two critical habitat units for the Amargosa niterwort and Ash Meadows gumplant to create one Lower Carson Slough ACEC (4,340 acres). The Lower Carson Slough ACEC would be dedicated to conservation of special status plant populations in the ACEC, Amargosa River watershed values, ephemeral wetlands mesquite bosques and riparian areas. The ACEC would be comprised of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amargosa niterwort critical habitat 1,200 acres</li> <li>• Ash Meadows gumplant critical habitat 340 acres</li> <li>• Lower Carson Slough linkage 2,800 acres</li> </ul>

Northern & Eastern Mojave Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Issue	NEMO Preferred Alternative
	<p>Establish a strategy for the proposed Lower Carson Slough ACEC to accomplish the conservation objectives for special status plants and riparian ephemeral wetland and mesquite bosque habitats. Integrate this strategy with that to be developed for the proposed Amargosa River ACEC. The Lower Carson Slough ACEC Management Plan would be completed within 3 years and would include an Endangered Species Act consultation with the USFWS if the scope of actions warrants such consultation. Actions would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify locations of threatened, endangered and sensitive species and develop appropriate measures to protect them;</li> <li>• Develop a monitoring program for and determine habitat needs of Amargosa niterwort, Ash Meadows gumplant, spring-loving centaury and Tecopa birdsbeak;</li> <li>• Implement route designations;</li> <li>• Develop a strategy for conservation and monitoring of ephemeral wetlands, mesquite bosques and riparian areas in cooperation with adjacent private landowners and other Federal, State, and local agencies; and</li> <li>• Identify mechanisms to track progress in reaching special status plant population and recovery goals;</li> <li>• conduct route designation in conjunction with the ACEC Management Plan.</li> <li>• Develop guidelines for road construction and other activities adjacent to special status plant populations;</li> <li>• Administratively change the Appropriate Management Level (AML) for wild horses and burros from 28 horses and 28 burros to 12 horses and 0 burros to protect impacts on special status plants. This change reflects the current management strategy.</li> <li>• Delineate the Amargosa aquifer and develop a strategy in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies to safeguard surface and groundwater flows.</li> </ul>
<b>Bats</b>	<p>Change the existing Moderate MUC to Limited designation and establish standard mitigation measures for 7,400 acres of public land in the Silurian Hills region, known to support extensive habitat for several designated sensitive bat species. Route designation would occur on MUC L lands, including seasonal limitations and/or closures to sensitive bat values (e.g. active bat maternity roosts). Mitigation would be based on regional standards for public land health and MUC guidance, and would be accomplished within 12 months. Issues to be addressed in these measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• specific mitigation strategies for active mining operations and reclamation strategies for inactive minesites, which preserve the potential for bat use and may be applied on a programmatic basis; and</li> <li>• other specific mitigation measures that can be applied to activities, which may impact bats or bat habitat and which potentially, may be applied programmatically.</li> </ul>
<b>MUC for released WSAs</b>	
	<p>Designated consistent with the original CDCA Plan findings except in the following locations where MUC of lands surrounding have been redesignated and new data substantiate need. *Acres of public lands released from further wilderness review by Congress as Multiple-Use Class Limited and *acres of public lands as Moderate. Locations where changes have been made: MUC M - 75,380 MUC L - 392,920</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cerro Gordo (*21,244 acres)</li> <li>• Surprise Canyon (*849 acres)</li> <li>• Greenwater (3,000 acres)</li> <li>• Eagle Mountain (15,746 acres)</li> <li>• East of China Ranch (4009 acres)</li> <li>• Dumont (17,401 acres)</li> <li>• Boulder Corridor W &amp; E (11,593)</li> <li>• Mesquite Springs (18564 acres)</li> </ul>
<b>Greenwater Canyon ACEC Deletion</b>	
	<p>The Greenwater Canyon Cultural ACEC would be deleted and the 820 acres remaining under BLM jurisdiction would be managed according to MUC Limited guidelines</p>

Northern & Eastern Mojave Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Issue	NEMO Preferred Alternative
<b>Organized Competitive Vehicle Events</b>	
	<p>Amend the California Desert Conservation Area Plan to:</p> <p>a) Remove delineation of the Barstow-to-Las Vegas Race Course from the Land Use Map of the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, (1980 as amended).</p> <p>b) Replace the text in the section titled Organized Competitive Vehicle Events under the Recreation Element of the CDCA Plan with: <u>Competitive vehicle events may only be held in MUC L with an area designation of "Open"</u>.</p> <p>c) Amend the MUC Guidelines to delete all reference to organized competitive vehicle events in MUC L and M, under recreation.</p>
<b>Motor Vehicle Access: Routes of Travel</b>	
	<p>Designate routes in accordance with criteria in 43 CFR 8342.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend the CDCA Plan Motorized-Vehicle Access Element to manage routes of travel in accordance with MUC Limited guidelines irrespective of Multiple-Use Class, except in MUC "C" (Wilderness) and in areas designated "Open" for vehicle use.</li> <li>• Designate "existing" routes, including navigable washes, that have been individually identified (per 1979 maps) "open" for motor-vehicle use with the same exceptions as Alternative 2, with the following modification for washes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluate existing washes as potential routes, including navigable washes, on a case-by-case basis, based on their contribution to the primary transportation network and providing access to specific recreational destinations, consistent with criteria.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In addition to the above general exceptions, in the Desert Tortoise DWMA, routes would be designated "open" for motor-vehicle use with the following additional exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three routes (11 mi.) that were closed through the initial route designation process in 1979, two in Shadow Valley and one in Northern Ivanpah, would be designated as "closed" for motor-vehicle use.</li> <li>- Routes where specific biological parameters proposed under this alternative are applied to meet desert tortoise DWMA goals and objectives (see appendix A), shall be designated "closed" or "limited" as appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In addition, non-existent and wilderness routes not included and designated as "closed" would be the same as Alternative 1 (No Action)</li> </ul>
<b>Landfills</b>	
<b>Tecopa</b>	On 29.4 acres encumbered by the former and current Tecopa community landfill site, public lands would be redesignated from MUC Limited to Unclassified to facilitate conveyance out of Federal ownership to the County of Inyo.
<b>Shoshone</b>	On 50 acres encumbered by the former and current Shoshone community landfill site, public lands would be redesignated from MUC Limited to Unclassified to facilitate conveyance out of Federal ownership to the County of Inyo.
<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers</b>	
	The WSR Act and Federal guidelines require Federal agencies, upon determination of WSR eligibility, to provide interim protection and management for a river's free-flowing character and any identified outstandingly remarkable values, subject to valid existing rights, until such time as a suitability study is completed. Refer to Appendix O for a description of the outstanding remarkable values that will benefit by this eligibility determination. During this interim period all proposals that could affect the Amargosa River, Cottonwood Creek, and Surprise Canyon and their resources will be evaluated against the regulatory criteria and additional limits on uses may occur. Further analysis of potential impacts to all resources and uses will be evaluated during the suitability analysis.