

DRAFT

BLM Screening of Candidate Regional Mitigation Sites for Dry Lake SEZ

Screening tool for the BLM Interdisciplinary Team to use for evaluating and recommending candidate sites to the BLM Authorized Officer (See definitions for criteria categories at bottom.)

#	Criteria	SEZ	BLM-Recommended Sites				TNC-Recommended Sites				Criteria Notes
			Gold Butte ACEC, LV FO	Mormon Mesa ACEC - Ely and LV FOS	Coyote Springs ACEC, LV FO	Plute-El Dorado ACEC, LV FO	Coyote Springs	Mt Stirling Reserve	Jenn/Roach Lake	Stump Springs/Hidden Hills	
		Dry Lake SEZ									
SITE CHARACTERISTICS											
1	Contiguous area of site (acres)	3,471									Enter the size, in acres, of the candidate site.
2	For ACECs, reason for designation	n/a									If the candidate site encompasses land in an ACEC, list the value(s) present that the ACEC was established to protect.
3	Mitigation tool (restoration/enhancement, acquisition, banking, withdrawal, special designation, etc.)	n/a									List the type(s) of mitigation tool that would implemented at the site
4	In SEZ Ecoregion?	Mojave Basin and Range									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
5	In SEZ ecological subregion?	Eastern Mojave									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
6	Meets priorities for ESA recovery unit?	n/a									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
7	Consistent with ESA mitigation priorities in adjoining states?	n/a									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not. The BLM Interdisciplinary Team will compare attributes of the candidate site with the appropriate ESA species-specific recovery plan(s) to determine if candidate site meets the conservation goals and objectives that are outlined in the ESA species recovery plan.
8	Same HUC 4 watershed?	Lower Colorado-Lake Mead (1501)									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not, 0 if candidate site is partially in watershed and partially not. The HUC 4 watershed will be used to evaluate the sites; sites not in the same HUC 4 watershed would have a pretty strong hydrologic disconnect from Dry Lake SEZ.
9	Mitigates unavoidable impacts to most sensitive/valuable resource(s)?	Desert tortoise and Rosy two-toned Beardtongue									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
10	Mitigates for all identified unavoidable impacts that warrant offsite mitigation?	Unavoidable impacts that warrant mitigation at the Dry Lake SEZ include soils, vegetation, wildlife, special-status species, and visual resources. Impacts to Native American concerns that warrant mitigation may be identified through consultation.									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
11	Similar landscape value, ecological functionality, biological value, species, habitat types, and/or natural features?	This is the reference site									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
12	Provides adequate level of protection and geographic extent?	n/a									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
13	Presence of unique/valuable resources or features	see below									Calculate score on the basis of the number of unique/valuable resources or features present at the candidate site, as listed for criteria 13a through 13f.
13a	Perennial, protected sources of water?	No									List specific resource(s)
13b	Unique species assemblages?	None known									List specific resource(s)
13c	Protected species and/or critical habitat?	Desert tortoise									List specific resource(s)
13d	Rare plants?	Rosy two-tone beardtongue (Penstemon bicolor spp. Roseus)									List specific resource(s)

DRAFT

BLM Screening of Candidate Regional Mitigation Sites for Dry Lake SEZ

Screening tool for the BLM Interdisciplinary Team to use for evaluating and recommending candidate sites to the BLM Authorized Officer (See definitions for criteria categories at bottom.)

#	Criteria	SEZ	BLM-Recommended Sites				TNC-Recommended Sites				Criteria Notes
			Gold Butte ACEC, LV FO	Mormon Mesa ACEC - Ely and LV FOS	Coyote Springs ACEC, LV FO	Plute-El Dorado ACEC, LV FO	Coyote Springs	Mt Stirling Reserve	Jenn/Roach Lake	Stump Springs/Hidden Hills	
		Dry Lake SEZ									
13e	Desert washes or ephemeral playas?	Avoided									List specific resource(s)
13f	Other?	Vegetation types: Creosotebush, White bursage, Yucca, Cactus. Wildlife: Mule deer, kit fox. Special-status species: Desert tortoise, Golden eagle, Gila monster, Mojave desert sidewinder, Ferruginous hawk, Loggerhead shrike, LeConte's thrasher; migratory birds. Also present: desert pavement, biological crusts. Old Spanish Trail/Mormon Road eligible archaeological site									List specific resource(s)
14	Sources of data for the site	Solar PEIS; BLM Interdisciplinary team, stakeholders									Enter source(s) of information used to evaluate the site.
EFFECTIVENESS / ADDITIONALITY											
15	To what extent can the full spectrum of regional mitigation goals/objectives be met simultaneously? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	Enter succinct summary of goals/objectives for each SEZ mitigation plan.									Rate the extent to which the regional mitigation goals/objectives can be met simultaneously through mitigation actions at the site, based on the following scale: all (100%) of the goals and objectives can be met (score of 5); 75-99% can be met (score of 4); 50-75% (score of 3); 25 - 49% can be met (score of 2); less than 25% can be met (score of 1); none of the goals/objectives can be met (score of 0).
16	How effective will the mitigation be in the context of achieving mitigation goals/objectives for conserving/restoring ecosystem intactness? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	n/a									Rate the effectiveness of the mitigation actions at the site in terms of achieving mitigation goals/objectives, based on the following scale: highly effective (score of 5); moderately effective (scores of 2-4), and minimally effective (score of 1).
17	Mitigation action adds to/goes beyond BLM's existing mandates for resource management (i.e., the additionality requirement is met).	n/a									Enter 1 if criterion is met, -2 if not.
FEASIBILITY											
18	Based on action required (e.g., restoration, BLM land management action, land acquisition, Congressional action), how difficult will implementation be? Use scale of 1 (difficult) to 5 (relatively easy)	n/a									Rate the mitigation action, based on the following scale: restoration/enhancement actions (score of 5); BLM planning decisions (score of 3-4); land acquisition actions (score of 1-3); Congressional actions (score of 1). Ratings should be adjusted on the basis of factors such as cost of the action; time and effort requirements; public and/or BLM support for or opposition to action; and, for land acquisitions, willingness of seller.
19	Time frame needed to establish site as mitigation location (estimated years)	n/a									Enter the estimated number or range of years required to establish the site as the location for mitigation action (e.g., number of years to establish priority on restoration actions at the site, number of years to acquire parcel of land).
20	Time frame for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from implementation (estimated years)	n/a									From first date of implementation, enter the estimated number or range of years required to implement actions and achieve mitigation goals and objectives.
21	Cost estimate	n/a									Enter a total and per-acre cost estimate for the proposed mitigation action(s) at the site, including cost of restoration and enhancement actions, future maintenance costs (e.g., weed management), land acquisition costs, enforcement costs, BLM management costs.

DRAFT

BLM Screening of Candidate Regional Mitigation Sites for Dry Lake SEZ

Screening tool for the BLM Interdisciplinary Team to use for evaluating and recommending candidate sites to the BLM Authorized Officer (See definitions for criteria categories at bottom.)

#	Criteria	SEZ	BLM-Recommended Sites				TNC-Recommended Sites				Criteria Notes
		Dry Lake SEZ	Gold Butte ACEC, LV FO	Mormon Mesa ACEC - Ely and LV FOS	Coyote Springs ACEC, LV FO	Piute-El Dorado ACEC, LV FO	Coyote Springs	Mt Stirling Reserve	Jenn/Roach Lake	Stump Springs/Hidden Hills	
DURABILITY											
22	How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	n/a									Rate the temporal and managerial durability of the mitigation action, based on the following scale: Congressionally protected lands would be very durable (score of 5); other federally administered lands specifically designated in land use plans or withdrawn by public land order would be moderately to very durable (score of 4-5); federally administered lands without any special designation but with enforcement oversight would have limited durability (score of 2); lands without special designation or enforcement oversight would not be very durable (score of 1).
RISK											
23	What are the constraints or threats to success?	n/a									List the constraints or threats present at the site or in the surrounding area that could jeopardize long-term success of the mitigation action(s).
24	To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success? Use scale of 1 (considerable) to 5 (low)	n/a									Rate the extent to which surrounding land uses and stressors (e.g., proximity to expanding urban areas, pressures on region for recreational land use, excessive groundwater withdrawal and drawdown conditions that could affect resources on the mitigation site) would jeopardize long-term success of the mitigation actions, based on the following scale: if surrounding land uses are similar to or compatible with mitigation actions, the impact would be low (score of 5); if surrounding land uses are incompatible with mitigation actions or present significant pressure for use of the site for incompatible uses, the impact would be considerable (score of 1); surrounding land uses falling within this range would be assessed to determine degree of impact (score of 2-4).
25	What is the relative probability of success? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	n/a									Rate the relative probability of success of the actions at the mitigation site, based on the combination of factors evaluated in criteria 15 through 24, giving a score of 5 (high probability of success), a score of 1 (low probability of success), and scores of 2-4 to represent moderate degrees of probability of success.
PRELIMINARY SCORING											
											Calculate score by summing the entries in blue-shaded cells.

Definitions for Criteria Categories

Site Characterization Criteria: characteristics of the site that are largely known or measureable, that determine whether the site is comparable to the SEZ site and/or is suitable for supporting effective mitigation actions.

Effectiveness/Additionality Criteria: factors that (1) measure how effective the actions at the mitigation site will be in terms of meeting the BLM's mitigation goals/objectives for the SEZ and (2) assess whether or not the action meets the requirement for additionality (i.e., does the action add to or go beyond BLM's existing mandates).

Feasibility Criteria: factors that measure the degree of difficulty in terms of implementing the actions at the mitigation site, the amount of time required to successfully implement the mitigation action(s), and the total and per-acre cost of the mitigation.

Durability Criteria: factors that measure the durability of the mitigation in terms of the permanence and stability of the mitigation area.

Risk Criteria: factors that measure the degree to which external factors might jeopardize long-term success of the mitigation action(s).