

CHAPTER 2 TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 2. ALTERNATIVES1

INTRODUCTION 1

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALTERNATIVES..... 1

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES 2

 Land Health Standards 2

 NPS Vital Signs 7

 Wildland Fire Acres in the Alternative Decision Tables 7

MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES 8

THE ALTERNATIVES 8

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE..... 8

 Alternative A: No Action..... 8

 BLM Guidance Areas and NPS Management Zones 9

ACTION ALTERNATIVES: ALTERNATIVES B, C, D, AND E 11

 Alternative B 11

 Alternative C 11

 Alternative D 12

 Alternative E: Proposed Plan 12

 Management Units 13

NPS ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE..... 16

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES 18

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT 19

TYPES OF BLM AND NPS DECISIONS..... 19

LAND USE PLAN DECISIONS..... 19

 Desired Future Conditions 20

 Special Designations 20

 Allowable Uses (Land Use Allocations)..... 20

 Management Actions 20

IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS 21

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS 21

ALTERNATIVE DECISION TABLES..... 21

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING 258

IMPLEMENTATION..... 258
 MONITORING..... 258

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND INTERRELATIONSHIPS..... 259
 REQUIREMENTS FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS 259
 INTERRELATIONSHIPS 259

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS 262

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1: AIR, WATER, AND SOILS..... 23
 TABLE 2.2: GEOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY 26
 TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT 28
 TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE 67
 TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES..... 81
 TABLE 2.6: WILD BURROS 119
 TABLE 2.7: CULTURAL RESOURCES 120
 TABLE 2.8: VISUAL RESOURCES..... 126
 TABLE 2.9: SOUNDSCAPES 130
 TABLE 2.10: WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS 131
 TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY 136
 TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING 151
 TABLE 2.13: MINERALS 164
 TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION..... 171
 TABLE 2.14A: SPECIAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS 193
 TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT 213
 TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS 231
 TABLE 2.17: PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY..... 256
 TABLE 2.18: SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH 257
 TABLE 2.19: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS 263

LIST OF MAPS

MAP 2.1: MANAGEMENT UNITS FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN..... 155
 MAP 2.2: WILDLAND FIRE USE ALLOCATIONS - PROPOSED PLAN..... 66
 MAP 2.3: VEGETATION HABITAT AREAS - PROPOSED PLAN 117
 MAP 2.4: WILDLIFE HABITAT AREAS - PROPOSED PLAN 118
 MAP 2.5: VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT - PROPOSED PLAN 129
 MAP 2.6: WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS - PROPOSED PLAN..... 135

MAP 2.7: LAND OWNERSHIP AND ADJUSTMENTS - PROPOSED PLAN 150
MAP 2.8: GRAZING ALLOTMENTS - PROPOSED PLAN..... 163
MAP 2.9: FLUID MINERAL LEASING CATEGORIES - PROPOSED PLAN..... 168
MAP 2.10: LOCATABLE MINERAL LAND CLASSIFICATIONS - PROPOSED PLAN.... 169
MAP 2.11: SALABLE MINERAL LAND CLASSIFICATIONS - PROPOSED PLAN..... 170
MAP 2.12: SPECIAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREAS - PROPOSED PLAN 188
MAP 2.13: RECREATION MANAGEMENT ZONES - PROPOSED PLAN 189
MAP 2.14: RECREATION SETTINGS (PHYSICAL) - PROPOSED PLAN 190
MAP 2.15: RECREATION SETTINGS (SOCIAL) - PROPOSED PLAN 191
MAP 2.16: RECREATION SETTINGS (ADMINISTRATIVE) - PROPOSED PLAN 192
MAP 2.17: DESIGNATED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM & PRELIMINARY ROUTE
NETWORK - PROPOSED PLAN 228
MAP 2.18: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT AREAS - PROPOSED PLAN..... 229
MAP 2.19: OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE DESIGNATIONS - PROPOSED PLAN..... 230
MAP 2.20: AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN - PROPOSED PLAN 255

CHAPTER 2. ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes and compares five alternatives, consisting of four action alternatives and the “No Action” Alternative, for managing the Planning Area. Each alternative varies in both context and intensity of management actions, and consists of a set of designations, land use allocations, and management actions needed to implement the alternative. Each alternative is subsequently assessed for environmental impacts, which are summarized at the end of this chapter. A detailed discussion of impacts by alternative is presented in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences.

Each alternative portrays a different concept for management, as defined by the application of its management units, desired future conditions (DFCs), special designations, land use allocations, management actions, and allowable uses. All alternatives afford a high degree of protection for Monument resources, as required by the proclamations.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and National Park Service (NPS) developed five alternatives using public comments, ideas, and concerns from the staffs of both agencies, and input from cooperating agencies. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations and BLM and NPS management planning regulations require the formulation of a reasonable range of alternatives to address identified planning issues and management concerns. Each alternative was evaluated to ensure that it would be consistent with the three planning areas’ significance and mission statements, the Monuments’ proclamations and purpose statements, as well as current laws, regulations, and policies.

The existing management plans (1992 Arizona Strip Resource Management Plan (RMP) and 1986 Lake Mead General Management Plan (GMP)) and the interim management policies for the Monuments (BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2000-062 and Addendum for Parashant, and IM 2002-008 for Vermilion) served as the baseline for the No Action Alternative.

A number of management actions stemming from other plans amending the Arizona Strip RMP, Lake Mead GMP, and interim management guidelines were also taken into consideration (see Chapter 1 for specific plans). Many of the management actions occurring in these documents were found to be acceptable and reasonable and were thus carried forward under all the alternatives.

Public input received during the scoping process was considered to ensure that all issues and concerns were addressed, as appropriate, in developing the alternatives and their management action options. An additional set of public meetings not required under NEPA were held

specifically for the public to comment on preliminary alternatives to ensure that the issues and concerns raised during the initial public comment period were adequately addressed under the alternatives. The public scoping process and its results are presented in more detail in Chapter 5.

A number of cooperating and federal agencies (see Chapter 5) also participated in alternative development. The BLM and NPS coordinated meetings with these agencies to gather input during the alternative development process. The BLM and NPS provided preliminary drafts of the alternatives for the cooperating agencies and affected federal and state agencies to review.

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

In the alternative decision tables (tables 2.1-2.18) presented later in this chapter, the decisions common to all alternatives are readily noticeable as they cross the five columns in the table that represent the five alternatives. Most of the DFCs are common to all alternatives or common to all action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D, and E). These and other specific management decisions common to all alternatives are identified in the alternative decision tables (tables 2.1 – 2.18).

While the management decisions under the five alternatives vary, numerous decisions would be implemented under all the alternatives. Many of these consist of management actions carried forward from the current planning documents, including the Arizona Strip RMP (BLM 1992, as amended), Lake Mead GMP (NPS 1986), and the Monument interim management policies, as they were found acceptable and reasonable under all the alternatives.

Land Health Standards

One important management consideration common to all alternatives, resource programs, and all three planning areas is the integration of the land health standards described in Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (BLM 1997; see Appendix 2.A). The land health standards were developed, pursuant to 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 4180, through a collaborative process involving BLM staff and the Arizona Resource Advisory Council, and were approved by the Secretary of the Interior in April 1997. The land health standards have been developed to identify the characteristics of healthy ecosystems on BLM-administered public lands (BLM lands) and the management actions that promote them. When approved, the land health standards became BLM Arizona policy, guiding the planning for and management of BLM lands. The land health standards, therefore, have been incorporated into management decisions proposed for Parashant, Vermilion, and the Arizona Strip FO under all the alternatives. Listed below are the standards that describe the conditions necessary to encourage proper functioning of ecological processes, and which have been adopted as the land health standards applicable to BLM lands throughout Arizona. When appropriate, implementation of these standards may be modified for use on NPS-administered lands (NPS lands) by incorporating NPS Vital Signs initiatives. Any land health standards applied on NPS lands will be in compliance with NPS Management Policies (2001). As the Vital Signs initiative is developed, all or portions of it may be adopted on BLM lands in Parashant.

Standard 1: Upland Sites

Upland soils exhibit infiltration, permeability, and erosion rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, and landform (i.e., ecological zone).

Criteria for Meeting Standard 1

Soil conditions support proper functioning of hydrologic, energy, and nutrient cycles. Many factors interact to maintain stable soils and healthy soil conditions, including appropriate amounts of vegetative cover, litter, and soil porosity and organic matter. Under proper functioning conditions, rates of soil loss and infiltration are consistent with the potential of the site.

Ground cover in the form of plants, litter, or rock is present in pattern, kind, and amount sufficient to prevent accelerated erosion for the ecological site; or ground cover is increasing as determined by monitoring over an established period of time.

Signs of accelerated erosion are minimal or diminishing for the ecological site as determined by monitoring over an established period of time. As indicated by such factors as:

- Ground cover
- Litter
- Live vegetation (e.g., grass, shrubs, trees) amount and type
- Rock
- Signs of erosion
- Flow pattern
- Gullies
- Rills and plant pedestaling

Exceptions and exemptions (where applicable):

- None

Guidelines

- 1-1. Management activities will maintain or promote ground cover that will provide for infiltration, permeability, soil moisture storage, and soil stability appropriate for the ecological sites within management units. The ground cover should maintain soil organisms and plants and animals to support the hydrologic and nutrient cycles, and energy flow. Ground cover and signs of erosion are surrogate measures for hydrologic and nutrient cycles and energy flow.

- 1-2. When grazing practices alone are not likely to restore areas of low infiltration or permeability, land management treatments may be designed and implemented to attain improvement.

Standard 2: Riparian-Wetland Sites

Riparian-wetland areas are in properly functioning condition.

Criteria for Meeting Standard 2

Stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate for proper functioning condition for existing climate, landform, and channel reach characteristics. Riparian-wetland areas are functioning properly when adequate vegetation, landform, or large woody debris is present to dissipate stream energy associated with high-water flows.

Riparian-wetland functioning condition assessments are based on examination of hydrologic, vegetative, soil, and erosion-deposition factors. The BLM has developed a standard checklist to address these factors and make functional assessments. Riparian-wetland areas are functioning properly as indicated by the results of the application of the appropriate checklist.

The checklist for riparian areas is in Technical Reference 1737-9, "Process for Assessing Proper Functioning Condition." The checklist for wetlands is in Technical Reference 1737-11, "Process for Assessing Proper Functioning Condition for Lentic Riparian-Wetland Areas." As indicated by such factors as:

- Gradient
- Width/depth ratio
- Channel roughness and sinuosity of stream channel
- Bank stabilization
- Reduced erosion
- Captured sediment
- Ground water recharge
- Dissipation of energy by vegetation

Exceptions and exemptions (where applicable):

- Dirt tanks, wells, and other water facilities constructed or placed at a location for the purpose of providing water for livestock and/or wildlife, and which have not been determined through local planning efforts to provide for riparian or wetland habitat are exempt.
- Water impoundments permitted for construction, mining, or other similar activities are exempt.

Guidelines

- 2-1. Management practices maintain or promote sufficient vegetation to maintain, improve or restore riparian-wetland functions of energy dissipation, sediment capture, groundwater recharge and stream bank stability, thus promoting stream channel morphology (e.g., gradient, width/depth ratio, channel roughness and sinuosity) and functions appropriate to climate and landform.
- 2-2. New facilities are located away from riparian-wetland areas if they conflict with achieving or maintaining riparian-wetland function. Existing facilities are used in a way that does not conflict with riparian-wetland functions or are relocated or modified when incompatible with riparian-wetland functions.
- 2-3. The development of springs and seeps or other projects affecting water and associated resources shall be designed to protect ecological functions and processes.

Standard 3: Desired Resource Conditions

Productive, diverse upland and riparian-wetland plant communities of native species exist and are maintained.

Criteria for Meeting Standard 3

Upland and riparian-wetland plant communities meet desired plant community objectives. Plant community objectives are determined with consideration for all multiple uses, as appropriate. Objectives also address native species and the requirements of the Taylor Grazing Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), Endangered Species Act (ESA), Clean Water Act (CWA), and appropriate laws, regulations, and policies.

Desired plant community objectives will be developed to assure that soil conditions and ecosystem function described in Standards 1 and 2 are met. They detail a site-specific plant community, which when obtained, will assure rangeland health, state water quality standards and habitat for endangered, threatened, and sensitive species. Thus, desired plant community objectives will be used as an indicator of ecosystem function and rangeland health.

As indicated by such factors as:

- Composition
- Structure
- Distribution

Exceptions and exemptions (where applicable):

- Ecological sites or stream reaches on which a change in existing vegetation is physically, biologically, or economically impractical

Guidelines

- 3-1. The use and perpetuation of native species will be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species are appropriate for use where native species (a) are not available, (b) are not economically feasible, (c) cannot achieve ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or (d) cannot compete with already established non-native species.
- 3-2. Conservation of Federal threatened or endangered, proposed, candidate, and other special status species is promoted by the maintenance or restoration of their habitats.
- 3-3. Management practices maintain, restore, or enhance water quality in conformance with State or Federal standards.
- 3-4. Intensity, season and frequency of use, and distribution of grazing use should provide for growth and reproduction of those plant species needed to reach desired plant community objectives.
- 3-5. Grazing on designated ephemeral (annual and perennial) rangeland may be authorized if the following conditions are met:
 - Ephemeral vegetation is present in draws, washes, and under shrubs and has grown to useable levels at the time grazing begins.
 - Sufficient surface and subsurface soil moisture exists for continued plant growth.
 - Serviceable waters are capable of providing for proper grazing distribution.
 - Sufficient annual vegetation will remain on site to satisfy other resource concerns (i.e., watershed, wildlife, wild horses and burros).
 - Monitoring is conducted during grazing to determine if objectives are being met.
- 3-6. Management practices will target those populations of noxious weeds, which can be controlled or eliminated by approved methods.
- 3-7. Management practices to achieve desired plant communities will consider protection and conservation of known cultural resources, including historical sites, and prehistoric sites and plants of significance to Native American peoples.

NPS Vital Signs

The condition of key natural resources and ecological processes on NPS lands are verified through the NPS Vital Signs monitoring program. For Parashant and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA)-administered lands, Vital Signs selection, condition standards, and monitoring protocols are currently under development. Where indicated in the Plan, and for other key resources not specifically referenced in the Plan, Vital Signs monitoring will be developed and used to determine status and trends in resource condition from which management actions, if necessary, may be implemented in conformance with this Plan to prevent or reverse resource degradation. The intent of NPS Vital Signs monitoring is to track a subset of physical, chemical, and biological elements and processes of park ecosystems that are selected to represent the overall health or condition of park resources, known or hypothesized effects of stressors, or elements that have important human values. Monitoring results will be used to assess the efficacy of management and restoration efforts, provide early warning of impending threats, and provide a basis for understanding and identifying meaningful change in natural systems characterized by complexity, variability, and unknowns. Monitoring data may help to determine what constitutes impairment and to identify the need to initiate or change management practices. The elements and processes that are monitored are a subset of the total suite of natural resources that park managers are directed to conserve "unimpaired for future generations," including water, air, geological resources, plants and animals, and the various ecological, biological, and physical processes that act on those resources. While NPS Vital Signs standards may be different than BLM standards and guides for particular resources, Vital Signs monitoring on NPS lands may be designed to compliment similar natural resource monitoring conducted through BLM programs on BLM lands and vice versa, in terms of techniques and data collected.

Wildland Fire Acres in the Alternative Decision Tables

The number of acres predicted to be burned by wildland fire in each ecological zone in Table 2.3 is based on the total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003. This number does not change by alternative. Although proposed vegetation treatments change by alternative, there is not a direct correlation between acres treated and acres burned by wildland fire. Fuels treatments can decrease the potential for stand-replacing fire, but may not affect the number of acres burned. Projected acres of post-fire rehabilitation are based on fire history. Rehabilitation may not be implemented after all fires. Additional rehabilitation efforts could be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed these estimates.

MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

The proclamations and purpose, significance, and mission statements for the Monuments and the significance and mission statements for the Arizona Strip FO guided the development of the management actions presented in the alternatives (see Chapter 1). The BLM and NPS also considered the Planning Area vision and planning criteria in the process. An in-depth discussion of these management guidelines is found in Chapter 1. The BLM and NPS were also guided through the development of goals for each of the management units and DFCs for each resource/resource use within the Planning Area. DFCs are presented for resource/resources uses within the Monuments and Arizona Strip FO in the alternative decision tables (tables 2.1 – 2.18).

THE ALTERNATIVES

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Alternative A: No Action

Alternative A is the No Action Alternative that is required by NEPA and provides the baseline against which to compare the other alternatives. Under this alternative, current management practices would continue as funding allows.

With the establishment of Parashant, the BLM and NPS were instructed to follow the directives of Proclamation 7265 and the interim management policy issued pursuant to the proclamation. Following the establishment of Vermilion, the BLM was instructed to follow the directives of Proclamation 7374 and the interim management policy issued pursuant to that proclamation. Alternative A would entail the continued management of both Monuments and the Arizona Strip FO under the Arizona Strip RMP (1992, as amended) and the Lake Mead GMP (1986, for the NPS portion of Parashant), as modified by the interim management policies that have been incorporated in the BLM/NPS Interagency Agreement for Parashant and under BLM IM 2002-008 for Vermilion. Interim management policies provide temporary guidance until this Plan is completed. These interim policies are considered part of a viable alternative for future management and are incorporated into Alternative A.

The key components of Alternative A are identified below:

- Alternative A depicts current management under the existing management plans as modified by Proclamations 7265 and 7374 and the interim management policies for the Monuments.
- Alternative A provides the baseline to compare current management with various strategies suggested for future management (Alternatives B, C, D, and E).
- Alternative A responds to those public comments favoring keeping things as they are.

Management Actions under Alternative A

Alternative A would incorporate the management common to all alternatives as previously described. Specific management actions under Alternative A for each of the planning areas are presented in tables 2.1 – 2.18, and compared against the other alternatives. Maps illustrating management actions under Alternative A are located in the Draft Plan/DEIS at the end of Chapter 2.

BLM Guidance Areas and NPS Management Zones***BLM Guidance Areas***

Under the current management of the BLM portion of the Planning Area, public lands were partitioned into Guidance Areas (Areas A and B) in the Arizona Strip RMP (BLM 1992, as amended). These broad landscapes differentiate areas with special resource concerns, sensitivities, or characteristics and are defined as follows:

Area A

These lands contain a wide variety of resources and values that require continued multiple-use management. Most of these lands do not contain unusual characteristics and are not subject to unusual demands requiring special management attention.

Management guidelines for these areas would remain similar to current management practices, which are considered adequate. Existing laws, regulations, policies, and procedures would be followed. The following management guidelines apply to area A:

- Designate off-highway vehicle (OHV) use as either open or limited to existing roads and trails,
- Issue commercial, non-commercial, negotiated sales, and free-use permits as appropriate for woodland products and mineral materials,
- Provide for primitive motorized and primitive non-motorized recreation,
- Transfer public lands for community expansion, primarily through exchange.

Area B

Area B includes land identified by the public and BLM as having unique resource values and special management needs. These lands have characteristics that include important scenic values, exceptional natural features, and fragile physical features. In these fragile areas, disturbances would be very difficult to reclaim and permanent scars on the landscape can occur. With few exceptions, public lands in Area B are more remote than those in Area A. These lands are generally not developed and presently do not receive a great deal of public use.

Management guidelines for public lands in Area B focus on the maintenance and/or enhancement of various resource values while allowing for multiple uses. The BLM would manage authorized uses and prepare management prescriptions to protect remoteness, natural settings, or other unique resource values. The following management guidelines apply to area B:

- Close and rehabilitate roads where no obvious public or administrative need exists,
- Designate OHV use as either closed or limited to designated roads and trails,
- Implement special coordinated RMPs to protect the fragile character and unique resource values of specific areas,
- Permit the removal of woodland products only when it would enhance other resource values of the area,
- Retain land in federal ownership unless specifically required by law,
- Provide for primitive motorized and primitive non-motorized recreation,
- Accommodate mineral material disposal, provided Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II guidelines are met.

Most BLM lands (2,228,434 acres) would be in Area A, which contain a wide variety of resources and values that require continued multiple use management. Area B includes land identified as having unique resource values and special management needs (885,515 acres). Most of Area B now encompasses large portions of the Monuments and would be managed to protect these unique resource values.

NPS Management Zones

Under current management, the NPS portion of Parashant falls within “management zones” that were identified in the Lake Mead GMP (1986). Under Alternative A, the NPS portion of the Parashant would remain within the Gregg Basin/Grand Wash and Shivwits Zones.

Gregg Basin/Grand Wash Zone

The Gregg Basin/Grand Wash Zone includes remote and primitive lands in the lower Pakoon Basin that access Lake Mead NRA. This area is intended to provide a unique, isolated experience for visitors to access the Pakoon Basin and associated Mojave desert environment and Lake Mead.

Shivwits Plateau Zone

The Shivwits Plateau Zone includes remote and rugged plateaus, primarily in a forested pinyon-juniper and ponderosa pine landscape, that provide access to the north rim of western Grand Canyon via primitive roads. This area is intended to be managed for a primitive and remote visitor experience. Much of this area was proposed as wilderness in the 1986 Lake Mead GMP and 1979 Wilderness Proposal.

ACTION ALTERNATIVES: ALTERNATIVES B, C, D, AND E**Alternative B**

Alternative B places an emphasis on minimal human use/influence, and proposes the fewest miles of open roads and trails. It focuses on natural processes and other unobtrusive methods for ecosystem restoration, resource management, and scientific research; more protection and enhancement of remoteness and dispersed recreation; unstructured recreation opportunities; and the least amount of motorized recreation opportunities.

The key components of Alternative B are as follows:

- Alternative B responds to those public comments desiring greater focus on ecological health and the protection of naturalness, opportunities for solitude, and primitive recreation.
- Alternative B supports a restoration program that relies more on natural processes to restore ecological health.

Management Actions under Alternative B

Alternative B would incorporate the management common to all alternatives as previously described. Specific management actions under Alternative B for each of the planning areas are presented in tables 2.1 – 2.18, and compared against the other alternatives. Maps illustrating management actions under Alternative B are located at the end of this Chapter 2 in the Draft Plan/DEIS.

Alternative C

Alternative C represents an attempt to balance resource protection and human use/influence. It proposes a moderate amount of open roads and trails; mix of natural processes and “hands-on” techniques for ecosystem restoration, resource management, and scientific research; and a mix of motorized, non-motorized, dispersed, and structured recreation opportunities.

The key components of Alternative C are as follows:

- Alternative C provides a balanced response to competing public concerns between public use and protection of resources.
- Alternative C accommodates use and access while still protecting resources.

Management Actions under Alternative C

Alternative C would incorporate the management common to all alternatives as previously described. Specific management actions under Alternative C for each of the planning areas are presented in tables 2.1 – 2.18, and compared against the other alternatives. Maps illustrating management actions under Alternative C are located at the end of Chapter 2 in the Draft Plan/DEIS.

Alternative D

Alternative D places an emphasis on maximum appropriate human use/influence and the widest array of visitor experiences and opportunities. It includes the most miles of open roads and trails (with the exception of Alternative A), and focuses on “hands-on” techniques for ecosystem restoration, resource management, and scientific research. As such, it offers fewer remote settings and the most motorized and structured recreation opportunities compared to the other alternatives.

The key components of Alternative D are as follows:

- Alternative D allows the broadest use of restoration tools, including chemical, biological, mechanical, and natural processes as appropriate to the ecological zone.
- Alternative D responds to public comments stressing the desire for more motorized access, a stronger focus on multiple use of resources, and increased number of projects or facilities.

Management Actions under Alternative D

Alternative D would incorporate the management common to all alternatives as previously described. Specific management actions under Alternative D for each of the planning areas are presented in tables 2.1 – 2.20, and compared against the other alternatives. Maps illustrating management actions under Alternative D are located at the end of Chapter 2 in the Draft Plan/DEIS.

Alternative E: Proposed Plan

Alternative E, the Proposed Plan, emphasizes minimal human influence and use in the more remote sections of the Planning Area and more human use/influence in the areas adjacent to local communities or in areas presently receiving such use/influence. It attempts to balance human use/influence with resource protection. Where appropriate, it proposes a combination of management actions including allowing natural processes to continue, applying more hands-on treatment methods, and protecting the remote settings that currently exist in the Planning Area.

The key components of Alternative E, the Proposed Plan, are as follows:

- Alternative E responds to public comments to protect resources while still allowing use, especially near the communities.
- Alternative E provides the best means to accommodate the widest range of public and agency concerns over resources and resource uses.

Management Actions under Alternative E

Alternative E would incorporate the management common to all alternatives as previously described. Specific management actions under Alternative E for each of the planning areas are presented in tables 2.1 – 2.20, and compared against the other alternatives. Maps illustrating management actions under Alternative E follow these management action tables, where appropriate (see maps 2.2 – 2.20).

Management Units

Management units are geographic areas with similar resource management goals. Under Alternatives B, C, D, and E, four management units (Community, Corridors, Backroads, and Outback) were used as guidance for land use plan decisions in specific geographic areas with similar landscapes, resources, and resource uses in the Planning Area.

The polygons that outline the location of the four management units are identical to those that identify the location of travel management areas (TMAs; see Table 2.15 and Map 2.18). The corresponding TMAs for each Management Unit are shown in parentheses after the Management Unit name. TMAs, however, describe areas delineated for varying types of access, while management units are not land use allocations or decisions. This does not diminish their value as management tools as they assist in better understanding the differing areas and associated uses and resources in the Planning Area.

Improvements (facilities or projects) associated with valid, existing rights and permitted uses could occur in any management unit, though the influence they have on the landscape character may vary greatly. Facilities include, but are not limited to: transmission lines, communications facilities, or kiosks. Projects could include, but are not limited to: corrals, catchments, pipelines, fences, wells, and troughs.

The location and extent of the management units vary among the four action alternatives (See Map 2.1 for the Proposed Plan and maps for the other alternative at the end of Chapter 2 in the Draft Plan/DEIS), with the exception of the Corridors Management Unit that is identical under each of the action alternatives.

Community Management Unit (Rural Travel Management Area)

BLM lands within the Community Management Unit would provide room for community growth and development. These lands would also offer the widest variety of recreation opportunities, such as viewing scenery and activities; riding motorcycles/OHVs; vehicle touring; flying aircraft; hiking and walking; bicycling; horseback riding; camping; picnicking; hunting; studying nature; using interpretive services; and attending organized events. These activities, however, would not be to the detriment or exclusion of the protection of resources upon which the natural environment and recreation experiences depend. Visitors to this management unit would experience the highest frequency of interaction with other people.

These areas would also provide the most opportunities for short-term or day-use recreation activities “close to home.” Lands within the Community Management Unit may also provide resources, such as fuelwood and mineral materials, access to permitted commercial and recreational activities, and scenic backdrops or settings for communities.

Moderate to substantial modifications to the landscape character would be allowed to occur in the Community Management Unit compared to other management units but not to the exclusion of protecting important resources. Sights, sounds, and uses of other people would be readily evident. No NPS lands are found in the Community Management Unit as they are far-removed from communities, occurring in the southern end of the Planning Area.

Corridors Management Unit (Backways Travel Management Area)

Lands within the Corridors Management Unit would occur along major travel routes, providing, among other things, access to the Back Roads and Outback management units. They would offer a variety of recreation opportunities, such as viewing scenery, riding motorcycles/OHVs, vehicle touring, flying aircraft, hiking and walking, bicycling, horseback riding, camping, picnicking, hunting, studying nature, using interpretive services, and participating in compatible organized events. Such activities would occur with a moderate frequency of interaction with other people.

These areas would also provide the most opportunities for short-term or day-use recreation activities related to vehicle touring. Outside the Monuments, these lands may also provide resources, such as fuelwood and mineral materials, and access to permitted commercial and recreational activities.

The Corridors Management Unit is characterized by predominantly natural-appearing environments with moderate evidences of the sights and sounds and uses of others. Some modifications to the landscape could occur, but not to the exclusion of the protection of visual, natural, and cultural resources and uses. No NPS lands are found in the Corridors Management Unit as major travel routes cross BLM lands from the north and northwest before reaching NPS lands in the southern end of the Planning Area.

Map 2.1: Management Units for the Proposed Plan

Back Roads Management Unit (Specialized Travel Management Area)

Lands within the Back Roads Management Unit would provide a variety of dispersed recreation opportunities such as viewing scenery, riding motorcycles/OHVs, vehicle touring, hiking and walking, bicycling, horseback riding, camping, picnicking, hunting, studying nature, using interpretive services, and participating in compatible organized events. Such activities would occur with low to moderate frequency of interaction with other people.

While concentration of users would be low, evidence of other users would be relatively high. These lands may also provide resources such as fuelwood and mineral materials for use on the Arizona Strip FO, and access to permitted commercial activities and to lands in the Outback Management Unit.

BLM and NPS lands identified as within the Back Roads Management Unit would be characterized by predominantly natural or natural-appearing environments of moderate to large size with moderate probabilities of experiencing isolation from the sights and sounds of other people. These natural appearing landscapes and open spaces would contribute to high quality visitor experiences. Some modifications to the landscape could be expected, but would be tempered by the need to protect important resources.

Outback Management Unit (Primitive Travel Management Area)

Lands within the Outback Management Unit would provide opportunities for undeveloped, primitive, and self-directed recreation opportunities such as viewing scenery, hiking and walking, horseback riding, backpacking, hunting, studying nature, canyoneering, and rock climbing. The frequency of interaction with other people would be low and evidence of other users would be minimal.

BLM and NPS lands classified as within the Outback Management Unit would be characterized by predominantly natural or natural-appearing environments of moderate to large size. The lowest level of landscape modifications would be expected compared to the other management units. Remote settings, natural landscapes, solitude, and opportunities for primitive recreation would be minimally impacted by human activity.

NPS ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The Environmentally Preferred Alternative is identified to meet NPS requirements in the Proposed Plan/FEIS in managing the NPS portion of Parashant. The BLM is not required to identify an environmentally preferred alternative in the Proposed Plan/FEIS. The alternative would meet national environmental policy as expressed in Section 101 of NEPA, which identifies the responsibility of the federal government to do the following:

1. Fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations.
2. Ensure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.
3. Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk of health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences.
4. Preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage and maintain, wherever possible, an environment that supports diversity and variety of individual choice.
5. Achieve a balance between population and resource use that will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities.
6. Enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

In comparison with the other alternatives analyzed, Alternative E best meets the above NEPA goals for the future management of the NPS portion of Parashant. It provides a high level of protection of natural and cultural resources, while providing for a wide range of beneficial uses of the environment.

The No Action alternative, Alternative A, would allow visitor use to increase unchecked, thereby causing potential negative impacts on the visitor experience and resource conditions. This alternative does not address TMAs, thereby ignoring a proactive approach to visitor access and protection of natural and cultural resources. It does not address discrepancies that exist between the Lake Mead 1979 Wilderness proposal and the 1986 GMP, resulting in potentially confusing and conflicting information about which routes are designated open. This alternative also does not identify additional lands managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. Finally, Alternative A does not call for proactive restoration of pinyon pine or ponderosa pine communities, thereby causing unnatural accumulation of fuels that could cause potentially catastrophic fires. For these reasons, the No Action alternative is not preferred from an environmental perspective.

Alternative B represents the alternative with the most “hands off” management. It has the fewest acres of access and designated routes, most acres of primitive TMAs and lands managed to maintain wilderness characteristics, and very few areas identified for restoration. Though this alternative is the most “natural” management alternative, it does not provide for proactive visitor or resource management. This alternative was not selected as the environmentally preferred alternative because it does not achieve a balance between visitor use/access and protection of resources, nor does it involve restoration of natural processes and conditions.

Alternative C represents a better balance of visitor use and resource conditions, but does not recognize the unique nature of Parashant in terms of its accessibility and opportunities to provide a range of appropriate recreational experiences to Monument visitors. It does not acknowledge that, in general, areas closer to population centers may be more appropriate for more diverse visitor uses, whereas areas further from population centers may be more appropriate for

providing more primitive conditions and remote experiences. This alternative does not attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation.

Alternative D represents the alternative with the most “hands-on” management, maximum human use/influence, and the most recreation opportunities. It also identifies the fewest acres managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. This alternative proposes extensive proactive restoration, which means fewer acres restored via natural means, and more significant alterations to the primitive landscape. It provides a high range of visitor access and recreation opportunities, but fewer opportunities for primitive and remote experiences. For these reasons, this alternative does not achieve the balance between population and resource use that permits enhancement of resource conditions and visitor experience.

Alternative E takes the best components of each of the four above alternatives to ensure protection of Monument resources while providing a wide range of beneficial uses. This alternative acknowledges that the more isolated areas of the Monuments should be managed to preserve their remoteness and maintain wilderness characteristics, the protection of which was stressed during the public scoping comment period. At the same time, it would provide more access in areas closer to population centers to ensure that a range of appropriate outdoor recreation is available. This alternative provides a good balance of proactive restoration, while maintaining primitive and “natural-appearing” landscapes. This alternative preserves important natural aspects of our national heritage while providing an environment that supports diversity and a variety of individual choices. Overall, alternative E best meets the requirements of Section 101 of NEPA and was thus selected as the environmentally preferred alternative by the NPS.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The President’s National Energy Policy encourages the development of renewable energy resources and requires that the BLM increase and diversify national sources of both traditional and alternative energy resources, improve the energy transportation network, and ensure sound environmental management. As part of the BLM’s proposed National Energy Policy Implementation Plan, the BLM and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory identified BLM planning units with the highest potential for the development of renewable resources. Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data, the Arizona Strip FO was ranked 18th out of 25 planning units with the highest potential for concentrating solar power sites, 15th in photovoltaic sites, and 23rd in biomass sites. This Proposed Plan/FEIS encourages the development of renewable energy sources in the Arizona Strip FO. See Table 2.11 (Lands and Realty) for specific decisions on renewable energy.

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management is a formal, systematic, and rigorous approach to learning from the results of management actions, accommodating change, and improving management. It involves synthesizing existing knowledge, exploring alternative actions, and making explicit forecasts about their results. Management actions and monitoring programs are carefully designed to generate reliable feedback and clarify the reasons underlying results. Actions and objectives are then adjusted based on this feedback and improved understanding to continue to try to achieve the DFCs. In addition, decisions, actions, and results are carefully documented and communicated to others, so that knowledge gained through experience is passed on rather than lost when individuals move or leave the organization.

Land use plan level decisions would not be adaptable. These include the DFCs, special designations, and allocations. Plan amendments would be required to change these decisions. Implementation or activity level decisions could be adapted. Future activity level plans would follow NEPA procedures and involve the public.

This Proposed Plan/FEIS recommends an adaptive management strategy. This adaptive management process is flexible and generally involves four phases: planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. As the BLM and NPS obtain new information, they are able to evaluate monitoring data and other resource information to periodically refine and update DFCs, management actions, and allowable uses. This allows for the continual refinement and improvement of management prescriptions and practices.

TYPES OF BLM AND NPS DECISIONS

LAND USE PLAN DECISIONS

Land use plan decisions represent the desired outcomes and the actions needed to achieve them. Such decisions were attained using the planning process found in 43 CFR 1600 and guide future land management actions and subsequent site-specific implementation decisions. When presented to the public as proposed decisions, land use plan decisions can be protested to the BLM Director; however, they are not appealable to Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA).

Many land use plan decisions are implemented or become effective upon approval of the management plan and may include DFCs, land use allocation or designation decisions such as OHV area designations, and all special designations such as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs). Management actions that require additional site-specific project planning as funding becomes available will require further environmental analysis. Decisions to implement site-specific projects are subject to administrative review at the time such decisions are made. The BLM and NPS would continue to involve and collaborate with the public during implementation of this Plan.

Desired Future Conditions

Land use plans express DFCs or desired outcomes in terms of specific goals, standards, and objectives for resources and/or uses. They direct the BLM and NPS actions in most effectively meeting legal mandates; numerous regulatory responsibilities; national policy; state director (BLM) and director (NPS) guidance; and other resource or social needs. The allocations or designations, actions to achieve the DFCs, restrictions on uses, allowable uses, or special designations are the decisions that allow the BLM and NPS to work toward achieving the DFCs.

The first items on each alternative decision table are the DFCs appropriate to each alternative and planning area. DFCs are often common to all alternatives and all planning areas, and are clearly identified as such. Following the DFCs are special designations (where applicable), actions aimed at achieving the DFCs, and allowable uses.

Special Designations

Special designations include those that are designated by Congress for special protection, such as wilderness areas or national historic or scenic trails. Such designations are not land use plan decisions; however, recommendations for designation can be made to Congress at the land use plan level. Congress may then act on these recommendations at a later time.

Administrative designations made by the BLM (e.g., designating ACECs or watchable wildlife viewing sites) are also considered special designations and can be made in the land use plan.

Allowable Uses (Land Use Allocations)

Allowable uses or land use allocations are land use plan decisions that set apart geographic areas for specific resources or uses, such as areas where wildland fire is not desired, lands available or not for livestock grazing, or where OHV designated areas are necessary. Allocations have geographic boundaries and are represented by polygons on the maps at the end of Chapter 2 in the Draft Plan/DEIS and those maps specific to the Proposed Plan in this chapter (maps 2.2 – 20). The management of allocated resources is described through the decisions proposed under the alternatives. It is common for specific resource or use allocations to overlap with other resource or use allocations.

Management Actions

Management actions set the framework that allows achievement of the DFCs. In the alternative decision tables, management actions are categorized as actions to achieve desired outcomes, including actions to maintain, restore, or improve land health.

IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS

Implementation decisions are management actions tied to a specific location. For the BLM, these are decisions that take action to implement land use plan decisions and are generally appealable to IBLA under 43 CFR 4.410. Implementation or activity level decisions generally constitute BLM's or NPS's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. These types of decisions require appropriate site-specific planning and NEPA analysis. They may be incorporated into implementation plans (activity or project plans) or may exist as stand-alone decisions.

Unlike land use plan decisions, BLM implementation decisions are not subject to protest under the planning regulations. Instead, implementation decisions are subject to various administrative remedies, particularly appeals to the Office of Hearing and Appeals (Interior Board of Land Appeals). Where implementation decisions are made as part of the land use planning process, they are still subject to the appeals process or other administrative review as prescribed by the specific resource program regulations after the BLM resolves the protests to land use plan decisions and make a decision to adopt or amend the management plan. For example, the designation of a specific route as open or closed is an implementation level decision, rather than a land use plan decision. Consequently, individual route designations are subject to a different appeals process. NPS has no similar provision for protest of land use plan decisions nor appeals process for implementation decisions. A 30-day "no-action" period exists to address omissions or resolve issues prior to finalizing NPS decisions.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Although the BLM's and NPS's intent and commitment to accomplish administrative actions is generally addressed in Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)- or Environmental Assessment (EA)-level documents, such activities are not management decisions at either the land use plan level or implementation level. Administrative actions are day-to-day activities conducted by the BLM and NPS, often required by FLPMA or the NPS Organic Act. BLM and NPS administrative actions do not require NEPA analysis or a written decision by a responsible official to be accomplished. Examples of administrative actions include mapping, surveying, inventorying, monitoring, and collecting information needed such as research and studies.

ALTERNATIVE DECISION TABLES

The management decisions and administrative actions under each alternative for Parashant, Vermilion, and Arizona Strip FO are presented in the following alternative decision tables (tables 2.1 –2.18). Table 2.19, Summary of Impacts, summarizes the impacts from these decisions. These tables represent resource programs that address the management of Critical Elements of the Human Environment and land use planning topics for the BLM and mandatory EIS topics for the NPS (see Chapter 4; Table 4.1), and are arranged as follows:

- Table 2.1: Air, water, and soils
- Table 2.2: Geology and Paleontology
- Table 2.3: Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management (also includes Vegetation Products)
- Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife
- Table 2.5: Special Status Species
- Table 2.6: Wild Burros
- Table 2.7: Cultural Resources
- Table 2.8: Visual Resources
- Table 2.9: Soundscapes
- Table 2.10: Wilderness Characteristics
- Table 2.11: Lands and Realty
- Table 2.12: Livestock Grazing
- Table 2.13: Minerals
- Table 2.14: Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education
- Table 2.15: Travel Management
- Table 2.16: Special Designations
- Table 2.17: Public Health and Safety
- Table 2.18: Scientific Research

The alternative decision tables are divided into five columns representing the No Action Alternative and the four action alternatives. Those decisions common to all alternatives transcend the column boundaries, while decisions that vary by alternative are confined to their appropriate cell. Decisions that are common to two, three, or four alternatives also transcend column boundaries. In addition, decisions that are common to all planning areas are clearly labeled, as are decisions specific to Parashant, Vermilion, Arizona Strip FO, or a combination of these planning areas.

Area and length figures referenced in tables 2.1 – 2.18 and throughout this document are based on the best available GIS data at the time of publication. These figures are based on the Universal Transverse Mercator Zone 12 projection referencing the North American Datum of 1983. Analysis and calculation have been made on various GIS layers, which may or may not correspond to each other. Differences in area or length correlations between the various calculations in this document are due to minor discrepancies between GIS layers.

Acreage numbers provided in the Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management section, Table 2.3, were generated as actual acres treated or by specialists projections based on available habitat. They are not GIS generated numbers.

TABLE 2.1: AIR, WATER, AND SOILS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. AIR MANAGEMENT				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Federal and State air quality standards would be maintained within the Planning Area.			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Impacts to air quality would be prevented or reduced through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity level planning and NEPA level review.				
<i>Parashant</i>				
The potential adverse impact of fugitive dust would be mitigated during surface disturbing projects.				
II. WATER MANAGEMENT				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
All surface water would meet Arizona State water quality standards.				
N/A	Surface water availability at seeps and springs would be appropriate for the soil type, climate, and landform.			
N/A	Ecological functions and processes would be intact at all seeps and springs.			
N/A	Flowing water systems would provide continuous flowing water and associated riparian vegetative cover, where possible.			
N/A	The natural hydrologic functions of all watersheds would be intact.			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Impacts to water quality would be prevented or reduced through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity level planning and NEPA level review.				
The BLM would file for water rights in accordance with State of Arizona water laws on available water sources for recreational use, wildlife, livestock, administrative uses, and in-stream flows, subject to funding/staffing constraints.				
Flood plain occupancy and development would be avoided and the 100-year flood plain would be protected.	Natural values associated with floodplains and wetlands would be restored and preserved by avoiding floodplain occupancy and development. If development or occupancy is necessary, impacts would be mitigated through consulting and permitting with appropriate agencies.			

TABLE 2.1: AIR, WATER, AND SOILS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	The BLM would continue to work with appropriate state authorities to ensure that water resources needed would be available.			
III. SOIL MANAGEMENT				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Soils would exhibit infiltration, permeability, and erosion rates appropriate for the soil type, climate, and landform.				
N/A	Physical soil crusts would show an increase in organic cover including cryptobiotic colonies, moving them towards being organic crusts.			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<p>Surface disturbance and reclamation activities would proceed consistent with current permits and subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health would be followed to maintain or improve soil conditions. See Livestock Grazing Table 2.12. • Activities would be the minimum necessary to accomplish the task. • Reclamation would be required for road realignments. • Measures to stabilize soils and minimize surface water runoff would be required, both during project activities and following project completion. • Reclamation of all surface disturbances would be initiated during or immediately upon completion of the authorized project. Reclamation could include re-contouring the disturbed area to blend with the surrounding terrain, ripping compacted areas, replacement of topsoil, seeding, planting, and/or providing effective ground cover. • All temporary roads would be closed and reclaimed immediately upon completion of the project. Reclaimed roads could be barricaded or signed until reclamation objectives are achieved. • Facilities or improvements no longer necessary would be removed and the sites would be reclaimed, provided no historic properties are affected. 				
N/A	Restoration and reclamation actions would be consistent with vegetation management decisions for each Ecological Zone.			
Watershed and riparian objectives would continue to be coordinated into applicable Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) with emphasis on areas of moderate to severe erosion.	Emphasis for management of all grazing allotments in Watershed Condition Class IV would be to reduce erosion and improve the watershed condition class (See Arizona Strip RMP 1992). Evaluations would be completed through the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health (see Livestock Grazing Table 2.12). More detailed assessments of watershed condition would be done in priority watersheds, subject to funding/staffing constraints in the watershed program.			

TABLE 2.1: AIR, WATER, AND SOILS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	The following watersheds would be priority for assessment, treatments and/or restrictions on use to reduce erosion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Lang’s Run, Black Rock Mountain, and Parashant 			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	All watersheds in the Monument would be priority for assessment, treatments, and/or restrictions on use to reduce erosion.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	The following watersheds would be priority for assessment, treatments, and/or restrictions on use to reduce erosion, control flooding, and reduce salt contributions to the Colorado River: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Lang’s Run, Black Rock Mountain, Upper Parashant, Lower Hurricane Valley, Fort Pearce Salinity Area, Clayhole Flood Control Structures Area, and Wild Band Valley 			

TABLE 2.2: GEOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. GEOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Paleontological resources would be managed for their scientific, educational, and recreational values.			
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Geological and paleontological Monument objects would be protected. These may include all vertebrate or uncommon invertebrate fossils or localities and relevant and highly visible geological features and formations.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Vertebrate and uncommon invertebrate paleontological resources would be protected.			
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<p>Areas would be classified according to their potential to contain vertebrate fossils or noteworthy occurrences of invertebrate or plant fossils. These Paleontological Sensitivity Classes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class 1 (Low sensitivity): Igneous and metamorphic geologic units and sedimentary geologic units where vertebrate fossils or uncommon non-vertebrate fossils are unlikely to occur. • Class 2 (Moderate sensitivity): Sedimentary geologic units that are known to contain or have unknown potential to contain fossils that vary in significance, abundance, and predictable occurrence. • Class 3 (Moderate sensitivity): Areas where geologic units are known to contain fossils but have little or no risk of human-caused adverse impacts and/or low risk of natural degradation. • Class 4 (High sensitivity): Areas where geologic units regularly and predictably contain vertebrate fossils and/or uncommon non-vertebrate fossils, and are at risk of natural degradation and/or human-caused adverse impacts. 			
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	BLM and NPS would identify and protect significant fossils and allow for scientific research at paleontological sites, in accord with permitting procedures.			
N/A	Should paleontological resources be discovered within the Planning Area, the sites would be evaluated for sensitivity. The sites would then be classified and managed consistent with the land use allocation classifications described above.			
N/A	The collection of any objects in the Monuments, including paleontological resources (such as fossils or track ways) or rock specimens would not be authorized, except by permit for scientific research or use.			

TABLE 2.2: GEOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY	
N/A	Prior to authorizing land uses in any Class 4 areas, a records search and paleontological survey and/or monitoring would be required so that impacts to vertebrate fossils and/or uncommon invertebrate fossils could be minimized or mitigated.
N/A	Adverse impacts to vertebrate and/or uncommon invertebrate paleontological resources would be mitigated.
D. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>	
Inventories for paleontological resources would continue.	
N/A	A sensitivity map for paleontological resources would be developed and screening for all projects against potential for the project to impact vertebrate fossils or noteworthy occurrences of invertebrate or plant fossils would be required.
II. CAVE AND KARST RESOURCES	
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS	
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>	
N/A	Significant cave and karst resources would be protected.
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS	
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>	
N/A	All caves and karst features would be considered significant, if they meet the criteria defined in 43 CFR Part 37 (See Appendix 2.B). All caves on NPS land are classified as significant under the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act.
N/A	Cave and karst resources would be evaluated to determine proper and needed protective measures to ensure their continued viability. Protective measures could include restricting surface disturbing activities, limiting fire suppression, controlling visitor use, and restricting management actions.
<i>Parashant</i>	
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	
Inventories for cave and karst resources would continue.	

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: ALL ECOLOGICAL ZONES				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All BLM watersheds would meet, or would be progressing towards meeting, the Standards for Rangeland Health for BLM lands and NPS Vital Signs standards on NPS lands. (See Chapter 2 text and Appendix 2.A) • NPS watersheds would meet, or would be in improving condition toward meeting, NPS Vital Signs objectives and BLM Standards for Rangeland Health. • Native vegetative communities would be protected, including those considered Monument objects. A mosaic of native perennial and non-invasive annual vegetative communities would be present across the landscape with diversity of species, canopy, density, and age class reflecting its local ecological site potential and naturally occurring habitat conditions. • Vegetative communities would provide sufficient plant cover and litter accumulation to protect soils from wind and water erosion and enhance nutrient cycling and productivity, even during drought years. • Ecological processes and functions would be protected, enhanced, and/or restored by allowing tools that are necessary and appropriate to mitigate adverse impacts of allowable uses and undesirable disturbances, and contribute to meeting the Standards for Rangeland Health and NPS Vital Signs and enhance Monument objects and values. • Invasive plant species would be contained, controlled, or eliminated and native species restored to meet desired plant community objectives. • Loss of key ecosystem components to wildfire would be minimized. • Fire return intervals and natural disturbances would be appropriate for the ecological site. • In addition to the above, vegetation communities on NPS lands retain ecological integrity where natural processes maintain native plants and plant communities and are the principal influence on community and population fluctuation. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire is recognized as a natural process in fire-adapted ecosystems and is used to achieve objectives for other resources. • Fuels in Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) areas are maintained at non-hazardous levels to provide for public and fire fighter safety. • Prescribed fire activities comply with Federal and State air quality regulations. • Each vegetation community is maintained within its natural range of variation in plant composition, structure, and function, and fuel loads are maintained below levels that are considered to be hazardous. 				

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
a. Desired Plant Community Objectives				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Sensitive areas including desert tortoise and Siler pincushion cactus habitats would be seasonally restricted or closed to vegetation treatments.	Seasonal restrictions, temporary reductions, or elimination of authorized activities would be implemented in conjunction with vegetation treatment projects to protect sensitive resources and/or ensure attainment of Desired Plant Community (DPC) objectives or Vital Sign standards.			
b. Vegetative and Restoration Treatments				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Vegetative treatments could be conducted where plant cover or soil productivity is being lost to achieve a DPC, improve habitat conditions for wildlife, or meet activity plan objectives.	Restoration and vegetation treatments would be authorized where protection of sensitive resources is ensured. Priority areas for restoration or vegetative treatment projects would be defined by ecological zone and major vegetation type and based on the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase indigenous rare or uncommon species; • Where soil productivity has been reduced due to removal of soil organic matter or active erosion; • Where vegetative cover is inadequate to prevent soil erosion; • To improve habitat conditions for wildlife and/or special status species; • To restore degraded, drought-stricken, weed infested, or otherwise unhealthy areas; • To maintain previously treated areas; • To achieve DPC objectives; and • To meet activity plan objectives. On NPS lands, individual restoration plans would be developed to meet DFCs, NPS Vital Signs standards, and related ecological objectives. Mitigation measures would be implemented for reducing impacts such as soil erosion or non-native plant encroachment, and minimum requirements analysis would be used in proposed wilderness.			
The use and perpetuation of native species would be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-	On BLM lands, the use and perpetuation of native species would be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species may be used where native species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are not available, • Are not economically feasible, • Cannot achieve DFCs, DPCs, or other ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or • Cannot compete with already established non-native species. 			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>native plant species would be considered appropriate for use where native species (a) are not available, (b) are not economically feasible, (c) cannot achieve ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or (d) cannot compete with already established non-native species. Habitat restoration in desert tortoise habitat would not include planting or seeding of non-native plants.</p>	<p>Non-native forbs and perennial grasses could be used in preference to monocultures of non-native annuals.</p>			
<p>The development of site-specific DPC objectives, in accord with ecological site potential, would continue.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On BLM lands, the development of site-specific DPC objectives, in accord with ecological site potential, would continue. DPC objectives would be achieved through vegetation treatments and management of resource uses. DPC objectives would be included in all appropriate activity plans, including AMPs. On NPS lands, vegetation management objectives would be developed through Vital Signs monitoring. Monitoring vegetation communities would demonstrate retention of ecological integrity where natural processes maintain native plants and plant communities and are the principal influence on community and population fluctuation. When natural processes have been disrupted, DPC objectives would be achieved through vegetation treatments and managing resource uses, as appropriate. 			
<p><i>Parashant</i></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation and soil cover would be managed towards ecological stability using mechanical, chemical, biological, or fire as tools for accomplishment. Chaining and other methods that cause substantial surface disturbance should not be permitted. 	<p>Treatment methods and tools appropriate to the land use allocation and protection of Monument objects could be authorized to achieve DFCs, DPCs, or Vital Sign standards. Treatment methods could include, but are not limited to mechanical, chemical, biological and fire, or any combination thereof. Vegetation treatments and uses would be monitored as part of an adaptive management process. Seed priming and other enhancement techniques could be used to increase germination rates. Treatments would be designed so that they do not encourage an increase in any invasive species. Minimum requirement analysis would be used in BLM designated wilderness and in NPS proposed wilderness. (See Appendix 2.C for a list of potential methods and tools.)</p> <p>On NPS lands, chaining and other methods that cause substantial surface disturbance would not be permitted.</p>			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For all fire management activities in the Monument, measures would be taken to assure that no adverse effects occur to those resources, values, and objects identified in the respective proclamations or legislation as reasons for establishing the area. 				
<p>On NPS land, authorization of non-native seed use must be consistent with NPS policy, which states that revegetation efforts would use seeds, cuttings, or transplants representing species and gene pools native to the ecological portion of the park in which the restoration project is occurring. Where a natural area has become so degraded that restoration with native gene pools has proven unsuccessful, improved varieties or closely related native species may be used.</p>				
<p><i>Vermilion</i></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation and soil cover would be managed towards ecological stability using mechanical, chemical, biological, or fire as tools for accomplishment. Vegetation manipulation should proceed only when consistent with conservation and protection of Monument resources. Chaining and other methods that cause substantial surface disturbance should not be permitted. For all fire management activities in the Monument, measures would be taken to assure that no adverse effects 	<p>Treatment methods and tools appropriate to the land use allocation and protection of Monument objects could be authorized to achieve DFCs and DPCs. Treatment methods could include, but are not limited to mechanical, chemical, biological and fire, or any combination thereof. Vegetation treatments and uses would be monitored as part of an adaptive management process. Seed priming and other enhancement techniques could be used to increase germination rates. Treatments would be designed so that they do not encourage an increase in any invasive species.</p> <p>(See Appendix 2.C for a list of potential methods and tools.)</p>			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
occur to those resources, values, and objects identified in the respective proclamation or legislation as reasons for establishing the area				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Vegetation and soil cover would be managed towards ecological stability using mechanical, chemical, biological, or fire as tools for accomplishment.	Treatment methods and tools appropriate to the land use allocation would be authorized to achieve DFCs and DPCs. Treatment methods could include, but are not limited to mechanical, chemical, biological and fire, or any combination thereof. Vegetation treatments and uses would be monitored as part of an adaptive management process. Seed priming and other enhancement techniques could be used to increase germination rates. Treatments would be designed so that they do not encourage an increase in any invasive species. (See Appendix 2.C for a list of potential methods and tools.)			
c. Sale or Use of Vegetation Products				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
On BLM lands, commercial use would be in specified areas and managed under the multiple use/sustained yield concept.	No areas would be allocated to sustained yield timber harvest.			
On BLM lands, fees or permits would not apply for the collection of pinyon pine seeds (pine nuts) for non-commercial, personal use.				
Collection of listed, proposed, or candidate plant species would not be authorized.				
N/A	Fees may not apply on BLM lands for non-commercial, personal use quantities of items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes, such as herbals, medicines or traditional use items.			
Gathering of dead and downed wood for campsite use would be authorized in areas where campfires are allowed.				
<i>Parashant</i>				
The Monument would be closed to the general commercial sale of vegetative products, except for the following situations:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On BLM lands, the sale, collection, or use of vegetative materials (e.g. native seed, medicinals, landscape mulch, posts, fuel wood, etc.) would require a permit and may be authorized if tied to a clearly defined science-based research or restoration project, and the use would be consistent with achieving the DFCs and protecting Monument objects. Permits would be authorized only for those areas where resource management objectives have been developed. 				
On NPS lands, the collection or use of vegetative materials would only be authorized in conjunction with documented research or restoration programs in accordance with NPS regulations and policy. The sale of vegetative materials would not be authorized.				

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
The BLM may authorize limited harvest of posts and/or poles for on site administrative purposes, including fence repair.				
The Pakoon Desert Wildlife Management Area (DWMA) would be closed to the collection of vegetative materials.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
The Monument would be closed to the sale of vegetative products.				
The BLM would authorize limited harvest of posts and/or poles for on-site administrative purposes				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Personal Christmas tree cutting would be open everywhere except wilderness areas and ACECs. Area-wide limits for personal use post cutting would be established.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sale, collection, or use of vegetative materials (e.g. native seed, medicinals, landscape mulch, posts, fuel wood, Christmas trees, etc.) would require a permit. Permits would be authorized only for those areas where resource management objectives have been developed. Interested parties would need to check with the BLM office concerning specific locations, stipulations, fees, and other requirements. • Collection of vegetative materials in ACECs would be restricted unless it meets specific resource management objectives. 			
d. Salvage of Vegetation				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<p>On BLM lands, salvage of vegetation that would be destroyed through surface disturbing activities may be authorized where doing so would assist in achieving DPCs. Salvage and use would be allowed in the following priority (may require a permit from the State of Arizona):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal and maintenance for replanting during rehabilitation of the site being disturbed. • Removal and transplanting out of the area to be disturbed, especially to an area needing rehabilitation. • Removal and salvage by private individuals or to benefit the public (includes schools, churches, non-profit organizations). 			
<p>On NPS lands, vegetation that would be destroyed through surface disturbing activities may be salvaged and used to rehabilitate the site or used at another site with similar ecological conditions requiring restoration or rehabilitation. Salvage and use would be allowed in the following priority (may require a permit from the State of Arizona):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal and maintenance for replanting during rehabilitation of the site being disturbed. • Removal and transplanting out of the area to be disturbed, especially to an area needing rehabilitation. 				
e. Noxious Weeds				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Management practices would target those populations of	Implementation of ongoing noxious weed and invasive species control actions would be continued as per national guidance and the Weed Management Area Plan. Integrated weed management would continue using available tools to control noxious weeds			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
noxious weeds that can be controlled or eliminated by approved methods.	consistent with vegetation management decisions for each Ecological Zone and as appropriate to the land use allocation and in order to protect resources and Monument values.			
N/A	Certified weed-free feed, mulch, and seed would be required for all permitted uses to limit the spread of noxious weeds and other undesirable species. (See Table 2.12 Livestock Grazing and Table 2.14 Recreation and Visitor Services.)			
N/A	Construction equipment, fire vehicles, and/or vehicles from outside the Planning Area used to implement authorized projects and/or uses would be required to be cleaned (using air, low pressure/high volume, or high pressure water) prior to initiating the project. BLM and NPS vehicles would also be cleaned after being used within any infested area. As national policy is developed, the more stringent would be implemented. Vehicles leaving the area and later returning to continue the project would require re-cleaning.			
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
a. Desired Plant Community Objectives				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Ecological site inventories would be completed to determine site potentials and ecological conditions. (See Appendix 2.D for Standards and Guides.)				
b. Vegetative and Restoration Treatments				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Vegetation treatments and uses would be monitored as part of an adaptive management process. When new information from monitoring or other studies becomes available, practices and guidelines would be modified to incorporate best science available.			
D. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS - (Fire and Fuels Management)				
a. Wildland Fire Use Areas (See Map 2.2 at end of Table 2.3)				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
In Wildland Fire Use: Areas Suitable for Wildland Fire Use for Resource Management Benefit where fuel loading is high and current conditions constrain the use of fire (prescribed fire and fire use), prevention and mitigation programs would be emphasized to reduce unwanted ignitions and use mechanical, manual, chemical, or biological treatments to reduce fuel loads and meet resource objectives. Where conditions allow, consistent with land use allocations, naturally ignited wildland fire, prescribed fire, and a combination of mechanical, manual, chemical, and biological treatments would be used to maintain non-hazardous fuel levels, reduce the hazardous effects of unplanned wildland fires, achieve DFCs, and meet resource objectives (See BLM Fire Amendment, BLM Fire Management Plan, and NPS Fire Management Plan).				

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Parashant</i>				
<p><u>Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland, Great Basin Desert Scrub, Plains and Great Basin Grasslands, Interior Chaparral, and Montane Conifer Forest Vegetation Communities and some WUI areas.</p>	<p><u>Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Riparian, Great Basin, Grassland, Interior Chaparral, Ponderosa Pine, Colorado Plateau Transition, and Mojave Transition (NPS-Andrus Plain only) ecological zones, and WUI areas (BLM only, depending on the surrounding vegetation, fuel loads, and other factors as determined in the BLM Fire Amendment and BLM and NPS Fire Management Plans). Wildland fire use in the riparian ecological zone would only be considered in areas where riparian restoration is planned, where fire use would help meet restoration objectives (e.g., reduce exotic vegetation), and where subsequent restoration work would be implemented (e.g., planting native vegetation).</p>			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
<p><u>Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland, Great Basin Desert Scrub, and Plains and Great Basin Grasslands Vegetation Communities and some WUI areas.</p>	<p><u>Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Riparian, Great Basin, Grassland, and Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zones, and WUI areas (depending on the surrounding vegetation, fuel loads, and other factors as determined in the BLM Fire Amendment and BLM Fire Management Plan). Wildland fire use in the riparian ecological zone would only be considered in areas where riparian restoration is planned, where fire use would help meet restoration objectives (e.g., reduce exotic vegetation), and where subsequent restoration work would be implemented (e.g., planting native vegetation).</p>			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<p><u>Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland, Great Basin Desert Scrub, Plains and Great Basin Grasslands, Interior Chaparral, and Montane Conifer Forest Vegetation Communities and some WUI areas.</p>	<p><u>Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Riparian, Great Basin, Grassland, Interior Chaparral, Ponderosa Pine, and Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zones, and WUI areas (depending on the surrounding vegetation, fuel loads, and other factors as determined in the BLM Fire Amendment and BLM Fire Management Plan). Wildland fire use in the riparian ecological zone would only be considered in areas where riparian restoration is planned, where fire use would help meet restoration objectives (e.g., reduce exotic vegetation), and where subsequent restoration work would be implemented (e.g., planting native vegetation).</p>			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
b. Non-Wildland Fire Use Areas				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
In <u>Non Wildland Fire Use</u> : Areas Not Suitable for Wildland Fire Use for Resource Management Benefit, programs to reduce unwanted ignitions would be implemented by the BLM and NPS, and prevention, detection, and rapid suppression response techniques would be emphasized. Where fuel loading is high, mechanical, manual, chemical, or biological treatments and prescribed fire would be used to maintain non-hazardous levels of fuels and meet resource objectives.				
<i>Parashant</i>				
<u>Non Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Mojave Desert Scrub and Riparian vegetation communities and some WUI areas.	<u>Non Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include: Mojave Desert, and Mojave Transition (except NPS Andrus Plain area) Ecological Zones, and WUI areas (depending on the surrounding vegetation, fuel loads, and other factors as determined in the BLM Fire Amendment and BLM and NPS Fire Management Plans).			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
<u>Non Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include the Riparian vegetation community and some WUI areas.	<u>Non Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include WUI areas (depending on the surrounding vegetation, fuel loads, and other factors as determined in the BLM Fire Amendment and BLM Fire Management Plan).			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<u>Non Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Mojave Desert Scrub and Riparian vegetation communities and some WUI areas.	<u>Non Wildland Fire Use</u> areas would include Mojave Desert and Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zones, and WUI areas (depending on the surrounding vegetation, fuel loads, and other factors as determined in the BLM Fire Amendment and BLM Fire Management Plan).			
c. Fire Suppression				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Appropriate Management Response (AMRs) for managing wildland fires would be used by the BLM and NPS (as identified in the BLM Fire Amendment and the BLM and NPS Fire Management Plans). The AMR is based on firefighter and public safety and objectives and constraints derived from the fire management allocations (Wildland Fire Use, Non Wildland Fire Use), relative risk to natural and cultural resources, DFCs, fire management unit objectives, potential complexity, the ability to defend management boundaries, and costs of protection. AMRs would be used in areas classified as Wildland Fire Use and Non Wildland Fire Use.				

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Firefighter and public safety would be the first priority in every fire management activity. Setting priorities among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources would be based on the values to be protected, human health and safety, and costs of protection.				
Education, enforcement, and administrative fire prevention mitigation measures would continue to be provided to reduce unplanned human-caused fires.				
d. Fire Suppression in Sensitive Habitats				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Prescribed fire and fire use would be used in areas classified as Wildland Fire Use within BLM wilderness areas and NPS proposed wilderness to achieve DFCs and wilderness area management objectives described in each agency’s Fire Management Plan. Vegetation could also be treated manually if minimum tool requirements are met. (See management decisions relating to Wilderness in Table 2.16: Special Designations.)				
Minimum impact suppression tactics would be used in designated and proposed wilderness. (See wilderness decisions in Table 2.16: Special Designations.)				
Conservation measures described in Appendix 2.E. would be implemented for all fire suppression, restoration and rehabilitation, fuels treatments, prescribed burning, and other fire related actions in special status species habitats. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Appendix 2.E)				
Suppression tactics that limit damage or disturbance to sensitive vegetation, soils, and wildlife habitat would be used. The use of heavy equipment, such as dozers, on BLM lands would require approval from the BLM authorized officer. The use of heavy equipment on NPS lands would require approval from the NPS Park Superintendent.				
NA	Prescribed fire and fire use could be used within designated and proposed wilderness areas where the areas have been classified as Wildland Fire Use to achieve DFCs and wilderness management objectives. Selection of vegetation treatment methods in designated and proposed wilderness would be consistent with minimum tool requirements and non-impairment standards. (See decisions relating to Wilderness in Table 2.16: Special Designations.)			
II. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: RIPARIAN ECOLOGICAL ZONE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Riparian Ecological Zone				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual weed cover and density are controlled and ladder fuels and downed woody debris are limited or not present. Disturbances such as livestock grazing, mining, and off road vehicle travel, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riparian areas, including Monument objects, would consist of a diversity of vertical and horizontal structures, vegetative age classes, and endemic species. Riparian areas would be protected, enhanced, and/or restored by allowing tools that are necessary and appropriate to mitigate adverse impacts of allowable uses and undesirable disturbances, and contribute to meeting the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health, NPS Vital Signs, and enhance Monument objects and values. Ecological functions and processes would be intact with vegetative species composition and cover appropriate to the site. Where sites have the potential for over-story vegetation, the canopy cover of over-story and under-story vegetation would be at or approaching maximum density. 			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
that can potentially reduce natural vegetation cover and vigor, are managed to maintain adequate cover and mix of natural plant species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All riparian areas, including Monument objects, would be in, or moving towards, proper functioning condition. • All surface water would meet, or be improving towards, Arizona State water quality standards. • Flowing water systems would provide contiguous water and associated riparian vegetative cover, where possible. • Availability of surface water at seeps and springs would be appropriate for the soil type, climate, and landform and would support a diverse population of endemic plant and wildlife species. • A sufficient quantity of water with safe access for wildlife would be available, where appropriate. • Riparian communities would provide habitat for common species such as rush, cottonwood, willow, and yellow-breasted chat, as well as rare species such as Southwestern Willow (SW) Flycatcher, Common Black Hawk, Lucy’s Warbler, and speckled dace where consistent with site potential. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.) • Invasive plants and animals such as tamarisk, Russian olive, and Brown-headed Cowbird would be reduced or eliminated. • In addition to the above, riparian communities on NPS lands retain ecological integrity where natural processes maintain native plants and plant communities and are the principal influence on community and population fluctuation. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Riparian Ecological Zone				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<p>Habitat conditions at priority riparian areas would be maintained or improved. A preliminary list of priority riparian areas is included in Chapter 3, Table 3.8, and would be appended as new areas are identified. Priority riparian areas meet two or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal land with water rights. • Ecologically and economically feasible of reaching DFCs. • All riparian areas > or = to 0.5 acres in size. • Presence of Special Status Species. • Presence of surface water and/or saturated soil. • Presence of riparian species. • Distance to adjacent riparian areas greater than three miles. 			
N/A	The Riparian Ecological Zone would be managed for minimal disturbance to vegetation in riparian areas. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited.	The Riparian Ecological Zone would be managed for a mixture of herbaceous and woody vegetation in accord with agencies’ policies on native and non-native species.	The Riparian Ecological Zone would be managed for mostly herbaceous vegetation in riparian areas.	Same as Alternative C

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	No treatment priority areas or criteria would be established for the Riparian Ecological Zone.	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Riparian Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where riparian areas are non-functional or functioning at risk.	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Riparian Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where riparian areas are non-functional, functioning at risk with a downward trend, or dominated by invasive plant species.	
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Riparian Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Preferred treatment tools would include less intrusive methods such as wildland fire, fire use, prescribed fire, and chemical methods.	A combination of wildland fire, fire use, prescribed fire, chemical, mechanical, and biological treatment methods could be used as appropriate within land use allocations and areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics.	
Riparian areas would be maintained, restored, or improved to achieve healthy and productive ecological conditions for maximum long-term benefits using fire, mechanical, chemical, or biological means.	Prior to conducting vegetation treatments in the Riparian Ecological Zone, the area’s ability to serve as habitat for special status species would be evaluated. Treatments would not be authorized in suitable habitat of listed or proposed species.		Prior to conducting vegetation treatments in the Riparian Ecological Zone, the area’s ability to serve as habitat for special status species would be evaluated. Treatments would not be authorized in occupied, SW Flycatcher habitat unless such treatments would provide long-term benefits to the species or their habitat, would reduce fire frequency or intensity, or would provide replacement habitat of a higher quality than that removed.	
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Riparian Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 100 BLM acres and 10 NPS acres of Riparian Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 50% of available habitat).	Up to 200 BLM acres and 20 NPS acres of Riparian Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 100% of available habitat).	Same as Alternative C

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
On BLM lands, based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, no wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because this ecological zone contains flammable fuels, wildland fires may occur during the life of the Plan. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
No post-fire rehabilitation is anticipated. If wildland fires occur, post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented to meet DFCs.	N/A			Same as Alternative A
On NPS lands, 52,670 acres would be managed as Fire Suppression as designated in the Fire Management Plan.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Riparian Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 500 acres of Riparian Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 32% of available habitat).		Up to 1,560 acres of Riparian Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 100% of available habitat).
On BLM lands, based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, no wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because this ecological zone contains flammable fuels, wildland fires may occur during the life of the Plan. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
No post-fire rehabilitation is anticipated. If wildland fires occur, post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented to meet DFCs.	N/A			Same as Alternative A
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Riparian Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 1,000 acres of Riparian Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 13% of available habitat).		Up to 5,000 acres of Riparian Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 63% of available habitat).

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 37 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 37 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A	Same as Alternative A		
C. IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS – Riparian Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant</i>				
a. Pakoon Springs Restoration				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pakoon Springs would be restored, emphasizing natural processes. No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Riparian Ecological Zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The functions and processes of Pakoon Springs would be restored to within the range of natural variability or to meet Rangeland Health Standards and either be in, or moving towards Proper Functioning condition. • The spring area could be used as habitat for special status species native to the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The functions and processes of Pakoon Springs would be restored to within the range of natural variability or to meet Rangeland Health Standards. • An interpretive program on the role and function of Mojave Desert springs for wildlife and indigenous people would be developed. • A campground and/or picnic areas would be developed. • The spring area could be used as habitat for special status species native to the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The functions and processes of Pakoon Springs could be restored to a combination of naturally appearing pond and flowing water habitats that meet Rangeland Health Standards. • Relict leopard frogs, Grand Wash springsnails, or other special status species could be re-introduced to the area provided suitable habitat exists after restoration. • The processes of restoring previously developed Mojave Desert springs, and the function of Mojave Desert springs for wildlife, indigenous people, and the historic ranching activity,

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
				could be developed for interpretation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities to house the interpretive materials and enhance the visitor experience, including picnicking, could be provided. • Adequate protection (barriers, etc.) to ensure restoration efforts are not adversely impacted by visitors could be installed.
b. Tassi Ranch and Springs Restoration				
N/A	The irrigation system would be maintained, allowing for preservation of Grand Wash Springsnail, an endemic species.			
N/A		The spring would be considered for use as an introduction site for relict leopard frog.		
The genetic integrity of cottonwood trees would continue to be maintained.				
N/A	A site management plan for the spring, irrigation system, riparian area and ranch structures/historic landscape would be prepared to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation treatments for the historic building and irrigation structures; • Vegetation management and spring restoration for ecological benefits including rare species conservation; • Maintenance of the cultural landscape; • Interpretation of the biological, hydrologic, and cultural features of the area, including visitor use management needs. 			
c. Cane Springs Restoration				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grazing use in Cane Springs pasture of the Mud and Cane Allotment would authorized between November and December as a holding pasture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cane Springs pasture of the Mud and Cane Allotment would be unavailable for grazing. • The fence around the upper spring would be removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The riparian area of the Cane Springs pasture of the Mud and Cane Allotment would be fenced and unavailable for grazing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seasonal grazing use during the dormant season (November and December) of the Cane Spring Pasture of the Mud and Cane Allotment would be authorized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grazing and all associated facilities in the Cane Spring Pasture of the Mud and Cane allotment would be managed so that riparian resources are in or moving toward proper

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cane Springs would be allowed to evolve with minimum intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would be developed for interpretation and education of ranching history and the importance of riparian areas for wildlife. • A rest area/picnic area could be developed if demand increased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fence around the upper spring would be repaired and maintained. 	<p>functioning condition. Management would complement maintenance of riparian wildlife habitat, pre-historic and historic resources, and future recreation use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site management plan for the spring, riparian area, and cultural resources would be prepared that would include the development and implementation of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Interpretation to provide information on the native riparian vegetation and to emphasize the function of Mojave Desert springs for wildlife, indigenous people, and the historic and current ranching activity. 2) Interpretive trail and facility development to house the interpretive materials and enhance visitor experience, including picnicking. 3) Adequate protection (barriers, etc.) to ensure restoration efforts and cultural resources are not adversely impacted by visitors.

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Vermilion</i>				
a. Paria River Invasive Plant Species Removal				
N/A		Using a minimum requirement analysis, BLM could use appropriate tools to remove invasive plants such as tamarisk and Russian olive along the Paria River for the purpose of restoring ecological conditions and functions and reducing fuel hazards.		
N/A	The BLM would monitor treatment effects and ecological conditions within treated areas.	Prescribed fire would be used on large patches of invasive plants. Using hand tools, the BLM would construct minimal control lines that would be rehabilitated upon completion of burning. The BLM would hand seed the area as needed.	Prescribed fire would be used on large patches of invasive plants, and helicopters could be used. Hand application of herbicides would be used in addition to burning and/or cutting to remove invasive species. Using minimum tools, the BLM would construct minimal control lines that would be rehabilitated upon completion of burning. The BLM would hand seed the area as needed.	
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
a. Virgin River Invasive Plant Species Removal				
N/A		Mechanical, chemical, and biological treatment methods would be used to remove invasive plants such as tamarisk and Russian olive along the Virgin River outside of designated wilderness for the purpose of restoring ecological conditions and functions and reducing fuel hazards. Within the Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness Area, non-motorized hand tools (such as clippers, axes and pulaskis) would be used to cut and remove invasive species, after which a hand chemical treatment would be used to follow up on any resprouting.		
III. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: PONDEROSA PINE ECOLOGICAL ZONE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
“Dog-hair thickets” are controlled, ladder fuels and downed woody debris are limited or not present, a high percent of large trees are maintained, and tree stand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone would consist of a mosaic of tree densities, age classes, and openings (which may contain scattered trees), with healthy, diverse understories of native shrubs, grasses and forbs. • Ponderosa pine vegetation communities would be resilient to natural or human-caused disturbances, and losing key wildlife habitat components to wildfire would be minimized. • There would be no net loss of total acres within the ponderosa pine plant communities (i.e., long-term or permanent removal from the landscape). A no net loss objective would not preclude restoration, rehabilitation, or related management actions. 			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
vigor is maintained through controlled fire and mechanical treatments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patches of old and/or large trees and standing and fallen dead trees would be maintained and protected. • In addition to the above, Ponderosa pine communities on NPS lands would retain ecological integrity where natural processes maintain native plants and plant communities and are the principal influence on community and population fluctuation. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment objectives in ponderosa pine vegetation communities would focus on restoring natural disturbance processes such as fire; increasing vegetative ground cover of native grasses, forbs, and shrubs; enhancing forest structure, function, and composition; and removing invasive, non-native species.			
N/A	Stands of ponderosa pine would be managed for a balanced mosaic between tree, shrub, and perennial grass cover to support a healthy ecosystem while providing habitat for Merriam’s Turkey, Kaibab squirrel, and mule deer. The mosaics would include stands of old-growth ponderosa to support White-breasted Nuthatch; a component of Gambel oak with grass and forb understory to provide foraging habitat for mule deer; large openings of grasses, forbs, and shrubs to provide foraging habitat for raptors such as Sharp-shinned Hawk, Northern Goshawk, Coopers Hawk, American Kestrel, and Red-tailed Hawk; and areas of sparse to dense tree canopy cover with an understory of grasses, forbs, and shrubs to provide nesting habitat for Merriam’s Turkey, hiding cover for mule deer, and habitat for Kaibab squirrel. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.)			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Up to 4,600 BLM acres and 7,000 NPS acres of Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 25% of available habitat on BLM land and 75% on NPS land).	Up to 9,200 BLM acres and 7,000 NPS acres of Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 50% of available habitat on BLM land and 75% on NPS land).	Up to 13,800 BLM acres and 7,000 NPS acres of Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 75% of available habitat).	
On BLM and NPS lands, based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 3,104 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 3,104 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.				

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
On NPS lands, all acres could be considered for Wildland Fire Use, prescribed fire, fire suppression, and mechanical and chemical treatment to achieve resource objectives, consistent with land use allocations, minimum tool requirement for proposed wilderness, and to protect Monument values .				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone over the life of this Plan. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 1,000 acres of Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 26% of available habitat).		Up to 3,800 acres of Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 100% of available habitat).
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 301 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 301 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A			Same as Alternative A
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS - Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone				
NA	The BLM would monitor fire effects and ecological conditions within treated areas.			
N/A	Treatments would continue to be monitored to provide short- and long-term information on the effects of ponderosa pine restoration treatments on the plant and animal communities affected by the treatments.			
D. IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS - Ponderosa Pine Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant</i>				
a. Mt. Trumbull Ponderosa Pine Restoration				
Ponderosa pine restoration research treatments would	Implementation of ponderosa pine research treatments would be completed at Mt. Trumbull. Future treatments would focus on mimicking the natural disturbance regime.			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
continue to be conducted in the vicinity of Mt. Trumbull.				
N/A	Treatment emphasis would be in areas where ponderosa pine density exceeds the relative amount of “similar” for the applicable structural stage, patch size exceeds 200 acres, or cover of native grasses, and forbs is less than 5%.	Treatment emphasis would be in areas where ponderosa pine density exceeds the relative amount of “similar” for the applicable structural stage, patch size exceeds 200 acres, or cover of native grasses, and forbs is less than 10%.		Same as Alternative B and C
N/A	Treatment preference would be to use a combination of wildland fire, fire use, prescribed fire, mechanical, or chemical methods consistent with land use allocation and minimum tool requirement for designated and proposed wilderness areas.			
b. Mt. Trumbull Wilderness Ponderosa Pine Restoration				
Minimum tool policy emphasizing hand tools would be used in the wilderness area to suppress wildfires. Aircraft and other suppression methods could be used in emergencies, if approved by the BLM authorized officer.				
Prescribed fire would be allowed in the wilderness area to restore ecological conditions, provided wilderness values are enhanced. Wilderness policy, including a minimum requirements analysis, would be followed in the final design of all restoration projects.				
NA	The BLM would use prescribed fire and/or fire use on up to 6,000 acres within the Mt. Trumbull Wilderness over the life of the Plan for the purpose of restoring ecological conditions and functions and reducing fuel hazards.			
NA	The BLM would limit prescribed burning to appropriate conditions in order to decrease the likelihood of crown fires; the objective would be to remove brush and small diameter trees while maintaining, or contributing to the restoration of, the structure and composition of old-growth forest stands.			
N/A	Using a minimum requirement analysis, the BLM could use appropriate tools to construct minimal control lines, including the removal of trees and brush, and would rehabilitate these control lines upon completion of burning. In the analysis, BLM would consider how to deliver and remove personnel, equipment, and supplies during treatment operations.			
NA	The BLM would apply native seed manually, as appropriate.	The BLM would apply native seed manually and/or aerially, as appropriate.		
NA	NA	The BLM would protect old-growth forest stands by raking around their bases and	The BLM would protect old-growth forest stands by raking around their bases, constructing interior control lines, and using	

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
		constructing interior fire control lines.		minimum tools to fell and buck small-diameter trees and brush that constitute “ladder fuels,” which directly threatens old-growth forest stands .

IV. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: GREAT BASIN ECOLOGICAL ZONE (Sagebrush Communities)

A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Great Basin Ecological Zone: Sagebrush Communities

Common to All Planning Areas

<p>Allow fire to naturally reduce annual weed densities and cover, limit or reduce the invasion of juniper, and maintain shrub densities, such as big sagebrush, within their historic range of variability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sagebrush (primarily <i>Artemisia tridentata</i>) communities would consist of a healthy, diverse mosaic of different height and age structures with a thriving community of native grasses and forbs. Mosaics may include stands of young and old sagebrush, openings (ranging from bare ground to short or sparse vegetation to high-density grasslands), wet meadows, seeps, healthy streamside (riparian) vegetation, and other interspersed shrub and woodland habitats. • There would be no net loss of total acres within sagebrush communities (i.e., long-term or permanent removal from the landscape). A no net loss objective would not preclude restoration, rehabilitation, or related management actions. • Treatment objectives in sagebrush communities would focus on restoring natural disturbance processes, such as by using fire, increasing vegetative ground cover of native grasses and forbs, and removing invasive non-native plants. • Sagebrush communities on NPS lands would retain ecological integrity where natural processes maintain native plants and plant communities and are the principal influence on community and population fluctuation. • Existing stands of sagebrush would have a balance between shrub and perennial grass cover, for open to moderate shrub canopy cover (5 to 25%), and multiple height classes. This mosaic would include young, sparse stands to support Vesper Sparrows and Lark Sparrows, and older, dense stands to benefit Brewer’s Sparrows, Sage Sparrows, Black-throated Sparrows, Gray Flycatchers, and Sage Thrashers. • Sagebrush communities would include small, grassy openings to support Long-billed Curlews and Burrowing Owls. • Sagebrush communities would include large, continuous blocks (≥300 acres) of unfragmented sagebrush habitat, including mosaics of open to moderate shrub canopy cover (5 to 25%) and multiple age and height classes to benefit sage-dependent species. • Sagebrush communities would include openings of short vegetation surrounded by sagebrush for ground foraging by Sage Thrashers, Loggerhead Shrikes, Brewer’s Sparrows, and Sage Sparrows. • Sagebrush communities would include openings of short vegetation (2 to 8 in.) with wide visibility to provide breeding habitat for Long-billed Curlews, and Burrowing Owls. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.) • Sagebrush communities would include native grass and forb cover in balance with open to moderate (5 to 25%) shrub canopy
--	--

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	cover and within ecological site potential. Perennial grass components would be at or above 10%. Native forb composition would be at or above 5%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentation of sagebrush habitat would be less than 50% of the treatment area. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Great Basin Ecological Zone: Sagebrush Communities				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Great Basin Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where sagebrush canopy cover exceeds 25%, perennial grasses and forbs are less than 5%, and bare ground exceeds 50%.	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Great Basin Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where sagebrush canopy cover exceeds 20%, perennial grasses and forbs are less than 5%, and bare ground exceeds 40%.	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Great Basin Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where sagebrush canopy cover exceeds 15%, perennial grasses and forbs are less than 5%, and bare ground exceeds 30%.	Same as Alternative C
N/A	Chemical treatment methods would be used in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools in the Great Basin Ecological Zone sagebrush communities.	A combination of wildland fire, fire use, prescribed fire, and chemical treatment methods would be used in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools in the Great Basin Ecological Zone sagebrush communities.		
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Up to 5,000 BLM acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 3% of available habitat).	Up to 25,000 BLM acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 15% of available habitat).	Up to 50,000 BLM acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 30% of available habitat).	Same as Alternative C

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
On BLM and NPS lands, based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 20,961 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires in the Great Basin sagebrush communities.				
Up to 21,000 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A	Same as Alternative A		
On NPS lands, all acres could be considered for Wildland Fire Use, prescribed fire, fire suppression, and mechanical and chemical treatments to achieve resource objectives, consistent with land use allocations, minimum tool requirement for NPS proposed wilderness, and to protect Monument values.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	No sagebrush habitat would be treated over the life of this Plan.	Up to 50,000 acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 26% of avail. habitat).	Up to 100,000 acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 52% of available habitat).	
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, no wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because this ecological zone contains flammable fuels, wildland fires may occur during the life of the Plan. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
No post-fire rehabilitation is anticipated. If wildland fires occur, post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented to meet DFCs.	N/A	Same as Alternative A		
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Up to 20,000 acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 3% of available habitat).	Up to 100,000 acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 15% of available habitat).	Up to 200,000 acres of sagebrush habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 30% of available habitat).	

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 19,168 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 19,168 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A		Same as Alternative A	

V. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: GREAT BASIN ECOLOGICAL ZONE (Pinyon-Juniper Communities)

A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS - Great Basin Ecological Zone: Pinyon-Juniper Communities

Common to All Planning Areas

Annual weeds such as cheatgrass are controlled, ladder fuels and downed woody debris are limited or not present, and juniper and pinyon pine tree densities and cover occur at their historic range of variation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy, diverse woodland communities would consist of a mosaic of trees, shrubs, grasses, and forbs. Mosaic patches could include stands of young and old pinyon-juniper, openings, wet meadows, seeps, and other interspersed shrub habitats. The communities would be composed of a variety of different height structures and age classes, with a thriving understory community of native grasses, forbs, and shrubs. • To reduce the threat of catastrophic fire, ladder fuels and downed woody debris would be limited or not present. Woody debris would be present to stabilize soil and enhance vegetation recovery in restoration areas. • Treatment objectives in the pinyon-juniper vegetation communities would focus on restoring the natural disturbance regime; increasing vegetative ground cover of native grasses, forbs, and shrubs; and removing non-native invasive species. • Stands of pinyon-juniper would include a balance between tree, shrub, and perennial grass cover to support Pinyon Jay and mule deer. This mosaic would include old-growth forest stands of pinyon-juniper to support Juniper Titmouse; large openings of grasses, forbs and shrubs to support mule deer and provide foraging habitat for raptors such as Sharp-shinned Hawk, Northern Goshawk, Coopers Hawk, American Kestrel, and Red-tailed Hawk; and areas of sparse to dense tree canopy cover to support Pinyon Jay. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.) • Individual old growth trees would be present and would be protected during treatment implementation.
---	---

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Great Basin Ecological Zone: Pinyon-Juniper Communities				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Great Basin Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where juniper canopy cover exceeds 40%, perennial grasses and forbs are less than 5%, and bare ground exceeds 50%.	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Great Basin Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where juniper canopy cover exceeds 30%, perennial grasses and forbs are less than 5%, and bare ground exceeds 45%.	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Great Basin Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where juniper canopy cover exceeds 20%, perennial grasses and forbs are less than 5%, and bare ground exceeds 40%.	Same as Alternative B
N/A	Treatment preferences would be to use a combination of wildland fire, fire use, prescribed fire, and chemical.	Treatment preferences would be to use a combination of wildland fire, fire use, prescribed fire, mechanical, and chemical.		
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Up to 10,000 BLM acres and 100 NPS acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 5 % of available habitat).	Up to 31,000 BLM acres and 10,000 NPS acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 15% of available habitat).	Up to 102,000 BLM acres and 34,000 NPS acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 50% of available habitat).	
On BLM and NPS lands, based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 9,797 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 9,797 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to	N/A	Same as Alternative A		

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimate				
On NPS lands, all acres could be considered for Wildland Fire Use, prescribed fire, fire suppression, and mechanical and chemical treatment to achieve resource objectives consistent with land use allocations, minimum tool requirement for proposed wilderness, and to protect Monument values.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Up to 10,000 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 6% of available habitat).	Up to 30,000 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 17% of available habitat).	Up to 50,000 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 28% of available habitat).	
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 34 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up 34 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A		Same as Alternative A	
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Up to 10,000 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 6% of avail habitat).	Up to 30,000 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 17% of avail. habitat).	Up to 100,000 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 50% of available habitat).	
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 1,421 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Up to 1,421 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A		Same as Alternative A	

VI. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: MOJAVE DESERT ECOLOGICAL ZONE

A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Mojave Desert Ecological Zone

Parashant and Arizona Strip FO

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage for adequate cover and mix of natural plant species that have good vigor. • Allow fire to control or reduce exotic annual weeds such as red brome and to limit woody vegetation to non-hazardous levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endemic plant species and associated communities such as creosote bush, Joshua tree, Mojave yucca and cacti, would be present along with other shrubs, grasses, and wildflowers. These communities could include stands of young and old shrubs, sparse vegetation, scattered to larger expanses of creosote bush or Joshua trees, seeps, healthy streamside (riparian) vegetation, and other interspersed grassland and shrub habitats. • Endemic animal species such as desert tortoise, and chuckwalla would be present and thriving with more than adequate food, water, and cover resources. • There would be no net loss of acres of Mohave Desert plant communities (i.e., long-term or permanent removal from the landscape). A no net loss objective would not preclude restoration, rehabilitation, or related management actions. • Treatment emphasis would be to reduce the proliferation of non-indigenous annual plant species, reduce fire intensity and frequency, and improve tortoise structural and forage habitat components.
--	---

B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Mojave Desert Ecological Zone

Parashant and Arizona Strip FO

N/A	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Mojave Desert Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be where desert tortoise habitat has been burned and/or converted to invasive annual grass communities.
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Mojave Desert Ecological Zone. Fire Use and Treatment preference would be to use chemical methods. Prescribed fire and mechanical treatment methods would only be authorized where doing so would benefit desert tortoise or their habitat, reduce invasive plant species, reduce fire frequency or intensity by removing hazardous or flashy fuels, or be necessary for research.

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	Noxious weed control could be authorized where appropriate.			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Mojave Desert Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 70,000 BLM acres of Mojave Desert Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan. Up to 100 acres may be treated with prescribed fire on BLM lands if associated with scientific research.	Up to 80,000 BLM acres of Mojave Desert Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan. Up to 200 acres may be treated with prescribed fire on BLM lands if associated with scientific research.	Same as Alternative C
On BLM and NPS lands, based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 22,889 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate may be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires in the Mojave Desert Ecological Zone.				
Up to 50,000 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A	Same as Alternative A		
On NPS lands, all Mojave Desert Ecological Zone acres would be managed as Fire Suppression as designated in the Fire Management Plan utilizing the appropriate Management Response method. All acres could be considered for Mojave Desert Ecological Zone restoration, strategically applying mechanical and chemical treatment for invasive plant control, endangered species habitat restoration/protection, or to restore more natural fire regimes and fire frequency. All treatments would be consistent with land use allocations, and minimum tool requirements for proposed wilderness, and to protect Monument values.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Mojave Desert Ecological Zone.	Up to 5,000 acres would be treated in the Mojave Desert Ecological Zone over the life of this Plan (approx. 3% of available habitat). Up to 500 acres may be treated with	Up to 10,000 acres would be treated in the Mojave Desert Ecological Zone over the life of this Plan (approx. 6% of available habitat). Up to 500 acres may be treated with prescribed fire if associated with scientific research.	

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
		prescribed fire if associated with scientific research.		
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 3,794 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate may be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 3,794 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A		Same as Alternative A	
VII. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: MOJAVE-GREAT BASIN TRANSITION ECOLOGICAL ZONE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
See Mojave Desert and Great Basin (Sagebrush and Pinyon-Juniper) Ecological Zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endemic plant species and associated communities such as black brush, Joshua tree, Mojave yucca, and cacti would be present along with other shrubs, grasses, and wildflowers. These communities could include stands of young and old shrubs, sparse vegetation, scattered to larger expanses of black brush to various mixes of black brush, Joshua trees, pinyon-juniper, yucca, and shrub habitats. • Endemic animal species such as desert tortoise, chuckwalla, and desert bighorn sheep would be present and thriving with more than adequate food, water, and cover resources. • Priority plant species and associated communities such as black brush, Joshua tree, Mojave yucca, and cacti would be present along with other shrubs, grasses, and wildflowers. These communities could include stands of young and old shrubs, sparse vegetation, scattered to larger expanses of black brush to various mixes of black brush, Joshua trees, pinyon-juniper, yucca, and shrub habitats. • There would be no net loss in acres of Transition plant communities (i.e., long-term or permanent removal from the landscape). A no net loss objective would not preclude restoration, rehabilitation, or related management actions. • Management of Mohave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone plant communities would focus on removing invasive non-native plants, especially cheatgrass, Sahara mustard, and red brome, and preventing habitat degradation due to wildfire. 			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A		Vegetation treatments could be used in the Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment priority areas would be for protection of unburned desert tortoise habitat and restoration and rehabilitation of habitat previously burned and/or converted to invasive, annual grass communities.		
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Chemical treatment methods would be used in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools in the Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone.	Chemical or biological treatment methods would be used in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools in the Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone.	Same as Alternative C
N/A	Prescribed fire and mechanical treatment methods would only be authorized on BLM lands where doing so would reduce invasive plant species or fire frequency and/or intensity by removing hazardous fuels, or would be done for research.			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 150,000 BLM acres of Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan. Up to 100 acres may be treated with prescribed fire on BLM lands if associated with scientific research.	Up to 180,000 BLM acres of Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan. Up to 200 acres may be treated with prescribed fire on BLM lands if associated with scientific research.	Same as Alternative C
On BLM and NPS lands, based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 100,000 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate may be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires in the Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone.				
Up to 100,000 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs.	N/A	Same as Alternative A		

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires exceed the estimated acreage.				
On NPS lands, the Andrus Plain area is currently described as Mojave Transition. All acres could be considered for Wildland Fire Use, prescribed fire, fire suppression, and mechanical and chemical treatment to achieve resource objectives, consistent with land use allocations, minimum tool requirement for proposed wilderness, and to protect Monument values.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 5,000 acres of Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 4% of available habitat). Up to 500 acres may be treated with prescribed fire on BLM lands if associated with scientific research.		Up to 30,000 acres of Mojave-Great Basin Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 23% of available habitat). Up to 500 acres may be treated with prescribed fire on BLM lands if associated with scientific research.
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 3,561 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate may be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 3,561 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A			Same as Alternative A
VIII. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: COLORADO PLATEAU TRANSITION ECOLOGICAL ZONE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone				
See Mojave Desert and Great Basin (Sagebrush and Pinyon-Juniper) Ecological Zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endemic plant species and associated communities such as fourwing saltbush, shadscale, and black brush, would be present along with other shrubs, grasses, and forbs. These communities could include stands of young and old shrubs, sparse vegetation, scattered to larger expanses of fourwing and black brush. 			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endemic animal species such as House Rock valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat, Peregrine Falcon, and desert bighorn sheep would be present and thriving with more than adequate food, water, and cover resources. • There would be no net loss in acres of Transition plant communities (i.e., long-term or permanent removal from the landscape). A no net loss objective would not preclude restoration, rehabilitation, or related management actions. • Management of the Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone plant communities would focus on removing invasive non-native plants, especially cheatgrass and red brome, and preventing habitat degradation. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Colorado Plateau Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. No treatment priority criteria would be established for this Ecological Zone.			
N/A	No treatment preferences would be established for the Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone.	All available treatment methods could be used, alone or in combination, to achieve DFCs as defined for adjacent ecological zones.		
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 5,000 acres of Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 4% of available habitat).	Up to 30,000 acres of Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 23% of available habitat).	
N/A		All available treatment methods could be used, alone or in combination, to achieve DFCs as defined for adjacent ecological zones.		
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 17 acres of wildland fire are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Up to 17 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A		Same as Alternative A	
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone. Fire use and noxious weed control could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 5,000 acres of Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 4% of available habitat).	Up to 30,000 acres of Colorado Plateau Transition Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 23% of available habitat).	
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, less than one acre of wildland fire is anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Less than one acre of post-fire rehabilitation is anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A		Same as Alternative A	
IX. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: INTERIOR CHAPARRAL ECOLOGICAL ZONE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone would consist of diverse populations of endemic vegetative species, particularly shrubs, and a mosaic of age class distributions of these species. 			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endemic plant species and associated communities such as manzanita, silk tassel, and live oak would be present, along with other shrubs, grasses, and forbs. • Endemic animal species such as Black-chinned Sparrow and mule deer would be present and thriving with more than adequate food, water, and cover resources. • There would be no net loss of acres of Interior Chaparral plant communities (i.e., long-term or permanent removal from the landscape). A no net loss objective would not preclude restoration, rehabilitation, or related management actions. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment objectives would focus on providing for shrub regeneration, wildlife access for cover and browse, and exclusion of invasive non-native plants.			
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone over the life of this Plan. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Mechanical or chemical treatment methods would be used to create openings and to achieve DFCs, in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools	Mechanical, chemical, or biological treatment methods would be used to create openings and to achieve DFCs, in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools.	Same as Alternative C
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone over the life of this Plan. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 1,500 BLM acres of Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 15% of available habitat).	Up to 2,500 BLM acres of Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 25% of available habitat).	Same as Alternative C
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 877 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate may be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 877 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to	N/A	Same as Alternative A		

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted in the Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone over the life of this Plan. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 1,000 acres of Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 4% of available habitat).		Up to 5,000 acres of Interior Chaparral Ecological Zone would be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 21% of available habitat).
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 846 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate may be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 846 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A			Same as Alternative A
X. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT: PLAINS-GRASSLAND ECOLOGICAL ZONE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Manage for a predominance of perennial grass cover, reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endemic plant species and associated communities such as Galleta, sand dropseed, Indian ricegrass, blue grama, black grama, needle and thread grass, four-wing saltbush, shadescale, winterfat, and Mormon tea would be present, along with other 			

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
cover of annual grasses, and for fire to naturally inhibit the invasion of woody shrubs such as rabbitbrush, snakeweed, and big sagebrush.	shrubs, grasses, and forbs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endemic animal species such as pronghorn antelope, Cassin’s Sparrow, and Brewer’s Sparrow would be present and thriving with more than adequate food, water, and cover resources. • Grassland plant communities would be managed for no net loss (i.e., long-term or permanent removal from the landscape). • A no net loss objective would not preclude restoration, rehabilitation, or related management actions. • The Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone habitats would include a mosaic of grassland and shrub communities, varying age structure, sparse vegetation, scattered to larger expanses of separate grassland or shrub communities, or various mixes of these communities. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.) 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Vegetation treatments could be used in the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone to enhance vegetative diversity, restore native plant communities, maintain or increase wildlife habitat, and reduce or eliminate hazardous fuels. Treatment emphasis would be to reduce the proliferation of non-indigenous, annual plants and improve pronghorn antelope habitat consistent with site potential (see Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife).			
N/A	No treatment priority criteria would be established for the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone.	Treatment priority areas in the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone would be where grasses and forbs are less than 5% and bare ground exceeds 45%.		
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted for the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Mechanical or chemical treatment methods would be used in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools in the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone.	Mechanical, chemical, or biological treatment methods would be used in preference to, but not to the exclusion of, other available tools in the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone.	
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted for the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Use of prescribed fire would be authorized where doing so would benefit priority species or their habitat or would reduce fire frequency or intensity by removing hazardous fuels, consistent with land use allocations and minimum tool requirement for designated and proposed wilderness.		

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted for the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone. Noxious weed control and fire use could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 50 BLM acres of Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 6% of available habitat).	Up to 110 BLM acres of Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 13% of available habitat).	
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, no wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because this is a fire-adapted Ecological Zone, wildland fires may occur during the life of the Plan. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
No post-fire rehabilitation is anticipated. If wildland fires and fire use occur, post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented to meet DFCs.	N/A	Same as Alternative A		
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted for the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone. Fire use and Noxious weed control could be authorized where appropriate.	Up to 5,000 acres of Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 8% of available habitat).	Up to 10,000 acres of Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 15% of available habitat).	
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 4,496 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 4,496 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be	N/A	Same as Alternative A		

TABLE 2.3: VEGETATION AND FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	The following plant and priority wildlife species would be managed as indicators of the condition of Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone habitat condition: Fickeisen plains cactus, four-wing saltbush, needle and thread grass, grama species, pronghorn antelope, and Brewer’s sparrow. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.)			
N/A	No planned vegetation treatments would be conducted for the Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone.	Up to 50,000 acres of Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 6% of available habitat).	Up to 100,000 acres of Plains-Grassland Ecological Zone could be treated over the life of this Plan (approx. 13% of available habitat).	
Based on total acres burned by wildland fires from 1984-2003, approximately 4,496 acres of wildland fires are anticipated during the life of the Plan. Because the size of individual wildland fires and the number of annual fires can vary greatly, this estimate could be exceeded. It is unknown how proposed vegetation treatments would affect total acres burned by wildland fires.				
Up to 4,496 acres of post-fire rehabilitation are anticipated to meet DFCs. Additional post-fire rehabilitation may be implemented if wildland fires and fire use exceed the estimated acreage.	N/A		Same as Alternative A	

Map 2.2: Wildland Fire Use Allocations - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. FISH AND WILDLIFE: GENERAL				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS - Fish and Wildlife				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological conditions would be within the range of natural variability and would be functional for dependant animal species. • Forage, water, cover, and space would be available to wildlife of sufficient quantity and quality to support productive and diverse wildlife populations. • All waters would be safely accessible to wildlife. • Fences would be the minimum necessary for effective livestock control or other administrative purposes. Fences would be wildlife passable, consistent with the species found in the area. • Adverse impacts to wildlife and wildlife resources would be avoided or mitigated. • Human/wildlife conflicts would be avoided, resolved, or mitigated. • On BLM lands, management of game and nongame species by Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) would be consistent with AGFD Strategic Plans and other appropriate guidelines. • On NPS lands, wildlife management would be consistent with AGFD Strategic Plans, as applicable within NPS management policies. • The natural biological diversity of fish, wildlife, and plant species would be maintained or, where necessary and feasible, restored throughout the Planning Area. Habitats would be managed on an ecosystem basis, ensuring that all parts of the ecosystem and natural processes are functional. 				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Native wildlife communities would be protected, including those species considered Monument objects. A complete range of diverse, healthy, and self-sustaining populations of native animal species would occupy all available suitable habitats. • Habitat connectivity and wildlife movement between ecological zones would be maintained. • Predators would be recognized as an important component of plant and animal communities. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Fish and Wildlife				
a. Priority Species and Habitats				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<p>Management emphasis and priority would be given to priority species and habitats in conflict resolution. Priority species include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All special status wildlife species known or suspected to occur in the area. Special status species include those that are federally listed, proposed, or candidate species; species for which there is a signed conservation agreement or strategy; all species referenced in AGFD’s Wildlife Species of Concern in Arizona document; and species included on the Arizona BLM and NPS sensitive list. (See Appendix 2.F.) • All species of migratory birds known or suspected to occur within the Planning Area. (See Appendix 2.G.) 			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All game mammals including: mule deer, pronghorn antelope, desert bighorn sheep, mountain lion, Kaibab squirrel, and desert cottontail rabbit. • Game birds including Merriam’s Turkey, Gambel’s Quail, White-winged Dove, Mourning Dove, Band-tailed Pigeon, Chukar Partridge, and waterfowl. • The following carnivores: kit fox, gray fox, and long-tailed weasels. <p>Priority habitats include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All aquatic and/or riparian areas, including springs, seeps, and man-made waters. These areas are important for all wildlife species, particularly native fish, and migratory birds. • All portions of the ponderosa pine ecological zone. This habitat is important for Merriam’s Turkey and a variety of bats and migratory birds. It is also crucial summer range for mule deer. • All areas considered crucial mule deer winter range, including the Buckskin Mountains, Whitmore Canyon, Grey Points/Low Mountain, north and eastern slopes of Seegmiller Mountain, Bull Rush Point, Andrus Point, and the western slope of the Kaibab Plateau. (See Map 3.17.) • All bighorn sheep habitat areas, including the Virgin and Beaver Dam Mountains, Grand Wash Cliffs, Rock Canyon – Hurricane Cliffs, Kanab Creek, and the Paria – Vermilion Cliffs habitat areas. • House Rock Valley. The only known habitat for an endemic kangaroo rat and includes several special status plant species. 			
Wildlife habitat would continue to be managed through the habitat management plan (HMP) process to achieve desired plant community objectives.	For BLM lands, decisions and specific actions from this Plan intended to benefit fish and wildlife resources would be implemented through the development and implementation of three interdisciplinary wildlife HMPs. These plans would be developed and maintained cooperatively with AGFD, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and other interested participants. HMP area boundaries would follow AGFD Game Management Units 12B, 13A, and 13B. Implementation accomplishments would be monitored and reviewed annually and documented in HMP files. The HMPs would be amended or revised, as necessary, and would incorporate existing and new BLM and state strategies as applicable. See Appendix 2.H for HMP contents.			
N/A	Activities that adversely affect breeding, feeding, or sheltering activities of priority wildlife species could be modified, mitigated, or otherwise restricted to minimize disturbance to the species.			
N/A	On BLM lands, recreational collecting of animals or animal parts (e.g. antlers, skulls, feathers, etc.) in ecologically non-sensitive areas would be allowed, assuming compliance with AGFD regulations. On NPS lands, recreational collection of animal parts would not be authorized.			
N/A	Access to public lands with fish and wildlife hunting and viewing opportunities would be maintained as determined in the route evaluation/designation process. Access to public lands with sensitive wildlife and/or fisheries resources could be closed or limited, where determined necessary through monitoring of resource conditions.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
b. Wildlife Transplants and Augmentations				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Restoration of native wildlife into historic range would continue by transplanting wildlife in cooperation with AGFD.	Reintroductions, transplants, capture operations, and supplemental stockings (augmentations) of native wildlife populations into historic habitats would be carried out in collaboration with the AGFD and/or the USFWS where consistent with achieving DFCs, protection of Monument objects, and within applicable agencies policies. Restoration of native wildlife would be for the following purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To maintain current populations, distributions, and genetic diversity; • To conserve or recover threatened or endangered species; and/or • To restore or enhance native populations, diversity, or distribution of special status species. Species that may be reintroduced, transplanted, or augmented include but are not limited to the following: pronghorn antelope, mule deer, desert bighorn sheep, Merriam’s Turkey, Kaibab squirrel, and special status species. (See Table 2.5 and Appendix 2.F. for species list.)			
c. Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Projects				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
The need for and identification of suitable locations for construction of new wildlife waters in HMPs would be determined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On BLM lands, construction of wildlife habitat improvement projects, including water developments and vegetation treatments, could be authorized to meet DFCs, assuming compliance with NEPA, ESA, Monument proclamations, and other applicable laws, regulations, and policies. DPC objectives for wildlife would be incorporated into all habitat improvement projects including restoration and vegetation treatment projects. Specific projects would be listed in HMPs. • New water developments for wildlife would not be authorized on NPS lands. Vegetation treatments could be authorized to meet ecological objectives, including wildlife habitat management, assuming compliance with NEPA, ESA, Monument proclamations, and other applicable laws, regulations, and policies. DPC objectives for wildlife would be incorporated into all habitat improvement projects including restoration and vegetation treatment projects. 			
N/A	Existing vegetation treatment projects that benefit wildlife could be maintained.			
Safe access and reliability of wildlife water developments would continue to be provided. Maintenance of existing waters would take priority over new construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing water developments would be modified to ensure wildlife have safe access to water. Existing water developments would be maintained to ensure reliability of the water. Maintenance of existing waters would generally take priority over new construction. Development of cooperative waters for livestock and wildlife would be encouraged where doing so would benefit wildlife, would be consistent with achieving DFCs, and would be economically efficient. • On NPS lands, existing water developments may be maintained, repaired, or replaced in-kind but increased development (size, scope, or disturbance) would not be authorized. 			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Escape ramps would continue to be maintained and, where needed, installed at all waters accessible to wildlife to minimize drowning hazards.			
d. Animal Damage Control				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	No members of the pig family (Suidae) would be authorized on BLM or NPS lands.			
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
On BLM lands, existing agreements with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services (APHIS-WS) would be modified to ensure appropriate animal damage control, specifically targeting individual predators rather than predator populations.	The BLM would request that APHIS-WS focus predator control efforts in the Monuments to specifically target individual predators rather than predator populations.	The BLM would request that APHIS-WS focus predator control efforts in the Monuments to target individual predators rather than predator populations. BLM would also request proactive control to benefit priority species or enhance the success of planned transplants or augmentations of priority species providing Monument objects are enhanced.	APHIS-WS would conduct predator control efforts in the Monuments on an as needed basis. The BLM would request proactive control to benefit priority species, protect livestock, or enhance the success of planned wildlife transplants or augmentations.	
On NPS lands, predator control would only take place in accordance with NPS policies, ensuring that animal removals do not interfere with natural habitats, natural abundances, natural distribution of native species, nor natural processes.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
In cooperation with AGFD, exotic wildlife species and feral livestock in the Virgin River Corridor ACEC would be controlled.	The BLM would request that APHIS-WS focus predator control efforts in the Arizona Strip FO to specifically target individual predators rather than predator populations.	APHIS-WS would conduct predator control efforts in the Arizona Strip FO on an as needed basis. The BLM would request proactive control to benefit priority species, protect livestock, or enhance the success of planned wildlife transplants or augmentations.		
On adjacent NPS lands, predator control would only take place in accordance with NPS policies, ensuring that animal removals do not interfere with natural habitats, natural abundances, natural distribution of native species, nor natural processes.				

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
e. Watchable Wildlife				
<i>Parashant</i>				
The Mt. Trumbull area would continue to be managed as a Watchable Wildlife area.				
N/A		The following areas would be identified, nominated, and managed as Watchable Wildlife areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tassi Spring • Cane Spring • Pakoon Spring • Oak Grove 		
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A		The Condor release site would be identified, nominated, and managed as a Watchable Wildlife area.		
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A		The following areas would be identified, nominated, and managed as Watchable Wildlife areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black Rock • Beaver Dam Confluence • Lime Kiln Pass • Buckskin Mountains • House Rock Valley 		
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Benefits for dollars spent on managing and improving wildlife habitat on public lands would be maximized by continuing and expanding cooperative partnerships with AGFD, USFWS, and other interested groups.			
N/A	On NPS lands, wildlife decisions and specific actions from this Plan would be guided by a cooperative planning process focusing on ecosystem management that perpetuates a natural distribution of native wildlife in a mosaic of their associated habitats within a normal range of variability. Plans would be developed cooperatively involving AGFD, BLM, USFWS, and interested stakeholders. Plans would integrate BLM HMPs.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
II. FISH AND WILDLIFE: MULE DEER				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Mule Deer				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mule deer habitat would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. • On BLM lands, mule deer populations would be at or near maximum levels sustainable for the habitat. • On BLM lands, forage in crucial summer mule deer habitat would include at least 10% grasses and forbs composition by weight (CBW) and at least 30% palatable browse species CBW at all key areas, where consistent with site potential. • On BLM lands, forage in crucial winter mule deer habitat would include at least 30% palatable browse species CBW at all key areas, where consistent with site potential. • Mule deer habitat in pinyon-juniper woodland sites would include a healthy diverse mosaic of trees, shrubs, grasses, and forbs. • Water sources within mule deer habitat would be safely accessible to deer and other wildlife. • On BLM lands, water sources within mule deer habitat would be spaced no more than 3 miles apart. • All fences in mule deer habitat would be deer passable. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Mule Deer				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	On BLM lands, self-sustaining mule deer populations would be enhanced or maintained in Game Management Units 12B, 13A, and 13B. Initial or supplemental transplants could be authorized on a case-by-case basis. Existing habitat areas could be expanded and new habitat areas may be added where consistent with protection of Monument objects and MU objectives.			
On BLM lands, mule deer habitat would be improved where needed by increasing sufficient forage on summer ranges and nutritious browse on winter ranges through vegetation conversion and management prescriptions.	On BLM lands, crucial summer mule deer habitat would be managed for at least 10% grasses and forbs and at least 30% palatable browse species CBW, where consistent with site potential. Crucial winter mule deer habitat would be managed to include at least 30% palatable browse species, where consistent with site potential. Palatable browse species would be maintained and enhanced through vegetation conversion. Palatable browse species could include, but is not limited to cliffrose, bitterbrush, ceanothus, four-wing saltbush, desert holly, Mormon tea, and mountain mahogany.			
N/A	On BLM lands, mule deer would be managed for healthy, self-sustaining populations in accordance with population goals and objectives established in the AGFD Strategic Plan for the species.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	A HMP would be developed and implemented for mule deer habitat on BLM lands in Game Management Units 12B, 13A, and 13B, consistent with the AGFD Strategic Plan. Site-specific management actions would be included. The plan would be amended or revised as necessary. Implementation accomplishments would be monitored annually.			
III. FISH AND WILDLIFE: PRONGHORN ANTELOPE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Pronghorn Antelope				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pronghorn habitat would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. • On BLM lands, pronghorn antelope populations would be at or near maximum levels sustainable for the habitat. • On BLM lands, forage composition in pronghorn antelope habitat would include at least 20% grasses and forbs, and 20% palatable shrub species CBW at all key areas, where consistent with site potential. • Where consistent with site potential on BLM lands, the shrub component would be at least 15 inches tall at key fawning areas in pronghorn habitat to provide fawning cover. • Water sources within pronghorn antelope habitat would be safely accessible to pronghorn and other wildlife. • On BLM lands, water sources within pronghorn antelope habitat would be spaced no more than 3 miles apart. • All fences in pronghorn antelope habitat would be pronghorn passable and necessary for effective range management or other administrative functions. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Pronghorn Antelope				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	On BLM lands, self-sustaining pronghorn populations would be enhanced or maintained in Game Management Units 12B, 13A, and 13B. Initial or supplemental transplants could be authorized on a case-by-case basis. Existing habitat areas could be expanded and new habitat areas may be added where appropriate.			
N/A	On BLM lands, pronghorn antelope would be managed for healthy, self-sustaining populations in accordance with population goals and objectives established in the AGFD Strategic Plan for the species.			
N/A	The BLM would identify and map pronghorn fawning areas in the Planning Area. The BLM would implement actions to increase shrub height and density to enhance fawning cover, consistent with site potential.			
N/A	On BLM lands, pronghorn habitat would be managed for at least 20% grasses and forbs and at least 20% palatable browse species CBW, where consistent with site potential.			
Fence construction would be limited to that which is	Fences in pronghorn antelope habitat would be modified to ensure they are passable to pronghorn. Fences not necessary for range management or other administrative purposes would be removed.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
absolutely necessary. New fences would meet specifications developed by the BLM. Existing fences would be modified to meet standards.				
On BLM lands, pronghorn habitat would be managed through the HMP process to achieve and maintain viable populations in accordance with HMP objectives.	A HMP for pronghorn antelope on BLM lands would be developed and implemented in Game Management Units 12B, 13A, and 13B consistent with the AGFD Strategic Plan. Site-specific management actions would be included. The plan would be amended or revised as necessary. Implementation accomplishments would be monitored annually.			

IV. DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP

A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Desert Bighorn Sheep

Common to All Planning Areas

N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desert bighorn habitat would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. • On BLM lands, desert bighorn sheep populations would be at or near maximum levels sustainable for the habitat. • On BLM lands, forage in desert bighorn sheep habitat areas would include at least 20% grasses, 20% forbs, and 20% palatable shrub species CBW, where consistent with site potential. • Water sources within bighorn sheep habitat areas would be safely accessible to bighorn and other wildlife. • On BLM lands, water sources within bighorn sheep habitat would be spaced no more than 4 miles apart. 			
-----	--	--	--	--

B. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – Desert Bighorn Sheep

Arizona Strip FO

N/A	11,731 acres would be designated as the Lime Kiln / Hatchet Canyon ACEC for protection of the desert bighorn sheep.	The Lime Kiln / Hatchet Canyon ACEC would not be designated. (See Land Use Allocations for desert bighorn sheep.)		
N/A	12,881 acres would be designated as the Grey Points	The Grey Points ACEC would not be designated. (See Land Use Allocations for desert bighorn sheep.)		

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	ACEC for protection of the desert bighorn sheep.			
N/A	23,464 acres would be designated as the Hurricane Cliffs ACEC for protection of the desert bighorn sheep and riparian values.		Hurricane Cliffs ACEC would not be designated. (See Land Use Allocations for desert bighorn sheep.)	
C. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS – Desert Bighorn Sheep				
<i>Parashant</i>				
	N/A	114,288 acres would be allocated as the Grand Wash Cliffs Wildlife Habitat Area (WHA) for desert bighorn sheep.		
<i>Vermilion</i>				
	N/A	58,268 acres would be allocated as the Vermilion Cliffs WHA for desert bighorn sheep		
<i>Arizona Strip FO and Parashant</i>				
	N/A	180,451 acres would be allocated as the Virgin Mountains, Hurricane Cliffs, and Hack and Grama Canyon WHAs for desert bighorn sheep		
D. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Desert Bighorn Sheep				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	On BLM lands, desert bighorn sheep would be managed for healthy, self-sustaining populations in accordance with population goals and objectives established in the AGFD Strategic Plan for the species.			
On BLM lands, identified bighorn sheep habitat would be managed through the HMP process and the BLM’s range-wide plan for desert bighorn sheep.	Implementation of site-specific actions benefiting bighorn sheep would be continued by implementing the Arizona Strip Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan (BLM and AGFD 2001) in so far as it is consistent with this Plan. The desert bighorn sheep management plan would be amended or revised as necessary. Implementation accomplishments would be monitored annually. The plan would be amended to include NPS lands, with any actions taken in compliance with NPS Management Policies regarding restoration of native species.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Self-sustaining bighorn sheep populations would be enhanced or maintained within all WHAs for bighorn sheep. New habitat areas could be added where appropriate. Initial or supplemental transplants would be authorized on a case-by-case basis, and on NPS lands, would meet NPS Management Policies regarding the restoration of native animal species.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Activities that could adversely affect the lambing or rearing of newborn bighorn sheep along the lower Grand Wash Cliffs from December 1 through May 31 would not be permitted.	Activities that would adversely affect the lambing or rearing of newborn bighorn sheep would generally not be authorized in WHAs for desert bighorn sheep between December 1 and May 31.			
N/A	Exotic/non-native wildlife species and/or feral, non-permitted livestock would be immediately eliminated or controlled upon discovery within nine miles of WHAs for desert bighorn sheep to minimize the threat of disease. Agents authorized to eliminate exotics/non-natives include BLM and NPS rangers, AGFD, Wildlife Services, and county and local law enforcement agencies.			
Changes in kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep and/or goats would not be authorized within or adjacent to occupied bighorn sheep habitats unless monitoring studies and research indicate a disease transmission problem would not exist.	Changes in kind of livestock to other than cattle and horses would not be authorized within nine miles of WHAs for desert bighorn sheep. Sheep and goats would not be authorized as pack stock within nine miles of desert bighorn sheep WHAs. Only cattle and horse grazing, where allotted, would be authorized on NPS lands.			
V. FISH AND WILDLIFE: KAIBAB SQUIRREL				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Kaibab Squirrel				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaibab squirrel habitat would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. • Forage composition in Kaibab squirrel habitat would include at least 20% grasses and forbs, 20% mast-producing species, and 30% ponderosa pine CBW at all key areas, where consistent with site potential. 			
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS - Kaibab Squirrel				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	18,823 acres of ponderosa pine forest in the Mt. Trumbull and Mt. Logan areas would be allocated as the Trumbull-Logan WHA for Kaibab squirrels.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS - Kaibab Squirrel				
<i>Parashant</i>				
No new habitat areas would be authorized. No initial or supplemental transplants would be authorized.		Self-sustaining populations of Kaibab squirrels would be enhanced or maintained within the Trumbull-Logan WHA. Initial or supplemental transplants on BLM land would be authorized on a case-by-case basis.		
N/A	On BLM lands, Kaibab squirrels within the Trumbull-Logan WHA would be managed for healthy, self-sustaining populations in accordance with population goals and objectives established in the AGFD Strategic Plan for the species.			
D. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS - Kaibab Squirrel				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Kaibab squirrel populations would be monitored in cooperation with AGFD. Standardized surveys would be used to inventory populations and evaluate existing habitat.			
VI. FISH AND WILDLIFE: DESERT COTTONTAIL RABBIT				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Desert Cottontail Rabbit				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desert cottontail habitat would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. Desert cottontail rabbits would be present in sufficient quantity to provide an adequate prey base for raptors, carnivores, and other predatory species, as well as ample recreational opportunities for hunting and wildlife viewing. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Desert Cottontail Rabbit				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	On BLM lands, cottontails in the Planning Area would be managed for healthy, self-sustaining populations in accordance with population goals and objectives established in the AGFD Strategic Plan for these species.			
N/A	Cottontail rabbit habitat would be maintained, monitored, and improved to ensure a healthy and diverse predator component throughout the habitat area.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
VII. FISH AND WILDLIFE: MIGRATORY BIRDS				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Migratory Birds				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migratory bird habitats would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. • Migratory birds that nest in the Planning Area would have resources of sufficient quantity and quality to provide for nesting sites and to fledge young successfully. • Wintering populations of waterfowl would be sufficiently abundant to provide for recreational wildlife viewing and hunting opportunities. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Migratory Birds				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Projects to enhance waterfowl populations through habitat manipulations would be developed and implemented. Opportunities to view waterfowl would be promoted. On NPS lands, existing waterfowl habitat would be maintained within NPS policies to ensure sustainability of the natural range of habitats within the ecosystem.			
N/A	Adverse effects to breeding bird populations caused by disturbances from authorized activities would be minimized through stipulations and other mitigation.			
Migratory birds would be managed through implementation of Executive Order 13186.	Migratory birds would be managed through implementation of Executive Order 13186, with restrictions on surface disturbing activities.	Migratory birds would be managed through implementation of Executive Order 13186. Additional restrictions on surface disturbing activities would be developed on a case-by-case basis through NEPA analysis.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative C
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS – Migratory Birds				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Migratory bird populations would be monitored in cooperation with AGFD. Significant waterfowl habitat sites would be inventoried. Standardized surveys would be used to inventory breeding bird populations and evaluate existing habitat.			

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
VIII. FISH AND WILDLIFE: GAME BIRDS				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Game Birds				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merriam’s Turkey habitat would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. • Vertical structure and understory density would be sufficient in the ponderosa pine ecological zone to provide nesting and roosting habitat for Merriam’s Turkey. • On BLM lands, forage composition in Turkey habitat would include at least 20% grasses and forbs, and 20% mast-producing species at all key areas CBW, where consistent with site potential. • Water sources within game bird habitats would be safely accessible by all wildlife. • On BLM lands, water sources within Merriam’s Turkey habitat would be spaced no more than 3 miles apart. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Game Birds				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Priority game bird species would include Merriam’s Turkey, Gambel’s Quail, White-winged Dove, Mourning Dove, Chukar Partridge, and Band-tailed Pigeons.			
N/A	Self-sustaining populations of Merriam’s Turkey would be established within all habitat areas, including Mt. Trumbull, Mt. Logan, and Black Rock. New habitat areas could be added where appropriate. Initial or supplemental transplants would be authorized on a case-by-case basis and, on NPS lands, would meet NPS Management Policies regarding the restoration of native species.			
Good ground cover for nesting Merriam’s Turkey and large ponderosa pine trees for roosting in the Mt. Trumbull-Mt. Logan, and Parashant areas would be maintained	On BLM lands, Merriam’s Turkey habitat would be managed for at least 20% grasses and forbs and at least 20% mast-producing species CBW, where consistent with site potential. On BLM and NPS lands, old growth in the ponderosa pine ecological zone would be protected to ensure roost sites for Merriam’s Turkey.			
N/A	No initial or supplemental transplants of Chukar Partridge would occur in the Planning Area.	Initial or supplemental transplants of Chukar Partridge would be authorized on a case-by-case basis in cooperation	Same as Alternatives B & C	

TABLE 2.4: FISH AND WILDLIFE

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
			with AGFD. No Chukar would be released on NPS lands.	
N/A	On BLM lands, game bird populations in the Planning Area would be managed for healthy, self-sustaining populations in accordance with population goals and objectives established in the AGFD Strategic Plan for these species.			
N/A	An HMP for game birds on BLM lands would be developed and implemented in Game Management Units 12B, 13A, and 13B consistent with the AGFD Strategic Plan. Site-specific management actions would be included. The plan would be amended or revised as necessary. Implementation accomplishments would be monitored annually. The plan would be amended to include NPS lands with actions taken in compliance with NPS Management Policies regarding restoration of native species.			

IX. FISH AND WILDLIFE: CARNIVORES AND FURBEARERS

A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Carnivores and Furbearers

Common to All Planning Areas

N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carnivore habitat would provide the necessary forage, water, and shelter components for healthy, self-sustaining populations within the range of natural variability. • Opportunities for hunting, trapping, and viewing carnivores and furbearers such as coyote, bobcat, mountain lion, kit fox, gray fox, and others would continue to be provided.
-----	---

B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Carnivores and Furbearers

Common to All Planning Areas

N/A	Priority carnivore species would include mountain lion, kit fox, gray fox, and long-tailed weasel.
N/A	The historical range and distribution of furbearers and predatory mammals would be maintained. Maximum recreational, economic, and aesthetic uses commensurate with existing populations would be allowed.
N/A	On BLM lands, carnivores would be managed for healthy, self-sustaining populations in accordance with population goals and objectives established in the AGFD Strategic Plan for these species.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS – Carnivores and Furbearers

Common to All Planning Areas

N/A	Carnivore and furbearer habitats would be monitored to ensure a healthy and diverse predator component throughout the Planning Area.
-----	--

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: ALL SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All federally listed threatened or endangered species found in the Planning Area would be recovered. • Management of discretionary activities in the Planning Area would not contribute to the need to list proposed, candidate, state, BLM, or NPS sensitive species, and would include conservation measures and stipulations benefiting special status species. • The Arizona Strip would provide a block of remote, contiguous habitat that would serve as refugia for populations of special status species. • There would be no net loss in the quality or quantity of special status species habitat throughout the Planning Area. • The public would be well informed about special status species in the Planning Area and the need for conservation. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<p>Priority for the application of management actions would be for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species federally listed under the ESA as endangered or threatened, • Species proposed for federal listing, • Species that are candidates for federal listing, • Species included in the Wildlife Species of Concern in Arizona document, • Species for which a conservation strategy/agreement has been developed, and • Species included on the BLM or NPS Sensitive Species List. 			
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On BLM lands, specific actions and direction for managing special status species would be guided by the use of interdisciplinary wildlife HMPs produced cooperatively with the AGFD, USFWS, and other interested participants. Implementation accomplishments would be monitored and reviewed annually and documented in HMP files. HMPs would be amended or revised as necessary to incorporate new information and adjust management (See Appendix 2.H). • On NPS lands, management of special status species, as needed, would be implemented through specific action plans tied to the Lake Mead Resources Stewardship Plan or General Management Plan. Planning and implementation would be conducted cooperatively with AGFD, BLM, USFWS, and other stakeholders. 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>Management of sensitive and endangered species would be consistent with biological opinions, recovery plans, BLM policies, and the ESA.</p>	<p>Management of sensitive and endangered species would be consistent with biological opinions, recovery plans, conservation strategies, BLM and NPS policies, and the ESA, and would be consistent with achieving all DFCs, to the extent possible.</p>			
<p>The BLM would support and assist with transplants of special status species.</p>	<p>Reintroductions, transplants, and supplemental stockings (augmentations) of special status species populations would be carried out in collaboration with the AGFD and or the USFWS for the following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To maintain current populations, distributions, and genetic diversity; • To conserve or recover threatened or endangered species; and/or • To restore or enhance native populations, diversity, or distribution of special status species. <p>Species that may be reintroduced, transplanted, or augmented may include, but would not be limited to, desert tortoise, chuckwalla, banded gila monster, northern leopard frogs, relict leopard frogs, lowland leopard frogs, endemic springsnails, woundfin minnow, Virgin River chub, Virgin spinedace, desert sucker, flannelmouth sucker, California Condor, Yuma Clapper Rail, Yellow-billed Cuckoo, SW Flycatcher, Ferruginous Hawk, Northern Goshawk, Western Burrowing Owl, White-faced Ibis, and House Rock Valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat. These actions would be based on the best available scientific information.</p> <p>Introductions of non-endemic, special status animal species native to the region could be authorized on BLM lands only, on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the AGFD, USFWS, counties, and adjacent landowners.</p>			
<p>Conservation of federal threatened or endangered, proposed, candidate, and other special status species would be promoted by the maintenance or restoration of their habitats.</p>	<p>The BLM and NPS would continue to cooperate with the USFWS to ensure specific actions comply with the ESA. The BLM and NPS would continue to undertake active management programs to inventory, monitor, restore, and maintain listed species habitats, control detrimental non-native species, control detrimental public access, and re-establish extirpated populations as necessary to maintain the species and their habitats.</p>			
<p>N/A</p>	<p>Where actions authorized or permitted by the BLM and/or NPS may adversely affect a listed or proposed species, or adversely modify designated or proposed critical habitat, the BLM and NPS would work cooperatively with the USFWS to resolve or mitigate these impacts through implementation of species-specific conservation measures. (See Appendix 2.E.)</p>			
<p>N/A</p>	<p>Where actions that occur within the Planning Area, but are not specifically authorized or permitted by the BLM or NPS, may result in death or injury of a listed or proposed species or adversely modify designated or proposed critical habitat, the BLM and NPS would work cooperatively with the USFWS, as well as other county, state, and federal agencies, non-governmental organizations, and members of the public to reduce or eliminate the possibility of adverse effects in a timely and appropriate manner. The BLM and NPS could use planning, education programs, restrictions on season of use or number of users, area</p>			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	closures, law enforcement contact, or other vigorous compliance efforts to discourage activities that cause injury or mortality or degrade habitat of listed or proposed species.			
a. Vegetation Management and Fire and Fuels				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Vegetation management within special status species habitats would include conservation measures for the species as described in the 2004 Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels.	<p>Conservation measures described in Appendix 2.E. would be implemented for all vegetation management actions including restoration and rehabilitation, fuels treatments, prescribed burning, and other related actions in special status species habitats.</p> <p>Collection of dead and down wood in special status species habitats would be allowed for personal camp use only.</p>			
Fire management within special status species habitats would include conservation measures for the species as described in the 2004 Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels.	<p>Conservation measures described in Appendix 2.E. would be implemented for all fire suppression, restoration and rehabilitation, fuels treatments, prescribed burning , and other fire related actions in special status species habitats.</p>			
b. Grazing Management				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Season of use or other modifications to livestock grazing systems could be implemented to protect special status species. (Specific implementation actions are discussed below for the species they benefit and in the Livestock Grazing Management section.)			
c. Recreation Management				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
No new developed campgrounds would be authorized or constructed in desert tortoise habitat.	No new developed campgrounds would be authorized or constructed in listed or proposed special status species habitat. The BLM and NPS could further limit or restrict any recreation activity or use that degrades any special status species habitat or may cause disturbance, injury, or mortality to the species.			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
d. Surface Disturbing Actions				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Prior to surface disturbing activity on public land, a special status species review would be conducted by a qualified specialist.	Prior to surface disturbing activity, a special status species review would be conducted by a qualified specialist. Special status species habitat surveys would be required whenever surface disturbances occur within an area of known or suspected occupancy by special status species.			
e. Lands and Realty Management				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All lands within desert tortoise ACECs and within all other desert tortoise designated critical habitat would be retained. Exchanges or sales of desert tortoise habitat out of public ownership would be limited to parcels identified in the RMP. New rights-of-way (ROWs) would be routed away from high-density desert tortoise habitats and along the edges of avoidance areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BLM would retain in federal ownership designated or proposed critical habitat for listed or proposed threatened or endangered species. BLM would retain in federal ownership habitats essential to the survival and recovery of Federally listed species (including historically occupied habitats). The BLM would seek to acquire non-federal lands and interests in lands within the above-identified areas and legal access to landlocked public land from willing sellers by purchase, exchange, or donation. Interests in land include, but are not limited to, surface and subsurface rights, conservation easements, and water rights New land use authorizations would only be allowed within listed species habitat when no reasonable alternative exists and impacts to the species and their habitat can be mitigated. New ROWs would be routed away from high-density listed species' populations and along the edges of avoidance areas. (See Table 2. 11 Lands and Realty). Unauthorized dumpsites in special status species habitat would be given the highest priority for removal and cleanup actions. 			
f. Travel Management				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The BLM and cooperating agencies would identify roads and trails that are the cause of desert tortoise mortality due to impacts from vehicles. The	Following completion of route inventory and evaluation, roads/routes causing or contributing to mortality of individuals of listed species or degradation of their habitat would be identified. Where practical, such roads/routes would be closed and signed. Where closing such roads would not be practical, seasonal restrictions or other mitigation would be developed to minimize adverse effects to special status species. Where necessary, fences, culverts or other physical barriers would be installed to protect special status species.			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
BLM would close, sign, fence or otherwise establish effective barriers to tortoises along heavily traveled roads and/or install culverts that allow passage of tortoises.				
g. Minerals Management				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Special mitigation in mining plans of operation would be required to avoid impacts to Siler pincushion cactus in the Johnson Spring, Lost Spring Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special mitigation would be required in mining plans of operation to avoid impacts to special status species or proposed or designated critical habitat. • Exploration, drilling, and/or other development activity within a special status species ACEC or WHA/Vegetation Habitat Management Area (VHA) may be restricted seasonally to a period when the species is not active. • Mineral leasing would include notification to potential lessees of presence or potential for occurrence of special status species within a parcel proposed for leasing. Lessees would also be advised of additional stipulations or other restrictions that would apply at the APD stage. (See Appendix 2.I for lease stipulations by species). • New mineral material sites would not be authorized in listed species ACECs. Existing material sites would be evaluated for retention. 			
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Public awareness of desert tortoises would be increased through signs, information, and education in the Beaver Dam Slope ACEC.	Public awareness of special status species would be increased through signs, educational media, and other outreach efforts to promote conservation of the species.			
N/A	Guidance criteria for assessing impacts to listed species from livestock grazing actions would be used as appropriate.			
N/A	To the extent practicable, inventory and monitoring of special status species would be conducted in accordance with accepted survey protocols.			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
II. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: SPECIAL STATUS PLANTS				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Special Status Plants				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Populations of plants that are listed or proposed for federal listing would be recovered. • Populations of special status plant species would increase to stable, self-sustaining levels. • There would be no net loss in the quality or quantity of special status species habitat throughout the Planning Area. 			
B. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – Special Status Plants (See Table 2-16. Special Designations for ACEC Management.)				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 916 acres.	The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be enlarged to 5,498 acres. Increases in the ACEC size would be due to incorporating areas with known populations of Siler pincushion cactus not previously included within the ACEC boundary.		The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus designation would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection.	The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be enlarged to 5,724 acres. Increases in the ACEC size would be due to incorporating areas with known populations of Siler pincushion cactus not previously included within the ACEC boundary
The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 2,464 acres.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 2,058 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 1,986 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	The Johnson Spring ACEC designation for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 3,444 acres. Increases in the ACEC acreage would be due to incorporating areas with known populations of Siler pincushion cactus not previously included within the ACEC boundary.
The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC designation for	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 8,262 acres.	threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 17,744 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.	threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 4,431 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 19,248 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.
The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 5,095 acres .	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 9,231 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 2,575 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC designation for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 9,310 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.
N/A	The Shinarump ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be designated at 3,619 acres.	N/A		The Shinarump ACEC would be designated southwest of the originally proposed location and would be designated for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus at 3,237 acres.
The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus would be maintained at 11,012 acres.	The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus would be enlarged to 102,141 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of most of the lower portion of House Rock Valley for	The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus would be enlarged to 11,926 acres. Changes in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas of occupied habitat, removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated the cactus is not present, and removal of portions of House Rock Valley with Fickeisen plains cactus, pronghorn antelope, and House Rock Valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat.		The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus would be enlarged to 12,105 acres. Changes in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas of occupied habitat, removal of areas where

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	additional protection afforded to Fickeisen plains cactus, pronghorn antelope, and House Rock Valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat.			repeated surveys have indicated the cactus is not present, and removal of portions of House Rock Valley with Fickeisen plains cactus, pronghorn antelope, and House Rock Valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat.
N/A	The Lone Butte ACEC for the protection of threatened Jones cycladenia would be designated at 1,900 acres.		The Lone Butte ACEC for protection of threatened Jones cycladenia would not be designated because route designation would provide sufficient protection from OHV impacts..	The Lone Butte ACEC for protection of threatened Jones cycladenia would be designated at 1,762 acres.
N/A	The Coyote Valley ACEC for protection of special status Paradine pincushion cactus would be designated at 776 acres.	The Coyote Valley ACEC for protection of special status Paradine pincushion cactus would not be designated because Monument status provides additional protection of resources beyond ACEC designation.		
N/A	The Black Knolls ACEC for the protection of endangered Holmgren milkvetch would be designated at 80 acres.		The Black Knolls ACEC for the protection of endangered Holmgren milkvetch would not be designated because route designation would provide sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	The Black Knolls ACEC for the protection of endangered Holmgren milkvetch would be designated at 428 acres and would include proposed critical habitat for the species.
N/A	The Buckskin ACEC for protection of BLM sensitive species cliff milkvetch would be designated at 160 acres.	The Buckskin ACEC for protection of BLM sensitive species cliff milkvetch would not be designated because this species is not recognized as being rare and therefore is not regionally significant.		

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	The Clayhole ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would be designated at 7,362 acres.	The Clayhole ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would not be designated because route designation would provide sufficient protection from OHV impacts.		
N/A	The Twist Hills ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would be designated at 1,255 acres.	The Twist Hills ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would not be designated because route designation would provide sufficient protection from OHV impacts.		
C. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS – Special Status Plants				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	The Twist Hills VHA would be allocated for Fickeisen plains cactus. Management emphasis and priority would be given to Fickeisen plains cactus to meet DFCs.			
N/A	The Clayhole VHA would be allocated for Fickeisen plains cactus. Management emphasis and priority would be given to Fickeisen plains cactus to meet DFCs.			
N/A	The Buckskin VHA would be allocated for cliff milkvetch. Management emphasis and priority would be given to cliff milkvetch to meet DFCs.			
N/A	The Coyote Valley VHA would be allocated for Paradine pincushion cactus. Management emphasis and priority would be given to Paradine pincushion cactus to meet DFCs.			
D. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Special Status Plants				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<p>Special Status Plant Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in conservation efforts for special status plant species would continue. • Special status plant habitat on state and federal lands in the Planning Area would be preserved, protected, and managed. • Monitoring efforts for special status plant populations within the Planning Area would continue. • A program of public conservation education and planning directed towards preservation of special status plant habitat would be carried out. 				
<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical vegetation manipulation would be prohibited in Marble Canyon, Johnson Spring, Lost Spring 	<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration and vegetation treatments would not be authorized in special status plant habitat, unless doing so would provide benefits to the species. • The impact of herbicides pesticide use on special status plant species would be determined. The use of harmful herbicides in areas where special status plants could be affected would be limited or eliminated. 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs, unless beneficial to Siler pincushion cactus management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of fuel wood would not be authorized in special status plant ACECs. • Conservation measures would be implemented for all vegetation management actions in special status plant habitats as described in Appendix 2.E. 			
N/A	<p>Surface Disturbing Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to special status plants and their habitats from surface disturbing activities would be reduced or eliminated. • Proposed actions would be evaluated to ensure that trampling or crushing of special status plants would be minimized or eliminated. The BLM and NPS would continue to coordinate with USFWS to delineate buffer areas around special status plant populations. Use restrictions could be developed to minimize or eliminate trampling and/or crushing of special status plants within buffer areas. • Conservation measures would be implemented for special status plants for all surface disturbing activities as described in Appendix 2.E. 			
N/A	<p>Livestock Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disturbance, injury, or mortality of special status plants resulting from grazing by livestock would be minimized or eliminated. Where grazing by livestock is leading to adverse effects, conservation measures would be implemented to reduce or mitigate loss of the plant species. Measures could include fencing, seasonal restrictions, or relocation of livestock developments. The need for implementation of conservation measures would be assessed on a case by case basis, typically at the time of the rangeland health assessment. 			
N/A	<p>Recreation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational activities that degrade special status plant habitats would be modified or relocated to minimize or eliminate adverse effects. 			
N/A	<p>Recreation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In special status plant habitats, recreational uses would be limited to designated areas and hiking and biking would be allowed only on designated routes 	<p>Recreation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In special status plant habitats, hiking would be allowed. Biking would be allowed only on designated routes. Education programs and law enforcement contact would be used to minimize recreational activities that cause injury or mortality or 	<p>Recreation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In listed plant habitats, hiking would be allowed. Biking would be allowed only on designated routes. Education programs and law enforcement contact would be used to minimize recreational activities that cause injury or mortality or degrade habitat of these species. 	

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
		degrade habitat of these species.		
N/A	Travel Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle use in special status plant habitats would be limited to designated routes with reasonable use of the shoulder. • In special status plant ACECs, use of OHVs off of designated routes would not be authorized except in emergencies. • In special status plant ACECs, vehicles would not be allowed to pull off the road to camp. 			
Implementation of the HMP for Brady pincushion cactus developed from the recovery plan for the species would continue. The HMP would serve as the ACEC plan for Brady pincushion cactus. The HMP would be reviewed annually and amended as new information and monitoring results become available.	The BLM and NPS would develop and implement HMPs for special status species in cooperation with the AGFD and the USFWS. These HMPs would serve as the ACEC plan for listed plant ACECs and as the management plan for VHAs.			
E. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS – Special Status Plants				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	The BLM and NPS would continue to inventory and map known locations and potential habitat for special status plant populations to ensure protection of these populations and facilitate management.			
N/A	The BLM and NPS would continue appropriate monitoring of all special status plant species within the Planning Area.			
N/A	Public conservation education programs would be implemented to inform publics of the value of conserving special status plant habitats and the rules and policies governing their protection.			
III. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: DESERT TORTOISE				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Desert Tortoise				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mojave population of desert tortoise would be recovered and delisted. • There would be no net loss in the quality or quantity of desert tortoise habitat within the ACECs or WHA. • Desert tortoise populations within the ACECs and DWMA would be healthy and self-sustaining. Populations would be 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	stable or increasing. Population declines would be halted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desert tortoise populations outside of the ACECs and WHA would be healthy and stable. Declines in the WHA would be minimized to the extent possible through mitigation. • Desert tortoise habitat would provide sufficient forage and cover attributes to support thriving populations of the species. • Habitat connectivity would be maintained, providing sufficiently frequent contact between tortoises to maintain genetic diversity. 			
B. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – Desert Tortoise (See Table 2.16: Special Designations for proposed ACEC management.)				
<i>Parashant</i>				
The Pakoon DWMA/ACEC would be maintained at 76,014 acres for protection of the threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values. Activities administered by the Arizona Strip BLM on Lake Mead (NRA) and on public lands in Nevada would be managed in accordance with DWMA/ACEC prescriptions.	The Pakoon ACEC for protection of the threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone would be revoked because Monument status provides additional protection of resources beyond that afforded by ACEC designation.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The Beaver Dam Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be maintained at 51,197 acres.	The Beaver Dam Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 52,753 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC.	The Beaver Dam Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 51,984 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat, desert tortoise habitat previously in the Virgin River Corridor ACEC, and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC. Desert tortoise needs would be considered the highest priority in resolving resource conflicts in the Beaver Dam Slope ACEC.		

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be maintained at 39,931 acres.</p>	<p>The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 40,287 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC.</p>	<p>The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 40,206 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat, desert tortoise habitat previously in the Virgin River Corridor ACEC, and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC. Desert tortoise needs would be considered the highest priority in resolving resource conflicts in the Virgin Slope ACEC.</p>		<p>The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 39,514 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat, desert tortoise habitat previously in the Virgin River Corridor ACEC, and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC. Desert tortoise needs would be considered the highest priority in resolving resource conflicts in the Virgin Slope ACEC.</p>
<p>The Virgin River Corridor ACEC for protection of Virgin River fishes and threatened desert tortoise would be maintained at 8,075 acres.</p>	<p>The Virgin River Corridor ACEC for protection of Virgin River fishes and threatened desert tortoise would be modified to include only the 100-year floodplain (approx. 2,064 acres). Boundary adjustments would eliminate areas outside of the 100-year floodplain previously included in the ACEC. Desert tortoise habitat previously included within this ACEC would be incorporated into and managed as a part of the Beaver Dam Slope or Virgin Slope ACEC. The ACEC would be managed for Virgin River fishes and riparian values.</p>			
<p>C. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS – Desert Tortoise</p>				
<p><i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i></p>				
<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Pakoon WHA would be allocated for protection of desert tortoise at 76,014 acres, including the area formerly designated as the Pakoon ACEC. Management objectives would give priority to desert tortoise and implementation of recovery plan actions. Activities administered by the Arizona Strip BLM on Lake Mead NRA and on public lands in Nevada would be managed in accordance with WHA prescriptions. Desert</p>	<p>The Pakoon WHA would be allocated for protection of desert tortoise at 71,959 acres, including the area formerly designated as the Pakoon ACEC, minus the Grand Gulch Wash portion. Management</p>	<p>The Pakoon WHA would be allocated for protection of desert tortoise at 171,709 acres including the area formerly designated as the Pakoon ACEC, plus all critical desert tortoise habitat in Parashant.</p>	

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	tortoise needs would be considered the highest priority in resolving resource conflicts in the Pakoon WHA.		objectives would give priority to desert tortoise and implementation of recovery plan actions. Activities administered by the Arizona Strip BLM on Lake Mead NRA and on public lands in Nevada would be managed in accordance with WHA prescriptions. Desert tortoise needs would be considered the highest priority in resolving resource conflicts in the Pakoon WHA.	Management objectives would give priority to desert tortoise and implementation of recovery plan actions. Activities administered by the Arizona Strip BLM on Lake Mead NRA and on public lands in Nevada would be managed in accordance with WHA prescriptions. Desert tortoise needs would be considered the highest priority in resolving resource conflicts in the Pakoon WHA.

D. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Desert Tortoise

Parashant and Arizona Strip FO

Desert Tortoise Management:

- Active participation in the recovery of desert tortoise would continue.
- Assistance would be provided in the implementation of recovery tasks identified in the recovery plan.
- Adjacent land owners would be encouraged in the development of a habitat conservation plan (HCP) to provide for the conservation of desert tortoise while managing community and regional growth. Assistance would be provided in the development of the HCP. The HCP would be integrated with the Arizona Strip RMP.
- Highest quality desert tortoise habitat would be identified based on habitat features, vegetation, and tortoise densities.
- Lowest quality desert tortoise habitat would be identified based on habitat features, vegetation, and tortoise densities. Some parcels of low quality habitat between the impassable boundaries of Interstate 15 and the Virgin River, outside of critical habitat and desert tortoise ACECs, would be assessed for suitability for other allowable uses or disposal. A preliminary list of these parcels appears in Appendix 2.M.
- The BLM could authorize translocations of desert tortoises onto public lands only when all of the following conditions are met 1) prior authorization from USFWS and AGFD is obtained, 2) the desert tortoise population in the area to which a tortoise(s) be moved is depressed, 3) testing of animals to be translocated is conducted to ensure that spread of URTD or other diseases is not facilitated as a result of translocations, 4) handling of desert tortoises is in compliance with conservation measures, and 5) protocols are followed to ensure that translocated animals have the greatest chance for survival and do not disrupt the behavior of resident animals.

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilderness management plans for the Beaver Dam Mountains, Paiute, and Grand Wash Cliff wilderness areas would be amended or revised to incorporate applicable recovery needs for desert tortoise. The BLM and NPS would continue to monitor and patrol desert tortoise habitat, and to investigate illegal activities on public lands in the area. Law enforcement presence would be at a level adequate to promote public compliance with use regulations. 				
<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invasive exotic annual grasses in desert tortoise habitat would be reduced and/or removed. Desired plant community (DPC) objectives would be developed during rangeland health assessments that consider desert tortoise forage, cover, and habitat needs. DPC objectives and recommended actions for achieving these objectives would be incorporated into allotment management plans (AMPs). Areas of highest quality, unburned desert tortoise habitat would receive highest priority for restoration. Vegetative conditions in desert tortoise habitat would be maintained or improved in accordance with DPC objectives. No mechanical treatment or conversion would be allowed unless the project benefits or improves tortoise management and condition of habitat. Desert tortoise habitat would be closed to live vegetation harvest, except salvage in areas where surface disturbance has been authorized. Collection of dead and down wood would be allowed for personal camp use only. Conservation measures for desert tortoise would be implemented for all vegetation management actions in desert tortoise habitat as described in Appendix 2.E. Vegetation management actions would include vegetation treatments, fuels reduction, restoration, and rehabilitation. 				
<p>Fire Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate action would be taken to suppress all wildfires in desert tortoise habitat, based on preplanned analysis and consistent with land management objectives, including threats to life and property. All wildfires in desert tortoise habitat would be suppressed with minimum surface disturbance, in accordance with the guidelines in Duck et al. (1995). Protection of highest quality desert tortoise areas from wildfire would be the highest priority. Suppression forces would be pre-positioned in critical areas during periods of high fire dangers. Assistance with design, funding, and implementation of efforts to construct minimal impact fire breaks in desert tortoise habitat would continue. Conservation measures for desert tortoise would be implemented for all fire suppression and management actions in desert tortoise habitat as described in Appendix 2.E (fire suppression, fuels treatment, prescribed burning). Fire management actions would include fire use, prescribed fire, restoration, and rehabilitation. 				
<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portions of grazing allotments within the Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for livestock grazing. Grazing allotments within 	<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desert tortoise habitat would be unavailable for livestock grazing. All grazing preferences would be canceled. <p>Exclusion fences or other</p>	<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grazing systems would be established for all allotments with desert tortoise habitat with a full range of management options including no grazing (unavailable), inactive season grazing, and rotational grazing prescriptions. Grazing would be authorized based on maintaining or improving vegetation conditions in desert tortoise habitat using ecological site inventory data as the baseline condition. Adaptive management would be used to determine if and when changes 		

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>the Beaver Dam Slope and Virgin Slope would be available for livestock grazing from October 15 to March 15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grazing utilization levels would be set at 45% of current year's growth on allotments in desert tortoise habitat. 	<p>methods would be used to ensure areas unavailable to grazing would not be grazed.</p>			<p>in grazing systems, season of use, and other parameters would be implemented to meet DFCs. Exclusion fences or other methods would be used to ensure areas unavailable to grazing would not be grazed. See pages 2-96, 2-97, 2-156, and 2-157 for specific grazing management and proposed season of use by allotment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grazing utilization levels would be set at 45% of current year's growth on allotments in desert tortoise habitat.
<p>Surface Disturbing Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects to desert tortoise from authorized projects would be minimized or eliminated. "Project" refer to any surface-disturbing activities proposed that may cause disturbance of desert tortoise habitat and/or death or injury of a desert tortoise, with the exception of grazing by livestock and activities associated with fire suppression. Authorized actions that may result in adverse effects to desert tortoises would require implementation of project stipulations including personnel education programs, pre-construction clearances, defined construction areas, operational restrictions, and procedures for moving tortoises out of harm's way. (See Appendix 2.E for a list of stipulations.) To the extent possible, project activities would be scheduled when tortoises are inactive (October 15 through March 15). The following project activities would only be authorized between October 15 through March 15: surface disturbance associated with mineral leasing; organized, non-speed vehicular events; construction and non-emergency maintenance activities in ROWs; and non-emergency maintenance of existing roads. To the extent possible, project features would be located in previously-disturbed areas or outside of desert tortoise habitat. Proposed actions would be evaluated to ensure they do not contribute to the proliferation of natural predators within desert tortoise habitat. New water developments could be authorized if they are designed to minimize or eliminate the potential for tortoise drowning and predators are not attracted. Reclamation would be required for activities that result in loss or degradation of tortoise habitat. Habitat would be restored or reclaimed to as close a pre-disturbance condition as practicable. Mitigation measures may be included in decision documents to offset the loss of quality or quantity of desert tortoise habitat. Compensation may be required to mitigate residual impacts from authorized actions. The BLM would not authorize any military maneuvers in desert tortoise habitat. 				
<p>Recreation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No competitive speed vehicle events would be authorized in desert tortoise habitat. The BLM and/or NPS would apply the following stipulations to any non-speed motor vehicular events in desert tortoise habitat (or non-speed portions of speed events) requiring permitting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No organized non-speed events would occur from March 15 through October 15. 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>2. Permits would be required for events with 50 or more participants.</p> <p>3. Vehicle travel would be limited to designated routes, or before route designation, to existing routes.</p> <p>4. Vehicles would not exceed the legal speed limit (posted or unposted) of the road in which they are on during the event.</p> <p>5. No more than 400 motorcycles or all terrain vehicles, or 300 four-wheeled vehicles would be allowed in any one event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events would have enough monitors to ensure compliance with regulations. • The BLM would identify areas where uncontrolled dogs are causing desert tortoise mortality. If predation of tortoises by dogs is discovered, BLM would encourage Mohave County to enforce ordinances prohibiting uncontrolled dogs in those areas. Dogs are required to be on leash on NPS lands. • Vehicle camping would be restricted to disturbed areas along designated routes in desert tortoise habitat. Mountain biking would be allowed on designated routes throughout the area; back packing and horseback riding would also be allowed, providing desert tortoise or their habitats are not adversely impacted. • Activities that could adversely affect the desert tortoise during their active season within tortoise habitat would be limited to the period between October 15 and March 15. The BLM and NPS may restrict season of use, number of visitors, and/or close an area to recreational activities. 				
<p>Travel Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motorized and mechanized travel would be limited to designated roads and trails. • The BLM and/or NPS would maintain or authorize maintenance of existing roads in desert tortoise habitat, except that non-emergency maintenance activities could be conducted from October 15 to March 15. Operators of road graders and other maintenance equipment would be required to attend an educational briefing prior to performing the work. Maintenance activities would be limited to previously disturbed areas, unless cleared by a qualified biologist. • Vehicles associated with agency-authorized projects traveling on unpaved roads in desert tortoise habitat would be required to keep speeds at or below 40 mph during the tortoise’s active season to protect the species. Speed limits may be less on specific roads through high-density tortoise areas. 				
<p><i>Parashant WHA (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species)</i></p>				
<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tassi Allotment would continue to be unavailable for livestock grazing. 				
<p>Those portions of the Mosby-Nay Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing.</p>	<p>Those portions of the Mosby-Nay Allotment within the Pakoon WHA would be unavailable for grazing.</p>	<p>Those portions of the Mosby-Nay Allotment with the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing, and those portions of the allotment within the Pakoon WHA would be available for grazing with seasonal restrictions.</p>	<p>Those portions of the Mosby-Nay Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing. The remaining portions of the Mosby-Nay allotment would be available for grazing.</p>	
<p>Those portions of the Pakoon Springs Allotment within the</p>	<p>The entire Pakoon Springs Allotment would be</p>	<p>Those portions of the Pakoon Springs Allotment within the</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C</p>

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing.	unavailable for livestock grazing.	former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing. In addition, the area unavailable to grazing would be expanded from the southern allotment boundary north up Pakoon Wash approximately 3 miles, and up Cedar Wash and Cottonwood Wash to approximately Wayne’s Well. This would include the Pakoon Springs area.		
Those portions of the Pakoon Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC (Grand Gulch Wash area) would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	The entire Pakoon Allotment within the Pakoon WHA would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	Those portions of the Pakoon Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC (Grand Gulch Wash area) would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	Those portions of the Pakoon Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC (Grand Gulch Wash area) would be available for livestock grazing.	
<p>Burro management within the Pakoon DWMA would include the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wild horses and burros would not be authorized on NPS and BLM lands in the planning area. Burros on NPS lands are managed to prescription set by the 1995 Lake Mead NRA Burro Management Plan. • The herd management level for the Tassi-Gold Butte Herd Management Area would be set to zero on BLM lands in the planning area. Burros would be removed rather than destroyed on site. 				
<p>Surface Disturbing Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation may be required to mitigate residual impacts from authorized actions. The BLM would assess compensation at the Category 1 rate for any proposed projects in the Pakoon WHA. 				
<p>Travel Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New paved roads would not be authorized in the Pakoon WHA. Temporary upgrading of existing roads and construction of new unpaved roads in the WHA could be authorized only on BLM lands where positive benefits would result for desert tortoise or their habitat. • The BLM and/or NPS would maintain or authorize maintenance of existing roads in desert tortoise habitat, except that non-emergency maintenance activities 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>could be conducted from October 15 to March 15. Operators of road graders and other maintenance equipment would be required to attend an educational briefing prior to performing the work. Maintenance activities would be limited to previously disturbed areas, unless cleared by a qualified biologist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM would implement route designation within the Pakoon WHA. Roads targeted for closure would include those that 1) have no purpose, 2) are duplicative or redundant, or 3) are causing high levels of mortality of tortoises. Vehicles would be restricted to existing roads and trails prior to route designation. After designation, vehicles would be restricted to designated routes only. Implementation of the closure/designation plan would include the following actions 1) sign entry portals/major intersections with signs that read "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails", 2) sign all designated routes as open, 3) and sign along designated routes indicating that driving off of designated routes is not permitted. 				
<p><i>Arizona Strip FO (Areas outside desert tortoise ACECs)</i></p>				
<p>Livestock Grazing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cedar Wash Allotment would be available for livestock grazing from October 15 – March 15. Ephemeral extensions to May 15 would be authorized when production exceeds 280 lbs/acre. 	<p>Livestock Grazing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cedar Wash Allotment would be unavailable for livestock grazing. 	<p>Livestock Grazing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cedar Wash Allotment would be available for livestock grazing from October 15 – March 15. Ephemeral extensions to May 15 would be authorized when conditions outlined in Guideline 3-5 of the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health are met. 	<p>Livestock Grazing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cedar Wash Allotment would be available for livestock grazing from October 15 – May 15. 	<p>Same as Alternative C</p>
<p>Lands and Realty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All lands within desert tortoise ACECs and within all other desert tortoise designated critical habitat would be retained. Exchanges or sales of desert tortoise habitat out of public ownership would be limited to parcels identified in the RMP. 	<p>Lands and Realty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific parcels of low density (former category 3) desert tortoise habitat that have little to no potential for self-sustaining tortoise populations have been identified in Appendix 2.M. as eligible for disposal. These parcels occur in the area between the impassable barriers of Interstate 15 and the Virgin River, outside of any ACEC, and would allow for regional growth near Littlefield and Beaver Dam with the least disturbance to desert tortoise. Parcels would be surveyed for special status species and other sensitive resources prior to disposal. The effects of future development on water quality and flows in the Virgin River would be addressed in NEPA documents and ESA consultation prior to disposal. Up to 200 acres not listed in Appendix 2.M or identified for specific purposes in these alternatives would be retained in public ownership unless needed for recreation or public purposes. Disposal proposals under the R&PP Act on lands not identified for disposal would be considered on a case-by-case basis. (See Appendix 2.M and Map 2.7. Also see <i>Acquisitions/Retentions</i> section above for lands exempt from disposals.) Revenues generated from the sale of FLTFA parcels could be used to acquire adjacent lands with high resource values in accordance with the Arizona Statewide Interagency Implementation Agreement. 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM would seek to acquire non-Federal lands in the desert tortoise ACECs from willing sellers through purchase or exchange. • New ROWs through desert tortoise habitat would be routed away from high-density tortoise populations. Linear ROWs would be placed adjacent or parallel to existing ROWs and share vehicular access. • Utilities would be co-located with other utility projects whenever feasible. Utility lines on BLM lands would be designed, located, and constructed so as to avoid attracting desert tortoise predators. • No new landfills or sewage treatment ponds would be authorized in the desert tortoise ACECs. 			
<p>Surface Disturbing Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation may be required to mitigate residual impacts from authorized actions. The BLM would assess compensation at the Category 1 rate for any proposed projects in the Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness Area. 				
<p>Travel Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM would complete a proposal to close roads and designate routes in the desert tortoise ACECs. Roads targeted for closure would include those that 1) have no purpose, 2) are duplicative or redundant, or 3) are causing high levels of mortality of tortoises. Vehicles would be restricted to existing roads and trails prior to route designation. After designation, vehicles would be restricted to designated routes only. Implementation of the closure/designation plan would include the following actions 1) sign entry portals/major intersections with signs that read "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails", 2) sign all designated routes as open, 3) and sign along designated routes indicating that driving off of designated routes is not permitted. • Use of roads constructed for specific non-public purposes on BLM lands, such as access to communication sites, would be limited to administrative use only. • Temporary access routes in desert tortoise habitat created during project construction would be modified as necessary to prevent further use. • New paved roads and highways in desert tortoise habitat or major reconstruction or modifications of existing paved roads through desert tortoise habitat would be fenced with desert tortoise barrier fencing. Culverts, to allow safe passage of tortoises, would be constructed in coordination with Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHA), and USFWS. 				
<p>Minerals Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desert tortoise habitat would remain open to mineral entry under the mining laws. • Special mitigation would be required in mining plans of operation to avoid impacts to desert tortoise in their habitat. • Desert tortoise habitat would remain open to leasing subject to seasonal restrictions and subject to a waivable no surface occupancy stipulation (WNSO). Surface disturbing activity would be limited to the period from October 15 to March 15 under a seasonal restriction. • The BLM would require plans of operations and bonding for any activity above the level of casual use, pursuant to the surface management regulations (43 CFR 3809). The Bureau would approve plans of operation that reduce the chance of take occurring in accordance with these terms and conditions. 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
E. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS – Desert Tortoise				
<i>Arizona Strip FO Desert Tortoise ACECs (Beaver Dam Slope and Virgin Slope ACECs; see Table 2.16. Special Designations.)</i>				
Desert Tortoise Management:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assisting with funding, adaptation, and implementation of monitoring programs, including line-distance sampling or other approved techniques, would continue. • Assisting with funding, inventory, and modeling efforts to develop a habitat map of desert tortoise habitat in the planning area would continue. • Assisting with design, funding, and implementation of research to determine limiting factors for desert tortoise within the planning area would continue. • The BLM/NPS would use various mechanisms of public outreach to inform the public about desert tortoise recovery. These may include interpretive displays, interpretive kiosks, news releases, open houses to answer questions about DWMA/ACEC designation and management, and/or other actions. 				
Vegetation Management:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assisting with design, funding, and implementation of research to determine methods for reducing exotic invasive annual grasses in desert tortoise habitat would continue. 				
Fire Management				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance with design, funding, and implementation of research to determine the effects of chemical fire retardants on the desert tortoise and its habitat would continue. 				
IV. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: NATIVE FISH				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Native Fish				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential habitats, important migration routes, required flows, and water quality would be protected and maintained in lentic and lotic systems in the planning area. • All biologically suitable perennial waters on public lands in the planning area would be occupied by thriving, self-sustaining populations of native fish, as appropriate. • Populations of woundfin minnow and Virgin chub in the planning area would be recovered and delisted. • Virgin spinedace habitat would support viable populations sufficient to preclude the need for federal listing. 			
B. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – Native Fish (See Table 2.16: Special Designations for proposed management.)				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The Virgin River Corridor ACEC for protection of Virgin	The Virgin River Corridor ACEC for protection of Virgin River fishes and threatened desert tortoise would be modified to include only the 100-year floodplain (approx. 2,064 acres). Boundary adjustments would eliminate areas outside of the 100-			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
River fishes and threatened desert tortoise would be maintained at 8,075 acres.	year floodplain previously included in the ACEC. Desert tortoise habitat previously included within this ACEC would be incorporated into and managed as a part of the Beaver Dam Slope or Virgin Slope ACEC. The ACEC would be managed for Virgin River fishes and riparian values.			
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Native Fish				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	<p>Native Fish Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participate in the recovery of Virgin River fishes would continue. • Assistance would be provided in Implementating recovery tasks identified in the Recovery Plan. • Protection from threats would be provided and sufficient habitat would be created/secured to assure maintenance of these populations and/or habitats over time. • Applications for instream flow rights with the Arizona Department of Water Resources in rivers supporting native fish species would continue to be supported. • Riparian area river channels, floodplains, and terraces would be retained in federal ownership. All exchanges that could affect water flows (either groundwater or surface water) would be carefully examined to ensure that development on those lands would not adversely affect riparian habitats. • In cooperation with the USFWS, AGFD, and the Virgin River Fishes Recovery Team, assistance would be provided in efforts to reduce or eradicate non-native fish populations. • In cooperation with the USFWS, AGFD, and the Virgin River Fishes Recovery Team, assistance would be provided with construction and installation of habitat improvement projects to benefit native fish species. The BLM would assist in location and construction of non-native fish barriers at suitable locations along the Virgin River in the Planning Area. • Employees and public users would be educated about Virgin River fishes. 			
<p>Fire Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire management buffer zones between riparian habitats and adjacent upland areas would be established. • Fire management actions within the Virgin River Corridor ACEC would include conservation measures for native fishes as described in Appendix 2.E. 				
<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Native riparian vegetation in floodplains and channels would be retained. • A temporally staged approach would be used in habitats where exotic species are to be removed through chemical or mechanical means, so that some mature habitat remains throughout the restoration period for cover and shade for Virgin River fishes. • Riparian and aquatic habitats for Virgin River fishes would be maintained or enhanced. The establishment of areas of slow/back waters would be promoted. • Regeneration of native species would be promoted in regenerating riparian habitats. Natural reaches of riparian habitat would be restored by restoring intervening degraded segments. In accordance with guideline 3-1 of Standard 3 of the Arizona Standards and Guidelines habitat restoration in riparian areas 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
should not include planting or seeding of nonnative plants. • Vegetation management actions within the Virgin River Corridor ACEC would include conservation measures for native fishes as described in Appendix 2.E.				
N/A	Livestock Grazing Management: • Disturbance, injury, mortality, or other forms of take of Virgin River fishes resulting from grazing by livestock would be minimized or eliminated.			
N/A	Surface Disturbing Activities: • Impact of pesticide use on Virgin River fishes would be determined. • The use of harmful pesticides adjacent to riparian areas would be limited or eliminated. If used, application would be in a manner that avoids drift, according to directions (i.e. not broad applications). • Water diversions and groundwater withdrawals would be managed to maintain streamside vegetation. • Where possible and practicable, physical stresses, such as high salinity or reduced stream flows that favor exotic plants, would be reduced or eliminated. Actions that do not allow for natural stream flow regimes including periodic flood events would not be allowed.			
Lands and Realty: • Net effects of land disposals/exchanges in the Virgin River corridor would be beneficial to Virgin River fishes. All land exchanges or disposals should benefit aquatic and riparian resources by reducing threats to those habitats associated with dewatering and surface disturbance.	Lands and Realty: • Specific parcels identified for disposal would be surveyed for special status species and other sensitive resources prior to disposal. The effects of future development on water quality and flows in the Virgin River would be addressed in NEPA documents and ESA consultation prior to disposal. Revenues generated from the sale of FLTFA parcels could be used to acquire adjacent lands with high resource values in accordance with the Arizona Statewide Interagency Implementation Agreement.			
Lands and Realty: • All acquired lands would not have ground or surface water used or reserved for use by non-federal interests after it is acquired by the government. All existing such uses must be terminated upon acquisition and all rights transferred to the federal government. • Lands to be acquired would have development potential similar to the disposed lands and would be located in similar proximity to the Virgin River or significant tributaries.				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Recreation Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to Virgin River fishes and their habitat from recreational activities would be reduced or eliminated. Recreation that degrades riparian habitat would be prohibited in riparian areas on Bureau land along the Virgin River. 			
N/A	Surface Disturbing Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions that degrade riparian habitat or reduce the potential of the area to support riparian vegetation would be modified, restricted, or prohibited. 			
D. ADMISTRATIVE ACTIONS – Native Fish				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Appropriate monitoring of all riparian areas within the Planning Area would continue, including greenline transects, riparian functionality assessments, etc.			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Monitoring native fish populations in the Paria River would continue in cooperation with USFWS and AGFD.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Assistance in monitoring efforts for native Virgin River fish populations would continue in cooperation with the USFWS, AGFD, and the Virgin River Fishes Recovery Team.			
N/A	Grazing systems, strategies, and intensities for riparian recovery and maintenance would be investigated.			
IV. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: AMPHIBIANS AND AQUATIC INVERTEBRATES				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Amphibians and Aquatic Invertebrates				
<i>Common to all Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essential habitats, important migration routes, required flows, and water quality would be protected and maintained in lentic and lotic systems in the Planning Area. No net loss would occur in the quality and quantity of suitable habitat for endemic amphibians and aquatic invertebrate species within the Planning Area. All biologically suitable perennial waters on public lands in the Planning Area would be occupied by thriving, self-sustaining populations of native, endemic amphibians and aquatic invertebrate species, as appropriate. New introduced (or re-introduced) populations of relict leopard frog would increase to the point of being viable and self-sustaining. Relict leopard frogs would be recovered and managed in accordance with the Conservation Agreement to maintain viable populations throughout their range. 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Amphibians and Aquatic Invertebrates				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions and/or augmentations of relict leopard frogs could be authorized at suitable habitat locations, such as Pakoon Springs and Tassi Springs. Introductions and augmentations would be coordinated closely with the Relict Leopard Frog Conservation Team, AGFD, USFWS, counties, tribes, and adjacent land owners. Introductions could be made in areas where doing so is not detrimental to viability of populations of other native species. • The final Conservation Agreement and Rangewide Conservation Assessment and Strategy for Relict Leopard Frogs would be implemented. 			
Actions that degrade riparian habitat or reduce the potential of the area to support riparian vegetation would be modified, restricted, or prohibited.				
V. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: SPECIAL STATUS RAPTORS				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special status raptor populations would be healthy and self-sustaining throughout their range. • Habitat areas for special status raptors would provide sufficient forage and cover to support thriving populations of raptors. • No net loss would occur in the quality and quantity of suitable habitat for special status raptors within the Planning Area. • Potential roosting and nesting sites would be abundant. • Riparian areas would be in proper functioning condition and be of sufficient quantity and quality to provide adequate foraging areas for Bald Eagles, Peregrine Falcon, Common Clack Hawk, and other special status raptors. • Rodent populations, as a prey base, within the Planning Area would be abundant. • Bald Eagles and Mexican Spotted Owls would be recovered and delisted. • The experimental non-essential population of California Condor would be at or above 150 individuals, viable, and stable to increasing in number. • Peregrine Falcon, Ferruginous Hawks, Common Black Hawks, Northern Goshawks, and Burrowing Owls would be sufficiently abundant so that there would be no need to list these species. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – Special Status Raptors				
a. Common to All Special Status Raptors				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Special Status Raptor Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority special status raptors would include Bald Eagles, California Condors, Mexican Spotted Owls, Peregrine Falcon, 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	Burrowing Owls, Ferruginous Hawks, Northern Goshawks, and Common Black Hawks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special status raptor habitats on state and federal lands in the Planning Area would be preserved, protected, and managed for population maintenance and expansion. • A policy of “no net loss” of special status raptor habitat would be maintained. • Occupied special status raptor habitats would be protected as a first priority. • The BLM, NPS, and AGFD would determine population numbers, distribution, and trends of special status raptors. • The effects of use pesticides and herbicides on special status raptors in the Planning Areas would be assessed. 			
N/A	Vegetation Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing and potential habitat for special status raptor population continuance and expansion would be identified, protected, and improved. Land use practices and developments which alter the character of the habitat that make it suitable for special status raptors would be limited, modified, or relocated. • Suitable and potential habitats would be maintained and upgraded to insure they remain attractive to special status raptors. • The use of harmful pesticides or herbicides would be reduced or eliminated within one mile of special status raptor use areas. If used, application would occur in a manner that avoids drift, according to directions (i.e. not broad applications). • Suitable habitats for special status raptors in the Planning Area would be maintained and increased. Suitable structural characteristics may be achieved through restoring, maintaining, enhancing, and creating habitat. • Suitable habitats would be managed so their suitable characteristics are not eliminated or degraded. Habitats would be managed for large, contiguous blocks, rather than for small fragmented areas. Connectivity to currently isolated suitable sites would be enhanced. Use of buffer zones between suitable and unsuitable areas would be encouraged. 			
Surface Disturbing Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions that would adversely affect special status raptors during their nesting period could be subject to stipulations, mitigation, or may not be approved. 				
Recreation Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to special status raptors and/or their habitat from recreational activities would be reduced or eliminated. • The presence and intensity of allowable recreational activities within special status raptor habitats would be assessed. Seasonal closures of specifically designated recreation activities could be considered where appropriate. 				
b. Bald Eagle				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Bald Eagle Habitat Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance would be provided in implementation of recovery tasks identified in the Recovery Plan. 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas for construction of roost and perch poles in the Planning Area would be identified to replace natural roosts and perches lost by development or decay. • Patterns of movement for wintering Eagles, including fledglings, immatures, and adults, would be determined. Food habits for Bald Eagles within the Planning Area would be determined. 			
N/A	<p>Surface Disturbing Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM and NPS could limit, modify, or relocate authorized and/or permitted activities within 0.5 miles of active Bald Eagle wintering roosts. • Projects and activities causing disturbance to roosting Bald Eagles should be avoided from October 15 to April 15. The BLM and NPS would implement conservation measures for protection of Bald Eagles as defined in Appendix 2.E. 			
c. Mexican Spotted Owl				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<p>Mexican Spotted Owl Habitat Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participate in the recovery of the Mexican Spotted Owl would continue. Assistance would be provided in implementation of recovery tasks identified in the Recovery Plan. 			
N/A	<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canyon and forest habitats with the potential to support Mexican Spotted Owl would be managed for maintenance or enhancement of the habitat attributes that make them suitable. 			
N/A	<p>Surface Disturbing Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use practices and developments which alter the character of the habitat that make it suitable for Mexican Spotted Owls would be limited, modified, or relocated • The BLM and NPS would implement conservation measures for protection of Mexican Spotted Owl as defined in Appendix 2.E. 			
d. California Condor				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<p>California Condor Habitat Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM and NPS would continue to actively participate in the recovery of the California Condor. • The BLM and NPS would assist in implementation of recovery tasks identified in the Recovery Plan. • Restoration of California Condor into historic habitats in northern Arizona would be continued in cooperation with the Peregrine Fund, AGFD, USFWS, California Condor Recovery Program, and others. Supplemental releases would be authorized. 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The population objective for California Condor would be to maintain a self-sustaining population with a positive growth rate of at least 150 individuals with at least 15 breeding pairs. Population objectives would be modified or changed in accordance with the recovery plan for the species. The BLM and NPS would identify and, where possible, reduce or eliminate sources of lead contamination for Condors within the Planning Area. The BLM and NPS would encourage voluntary use of non-lead ammunition in the Planning Area. 			
Vegetation Management:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protective measures for California Condors that are contained in the July 2004 “Recommended Protection Measures for Pesticide Applications in the Southwest Region of the USFWS” when conducting chemical treatments would be implemented. California Condor foraging habitat would be maintained. 				
Surface Disturbing Activities				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BLM and NPS would implement conservation measures for protection of California Condors as defined in Appendix 2.E 				
Surface Disturbing Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM-permitted activities within known or occupied nesting areas of endangered or threatened raptors would be restricted. 	Surface Disturbing Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the 10(j) area, the BLM would not restrict authorized and/or permitted activities solely for the benefit of California Condors. Persons engaged in authorized or permitted actions that encounter a Condor would be requested not to haze the birds, but to notify the BLM or the Peregrine Fund. Administrative or other actions implemented by the BLM could be subject to additional stipulations and conservation measures as described in Appendix 2.E. 			
e. Peregrine Falcon				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Peregrine Falcon Habitat Management:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active participation would continue in the post-delisting recovery monitoring of Peregrine Falcons in the Planning Area. Actions that would adversely affect nesting peregrines between March 1 and August 1 could be subject to stipulations, mitigation, or may not be approved. 				
N/A	Surface Disturbing Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorized actions, including construction projects, to areas more than 0.5 miles of known Peregrine Falcon during the active nesting season between April 15 and August 15 would be limited, modified, or relocated. The BLM and NPS would implement conservation measures for protection of Peregrine Falcon as defined in Appendix 2.E. 			
f. Burrowing Owls				
<i>Parashant</i>				
No species-specific augmentations of Burrowing Owl would be planned or implemented.	Burrowing Owl populations would be augmented by installing artificial nest burrows and releasing owls displaced by surface		Same as Alternatives A and B	

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
		disturbing activities from other parts of their range. Priority sites for release include the Pakoon Basin.		
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
No species-specific augmentations of any migratory bird populations would be planned.		Burrowing Owl populations would be augmented by installing artificial nest burrows and releasing owls displaced by surface disturbing activities from other parts of their range. Priority sites for release include the St. George Basin, Clayhole Valley, Lower Hurricane Valley, the area east of Kanab Creek, and House Rock Valley.	Burrowing Owl populations would be augmented by installing artificial nest burrows and releasing owls displaced by surface disturbing activities from other parts of their range. Priority sites for release include the St. George Basin, Clayhole Valley, Lower Hurricane Valley, and the area east of Kanab Creek.	Same as Alternative C
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS – Special Status Raptors				
a. Common to All Special Status Raptors				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Potential raptor habitat would be inventoried.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM and NPS would continue to survey and/or monitor potential habitat for special status raptors within the Planning Area. • The BLM and NPS would continue to maintain a database of raptor observations. • The BLM and NPS would continue to identify roost locations. • A program of public conservation education and planning directed towards preservation of special status raptor habitats would be carried out. 			
b. Bald Eagle				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important foraging habitat of Bald Eagles within the Planning Area would be located and mapped. • Bald Eagle habitat assessments would be continued at least every third year. • Bald Eagle occurrence surveys would be continued at least every other year at all suitable habitat locations. 			

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
c. Peregrine Falcon				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
The BLM and NPS would cooperate and assist with post-delisting monitoring efforts for Peregrine Falcon within the Planning Area.				
VI. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: RIPARIAN DEPENDENT SPECIAL STATUS BIRDS				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS – Riparian-Dependent Special Status Bird Species				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No net loss would occur in the quality and quantity of suitable habitat for riparian-dependent special status bird species within the Planning Area. • Occupied habitats would be protected as a first priority. • Riparian areas would be in proper functioning condition and be of sufficient quantity and quality to provide adequate foraging areas for SW Flycatcher, Yuma Clapper Rail, Yellow-billed Cuckoo, and other special status birds. • SW Flycatcher and Yuma Clapper Rail would be recovered and delisted. • Riparian areas that could physically support SW Flycatcher habitats due to floodplain width and gradient would attain the vegetation structure, plant species diversity, density, and canopy cover to be suitable habitat. • Riparian vegetation would be sufficiently dense and structurally complex to minimize or eliminate the effects of SW Flycatcher predators and preclude Brown-headed Cowbirds from finding SW Flycatcher nests. • Cattail and dense marsh habitats would be abundant and provide habitat for Yuma Clapper Rails. • Cottonwood gallery forests would be abundant and provide habitat for Yellow-billed Cuckoos. • Potential roosting and nesting sites for riparian dependent special status birds would be abundant. 			
B. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – Riparian-Dependent Special Status Bird Species (See Table 2.16 Special Designations for ACEC Management.)				
a. Southwestern Willow Flycatcher				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of endangered SW Flycatcher habitat would be designated at 13,148 acres.	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of endangered SW Flycatcher habitat would be designated at 9,211 acres.	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of endangered SW Flycatcher habitat would not be designated because the isolated nature of this area provides sufficient protection.	Same as Alternative B

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
a. Common to All Riparian-Dependent Special Status Bird Species				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<p>Riparian-Dependent Special Status Bird Species and Habitat Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection from threats would be provided and sufficient habitat to assure maintenance of populations and/or habitats over time would be created/secured. • Water diversions and groundwater withdrawals would be managed to maintain streamside vegetation. • Impacts of pesticide use on riparian-dependent special status bird species’ reproduction adjacent to riparian areas would be determined. • The BLM, NPS, and AGFD would determine population numbers, distribution, and trends of riparian-dependent special status bird species. • The use of harmful pesticides adjacent to riparian areas would be limited or eliminated. If used, application would occur in a manner that avoids drift, according to directions (i.e. not broad applications). 				
<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian areas would be managed to achieve and/or maintained in proper functioning condition in accordance with prescriptions described in the vegetation management section of this document (See Table 2.4: Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management). • Suitable nesting riparian habitats for riparian-dependent special status bird species would be maintained or increased. Suitable structural characteristics may be achieved through restoring, maintaining, enhancing, and creating habitat. Management would aim for large, contiguous blocks of habitat rather than for small fragmented areas. Connectivity to currently isolated suitable sites would be enhanced. The use of buffer zones between riparian habitats and adjacent upland areas would be encouraged. Establishment of areas of slow/back waters would be promoted. • Regeneration of native vegetation in regenerating riparian habitats would be promoted. Natural reaches of riparian habitat would be restored by restoring intervening degraded segments. • Occupied, suitable, and potential breeding habitat would be increased and improved. • Restoration of native riparian vegetation would continue in sites that have potential to support future breeding habitat for riparian-dependent special status bird species. • Support would continue for applications for instream flow rights with the AZ Department of Water Resources in rivers supporting riparian-dependent species. • Native riparian vegetation in floodplains or channels would be retained. • Protective measures for riparian-dependent special status bird species that are contained in the July 2004 “Recommended Protection Measures for Pesticide Applications in The Southwest Region of the USFWS” would be implemented when conducting chemical treatments. • The BLM and NPS would implement conservation measures for protection of riparian-dependent special status bird species as defined in Appendix 2.E. 				
<p>Livestock Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disturbance, injury, mortality, or other forms of take of riparian-dependent special status bird species’ resulting from grazing by livestock would be minimized or eliminated. 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grazing systems, strategies, and intensities for riparian recovery and maintenance would be investigated. • Direct effects of livestock grazing on SW Flycatchers and their habitat would be investigated. 				
<p>Lands and Realty :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net effects of land disposals/ exchanges in Virgin River corridor would be beneficial to Virgin R. fishes. All land exchanges or disposals should benefit aquatic and riparian resources by reducing threats to those habitats associated with dewatering and surface disturbance. 	<p>Lands and Realty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific parcels identified for disposal would be surveyed for special status species and other sensitive resources prior to disposal. The effects of future development on water quality and flows in the Virgin River would be addressed in NEPA documents and ESA consultation prior to disposal. Revenues generated from the sale of FLTFA parcels could be used to acquire adjacent lands with high resource values in accordance with the Arizona Statewide Interagency Implementation Agreement. 			
<p>Lands and Realty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian area river channels, floodplains, and terraces would be retained in federal ownership. All exchanges that could affect water flows (either groundwater or surface water) would be carefully examined to ensure that development on those lands not affect riparian habitats. • Lands to be acquired would have development potential similar to the disposed lands and would be located in similar proximity to the Virgin River or significant tributaries. • All acquired lands would not have ground or surface water used or reserved for use by non-Federal interests after it is acquired by the government. All existing such uses must be terminated upon acquisition and all rights transferred to the Federal government. 				
<p>Travel Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads and trails used by off-highway vehicles within riparian areas, or areas with the potential to support riparian vegetation would be closed and rehabilitated. 				
<p>Surface Disturbing Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible and practicable, physical stresses, such as high salinity or reduced stream flows that favor exotic plants, would be reduced or eliminated. Actions that would not allow for natural stream flow regimes including periodic flood events would not be authorized. • Direct impacts that topple or otherwise destroy nests would be reduced. 				
<p>Recreation Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to riparian-dependent special status bird species and/or their habitat from recreational activities would be reduced or eliminated. Recreation that degrades riparian habitat would be prohibited in riparian areas in the Planning Areas. Restrictions could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing or eliminating recreational fires. 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confining camping areas. • Locating recreational activity areas away from suitable or potential SW Flycatcher habitat. • Minimizing trash, debris, and other attractants to scavengers, predators, and Brown-headed Cowbirds. 				
<p>b. Southwestern Willow Flycatcher</p>				
<p><i>Common to All Planning Areas</i></p>				
<p>SW Flycatcher Habitat Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation would continue in the recovery of the SW Flycatcher. Assistance would be provided in the implementation of recovery tasks identified in the Recovery Plan. • The BLM would continue to identify and evaluate areas where concentrations of Brown-headed Cowbirds occur on public lands in the Planning Area. • The BLM would evaluate ways to reduce Cowbird concentrations. • Cowbird management programs would be developed and implemented where parasitism rates are greater than 20%. Effectiveness of Cowbird trapping at present locations would be evaluated by monitoring nests for parasitism and reproductive success. Reconsideration would be given to assessment of habitat quality or other threats if Cowbird control measures do not increase number of breeding Flycatchers. 				
<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable Flycatcher habitat should be managed so that its suitable characteristics are not eliminated or degraded. Management would be for large, contiguous blocks of habitat rather than for small fragmented areas. Connectivity to currently isolated suitable sites would be enhanced. The use of buffer zones between riparian habitats and adjacent upland areas would be encouraged. Establishment of areas of slow/back waters would be promoted. • Potential habitat would be managed to achieve structural and vegetation characteristics necessary to support increasing numbers of breeding SW Flycatcher pairs within 5-20 years. Potential Flycatcher habitat should be managed to allow natural regeneration (through natural processes) into suitable habitat as rapidly as possible. • The use vs. availability of invasive exotic species, such as tamarisk, by SW Flycatcher at occupied nesting sites would be determined. • Native riparian vegetation would be retained in floodplains or channels. • At native dominated sites, tamarisk would be retained in occupied Flycatcher habitat and, where appropriate, in suitable but unoccupied habitat, unless there is a trend for steady increase of tamarisk. • The BLM and NPS would implement conservation measures for protection of SW Flycatcher as defined in Appendix 2.E. 				
<p>Livestock Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock would be excluded from suitable Flycatcher habitat (whether occupied or unoccupied) during the growing season (bud break to leaf drop). This includes portions of the following allotments: the River Pasture of Lambing Allotment and Kanab Creek. Unsurveyed suitable habitat should be considered occupied. If livestock are excluded using fencing, fencing should be inspected and maintained annually. 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In potential habitat, it would be determined if livestock grazing is a major stressor or is otherwise preventing development of the habitat into suitable Flycatcher habitat. Where this is the case, livestock grazing would be excluded from potential SW Flycatcher nesting habitat during the growing season (bud-break to leaf drop). 				
<p>c. Yuma Clapper Rail</p>				
<p><i>Common to All Planning Areas</i></p>				
<p>Yuma Clapper Rail Habitat Management:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in the recovery of the Yuma Clapper Rail would continue. Assistance would be provided in implementation of recovery tasks identified in the Recovery Plan. 				
<p>Vegetation Management:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupied Yuma Clapper Rail habitats would be protected as a first priority. Fresh water marsh habitat suitable for Yuma Clapper Rail nesting would be maintained, enhanced, restored, and/or created. A mosaic of uneven aged marsh vegetation would be maintained. Mechanical manipulation would be avoided during the breeding season (April-June). Management of potential habitat would be aimed at achieving structural and vegetation characteristics necessary to support increasing numbers of breeding Yuma Clapper Rails. Potential habitat should be managed to allow natural regeneration (through natural processes) into suitable habitat as rapidly as possible. Cattail marshes would be retained in occupied Clapper Rail habitat and, where appropriate, in suitable but unoccupied habitat. 				
<p>Livestock Grazing Management:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbance, injury, mortality, or other forms of take of Yuma Clapper Rail resulting from grazing by livestock would be minimized or eliminated. Livestock grazing would be excluded from occupied suitable Yuma Clapper Rail nesting habitat. In potential habitat, it would be determined if livestock grazing is a major stressor or is otherwise preventing development of suitable Clapper Rail habitat. Where this is the case, livestock grazing would be excluded from potential Clapper Rail habitat during the growing season (bud-break to leaf drop). 				
<p>d. Yellow-billed Cuckoo</p>				
<p><i>Common to All Planning Areas</i></p>				
<p>Yellow-billed Cuckoo Habitat Management:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in actions to prevent the need to list Yellow-billed Cuckoo would continue. 				
<p>Vegetation Management:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mature cottonwood-willow gallery forest habitat suitable for Yellow-billed Cuckoo nesting would be maintained, enhanced, restored, and/or created. Large, contiguous blocks of habitat (>15 ha) would be managed in conjunction with removal of competing exotic species (i.e. salt cedar). The use of buffer zones between riparian habitats and adjacent development would be encouraged. Corridors between “islands” of suitable habitat would be established to allow natural dispersal and recolonization of historic habitats. 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential habitat would be managed to achieve structural and vegetation characteristics necessary to support increasing numbers of breeding Yellow-billed Cuckoo. Potential habitat should be managed to allow natural regeneration (through natural processes) into suitable habitat as rapidly as possible. Retain mature cottonwood-willow gallery forests in Yellow-billed Cuckoo habitat. 				
<p>Livestock Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbance, injury, or mortality of Yellow-billed Cuckoo resulting from grazing by livestock would be minimized or eliminated. Grazing impacts on cottonwood and willow seedlings in riparian systems would be closely monitored and grazing would be reduced or removed when seedlings are being impacted. 				
<p>Recreation Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intense and repeated human disturbance would be avoided at nesting areas from 15 May through 1 September. 				
<p>D. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS</p>				
<p>a. Southwestern Willow Flycatcher</p>				
<p><i>Common to All Planning Areas</i></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification and mapping of suitable and potential habitat areas for SW Flycatchers would continue. The BLM would continue to maintain a database of SW Flycatcher observations. Habitat conditions in suitable and potential SW Flycatcher habitat would continue to be monitored at least every third year in order to determine best management of riparian areas. Appropriate monitoring of all riparian areas within the Planning Area, including greenline transects, riparian functionality assessments, etc., would continue SW Flycatcher occurrence surveys would continue at least every other year at all suitable habitat locations. Nest monitoring would continue to determine nesting success, parasitism rates, and predation rates. Baseline data on Cowbird parasitism would be collected. Employees and public users would be educated about SW Flycatchers. 				
<p>b. Yuma Clapper Rail</p>				
<p><i>Arizona Strip FO</i></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification and mapping of suitable and potential habitat areas for Yuma Clapper Rails would continue. Yuma Clapper Rail occurrence surveys would continue at least every other year at all suitable habitat locations. Monitoring of habitat conditions in Yuma Clapper Rail habitat would continue at least every third year in order to determine how best to manage riparian habitats to protect this species. Appropriate monitoring of all riparian areas within the Planning Area would continue, including greenline transects, riparian functionality assessments, etc. A program of public conservation education and planning directed towards preservation of Yuma Clapper Rail habitat would continue. 				

TABLE 2.5: SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
c. Yellow-billed Cuckoo				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM and NPS would continue to maintain updated maps of Yellow-billed Cuckoo habitat in the Planning Areas. • Support and Participation for Yellow-billed Cuckoo survey and monitoring efforts on lands within the Planning Area would continue. • Habitat conditions in Yellow-billed Cuckoo habitat would continue to be monitored in order to be able to determine how best to manage these riparian areas to protect this and other riparian dependent species. • The BLM would continue to maintain a database of Yellow-billed Cuckoo observations. 			

Map 2.3: Vegetation Habitat Areas - Proposed Plan

Map 2.4: Wildlife Habitat Areas - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.6: WILD BURROS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. WILD BURROS				
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Parashant</i>				
The Herd Management Level would continue to be set at zero on BLM lands. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species). Wild horse and burros would not be authorized on NPS lands.				

TABLE 2.7: CULTURAL RESOURCES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant cultural resources, including Monument objects, would be identified, conserved, protected, stabilized or restored, and maintained in good or better condition to ensure they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations. • Imminent threats and potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration or potential conflict with other resource uses would be reduced (FLPMA Sec. 103, National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Sections 106 and 110 (a) (2)) by ensuring that all land uses and resource uses initiated or authorized by the BLM comply with Section 106 of the NHPA in accordance with the BLM’s National Cultural Resources Programmatic Agreement and Arizona Protocol. • All sites on BLM lands would be managed according to the DFCs of their use allocation(s) (See Appendix 2.J). • Preservation/restoration would preserve existing original work and maintain it by restoration, replacement, or repair. • Imminent threats from deterioration and potential conflicts with other resource uses on NPS lands would be reduced, mitigated or eliminated. All actions potentially impacting cultural resources would be assessed via compliance with section 106 of the NHPA and Director’s Order 28 to achieve DFC’s. 				
B. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS				
a. Areas of Critical Environmental Concerns (See Table 2-16. Special Designations for ACEC Management)				
<i>Parashant</i>				
The following ACECs would be maintained: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nampaweap at 535 acres • Witch Pool at 279 acres 	The following ACEC designations would be revoked because Monument status provides protection of cultural resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nampaweap (535 acres) • Witch Pool (279 acres) 			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
See Special Designation Section 2.8I for specific decisions and Appendix 2.K for Values, Relevance, and Importance Criteria for each ACEC.				
The Little Black Mountain ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be maintained at 241 acres. (See Table 2-16. Special Designations for ACEC Management)				
The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be maintained at 2,464 acres.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be reduced to 2,058 acres.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be reduced to 1,986 acres.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be revoked because route designation provides protection.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be increased to 3,444 acres.

TABLE 2.7: CULTURAL RESOURCES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN						
The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be maintained at 8,262 acres.	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be enlarged to 17,744 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be reduced to 4,431 acres.	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC designation for protection of cultural resources would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be enlarged to 19,248 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.						
The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be maintained at 5,095 acres.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be enlarged to 9,231 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be reduced to 2,575 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC designation for protection of cultural resources would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources would be enlarged to 9,310 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.						
The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be maintained at 11,012 acres.	The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be enlarged to 102,141 acres.	The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be enlarged to 11,926 acres.		The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be enlarged to 12,105 acres						
N/A	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be designated at 13,146 acres.	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be designated at 9,211 acres.	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would not be designated.	Same as Alternative B						
C. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS										
a. Public Use Sites (See Appendix 2.J for management emphasis for sites allocated to public use)										
<i>Parashant</i>										
<p>The following sites would continue to be managed for public use:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Nampaweap</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Uinkaret Pueblo</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sawmill Site</td> <td>Witch Pool</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Temple Trail</td> <td>Tassi Ranch and Waring Ranch</td> </tr> </table>					Nampaweap	Uinkaret Pueblo	Sawmill Site	Witch Pool	Temple Trail	Tassi Ranch and Waring Ranch
Nampaweap	Uinkaret Pueblo									
Sawmill Site	Witch Pool									
Temple Trail	Tassi Ranch and Waring Ranch									

TABLE 2.7: CULTURAL RESOURCES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	The following additional sites would be allocated to public use: Grand Gulch Mine Lower Kent Ranch Pine Ranch Oak Grove Cabin			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
The following sites would continue to be managed for public use: Honeymoon Trail Dominguez/Escalante Trail West Bench Pueblo				
N/A	The following additional sites would be allocated to public use: Maze Site Sun Valley Mine Old Spanish National Historic Trail (NHT)			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The following sites would continue to be managed for public use: Little Black Mountain Temple Trail Paiute Cave Dominguez/Escalante Trail Honeymoon Trail				
N/A	The following additional site would be allocated to public use:			Old Spanish NHT
D. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Historic structures that do not merit preservation because of minimal significance, advanced deterioration, or excessive cost would be recorded and allowed to deteriorate. Some removal of hazardous elements would be allowed for safety and to avoid an attractive nuisance.				
N/A	Geocache sites would be prohibited in cultural sites including, but not limited to, archaeological sites, alcoves, rock shelters, cultural landscapes, traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and historic sites.			
E. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Proactive research, protection, and inventories with universities, avocational and service groups, site stewards, tribes, and communities would be used to gain a better understanding of cultural resources for present and future management and protection.				
Scientific study to gain knowledge on the full array of cultural resources in the Monuments would be allowed in order to fulfill regional research objectives and to fill regional data gaps identified in Altschul and Fairley (1989), when possible. Such studies could include ethnographic and oral histories, historic and landscape studies, archaeological studies, and ethnobotanical and environmental studies				
Geographic and archaeological scientific inventories would be continued based on imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, potential conflict with other resource uses, and the probability for unrecorded significant resources.				
Archives and museum collections would be located, inventoried, and managed to ensure accessibility and use for research, documentation, and public interpretation.				

TABLE 2.7: CULTURAL RESOURCES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Properties eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be nominated.				
N/A	TCPs would be identified and associated socio-cultural values would be documented.			
N/A	The Arizona Site Steward Program, service groups, and other volunteers would be supported in order to monitor resource conditions, assist in resource protection, assist in project work, aid in effective land management, and to serve as advocates and stewards of BLM and NPS missions to protect and conserve cultural resources.			
N/A	Non-destructive research proposals such as inventory, intensive site mapping, Historic American Building Survey (HABS)/Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation of historic structures, cultural landscapes, and other significant historic properties, and scaled rock art recording would be pursued through interagency cooperation, grants, contracts, and other funding sources.			
N/A	Cooperative management agreements would be developed with the neighboring federal agencies, local and regional American Indian tribes and communities, institutions of higher learning, and/or other agencies or groups to improve the efficiency and quality of site management.			
N/A	Databases, maps, site, and inventory records would be maintained to current professional standards.			
N/A	Databases and finder guides that help to locate, use, and organize archives and museum collections would be established.			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Priority geographic and historic areas for new field inventory would include riparian first terrace locations, woodlands, Shivwits Plateau, and wilderness areas.			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Priority geographic and historic areas for new field inventory would include the Paria Canyon, Paria Plateau, House Rock Valley, wilderness areas, and areas with high concentrations of visitors.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Priority geographic and historic areas for new field inventory would include the first terrace above riparian areas, woodlands, the vicinity of Johnson Springs, Shinarump Plateau, Lost Spring Mountain, Yellowstone Mesa, House Rock Valley, current and potential high visitor use areas, and wilderness areas.			
F. IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Protective measures would be taken to preserve significant sites, such as monitoring through patrol, signing, fencing, data recovery to mitigate vandalism, and stabilizing undamaged deposits, and preserving at risk features such as standing walls or historic structures.				

TABLE 2.7: CULTURAL RESOURCES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Interpretation of and education about previous human occupation and use of the area would be accomplished using appropriate sites and methods.			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	The following implementation actions would occur at Tassi Ranch and Springs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historic irrigation ditch system would be maintained to allow for preservation of Grand Wash Spring snail, an endemic species. • The historic landscape would be managed so that it maintains historic and ecological integrity. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.) • The Tassi Ranch cultural landscape would be nominated for listing on the NRHP. • A cyclic maintenance program would continue. 			
N/A	The following implementation actions would occur at Waring Ranch and Regional Cultural Landscape: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Waring Ranch NRHP listing would be broadened to encompass the entire Kelly Point ranching landscape (Pine Ranch to Kelly Point). • Other features associated with Kelly Point ranching landscape would be examined and assessed for future stabilizing efforts. • Condition assessment and stabilization of outlying cultural resources would continue to be conducted. 			
N/A	The Grand Gulch Mine buildings, Oak Grove Cabin, Pine Ranch, Lower Kent Ranch, and other historic properties would be mapped, stabilized, signed, and interpreted as they are identified, documented, and evaluated.			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Development of West Bench Pueblo Public Use Site would be pursued and would include stabilization and rerouting of the current road through the site, data recovery efforts, and construction of a trail, interpretive signs, and a small parking area for day use only.			
N/A	“The Maze” Rock art site would be developed with a backcountry access trail and off-site interpretive signing.			
N/A	The Sun Valley Mine Public Use Site would be developed for public use, including reconstruction of head frame, construction of a bat gate, and interpretive signing. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.)			
G. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	All implementation actions would be contingent upon the outcome of Sec 106 consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and would not proceed until that process was completed.			

TABLE 2.7: CULTURAL RESOURCES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
III. RESOURCES OF TRADITIONAL IMPORTANCE TO AMERICAN INDIANS				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific information on ancestral and traditional cultural places on the Arizona Strip would be protected to the extent allowable by law and, when appropriate, interpreted for the public. • A good working relationship would be maintained with the Kaibab Paiutes, the Paiute Tribe of Utah, the Moapa Paiute Tribe, the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe, the San Juan Paiute Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Havasupai Tribe, and the Navajo Nation, the latter being accomplished particularly through specific affected local chapters (Bodaway/Gap, Cameron, Coalmine, Coppermine, LeChee, and Tuba City). • TCPs of importance, including Monument objects, and associated with American Indians whose cultural memory, traditions, and lives are closely associated with the Planning Area would be nominated to the NRHP. • American Indians with cultural and historic ties to the Planning Area would have access to and use of sites allocated to traditional use, consistent with laws, regulations, and authorities. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Tribes would be consulted to determine limitations for use on sites allocated to Traditional Use areas.			
N/A	Fees would not apply on BLM lands to American Indians for the collection of non-commercial, personal use quantities of herbals, medicines, traditional use items, or items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes.			
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Tribes and individual members of tribes with cultural and historic ties to the Arizona Strip would be consulted, according to the provisions specified in Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), NHPA, and pertinent Executive Orders.			
N/A	Mutually acceptable methods of protecting and preserving areas of sacred and traditional importance would be adopted.			

TABLE 2.8: VISUAL RESOURCES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. VISUAL RESOURCES				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public lands would be managed in a manner which would protect the quality of the scenic (visual) values of these lands (43 U.S.C. 1701, Section 102 (a) (8)). Esthetically pleasing surroundings would be assured for all Americans (43 U.S.C. 4321, Section 101 (b)). The region’s scenic beauty, open space landscapes, and other high-quality visual resources, including Monument objects, would be maintained within the Planning Area. The existing “footprint” of cultural landscapes (facilities, projects, and improvements) would generally be maintained. 				
N/A	Dark night sky conditions that are affected primarily by natural light sources would be maintained.			
<p>There are four visual resource management (VRM) classes. These classes would establish the following objectives, which also provide visual management standards for the design and development of future projects and for rehabilitation of existing projects in the Planning Areas (see Appendix 2.L: VRM Classes).</p> <p>Class 1 - The objective of this class is to preserve the existing character of the landscape. This class provides for natural ecological changes; however, it does not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change of the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention.</p> <p>Class 2 - The objective of this class is to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.</p> <p>Class 3 - The objective of this class is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.</p> <p>Class 4 - The objective of this class is to provide for management activities that require major modification of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements.</p>				
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual resources identified in the Monument proclamations, such as <i>impressive landscapes; engaging scenery; natural splendor; colorful vistas; rugged and beautiful canyons; colorful, lava-capped strata; spectacular escarpments; stunning river; spectacular geology; and colorful banding</i> would be protected. 				
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
The following VRM classes would be designated under each alternative to support management of the various other resources, such as designated and proposed wilderness, NHT segments, primary travel corridors, areas where wilderness characteristics would be maintained, Virgin River Gorge Recreation Withdrawal,				

TABLE 2.8: VISUAL RESOURCES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
certain special recreation management areas, Great Western and Arizona Trail Corridors, various ACECs, and important watershed and wetland areas (Map 2.5).				
<i>Parashant</i>				
(BLM lands only)	(BLM and NPS lands)	(BLM and NPS lands)	(BLM and NPS lands)	(BLM and NPS lands)
Class I: 95,239 acres	Class I: 431,216 acres	Class I: 394,686 acres	Class I: 283,289 acres	Class I: 291,219 acres
Class II: 348,726 acres	Class II: 617,089 acres	Class II: 393,975 acres	Class II: 474,556 acres	Class II: 592,699 acres
Class III: 38,316 acres	Class III: 0 acres	Class III: 259,644 acres	Class III: 290,460 acres	Class III: 164,389 acres
Class IV: 356,820 acres	Class IV: 12 acres	Class IV: 12 acres	Class IV: 12 acres	Class IV: 11 acres
<i>Vermilion</i>				
Class I: 89,829 acres	Class I: 127,274 acres	Class I: 106,205 acres	Class I: 89,829 acres	Class I: 89,825 acres
Class II: 203,859 acres	Class II: 166,406 acres	Class II: 186,847 acres	Class II: 203,850 acres	Class II: 203,851 acres
Class III: 0 acres	Class III: 0 acres	Class III: 625 acres	Class III: 0 acres	Class III: 0 acres
Class IV: 0 acres	Class IV: 12 acres	Class IV: 12 acres	Class IV: 12 acres	Class IV: 12 acres
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Class I: 82,828 acres	Class I: 91,537 acres	Class I: 80,760 acres	Class I: 80,760 acres	Class I: 80,760 acres
Class II: 573,243 acres	Class II: 437,256 acres	Class II: 202,092 acres	Class II: 164,932 acres	Class II: 368,032 acres
Class III: 374,725 acres	Class III: 1,379,468 acres	Class III: 1,625,409 acres	Class III: 1,656,576 acres	Class III: 1,459,374 acres
Class IV: 950,227 acres	Class IV: 72,803 acres	Class IV: 72,803 acres	Class IV: 78,797 acres	Class IV: 72,897 acres
During the life of the Plan, any areas designated as Wilderness or classified as “wild” as part of a national wild and scenic river designation would, upon designation, be re-designated as VRM Class I.				
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Actions would continue to be implemented to restore and/or maintain natural conditions or appearance in all areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the extent opportunities are practicable, extreme visual contrast created by past management practices or human activities would be minimized. Examples could include ROW amendments, mineral material sites, abandoned mines, and areas impacted by unauthorized off-road driving, etc. Basic criteria for “practicality” could include 1) location (would the site be in an area with high visual sensitivity and in a foreground/midground distance zone as mapped in the visual resource inventory?), 2) feasibility (would it be physically possible to achieve a desired level of restoration success, as measured by use of the contrast rating process?), and 3) cost (would the cost be reasonable and is funding obtainable?). 			

TABLE 2.8: VISUAL RESOURCES

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
2. Allowable Uses				
a. New Projects and Activities				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Ecosystem restoration projects would ensure that visual impacts are minimized in the short term (5 years) and that VRM objectives in the project area are met in the long term (life of the project) when such projects are a) considered essential for public safety, achieving DFCs, or reducing hazardous fuels buildups and b) expected to be visually prominent.			
Activities that would cause adverse long-term impacts to the important visual resources in the following areas would be prohibited or mitigated to the extent practicable: Hurricane Rim, Diamond Butte, Moccasin Mountain, and Grama and Kanab creeks.	<p>All new surface disturbing projects or activities, regardless of size or potential impact, would incorporate visual design considerations during project design as a reasonable attempt to meet the VRM objectives for the area and minimize the visual impacts of the proposal. Visual design considerations would be incorporated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the VRM contrast rating process (required for proposed projects in highly sensitive areas, high impact projects, or for other projects where it would appear to be the most effective design or assessment tool), or by • Providing a brief narrative visual assessment for all other projects that require an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. <p>Measures to mitigate potential visual impacts could include the use of natural materials, screening, painting, project design, location, or restoration. (See Appendix 2.L-1; BLM Handbook H-8431-1, Visual Resource Contrast Rating; or online at http://www.blm.gov/nstc/VRM/8431.html, for information about the contrast rating process.)</p>			
b. Night Sky				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Permanent outdoor lighting in VRM Class I areas would not be allowed.			
N/A	Any facilities authorized would use the best technology available to minimize light emissions.			
N/A	Impacts to dark night skies would be prevented or reduced through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity level planning and NEPA level review. These measures may include directing all light downward, using shielded lights, using only the minimum illumination necessary, using lamp types such as sodium lamps (less prone to atmospheric scattering), using circuit timers, and using motion sensors.			

Map 2.5: Visual Resource Management - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.9: SOUNDSCAPES				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. SOUNDSCAPES				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Natural quiet and natural sounds would be preserved or restored, where practicable.			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Under any Section 4(f) consultations with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the BLM and NPS would recommend the protection or restoration of natural quiet in and above noise sensitive areas defined as all statutory wilderness areas, National Monuments, and all areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics.			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	The NPS would develop a Soundscape Management Plan for the NPS lands in coordination with similar Lake Mead NRA plans.			
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Parashant</i>				
Under any Section 4(f), Air Tour Management planning for adjacent national park system units or other consultations with FAA/U.S. Department of Transportation, the NPS would recommend the protection and/or restoration of natural quiet within and above Monument lands.				
The NPS would continue to evaluate how, when, and where motorized equipment is used on NPS lands. Where such use is necessary and appropriate, the least impacting equipment, vehicles, and transportation systems would be used.				
N/A	The NPS would develop baseline inventories of natural ambient and non-natural sound levels and an associated monitoring program for NPS lands.			

TABLE 2.10: WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following wilderness characteristics would be maintained on both BLM and NPS lands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High Degree of Naturalness: Lands and resources affected primarily by the forces of nature and where the imprint of human activity is substantially unnoticeable. ▪ Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude: When the sights, sounds, and evidence of other people are rare or infrequent and where visitors can be isolated, alone or secluded from others. ▪ Outstanding Opportunities for Primitive and Unconfined Recreation: Where the use of the area would be through non-motorized, non-mechanical means, and where no or minimal developed recreation facilities are encountered. • Areas where wilderness characteristics would be maintained would be ecologically sustainable and resilient to natural and human-caused disturbances. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.) • Wildlife populations and habitat are important aspects of the ecosystem and are an important component of naturalness. • Wildlife management activities would be consistent with naturalness in areas having wilderness characteristics. 			
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS				
Formal allocations would not be made for areas where wilderness characteristics would be maintained, nor would these acres be designated as Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) or proposed for wilderness in this Plan. Decisions to maintain wilderness characteristics would apply to the following areas (See Map 2.6):				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	411,256 acres	226,394 acres	141,003 acres	215,345 acres
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	96,796 acres	40,345 acres	0 acres	37,566 acres
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	46,135 acres	77,575 acres	34,628 acres	34,942 acres

TABLE 2.10: WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Visual Resource Management				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 145,084 acres, low on 265,124 acres, could be moderate on 0 acres, and high on 10 acres.	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 97,651 acres, low on 76,210 acres, could be moderate on 52,391 acres, and high on 10 acres.	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 419 acres, low on 98,121 acres, could be moderate on 42,444 acres, and high on 2 acres.	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 5,575 acres, low on 180,183 acres, could be moderate on 2,957 acres, and high on 0 acres.
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 19,973 acres, low on 76,821 acres, could be moderate on 0 acres and high on 0 acres.	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 15,933 acres, low on 24,408 acres, could be moderate on 0 acres and high on 0 acres.	N/A	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be low on 37,566 acres, could be moderate on 0 acres and high on 0 acres.
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 2 acres, low on 42,091 acres, could be moderate on 2,415 acres and high on 1,626 acres.	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 132 acres, low on 71,255 acres, could be moderate on 3,875 acres and high on 2,292 acres.	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be very low on 132 acres, low on 34,463 acres, could be moderate on 30 acres and high on 1 acre.	Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be low on 34,764 acres, could be moderate on 178 acres and high on 0 acre.
b. Land Tenure				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	The BLM would retain lands in federal ownership and seek to acquire non-Federal lands and interests in lands in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. (See Table 2.11: Lands & Realty.)			

TABLE 2.10: WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
c. Restoration				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Restoration, vegetation treatments, wildlife management projects on BLM lands, and other surface disturbing actions could be authorized in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics to achieve DFCs. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.)			
N/A	New projects or maintenance of existing projects that enhance wildlife habitat or other resources could be allowed, provided they can be designed to be substantially unnoticeable over time.			
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Natural processes would be primarily relied on to restore, over time, locations where human imprints are found.	Natural processes would be primarily relied on to restore, over time, locations where human imprints are found. When natural process would not restore areas within a reasonable timeframe or when resource damage would continue, a mix of chemical, biological, mechanical, and fire tools would be used consistent with DFCs of areas managed for wilderness characteristics.	Restoration work would be accomplished by the most efficient means available with access modes appropriate to the Primitive TMA.	Same as Alternative C
d. Fire Management				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Within areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics, the BLM and NPS would use minimum impact suppression tactics (MIST) to manage fire. Fire management actions would be consistent with DFCs for wilderness characteristics described in the Fire Management Plan. (See 2.8a: Vegetation Management.)			
2. Allowable Uses				
a. Motorized and Mechanized Uses				
<i>Common To All Planning Areas</i>				
Use of non-motorized, wheeled game carriers to retrieve game kills would be allowed in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics.				

TABLE 2.10: WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
(See Table 2.15: Travel Management for applicable decisions.)				
b. Competitive Events				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	No competitive events would be authorized where wilderness characteristics would be maintained.		Non-motorized competitive events could be authorized where wilderness characteristics would be maintained provided they are consistent with achieving DFCs and, in Monuments, consistent with the proclamations.	
c. Land Use Authorizations				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	New ROWs would be discouraged within avoidance areas, which include areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. On BLM lands, an exception could be granted for communication sites necessary for public safety where no other suitable sites are available. (See Table 2.11: Lands and Realty.) Existing land use authorizations (ROWs, permits, leases, etc.) would be administered within areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics in accordance with the terms and conditions of the authorizations.			
d. Leaseable Minerals and Mineral Materials				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Mineral leasing in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics would be subject to no surface occupancy. (See Table 2.13.)	Mineral leasing in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics would be subject to standard stipulations. (See Table 2.13: Minerals.)		
N/A	Mineral material sales would not be authorized in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. (See Table 2.13.)			

Map 2.6: Wilderness Characteristics - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. LANDS AND REALTY				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
The Lands and Realty Program would respond effectively to the needs of external customers (i.e., the public) and internal customers (i.e., BLM and NPS resource programs) for the use and enjoyment of current and future generations and for the protection and conservation of resources.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public lands would be retained in federal ownership; unless because of land use planning, it is determined that disposal of a particular parcel would serve the national interest. (See FLPMA Section 102(a)(1).) Lands or interests in lands could be acquired by purchase, exchange, or donation where they complement existing resource values as determined by land use planning. (See FLPMA Section 205.) Lands or interests in lands that, as a result of land use planning, have been determined to be difficult and uneconomic to manage, were acquired for a specific purpose and are no longer required for federal purposes, or would serve important public objectives could be disposed of or transferred. (See FLPMA Sections 203 and 206.) Community growth and expansion needs would be supported by making public lands available under the Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act, as amended. The BLM would strive to increase and diversify our nation’s sources of both traditional and alternative energy resources, improve our energy transportation network, and ensure sound environmental management in accordance with the President’s National Energy Policy. 				
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All federal lands (both BLM and NPS administered) within Parashant and Vermilion would be retained in accordance with the proclamations. Lands or interests in lands (both BLM and NPS administered) could be acquired to complement existing resource values and further/enhance the objectives of the proclamations/Monuments. 				
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
a. Land Tenure Decisions				
<i>i. Acquisitions/Retentions</i>				
<i>Parashant and/or Vermilion</i>				
Land or easement acquisitions and land exchanges that would enhance Monument values would be considered.	All BLM and NPS lands and interests in lands (including minerals) would be retained in federal ownership within the Monuments. Non-federally-administered lands and interests in lands (including legal access to landlocked public land) would be acquired within the Monuments by BLM/NPS from willing sellers by purchase, exchange, or donation. Exchanges with the State of Arizona to acquire state land interests within the Monuments would be pursued when the State is provided the authority.			

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal vehicle access would be acquired across private and state lands in locations listed in Appendix 14 (1992 RMP). This initial list of access needs is subject to additions or deletions. 	Interests in land include, but are not limited to, surface and subsurface rights, water rights, and easements for access, conservation, or other purposes.			
Both BLM and NPS lands and interests in lands within the Monuments would, upon acquisition, be reserved and/or managed as a part of the Monuments, wilderness, etc., consistent with planning guidance and objectives.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsurface rights on Shivwits would be acquired. Subsurface estate would be acquired where the BLM manages the surface (see Appendix 4 and Maps 2 and 2a of the 1992 RMP). On lands not identified for disposal, the BLM would retain the federal subsurface mineral estate and acquire through exchange the non-federal subsurface estate on existing split-estate public lands or on lands proposed for acquisition. 	In split estate situations a) where the surface estate is in federal ownership and the mineral estate is in non-federal ownership, acquisition of the mineral estate would be pursued on all BLM and NPS lands within the Monuments; and b) where the mineral estate is in federal ownership and the surface estate is in non-federal ownership, acquisition of the surface estate would be pursued on all BLM and NPS lands within the Monuments.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquisition of non-federal lands in Virgin River riparian areas would be negotiated as opportunities arise. The BLM would seek to acquire non-Federal lands in 	All lands and interests in lands (including minerals) would be retained in federal ownership within National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) units (e.g., designated wilderness, NHTs), administratively designated areas (e.g., ACECs), areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics, eligible and suitable wild and scenic river segments, habitats essential to the survival and recovery of federally-listed species (including historically-occupied habitats), priority riparian areas, springs and seeps, etc. The BLM would seek to acquire non-federal lands and interests in lands within the above-identified areas and legal access to landlocked public land from willing sellers by purchase, exchange, or donation. Exchanges with the State of Arizona			

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>the DWMAs/ACECs from willing sellers or through exchange. Acquisitions would include surface and subsurface mineral rights wherever possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lands with riparian and other high resource values would be acquired when opportunities occur. • State land in T.38N., R.6E., sec.16 would be acquired as part of the Marble Canyon ACEC. • State and private inholdings would be acquired, if available and in the public interest, in wilderness areas, Paria Plateau and Mt. Trumbull Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs), and in Johnson Spring, Lost Spring Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs. • The BLM would acquire up to 33,290.91 acres of private land through exchange. (See Appendix 4 and Maps 2 and 2a in the 1992 RMP.) • Legal vehicle access would be acquired across private and state lands in locations listed in appendix 14 of 1992 RMP. 	<p>to acquire lands within the above-identified areas or Monuments would be pursued when the State is provided the authority. Interests in land include, but are not limited to, surface and subsurface rights, water rights, and easements for access, conservation, or other purposes (see Table 2.5: Special Status Species).</p>			

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>This initial list of access needs is subject to additions or deletions.</p>				
<p>Lands and interests in lands within NLCS units or administratively designated areas would, upon acquisition, be reserved and/or managed as a part of the NLCS unit or administratively designated area. Lands and interests in lands outside NLCS units or administratively designated areas would, upon acquisition, be open to operation of public land laws and mining/mineral laws consistent with planning guidance and objectives, unless specifically modified by the opening order for purchases or donations, or unless a withdrawal or some other form of segregation is established on exchange lands.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsurface estate where the BLM manages the surface would be acquired. (See Appendix 4 and Maps 2 and 2a of the 1992 RMP.) On lands not identified for disposal, the BLM would retain the federal subsurface mineral estate and acquire through exchange the non-federal subsurface estate on existing split-estate public lands or on lands proposed for acquisition. 	<p>In split estate situations a) where the surface estate is in federal ownership and the mineral estate is in non-federal ownership, the BLM would seek acquisition of the mineral estate on all lands identified for retention; and b) where the mineral estate is in federal ownership and the surface estate is in non-federal ownership, the BLM would seek acquisition of the surface estate on all lands identified for retention.</p>			
<p><i>ii. Disposals</i></p>				
<p><i>Parashant and/or Vermilion</i></p>				
<p>Land exchanges may be considered within the Monuments where site-specific NEPA analysis determines the protective purposes of the Monuments would be furthered.</p>				
<p><i>Arizona Strip FO</i></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 7,335.45 acres would be made available for exchange, sale, or R&PP sale; exchanges would be first priority. These same lands plus 	<p>Up to 17,974 acres of public land would be identified for exchange, sale, or R&PP lease/sale with NEPA and ESA compliance and consistent with</p>	<p>Up to 19,743 acres of public land would be identified for exchange, sale, or R&PP lease/sale with NEPA and ESA compliance and consistent with planning guidance and objectives. Specific parcels of low density (former category 3) desert tortoise habitat that have little to no potential for self-</p>	<p>Up to 19,663 acres of public land would be identified for exchange, sale, or R&PP lease/sale with NEPA and ESA compliance and consistent with</p>	

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>an additional 17,853.47 acres would be available for exchanges only. (See Appendix 3 and Maps 2 and 2a of 1992 RMP.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition, any land identified for exchange, sale, or R&PP actions, would be evaluated under the requirements of NEPA. • Exchanges or sales of desert tortoise habitat out of public ownership would be limited to parcels identified in the RMP, except that critical habitat would be retained. 	<p>planning guidance and objectives. Specific parcels of low density (former category 3) desert tortoise habitat that have little to no potential for self-sustaining tortoise populations have been identified in Appendix 2.M as eligible for disposal. These parcels occur in the area between the impassable barriers of Interstate 15 and the Virgin River, outside of any ACEC, and would allow for regional growth near Littlefield and Beaver Dam with the least disturbance to desert tortoise. Parcels would be surveyed for special status species and other sensitive resources prior to disposal. The effects of future development on water quality and flows in the Virgin River would be addressed in NEPA documents and ESA consultation prior to disposal. (See Appendix 2.M and Map 2.7. Also see <i>Acquisitions/Retentions</i> section above for lands exempt from disposals.) Revenues generated from the sale of FLTFA parcels could be used to acquire adjacent lands</p>	<p>sustaining tortoise populations have been identified in Appendix 2.M as eligible for disposal. These parcels occur in the area between the impassable barriers of Interstate 15 and the Virgin River, outside of any ACEC, and would allow for regional growth near Littlefield and Beaver Dam with the least disturbance to desert tortoise. Parcels would be surveyed for special status species and other sensitive resources prior to disposal. The effects of future development on water quality and flows in the Virgin River would be addressed in NEPA documents and ESA consultation prior to disposal. Up to 200 acres not listed in Appendix 2.M or identified for specific purposes in these alternatives would be retained in public ownership unless needed for recreation or public purposes. Disposal proposals under the R&PP Act on lands not identified for disposal would be considered on a case-by-case basis. (See Appendix 2.M and Map 2.7. Also see <i>Acquisitions/Retentions</i> section above for lands exempt from disposals.) Revenues generated from the sale of Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (FLTFA) parcels could be used to acquire adjacent lands with high resource values in accordance with the Arizona Statewide Interagency Implementation Agreement approved May 9, 2006. Exchanges with the State of Arizona to consolidate land ownership within the Monuments and other areas identified for retention would be pursued when the State is provided the authority.</p>		<p>planning guidance and objectives. Specific parcels of low density (former category 3) desert tortoise habitat that have little to no potential for self-sustaining tortoise populations have been identified in Appendix 2.M as eligible for disposal. These parcels occur in the area between the impassable barriers of Interstate 15 and the Virgin River, outside of any ACEC, and would allow for regional growth near Littlefield and Beaver Dam with the least disturbance to desert tortoise. Parcels would be surveyed for special status species and other sensitive resources prior to disposal. The effects of future development on water quality and flows in the Virgin River would be addressed in NEPA documents and ESA consultation prior to disposal. Up to 200 acres not listed in Appendix 2.M or identified for specific purposes in these alternatives would be retained in public ownership unless needed for recreation or public purposes. Disposal proposals under the</p>

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	with high resource values in accordance with the Arizona Statewide Interagency Implementation Agreement approved May 9, 2006.			R&PP Act on lands not identified for disposal would be considered on a case-by-case basis. (See Appendix 2.M and Map 2.7. Also see <i>Acquisitions/Retentions</i> section above for lands exempt from disposals.) Revenues generated from the sale of Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (FLTFA) parcels could be used to acquire adjacent lands with high resource values in accordance with the Arizona Statewide Interagency Implementation Agreement approved May 9, 2006. Exchanges with the State of Arizona to consolidate land ownership within the Monuments and other areas identified for retention would be pursued when the State is provided the authority.
No Desert-Land Entries, Indian Allotments, or Carey Act Grants (disposals under the agricultural land laws) would be considered.				
b. Land Use Authorizations				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	The unoccupied Lime Kiln Utility Corridor shown on the Western Utility Group priority corridor map beginning at the Navajo McCullough power line on the Arizona Strip FO, crossing through the northern portion of Parashant and ending on the Arizona Strip FO at the Arizona/Nevada state line, would be terminated. A portion of this corridor now lies within the Parashant which precludes use of this segment of the corridor altogether.			

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Parashant and/or Vermilion</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Monuments, no new ROWs or ancillary public facilities would be processed, except for ROWs pursuant to existing policies and practices and necessary for access to and/or maintenance needs of private or state inholdings. In addition, ROWs may be permitted within the boundary of existing ROWs or designated ROW corridors established by previous land use planning, and where site-specific NEPA analysis determines that impact to the objects or values for which the Monument was designated would be negligible. • Maximum use of existing ROWs, including joint use whenever possible, would be encouraged. Linear ROWs would be placed adjacent or parallel to existing ROWs and share vehicular access. Utilities would be co-located with other utility projects, when possible. • Where feasible, linear ROWs would be placed underground along existing roads in the 	<p>No new ROWs or ancillary public facilities should be processed within the Monuments, except for ROWs pursuant to existing policies and practices such as, but not limited to, scientific monitoring stations, repeaters, utilities, water facilities, and access or other needs identified on private or state inholdings, public facilities, or administrative sites. In addition, ROWs may be authorized within the boundary of existing ROWs or designated ROW corridors. ROWs would only be authorized where site-specific NEPA analysis determines that the proposed action is consistent with protections required by the Monument proclamations and with DFCs described in the RMP. Mitigation measures may include underground placement of linear ROWs along existing roads and special protection measures for archaeological resources, among others. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Table 2.7: Cultural Resources.)</p>			

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>Parashant, Mt. Trumbull, and Uinkaret areas. Temporary ROWs would be excluded from underground placement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above ground ROWs in the Paria Plateau RCA would be discouraged. • Landfills or airports would not be authorized in the Pakoon or Virgin Slope ACECs or in the Paria Plateau RCA. • Special stipulation would be provided to protect archaeological resources on all roads in Mt. Trumbull area, which are maintained through land use authorizations. 				
<p>Physical facilities on Mt. Logan communication site would not be expanded. However, existing ROWs, not yet constructed, would be grandfathered and may be built.</p>	<p>New ROWs authorizing new physical facilities (new tower or building) at Mt. Logan, Hudson (West Point), and Fisher Point communication sites would not be allowed. Upgrades to the facilities/site that do not change the existing footprint or esthetics of the site may be allowed on a case-by-case basis, if necessary, to allow additional uses in the existing facilities.</p>			
<p>Any ROWs in wilderness that expire would be evaluated and, if still needed, would be processed under 43 CFR 2920.</p>	<p>On BLM lands, minimum impact permits within the Monuments would be evaluated and authorized on a case-by-case basis where site-specific NEPA analysis determines that impacts to the objects or values for which the Monuments were designated would be negligible. In addition, existing ROWs in BLM wilderness areas (i.e., exclusion areas) would be evaluated prior to expiration, and if still needed, would be authorized under 43 CFR 2920.</p>			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<p>New ROWs requiring new physical facilities (new tower or building) at Black Rock Mountain communication site would not be allowed. Upgrades to the facilities/site that do not change the existing footprint or esthetics of the site may be allowed on a case-by-case basis, if necessary, to allow additional uses in the existing facilities.</p>				

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>Other communication sites would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Communication site plans would be required prior to approval of application on all designated sites. BLM policy is to consolidate these sites as much as possible.</p>	<p>Applications for new communication sites, outside designated multi-user sites, would be considered on a case-by-case basis with NEPA analysis, emphasizing co-location and subleasing of existing facilities. Communication site management plans, including multi-user options and designation of the first leaseholder as the site manager, would be required prior to authorization as determined by the BLM authorized officer.</p>			
<p>The Navajo-McCullough ROW corridor would remain 1-mile wide, except ½-mile wide in the Ferry Swale area and the width of the ROW across the Beaver Dam Slope would be only the width occupied by the existing power lines and a second yet un-built line. Future proposals for power lines across the Beaver Dam Slope would be considered on a case-by-case basis addressing impacts to desert tortoise.</p>	<p>The existing utility corridor beginning at the Glen Canyon Dam and ending at the Arizona/Nevada border as shown on the Western Utility Group priority corridor map would remain 1 mile wide, except ½-mile wide in the Ferry Swale area. In addition, the corridor would be designated ½-mile wide in the Beaver Dam Slope ACEC. This would apply to BLM lands only.</p>	<p>The existing utility corridor beginning at the Glen Canyon Dam and ending at the Arizona/Nevada border as shown on the Western Utility Group priority corridor map would be designated 1-mile wide on BLM lands only.</p>		
<p>A ROW planning corridor would be designated via Rosy Canyon which is confined to the valley bottom, approximately ½ mile wide.</p>	<p>The existing utility corridor shown on the Western Utility Group priority corridor map through Rosy Canyon would be designated on BLM lands only beginning at the Utah/Arizona state line and extending to the section line between sections 7 and 18, T. 41 N., R. 5 W., GSRM, approximately ½-mile wide, confined to the valley bottom.</p>			
<p>A 1-mile wide ROW planning corridor would be designated via the Lime Kiln route.</p>	<p>The unoccupied Lime Kiln Utility Corridor shown on the Western Utility Group priority corridor map beginning at the Navajo McCullough power line on the Arizona Strip FO, crossing through the northern portion of the Parashant, and ending on the Arizona Strip FO at the Arizona/Nevada state line would be terminated. A portion of this corridor now lies within Parashant which precludes use of this segment of the corridor altogether.</p>			

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>The use of designated ROW corridors/sites and existing ROW use areas would be encouraged to the extent possible but, depending on site-specific needs, actual locations may vary. Such variances should be considered consistent with other plan provisions, provided such locations and uses are consistent with the selection criteria, and goals and objectives for ROW corridors and ROW use areas.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual land use authorizations (ROWs, permits, leases, easements) would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in accordance with decisions established in the RMP with NEPA analysis. New ROWs and temporary use permits would be discouraged within the Beaver Dam Slope, Virgin Slope, and Virgin River ACECs and allowed only when no reasonable alternative exists and impacts to tortoises and their habitat can be mitigated. ROWs would be routed away from high-density tortoise populations, and along the edges of DWMAs/ACECs. • ROWs in the Pakoon; Marble, Grama, Kanab, and Marble canyons; Moccasin Mountains; and Witch Pool and Nampaweap ACECs would not be authorized. • ROWs across Johnson Spring, Lost Spring Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs would be discouraged. 	<p>Individual land use authorizations (ROWs, permits, leases, easements) would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in accordance with other plan provisions and NEPA compliance. New land use authorizations would be discouraged within avoidance areas (i.e., ACECs, lands supporting listed species, NHTs, riparian areas, and areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics) and allowed in such areas only when no reasonable alternative exists and impacts to these sensitive resources can be mitigated. New ROWs would be routed away from high-density listed species' populations and cultural sites, and along the edges of avoidance areas. In addition, mitigation measures may include underground placement of linear ROWs along existing roads in the House Rock Valley area and special protection measures for archaeological resources (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Table 2.7: Cultural Resources).</p>			

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfills or airports would not be authorized in the Marble Canyon, Beaver Dam Slope, Virgin Slope, or Virgin River ACECs. • New landfills or sewage treatment ponds would not be authorized in desert tortoise DWMA/ACECs. • Where feasible, linear ROWs would be placed underground along existing roads in the House Rock Valley area. Temporary ROWs may be excluded from underground placement. 				
<p>Existing ROWs in wilderness areas (i.e., exclusion areas) would be evaluated prior to expiration, and if still needed, would be authorized under 43 CFR 2920.</p>				
<p>C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS</p>				
<p><i>Common to All Planning Areas</i></p>				
<p>Unauthorized dumpsites, abandoned vehicles, etc., on public lands would be identified and cleaned up as funding allows. Regulations pertaining to illegal dumping on public lands would be enforced.</p>	<p>The BLM would attempt to locate the potentially responsible party to remove/clean up any unauthorized use, restore/rehabilitate the public lands back to their original condition, and pay the administrative costs incurred by the BLM to investigate the unauthorized use along with applicable rental/additional fees as provided by BLM Manual 9232 and H-9232-1. Where the potentially responsible party is not found, the BLM would conduct the removal/cleanup as funding allows. However, if the potentially responsible party were later identified, the BLM would seek reimbursement of the costs incurred.</p>			
<p>Land ownership adjustments would not be considered on withdrawn land unless or until the withdrawal has been modified or lifted. Lands that become unencumbered through the withdrawal review process would then be subject to and managed in accordance with planning guidance and objectives.</p>				
<p>Existing withdrawals would continue for as long as needed or as statutorily/legislatively established/mandated which include Monuments (approx. 1,342,014 acres), wilderness (approx. 80,797 acres), Grand Canyon Game Preserve (approx. 13,335 acres, BLM portion), power site reservation, reclamation, public water reserve (approx. 142,442 acres), administrative site, and other miscellaneous withdrawals (approx. 24,261 acres).</p>				

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Existing land use authorizations (ROWs, permits, leases, etc.) would be administered within the Monuments, wilderness, and areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics in accordance with the terms and conditions of the authorizations.			
Floodplain occupancy and development would be avoided and base floodplain (100-year) would be retained or protected.				
N/A	There are a number of favorable places throughout the Planning Area that are commonly known and consistently used for aircraft landing and departure activities that, through such casual use, have evolved into backcountry airstrips (the definition contained in Section 345 of Public Law 106-914, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 2001). In accordance with that law, any closure of an aircraft landing strip contemplated in the future, would require full public notice, consultation with local and State government officials and the FAA.			
<i>Parashant</i>				
Existing withdrawals, reservations, or appropriations would not be revoked, but the Monument would remain the dominant reservation.	Existing withdrawals would continue for as long as needed or as statutorily/legislatively established/mandated, which include wilderness areas (95,242 acres) and power site reservation, reclamation, public water reserve (approximately 78,411 acres), administrative site, and other miscellaneous withdrawals (approximately 162 acres).			
No public airstrips would be authorized on NPS lands.				
Airstrips authorized by a public airport lease or reserved for use by the U.S. on BLM lands (Pakoon, Imlay, and Whitmore-Bar Ten) would continue to be managed.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
Existing withdrawals, reservations, or appropriations would not be revoked, but the Monument would remain the dominant reservation.	Existing withdrawals would continue for as long as needed or as statutorily/legislatively established/mandated, which include wilderness areas (89,829 acres) and power site reservation, reclamation, and public water reserve (approximately 8,183 acres).			
N/A	The BLM would work with ADOT to facilitate continued maintenance of existing drainage structures/areas inside the Vermilion and wilderness areas on the north side of Highway 89A to channel flash floods into existing culverts as identified in the Final Wilderness Management Plan for the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness (BLM 1986).			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Airstrips authorized by a public airport lease or permit (Cliffs Dwellers and a portion of Mesquite) would continue to be managed. The Colorado City Airport has been patented under the Airport and Airways Improvement Act.				
The BLM would advise prospective future owners of parcels identified for disposal on the need for ESA compliance. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)				

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	The BLM would work with Mohave County to determine the best location for a landfill to serve the Virgin River communities, including Beaver Dam, Littlefield, Desert Springs, Scenic, and Arvada.			
N/A	The BLM would work with the Washington County Water Conservancy District to determine the best route for the proposed water pipeline from Lake Powell to Sand Hollow Reservoir, Utah, and to authorize use of BLM land for that route and a portion of the proposed flood control reservoir at Fort Pearce in Utah, in accordance with other plan provisions and with NEPA and ESA compliance.			
N/A	Commercial development of renewable energy sources would be encouraged on all public land outside of exclusion or avoidance areas including concentrating solar power, photovoltaics, wind, and biomass resources and technologies. Wind energy development would be in accordance with policies and best management practices (BMPs) in the Final Wind Energy PEIS (BLM 2005).			
D. IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Nixon Spring Administrative Site withdrawal (PLO 5413, March 21, 1974) would be recommended for revocation.			
The hybrid oak withdrawal would be recommended for revocation (316 total acres; 162 in Parashant and 154 in Arizona Strip FO).				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
The Vermilion Cliffs Nat. Area withdrawal (portions totaling 70,437 acres) would continue.	The Vermilion Cliffs Natural Area withdrawal, now within the Monument, would be recommended for revocation (70,437 acres).			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Lands would be made available for an airport in the Colorado City area in coordination with city officials, ADOT, and FAA.	Public land would be made available for airport expansion at the existing Colorado City Airport in coordination with Colorado City officials, ADOT, and the FAA, subject to NEPA and ESA compliance.			
The Virgin River Gorge 23,186 acre recreation (scenic) withdrawal would be continued.	Part of the Virgin River Gorge Recreation Lands Withdrawal (PLO 5263) that overlaps statutory wilderness (16,465 acres) would be recommended for revocation. (See Table 2.14: Recreation and Visitor Services)			
The Hybrid Oak (316 total acres; 162 in Parashant and 154 in Arizona Strip FO) and Boulder Canyon withdrawals of the Virgin River Scenic Area would be recommended for revocation.				

TABLE 2.11: LANDS AND REALTY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Reclamation withdrawals in the Virgin River Communities area would be reviewed and if no longer necessary would be recommended for revocation including, but not limited to, AZA-12948, AZA-12948-01, AZA-12948-02, AZAZAA-10755, AZAZAA-10755-05, and AZAZAA-10755-06.			
N/A	Those R&PP classifications that are no longer necessary would be terminated which include, but are not limited to, AZAR-034401 (10.00 acres), AZA-6272 (20.00 acres), AZA-7379 (20.00 acres), AZA-9230 (160.00 acres), AZA-27333 (797.90 acres), AZA-23352 (80.00 acres), AZA-2482701 (199.530 acres), AZA-30897 (15.00 acres), and AZA-30909 (0.697 acre).			
Upon termination or expiration of the two Federal Energy Regulatory Commission withdrawals in Ferry Swale, ROWs to authorize the existing power transmission lines would be issued, if still needed.				
Point of Rock and Seegmiller Mountain area would be established as communication sites. Application of a commercial communicator would be encouraged as soon as possible as a means to keep future applicants in one building.	Point-of-Rock, Seegmiller Mountain, and Low Mountain would be designated as multi-user communication sites and managed in accordance with their approved Communications Site Plans. Seegmiller Mountain would be the only site allowed for commercial broadcasting with transmitter power levels above 1,000 watts effective radiated power. Co-location and subleasing would be encouraged and the preferred option. Upgrades to existing facilities may be allowed upon review and approval by the BLM authorized officer.			
The improved road access from the east to Little Black Mountain would be maintained. (See Table 2.7: Cultural Resources.)	An easement across state of Arizona lands from Quail Hill Road to Little Black Mountain ACEC would be acquired to provide legal access from the west, if determined to be the most feasible option.			
N/A	In Ferry Swale, the paved access road to the now closed Page Landfill would remain in place for monitoring purposes as required by state and federal regulations. The city of Page would not be required to remove the pavement.			
Leasing 12 acres of agriculture land to Hafen, Hemmeter, and Hughes would continue.	Existing agricultural leases to Hafen and Hughes would continue. A lease was not issued to Hemmeter.			

Map 2.7: Land Ownership and Adjustments - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. LIVESTOCK GRAZING				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems would be maintained or improved to meet Arizona’s Standards for Rangeland Health (1997; Appendices 2.D and 2.G) and Vital Sign Standards on NPS lands, and produce a wide range of public values such as wildlife habitat, livestock forage, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds. • Livestock use and associated management practices would be conducted in a manner consistent with other resource needs and objectives to ensure that the health of rangeland resources is preserved or improved so that they are productive for all rangeland values. Where needed, public rangeland ecosystems would be improved to meet objectives. • Sensitive resources on NPS lands would demonstrate no long-term degradation due to livestock grazing management techniques and restoration actions. 				
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
Monument values would be maintained, protected, and improved.				
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
On BLM lands, all allotments would continue to be classified as available for grazing by livestock under the principle of multiple use and sustained yield, except where specifically noted (See Map 2.8 at end of Table 2.12).				
<i>Parashant</i>				
By administrative action in 1990, grazing on the NPS portion of the Parashant Allotment was made unavailable in perpetuity. The allotment boundaries are modified to include only BLM lands.				
Livestock grazing on the Home Ranch Allotment was terminated based on a 1967 written agreement between NPS and the grazing permittee and is therefore unavailable in perpetuity. The allotment no longer exists.				
The Tassi Allotment described in the 1998 LUP Amendment would continue to be unavailable for grazing. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.) By administrative action at the same time, that portion of the Tassi Allotment on NPS lands was made unavailable in perpetuity for grazing. The allotment boundaries are modified to include only BLM lands.				
Those portions of the Mosby-Nay Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)	Those portions of the Mosby-Nay Allotment within the Pakoon WHA would be unavailable for grazing. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species)	The portion of the Mosby-Nay Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing. The portions of the allotment within the Pakoon WHA would be	The portion of the Mosby-Nay Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing. The remainder of the allotment would be available for grazing. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species)	

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
		available subject to seasonal restrictions. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species)		
Those portions of the Pakoon Springs Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)	The entire Pakoon Springs Allotment would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	Those portions of the Pakoon Springs Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing. In addition, the unavailable area would be expanded from the southern allotment boundary north up Pakoon Wash approx. 3 miles, and up Cedar Wash and Cottonwood Wash to approx. Wayne's Well. This would include the Pakoon Springs area. (See Table 2.5 Special Status Species.)	Those portions of the Pakoon Springs Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC would be unavailable for grazing.	Same as Alternative C.
Those portions of the Pakoon Allotment within the former Pakoon ACEC (Grand Gulch Wash area) would be unavailable for livestock grazing. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)	The entire Pakoon Allotment within the Pakoon WHA would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A	The entire Pakoon Allotment would be available for grazing, including the area within the former Pakoon ACEC (Grand Gulch Wash area). (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)	
Tuweep Allotment would be authorized for yearlong grazing in accordance with the approved AMP.	The Tuweep Allotment would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A		
<i>Vermilion</i>				
The Lees Ferry Allotment would be available for livestock grazing.	The River Pasture of the Lees Ferry Allotment would be unavailable for livestock	Same as Alternative A		Same as Alternative B

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	grazing, in order to eliminate conflicts between livestock grazing and recreation users.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The Beaver Dam Confluence of the Littlefield Community allotment would continue to be unavailable for grazing.				
The following livestock grazing allotments with desert tortoise habitat would be available for livestock grazing : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beaver Dam Slope • Highway • Mormon Well • Littlefield Community • Mesquite 	The following livestock grazing allotments with desert tortoise habitat would be unavailable for livestock grazing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beaver Dam Slope • Highway • Mormon Well • Littlefield Community (Littlefield Slope Pasture only) • Mesquite (Littlefield Slope Pasture only) 	Same as Alternative A		
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Changes in kind of livestock from cattle to sheep or goats would not be authorized within or adjacent to occupied desert bighorn sheep habitat unless monitoring studies and research indicate a disease transmission problem would not exist.	Changes in kind of livestock to sheep or goats would not be authorized within nine miles of desert bighorn sheep habitat. Sheep and goats would not be authorized as pack stock within nine miles of desert bighorn sheep habitat. Sheep or goats would not be authorized on NPS lands. (See Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife.)			
Implementing the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health would continue on all grazing allotments in accordance with established schedules and congressional requirements. The Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and guidelines for grazing management would apply to all livestock grazing activities on BLM and NPS lands consistent with the appropriate enabling legislation. These guidelines address management practices at the grazing allotment management plan (AMP) level and are intended to maintain desirable conditions or improve undesirable rangeland conditions within reasonable time frames. (See Appendix 2.D.)				

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>The interdisciplinary allotment evaluation process would continue to be used to provide specific guidance and actions for managing livestock grazing. Existing AMPs and other activity plans would be consistent with achieving the DFCs and standards for rangeland health. They would contain the site-specific management objectives, as well as actions, methods, tools, and appropriate monitoring protocols.</p>				
<p>Existing management practices and levels of use on grazing allotments would be reviewed and evaluated on a priority basis to determine if they meet or are making progress toward meeting the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health on BLM and NPS lands and Vital Sign standards on NPS lands. Appropriate and timely actions would be implemented to deal with those areas not meeting the standards.</p>				
<p>The allotment management categorization process would continue to be used to define the level of management needed to properly administer livestock grazing according to management needs, resource conflicts, potential for improvement, and BLM funding/staffing constraints. The allotment categories are Custodial (C), managed custodially to protect resource conditions and values; Maintain (M), managed to maintain current satisfactory resource conditions and are actively managed to ensure that the condition of resource values do not decline; and Improve (I), actively managed to improve unsatisfactory resource conditions.</p>				
<p>The category of grazing allotments would be changed as objectives are accomplished and/or conditions change. See Appendix 2.N for current specific allotment category assignments, grazing systems, preference, etc.</p>				
<p>Allowable use on key forage species is 50% on allotments with rotational grazing systems except in tortoise habitat. On allotments in desert tortoise habitat or being less intensively managed, utilization is set at 45%.</p>				
<p>Animals other than cattle and horses would not be authorized for livestock grazing purposes on NPS lands.</p>				
<p>Any hay or other feed used in administering the livestock operation would be certified weed-free</p>				
<p><i>Parashant</i></p>				
<p>On NPS lands, livestock grazing would be administered within NPS policy, the proclamation, and Lake Mead NRA enabling legislation, and verified through the Vital Signs monitoring program. On NPS lands, when appropriate, the implementation of BLM standards and guides may be modified for use on NPS lands by incorporating NPS Vital Signs initiatives. Any land health standards applied on NPS lands would be in compliance with NPS Management Policies (2001).</p>				
<p>The BLM portion of the Parashaunt Allotment would continue to be managed as a forage reserve. Under the forage reserve concept, any livestock use would be on a temporary basis. Livestock grazing use would be at BLM’s discretion and would be designed to complement management of other resources and to provide rest and deferment on other allotments undergoing restoration treatments, areas with fire damage, or other actions that establish an AMP or livestock grazing system, and help stabilize the livestock industry.</p>				
<p>Under the forage reserve concept, the BLM would assume maintenance of those facilities determined to be necessary for orderly protection and management of resources, including existing water developments on land the BLM continues to manage in the Parashaunt Allotment to ensure availability for wildlife use. A management plan has been developed for the Parashaunt allotment in cooperation with permittees and interested parties. The management plan specifies how the allotment would be managed, as well as season of use and other management consistent with achieving DFCs. This plan would be updated upon completion of the LUP or as needed to keep it current</p>				
<p>Existing water developments in desert tortoise habitat would be Water developments in listed species habitats could be modified to minimize adverse effects to the species. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)</p>				

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
evaluated to determine the potential to lead to the proliferation of desert tortoise predators. Where problems are identified, the hazards would be redesigned, moved, or otherwise mitigated.				
Season of use would be yearlong on that portion of the Mosby-Nay Allotment, which remains available for grazing.	Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs, would be established on that portion of the Mosby-Nay Allotment outside WHA.	Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs, would be established for all areas available for grazing, within the Mosby-Nay Allotment.	Same as Alternative A	Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs, would be established on that portion of the Mosby-Nay Allotment outside the former Pakoon ACEC, and available for grazing.
Season of use would remain yearlong on that portion of the Pakoon Springs Allotment outside of the former Pakoon ACEC.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That portion of Pakoon Springs Allotment remaining available to grazing would be managed as a forage reserve for livestock grazing. Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs, would be established along with a management plan detailing specifics of grazing use. The management plan would be developed in cooperation with permittees and interested parties. Under the forage reserve concept, any livestock use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That portion of the Pakoon Springs Allotment outside the former Pakoon ACEC would be reallocated and/or reconfigured for livestock grazing. Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs, would be established along with a management plan detailing specifics of grazing use. The management plan would be developed in cooperation with permittees and interested parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That portion of the Pakoon Springs Allotment, which remains available for grazing, would be managed as a forage reserve for livestock grazing. Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs, would be established along with a management plan detailing specifics of grazing use. The management plan would be developed in cooperation with permittees and interested parties. Under the forage reserve concept, any livestock use

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
		<p>would be on a temporary basis. Livestock grazing use would be at BLM’s discretion to complement management of desert tortoise habitat, both inside this allotment and other allotments with desert tortoise habitat, and to provide rest and deferment on other allotments undergoing restoration treatments, areas with fire damage, or other actions that establish an AMP or livestock grazing system. Specifics relative to this decision can be found in Table 2.5: Special Status Species.</p>		<p>would be on a temporary basis. Livestock grazing use would be at BLM’s discretion and would be designed to complement management of desert tortoise habitat, both inside this allotment and other allotments with desert tortoise habitat, and to provide rest and deferment on other allotments undergoing restoration treatments, areas with fire damage, or other actions that establish an AMP or livestock grazing system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option to reconfigure the allotment or any portion of the allotment to protect other priority resource values and/or promote more effective management as provided in 43 CFR 4110.2-4, would be considered. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)
<p>N/A</p>	<p>The BLM would assume maintenance of those facilities determined to be necessary for orderly protection and management of resources, including existing water developments on land the BLM continues to manage in the</p>	<p>Under the forage reserve concept, the BLM would assume maintenance of those facilities determined to be necessary for orderly protection and management of resources, including existing water developments on land</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C</p>

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	Pakoon Springs Allotment to ensure availability for wildlife use.	the BLM continues to manage in the Pakoon Springs Allotment to ensure availability for wildlife use.		
Season of use on that portion of the Pakoon Grazing Allotment, outside of the former Pakoon ACEC, would be November 1 through June 15.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Season of use on that portion of the Pakoon Grazing Allotment, outside of the former Pakoon ACEC, would be October 15 through April 15. • Ephemeral extensions would be authorized on the Pakoon Allotment to May 15 when conditions outlined in Guideline 3-5, of the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The season of use for the entire Pakoon Allotment would be October 15 through May 15. • Ephemeral extensions would be authorized on the Pakoon Grazing Allotment to June 1 when conditions outlined in Guideline 3-5, of the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grazing use within the former Pakoon ACEC portion (Grand Gulch Wash area) of the Pakoon Allotment would not be allowed between March 15 and October 15. Fencing at Eds' Pond would be required to facilitate this restriction. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species). • Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs would be established on the entire allotment, along with a management plan detailing specifics of grazing use. • Ephemeral extensions could be authorized on the lands outside the former Pakoon ACEC, in the Pakoon Allotment to June 1 when conditions outlined in Guideline 3-5, of the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health are met.
Tuweep Allotment would be authorized for yearlong grazing	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tuweep Allotment would be managed as a forage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All or parts of the Tuweep Allotment would be reallocated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuweep Allotment would be managed as a forage reserve

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>in accordance with the approved AMP.</p>		<p>reserve allotment and opportunities would be evaluated to reconfigure the allotment with other available areas having priority resource values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option to reconfigure any portion of the allotment land base and preference in exchange for other grazing areas with equal or larger land base and AUM preference would be allowed. • Under the forage reserve concept, any livestock use would be on a temporary basis. • All livestock grazing use on the Tuweep Allotment would be temporarily assigned at the discretion of BLM. 	<p>or reconfigured.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The livestock grazing preference on the Tuweep Allotment would be available for reallocation through application by qualified applicants. The applicant may apply for all or parts of the active preference, and if qualified, that preference may be re-allocated to another permittee. • Tuweep would be reconfigured by assigning parts of the allotment, such as pastures and their AUMs to other active, neighboring allotments. • Reconfiguration would eliminate Tuweep as an individual allotment. 	<p>allotment with livestock grazing being at the BLM's discretion, consistent with achieving DFCs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the forage reserve concept, any livestock use would be on a temporary basis. • The option to reconfigure the allotment or any portion of the allotment to protect other priority resource values and/or promote more effective management as provided in 43 CFR 4110.2-4 would be considered. • A management plan would be developed for the allotment in cooperation with permittees and interested parties. The management plan would specify how the allotment would be managed, as well as season of use and other management consistent with achieving DFCs.
<p>N/A</p>	<p>The BLM would assume maintenance of those facilities determined to be necessary for orderly protection and management of resources, including existing water developments on land the BLM</p>	<p>Under the forage reserve concept, the BLM would assume maintenance of those facilities determined to be necessary for orderly protection and management of resources, including existing</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C</p>

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	continues to manage in the Tuweep Allotment to ensure availability for wildlife use.	water developments on land the BLM continues to manage in the Tuweep Allotment to ensure availability for wildlife use.		
N/A		Acquired lands would be incorporated into the management scheme for the Tuweep Allotment.	N/A	Same as Alternative C
N/A		Livestock grazing use on the Tuweep Allotment would be managed to complement current and future forest restoration research, and to provide rest and deferment on other allotments undergoing restoration treatments, areas with fire damage, or other actions that establish an AMP or livestock grazing system.	N/A	Same as Alternative C
<i>Vermilion</i>				
On Glen Canyon NRA lands, livestock grazing would be administered by the BLM subject to Glen Canyon NRA policy and enabling legislation, as spelled out in interagency agreements and MOUs between the BLM and NPS, and verified through the Vital Signs monitoring program. On Glen Canyon NRA lands, implementation of standards and guides may be modified to ensure compliance with Glen Canyon NRA enabling legislation and applicable laws and policies. On GCNRA lands, sensitive resources would demonstrate no long-term degradation due to livestock management practices.				
Season of use on the Lees Ferry Allotment would be limited to November 1 through April 15, for two consecutive years and rested completely the	N/A	The River Pasture of the Lees Ferry Allotment would be managed as a forage reserve for livestock grazing, with a season of use from November	The River Pasture of the Lees Ferry Allotment would be managed as a forage reserve for livestock grazing, with a season of use from November	N/A

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
third year. Use in the River Pasture would be limited to November 1 through January 31 during the scheduled, two-year period.		15 through March 1. The River Pasture would not be used more than two years in five consecutive years.	1 through April 15. The River Pasture would not be used more than three years in five consecutive years.	
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
On Glen Canyon NRA lands, livestock grazing would be administered by the BLM subject to Glen Canyon NRA policy and enabling legislation, as spelled out in interagency agreements and MOUs between the BLM and NPS, and verified through the Vital Signs monitoring program. On Glen Canyon NRA lands, implementation of standards and guides may be modified to ensure compliance with Glen Canyon NRA enabling legislation and applicable laws and policies. On Glen Canyon NRA lands, sensitive resources would demonstrate no long-term degradation due to livestock management practices.				
Existing water developments in desert tortoise habitat would be evaluated to determine the potential to lead to the proliferation of desert tortoise predators. Where problems are identified, the hazards would be redesigned, moved, or otherwise mitigated.	Water developments in listed species habitats could be modified to minimize adverse effects to the species. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species.)			
Season of use on the following livestock grazing allotments with desert tortoise habitat would be from October 15 through March 15, with no authorization of ephemeral extensions (see Table 2.5 Special Status Species): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beaver Dam Slope • Highway • Mormon Well • Littlefield Community 	N/A	Same as Alternative A	Season of use on the following livestock grazing allotments with desert tortoise habitat would be from October 15 through March 15 with the option of authorizing ephemeral extensions to May 15 when conditions outlined in Guideline 3-5, of the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health are met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beaver Dam Slope • Highway 	Same as Alternatives A

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
(Littlefield Slope Pasture only) • Mesquite (Littlefield Slope Pasture only)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mormon Well • Littlefield Community (Littlefield Slope Pasture only) • Mesquite (Littlefield Slope Pasture only) 	
Season of use would remain yearlong on the portions of the Mesquite and Littlefield Community Allotments outside the Littlefield Slope pastures.	Season of use on the Littlefield Community, excluding the Littlefield Slope Pasture would be October 15 through June 15 and Mesquite Allotment, excluding the Littlefield Slope Pasture, would be October 15 through May 15.	Season of use and other management prescriptions consistent with achieving DFCs, as identified through the rangeland Health Assessment process, would be established, along with a management plan detailing specifics of grazing use, on the remaining portions of Littlefield Community and Mesquite Allotments, outside the Littlefield Slope Pastures.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative C
Season of use for livestock grazing on the Cedar Wash Allotment would be from October 15 through March 15. Ephemeral extensions to May 15 would be authorized when production exceeds 280 lbs/acre.	Season of use for livestock grazing on the Cedar Wash Allotment would be from October 15 through March 15. Ephemeral extensions would not be authorized.	Season of use for livestock grazing on the Cedar Wash Allotment would be from October 15 through March 15. Ephemeral extensions to May 15 would be authorized when conditions outlined in Guideline 3-5 of the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health are met.	Season of use for livestock grazing on the Cedar Wash Allotment would be from October 15 through May 15.	Same as Alternative C
On the Kanab Creek Wildband and Lambing Allotments, permittee would graze livestock between September 1 and April 15 by agreement	Portions of the following livestock grazing allotments with SW Flycatcher habitat would be available for grazing during the non-growing season (leaf drop to bud break). Conservative grazing guidelines would be used consistent with the SW Flycatcher recovery plan. Monitoring would be used to ensure compliance with utilization levels and to determine actual growing season and livestock grazing would not be authorized later than April 15 in the following portions of identified livestock grazing allotments (see Table 2.5: Special Status Species):			

TABLE 2.12: LIVESTOCK GRAZING				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
with the BLM to comply with the SW Flycatcher recovery plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearwater portion (suitable habitat) of the Kanab Creek Allotment • Clearwater portion (suitable habitat) of the Wildband Allotment • The river portion of the Lambing Allotment with SW Flycatcher habitat 			

Map 2.8: Grazing Allotments - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.13: MINERALS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. MINERALS MANAGEMENT				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral exploration and development is encouraged on public land in keeping with the Bureau’s multiple-use concept. Overall guidance on the management of mineral resources appears in the <u>Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953</u>, the <u>Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970</u>, the <u>Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976</u>, the <u>National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980</u>, BLM’s <u>Mineral Resources Policy of May 29, 1984</u>, and the <u>Energy Policy Act of 2005</u>. Leasable Minerals: the <u>Mineral Leasing Act of 1920</u>, <u>Geothermal Steam Act of 1970</u>, and <u>43 CFR 3100-3500</u> provide the legal and regulatory framework for the issuance and management of mineral leases. These regulations apply where public interest exists for the development of oil, gas, geothermal, coal and non-energy leasable mineral resources. Stipulations are attached to leases and permits in order to ensure protection of non-mineral resources that are susceptible to impacts resulting from the exploration and development of leasable mineral resources. Locatable Minerals: Exploration and development of locatable mineral resources are provided for by the <u>Mining Law of 1872</u>. <u>43 CFR 3809</u> provides for mineral exploration and development while assuring that activities are conducted in a manner that prevents unnecessary or undue degradation, provides protection of non-mineral resources, and provides for reclamation of disturbed areas. Salable Minerals: The <u>Materials Sale Act of 1947</u> and <u>43 CFR 3600</u> provide for the disposal and regulation of mineral materials. Disposal is administered on a case-by-case basis. Salable minerals are sold at fair market values. Free use permits are issued to federal and state agencies, local communities, and non-profit groups as the need arises. 				
Allow entire Planning Area to remain open to mineral leasing, location, and sale except where restricted by Monument and wilderness designation, withdrawals, or specific areas identified in this FEIS.				
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
1. Fluid Mineral Leasing				
Desert tortoise ACECs would remain open to leasing subject to seasonal restrictions and subject to a waivable no surface occupancy stipulation (WNSO). Surface disturbing activity would be limited to the period from October 15 to March 15 under a seasonal restriction. Surface occupancy could be allowed by a BLM authorized officer after consultation with USFWS on the authorization.				
Fluid Mineral leasing categories would be designated as follows: Category 1, open to lease subject to standard lease terms and conditions and appropriate special stipulations; Category 2, open with special terms and conditions or seasonal restrictions; Category 3, no surface occupancy or other surface disturbance; and, Category 4, withdrawn from minerals leasing (See Map 2.9 at end of Table 2.13).				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 1: 1,616,106 acres Category 2: 185,807 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 1: 1,476,698 acres Category 2: 377,275 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 1: 1,617,786 acres Category 2: 204,868 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 1: 1,651,747 acres Category 2: 213,829 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 1: 1,690,502 acres Category 2: 145,566 acres

TABLE 2.13: MINERALS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 3: 98,375 acres • Category 4: 80,710 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 3: 46,175 acres • Category 4: 80,864 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 3: 77,492 acres • Category 4: 80,871 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 3: 34,541 acres • Category 4: 80,902 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 3: 64,325 acres • Category 4: 80,671 acres
2. Locatable Minerals				
The following designations would apply to the Arizona Strip FO with regard to locatable minerals (See Map 2.10 at end of Table 2.13):				
Open to the operation of mining laws: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,528,946 acres Open • 152,356 acres Open with restrictions • 198,824 acres Open with plan of operation 	Open to the operation of mining laws: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,385,350 acres Open • 117,933 acres Open with restrictions • 376,837 acres Open with plan of operation 	Open to the operation of mining laws: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,516,824 acres Open • 156,146 acres Open with restrictions • 207,151 acres Open with plan of operation 	Open to the operation of mining laws: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,518,372 acres Open • 155,833 acres Open with restrictions • 205,917 acres Open with plan of operation 	Open to the operation of mining laws: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,534,396 acres Open • 145,226 acres Open with restrictions • 182,699 acres Open with plan of operation
Withdrawn to mining location subject to valid existing rights: 100,896 acres				
3. Salable Minerals				
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
The BLM, NPS, and county would continue to use mineral materials from existing material sites, washes, arroyos, and stock tanks on BLM lands for road maintenance projects provided the use would be consistent with Plan objectives and protection of Monument objects.				
<i>Parashant</i>				
NPS lands within Parashant are closed to mineral entry (Lake Mead NRA Minerals Management Plan, 1986).				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Glen Canyon NRA lands are open to mineral disposition but no specific minerals have yet been identified (Per the Glen Canyon NRA Mineral Management Plan, 1980, Arizona Strip District administers the minerals on Glen Canyon NRA).				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The following designations would apply to the planning area with regard to mineral material sales (See Map 2.11 at end of Table 2.13):				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,111,627 acres Open subject to standard stipulations • 658,657 acres Open with restrictions • 210,748 acres Closed to mineral material disposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 858,746 acres Open subject to standard stipulations • 716,930 acres Open with restrictions • 405,353 acres Closed to mineral material disposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,147,409 acres Open subject to standard stipulations • 613,688 acres Open with restrictions • 219,929 acres Closed to mineral material disposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,179,230 acres Open subject to standard stipulations • 603,409 acres Open with restrictions • 198,390 acres Closed to mineral material disposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,264,889 acres Open subject to standard stipulations • 433,457 acres Open with restrictions • 282,715 acres Closed to mineral material disposals

TABLE 2.13: MINERALS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
New reclamation stipulations for exploration and development plans directed toward maintaining naturalness and unique features and/or remoteness on the Arizona Strip FO would be developed and would be added to or replace the existing stipulations. These stipulations would be applied to site-specific proposals. (See Appendix 2.O.)				
1. Locatable Minerals				
Special mitigation would continue to be required in mining plans of operation to avoid impacts to: Brady pincushion cactus in Marble Canyon ACEC; Siler pincushion cactus in Johnson Spring, Lost Spring Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs; desert tortoise in Beaver Dam Slope, Virgin Slope, Pakoon, and Virgin River ACECs; cultural resources in Johnson Spring, Lost Spring Mountain, Moonshine Ridge, Witch Pool, and Nampaweap ACECs.	Special mitigation would be required in mining plans of operation to avoid impacts to cultural resources, special status species, and/or other sensitive resources in ACECs. (See Table 2.16: Special Designations.)			
2. Salable Minerals				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salable materials would continue to be available in a timely and orderly manner consistent with environmental constraints. Free use permits would continue to be issued to Federal and State agencies and to local communities. (See Appendix 2.Q for current mineral material sites.) • Extraction of mineral resources would proceed consistent with protection of sensitive resources and achieving DFCs. (See Appendices 2.I, 2.O, and 2.P.) • Material disposal in VRM Class II areas would not be allowed if reasonable alternative sources were available. 				
Mineral material disposal would continue to not be allowed in Marble Canyon, Virgin River, Virgin Slope,	New mineral material sites would not be allowed in ACECs. Existing material sites would be evaluated for retention. Permits could continue to be issued for noncommercial, hand collection of rock within 100 feet of designated open roads in the Beaver Dam and Virgin Slope ACECs.			

TABLE 2.13: MINERALS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Little Black Mountain, or Fort Pearce ACECs. Only hand picking of rocks within 100 feet of roadways would be permitted within the Beaver Dam and Virgin Slope ACECs.				

Map 2.9: Fluid Mineral Leasing Categories - Proposed Plan

Map 2.10: Locatable Mineral Land Classifications - Proposed Plan

Map 2.11: Salable Mineral Land Classifications - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. RECREATION MANAGEMENT				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
1. General Recreation DFCs				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of recreation settings would be provided where traditional, backcountry, extensive recreation activities such as camping, hunting, and sightseeing are possible and the experience opportunities for such activities as defined by the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) are high. • Recreation management direction would include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accommodation of current uses, protection of cultural values, and complementing wilderness management plans where appropriate, and 2. Providing visitor information. • A majority of BLM lands would be managed for extensive (dispersed) recreation while maintaining its naturalness/remoteness. The 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation and visitor services would be managed to provide varying levels of both: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured recreation opportunities that offer a range of specific benefits, activities, and experiences within outdoor settings (Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs, See Map 2.12 at end of Table 2.14) and/or, 2. Dispersed, unstructured recreation opportunities that focus only on visitor health and safety, user conflict, and resource protection issues (Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)). • Information needed to plan, prepare, and choose safe, enjoyable, and appropriate uses of the Arizona Strip region would be available to the public. • The NPS and BLM would work to provide seamless service to the public and use their resources accordingly. 			

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
exception to this would be the Cedar Pockets campground.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Management Area A, emphasis on recreation opportunities associated with motorized vehicle use such as exploring backcountry roads, vehicle camping, sightseeing, picnicking, and mountain biking opportunities on existing roads would be maintained. In ERMA A, shifting in ROS classes from semi-primitive, non-motorized to semi-primitive, motorized as a guide (not to exceed 1 percent per year) or from semi-primitive, motorized to rural natural as a guide (not to exceed 2 percent per year) where deemed necessary to meet recreation needs or other resource development would be allowed for. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing opportunities for visitors to enjoy sightseeing and viewing wildlife in the Backways Travel Management Areas (TMAs) would be maintained/enhanced. The excellent opportunities that exist to enjoy remote, rustic settings that provide moderate challenge and solitude in the Specialized TMAs would be maintained/enhanced. In Backways and Specialized TMAs, recreation opportunities associated with somewhat remote settings, such as exploring backcountry roads and trails, vehicle camping, hunting, sightseeing, recreation aviation, and picnicking would be maintained/enhanced as well as mountain biking opportunities on existing routes, provided they would be compatible with the protection and enhancement of sensitive resource values and Monument objects, where appropriate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Management Area B, emphasis on recreation opportunities associated more with non-motorized uses such as camping, sightseeing, hiking, horseback riding, 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Primitive TMA, high quality recreation opportunities associated more with primitive recreation experience opportunities and non-motorized uses such as camping, sightseeing, hiking, horseback riding, and hunting, would be maintained/enhanced, provided they would be compatible with the protection and enhancement of sensitive resource values and Monument objects, where appropriate.

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>hunting, and rockhounding would be maintained, provided they are compatible with the protection and enhancement of natural and cultural values. Vehicle exploring and backcountry travel are recreational components of this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Management Area B, opportunities for high quality, backcountry recreation experience would be enhanced through a variety of methods including rehabilitation and re-vegetation of disturbed sites, non-promotion, and continued current roads conditions. 				
<i>Parashant</i>				
NPS lands would be managed primarily for their wilderness values, and in accordance with Primitive TMA objectives.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Rural (TMA), a wide variety of recreation opportunities associated with near-urban settings, such as walking, OHV play, equestrian, rock crawling, mountain biking, and viewing events, could be maintained/enhanced, provided they would be compatible with the protection of sensitive resource values. (See Table 2.15 for a complete description of TMAs.) • The Virgin River Gorge Recreation Lands Withdrawal (PLO 5263) would be managed for the values listed in the withdrawal application (A-6451) 			
2. Specific Recreation Management Area DFCs				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two types of Recreation Management Areas (RMAs) would be identified in the land use plan for BLM lands: SRMAs and ERMAs. In the Parashant only, Special Management Areas (SMAs) would be identified on NPS lands. 				

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS SMAs typically involve the NPS proposed wilderness areas, as well as any areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. SMA management would be blended with SRMA management in the Parashant where appropriate. • Any area in a planning area not delineated as a SRMA would be identified as one or more ERMA. ERMA would receive only custodial management regarding visitor health and safety, user conflict and resource protection issues, with no activity level planning. Therefore, actions within ERMA would generally be implemented directly from land use plan decisions. • Refer to Table 2.14a for DFCs for each proposed SRMA. Refer to the General Recreation DFCs listed in I. A. 1 above for each proposed ERMA. 				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section A.2. of Table 2.14 describes the specific DFCs for each SRMA. The conditions described for a given SRMA would be targeted for that SRMA under any alternative where it would be allocated. Each SRMA would target a distinct, primary recreation-tourism market as well as a corresponding and distinguishing recreation management strategy, such as Community, Destination, or Undeveloped (see Glossary). In identifying SRMA and prescribing the management regime for each, a benefits-based management (BBM) approach would be utilized. BBM or “beneficial outcomes” focuses on the desired outcomes of recreation and leisure activities tied to experiences and benefits. • Within each SRMA, one or more potential Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) would be identified, with each zone providing for a particular recreation niche (see Glossary) within the overall SRMA. (See Map 2.12 for SRMA and Map 2.13 for RMZs). Each RMZ would be characterized by a description of its own DFCs in the form of outcomes (management objective(s), benefits, experiences, activities) and the setting prescriptions (physical, social, and administrative conditions) required to produce the outcomes. (see Appendix 3.H, Natural Resource Recreation Settings descriptions and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations). Some SRMA components, such as “primary market-based strategy,” “recreation niche,” and “benefits” are conspicuously absent from Alternative A and B because current management does not utilize a beneficial outcomes approach. 			
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS				
<p><i>(SRMA and ERMA allocations would be allocated very differently across the Plan alternatives. This is due to a number of factors: 1) in developing a range of alternatives, all existing (Alternative A) SRMA would essentially be reconfigured, renamed, dropped, or absorbed into larger new SRMA or ERMA in Alternatives B – E [shaded areas are “null”]; 2) SRMA allocations proposed in Alternatives C – E would reflect the BLM’s transition to BBM; 3) the previous notion that all wilderness areas would automatically be allocated as SRMA would be abandoned, as new SRMA are tied to market demand rather than areas of high visitor use or special designations.)</i></p>				
<p>The RMA (both Special and Extensive), accompanying RMZs within each SRMA, and NPS SMA would be identified as follows (See Appendix 2.R for more information about RMA):</p>				

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Parashant</i>				
Mt Trumbull RCA/SRMA: 102,307 acres RMZs: None Parashant RCA/SRMA: 39,868 acres RMZs: None		Parashant SRMA/NPS SMA BLM SRMA: 839,237 acres NPS SMA: 209,084 acres		
Mount Trumbull Wilderness SRMA: 8,000 acres RMZs: None Mount Logan Wilderness SRMA: 14,632 acres RMZs: None Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness SRMA: 37,276 acres RMZs: None Paiute Wilderness SRMA: 35,334 acres RMZs: None NPS SMA: 188,121 acres RMZs: None		Shivwits Frontier RMZ: 307,871 acres Parashant Wildlands RMZ 740,446 acres	Shivwits Frontier RMZ: 361,080 acres Parashant Wildlands RMZ 687,237 acres	Shivwits Frontier RMZ: 559,622 acres Parashant Wildlands RMZ 488,655 acres
Parashant ERMA: ERMA A: 529,914 acres ERMA B: 214,099 acres	Parashant ERMA: 764,840 acres			

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Vermilion</i>				
Canyons & Plateaus Of The Paria RCA/SRMA 293,689 acres RMZs: None		Gateways SRMA 814 acres		
		Vermilion Cliffs RMZ: 269 acres House Rock RMZ: 545 acres		
		Sand Hills SRMA 265,109 acres		
		Uplands RMZ: 197,031 acres Cliffs & Rims RMZ: 68,078 acres		
Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness SRMA 89,829 acres RMZs: None		Paria SRMA 27,741 acres		
		Coyote Buttes RMZ: 14,576 acres Paria Canyon RMZ: 13,165 acres		
	Vermilion ERMA 203,863 acres			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Mt Trumbull RCA/SRMA: 13,652 acres; RMZs: None		St. George Basin SRMA 141,024 acres		
Canyons & Plateaus Of The Paria RCA/SRMA 23,484 acres; RMZs: None		St. George Basin Rural Park RMZ: 104,113 acres Canyons and Mesas RMZ: 36,911 acres		
Virgin River Corridor ACEC/SRMA 8,078 acres; RMZs: None		Virgin River SRMA 4,955 acres		
Little Black Mountain ACEC/SRMA 241 acres; RMZs: None		Virgin River RMZ: 1,787 acres Virgin River Gorge Scenic Gateway RMZ: 135 acres The Motorways: 3,033 acres	Virgin River RMZ: 1,781 acres Virgin River Gorge Scenic Gateway RMZ: 135 acres Motorways: 3,039 acres	Virgin River RMZ: 2,110 acres Virgin River Gorge Scenic Gateway RMZ: 135 acres The Motorways: 2,710 acres

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness SRMA: 14,928 acres RMZs: None</p> <p>Cottonwood Point Wilderness SRMA: 6,575 acres RMZs: None</p> <p>Kanab Creek Wilderness SRMA: 6,804 acres; RMZs: None</p> <p>Paiute Wilderness SRMA: 52,491 acres; RMZs: None</p>			<p>Virgin Ridge SRMA 23,033 acres</p> <hr/> <p>Lime Kiln/Elbow Canyons RMZ: 7,738 acres Lime Kiln Cliffs RMZ: 1,749 acres Virgin Ridge RMZ: 13,547 ac</p>	
			<p>Lime Kiln/Elbow Canyons RMZ: 7,684 acres Lime Kiln Cliffs RMZ: 1,746 acres Virgin Ridge RMZ: 13,604 ac</p>	
			<p>Fredonia SRMA 15,932 acres</p> <hr/> <p>Fredonia SRMA 14,969 acres</p>	
			<p>Fredonia Rural Park RMZ: 6,816 acres Shinarump Cliffs RMZ: 3,965 acres The Badlands RMZ: 5,151 acres</p>	
<p>Arizona Strip ERMA ERMA A: 1,698,520 acres ERMA B: 282,487 acres</p>	<p>Arizona Strip ERMA 1,900,304 acres</p>	<p>Arizona Strip ERMA 1,831,306 acres</p>	<p>Arizona Strip ERMA 1,784,921 acres</p>	
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Recreation Management Actions				
<i>i. Resources</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<p>The generally natural, “remote” settings that exist throughout the resource area through mitigation of new projects and implementing restoration projects as necessary would continue to be restored and/or maintained.</p>	<p>To the extent practicable, the natural or “remote” settings in Specialized and Primitive TMAs would be restored and/or maintained using natural processes as the need or opportunity arises.</p>	<p>To the extent practicable, the natural or “remote” settings in Specialized and Primitive TMAs would be restored and/or maintained using a combination of projects and natural processes as the need or opportunity arises.</p>		

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Geocache sites would be removed if, through monitoring, it were determined that important resources would be at risk of unacceptable change due to use of the site.			Geocache sites would be relocated with help from local geocachers if, through monitoring, it were determined that important resources would be at risk of unacceptable change due to use of the site.
<i>ii. Signing and Recreation Facilities</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few, if any, visitor facilities such as directional, safety, or interpretive signing; interpretive sites; or kiosks would be installed in Management Area B. Those few that might be needed would be designed to blend in with the surrounding landscape. The majority of visitor management facilities, such as directional, interpretive, or safety signing, interpretive sites, or kiosks, would be installed in the roaded natural areas of ERMA B and would be designed to blend in with the landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within SRMAs, the levels and types of signing and recreation facility development would be guided by the individual RMZ objectives and the administrative and physical recreation settings components prescribed for each RMZ (see Appendix 3.H, Physical Setting (Facilities) and Administrative Setting (Management Controls) for descriptions of settings components). Where ERMAs would be allocated, the main emphasis areas for any signing and/or recreation facility placement would be in the Rural and Backways TMAs. Generally, signing and recreation facility development in the ERMAs would be the minimum necessary to provide for public safety, reduce user conflicts, and protect resources. Sign material and design would be unobtrusive in order to blend with local landscape settings and retain the natural and/or historic integrity of the site. Recreation facility development and maintenance would be limited in listed species and other sensitive habitats. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.) 			
N/A	Major visitor facilities (visitor center or contact stations) would not be built by the BLM.	Any major visitor facilities (visitor center or contact stations) built by the BLM would be located near communities.		Major visitor facilities (visitor center or contact stations) would be collaborative efforts within nearby communities, with the exception of the Virgin River SRMA where a small contact facility could be considered.

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
b. Recreation Marketing Actions				
<i>i. Promotion</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Sensitive areas where increased visitation could create unacceptable changes or impacts to natural or cultural resources would not be publicly promoted. Public information would be provided only for those cultural sites designated for public use.			
<i>ii. Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
(See below: Table 2.14, Part II: Interpretation and Environmental Education)				
c. Recreation Monitoring Actions				
<i>i. Inventory and Monitoring</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Recreation management direction, which includes the use of various methods to acquire visitor use data, maintenance of a system of traffic counters, monitoring results monthly and field verifying results annually, and conducting compliance patrols by law enforcement rangers, would be maintained.	Where appropriate, a framework for establishing carrying capacities for intensive use areas and primary recreation activity types would be established.	A Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) framework would be used to establish acceptable resource and social and managerial settings conditions using appropriate indicators and standards.	Resource and social impacts would be mitigated on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative C
2. Allowable Uses				
a. Recreation Administration Actions				
<i>i. Visitor Limits and Regulations</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Recreational activities could be limited or restricted in special status species and other sensitive habitats. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.)				

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Management responses to unacceptable resource and/or social conditions would range from least restrictive methods (e.g., information and education) to most restrictive (e.g., visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions). Where feasible, the least restrictive methods would be the first priority.				
No person or persons should occupy one area on BLM lands within the Arizona Strip District for longer than 14 consecutive days in any 28-day period. Any site on public land within 30 air miles constitutes the same area for the purpose of this rule. Persons occupying a regular campsite within the Virgin River Canyon Recreation Area are exempt from this rule. To protect resources, for public safety, or for other administrative purposes, an authorized officer may, by posting notification, close a given site to occupancy.	No person or persons should occupy one area on BLM lands within the Planning Area for longer than 14 consecutive days in any 28-day period; however, extensions beyond the 14-day length of stay could be authorized for permitted uses on a case-by-case basis. Any site on public land within 30 air miles constitutes the same area for the purpose of this rule. Persons occupying a regular campsite within the Virgin River Canyon Recreation Area are exempt from this rule. To protect resources, for public safety, or for other administrative purposes, an authorized officer may, by posting notification, close a given site to occupancy.			
Camping could be limited in listed species and other sensitive habitats. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.)				
N/A	Camping could be restricted or limited to protect cultural and/ or natural resources through campsite monitoring and LAC.			
Certified weed-free feed would be required for all recreation stock use. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.)				
Recreational stock use could be limited in listed species and other sensitive habitats or in the vicinity of cultural properties. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species, Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife, Table 2.3: Vegetation Management, and Table 2.7: Cultural Resources.)				
On BLM lands, collection of antlers or other unregulated animal parts would be allowed. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management for vehicular decisions, and Table 2.4: Fish and Wildlife and Table 2.5: Special Status Species for animal parts) On NPS lands, no collection of antlers or animal parts would be allowed.				
Recreational shooting on BLM lands would be allowed except where public health and safety is jeopardized and subject to state and local laws. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Table 2.17: Public Health for specific decisions.) Voluntary use of non-lead ammunition would be encouraged. Recreational shooting would not be allowed on NPS lands.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geocache sites would be prohibited in archaeological sites, alcoves, caves, rock shelters, threatened and endangered species habitat, and raptor nesting sites, or where identified Monument objects would be at risk. • Where geocaches are allowed, they could remain so long as acceptable resource and social conditions would be maintained. • On-the-ground placement of geocaches would be prohibited in designated and NPS proposed wilderness areas. 				
<i>Parashant</i>				
The institution and/or adjusting of visitor limits, regulations, or restrictions in the resource area, only when monitoring of	Visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions would be managed when carrying capacities are exceeded.	Visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions would be based on LAC.	Visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions would be managed on a case-by-case basis.	Visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions would be based on LAC. Carrying capacities may be established

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
resource and social conditions indicates a trend toward unacceptable change to desired recreation settings brought about by such use, would continue.				as wilderness management plans and activity plans are completed.
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Vehicle camping along designated routes would be allowed in designated sites only.	Vehicle camping along designated routes would be allowed only at existing sites where previous camping use is evident. However, existing sites that overlie or are causing significant impacts to sensitive resources would be closed and new sites could be made available in locations where resource impacts are lessened.		
Non-motorized, dispersed camping would be allowed subject to Trail and Travel Management decisions, except for the Coyote Buttes Fee Area.				
Recreational collecting of Monument resources, such as rocks, mineral specimens, petrified wood, fossils, or plants would be prohibited. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management for vehicular decisions and Table 2.3: Vegetation Management for collection of plants.)				
Collection of dead and down wood for campfires would continue to be allowed where fires are allowed.	Collection of dead and down wood for campfires would not be allowed.	Collection of dead and down wood for campfires would be allowed, subject to fire restrictions.		
<i>Vermilion</i>				
The current group sizes and visitor use limits in Paria Canyon, Buckskin Gulch, Wire Pass, and Coyote Buttes would continue, subject to adaptive management decisions deemed necessary through monitoring and evaluation of resource and social conditions. (For existing limits, see Chapter 3 Vermilion Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education; Recreation Administration-Visitor Limits and Regulations; Permits and Fees)				
All recreational and commercial horseback riding and pack stock use would continue to be prohibited in Coyote Buttes.				
Commercial use of horses and pack stock would continue to be prohibited in Paria Canyon upstream from Bush Head Canyon.	Commercial use of horses and pack stock would be prohibited in Paria Canyon.	Same as Alternative A	Commercial use of horses and pack stock would be allowed in Paria Canyon from Whitehouse to Big Spring and from Lee’s Ferry to Bush Head Canyon.	Same as Alternatives A

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Visitor limits, regulations, or restrictions in the resource area would be instituted and/or adjusted only when monitoring of resource and social conditions indicates a trend toward unacceptable change to desired recreation settings brought about by such use.	Visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions would be managed when carrying capacities are exceeded.	Visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions would be based on LAC.	Visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions would be managed on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative C
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	In developed campgrounds, camping outside designated campsites would be prohibited.			
Dispersed camping would be allowed, subject to Trail and Travel Management decisions.				
N/A	Reasonable limits for collecting petrified wood for personal use would be defined as no more than 25 pounds per person per day (plus one piece of petrified wood) up to a total of 250 pounds per person per year.			
N/A	The recreational collecting of plants and dead and down firewood would be allowed. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation Management for specific decisions.)			
<i>ii. Permits and Fees</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Visitor limits, regulations, or restrictions could be instituted and/or adjusted when monitoring of resource and social conditions indicate a trend toward unacceptable resource and social changes brought about by such use.				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial, competitive, organized group/event, and special area permits could be authorized when such uses accomplish or are compatible with management objectives and other plan provisions. Commercial services in designated or proposed wilderness should meet guidelines for commercial activities within wilderness. Recreation activities requiring use authorization could be limited in listed species and other sensitive habitats. (See Table 2.5: Special Status Species and Table 2.3 Vegetation Management.) 			
• Authorizations would continue to be considered on a	Special Recreation Permit (SRP) administration would	SRP administration would operate on a calendar year.	SRP application packages (application, operating plan, maps, etc.) would be considered for authorization on a case-by-case	

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
case-by-case basis upon receipt of application. • Commercial recreation permits would be issued to the extent that their cumulative impacts are consistent with the overall objectives of this Plan and in the public interest.	operate on a calendar year. Applications, operating plans, renewals, post-use reports, and fee payments would only be submitted between January 1 and February 1.	Applications, operating plans, renewals, post-use reports, and fee payments would only be submitted between January 1 and April 1.	basis upon receipt of application. (See 43 CFR 2930 for requirements)	
No competitive events would be authorized in desert tortoise ACECs, wilderness, or NPS proposed wilderness.	No competitive events would be authorized in wilderness or NPS proposed wilderness.			
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
N/A	No motorized speed events would be authorized in the Monuments.			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
The current special area permit and fee requirements for Paria Canyon, Buckskin Gulch, Wire Pass, and Coyote Buttes would continue, subject to adaptive management decisions deemed necessary through monitoring and evaluation of resource and social conditions.				
N/A	No new commercial SRPs would be authorized in Coyote Buttes North and the existing permits would be allowed to expire.	No new commercial SRPs would be authorized in Coyote Buttes North but existing permits would continue.	Commercial SRPs would be considered on a case-by-case basis in Coyote Buttes North	Commercial SRPs would be considered on a case-by-case basis in Coyote Buttes North. A limit may be established as conditions dictate.
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Current recreation use permit and fee program required for use in the Virgin Gorge Recreation Area would continue, subject to adaptive management decisions deemed necessary through monitoring, evaluation, and further planning.				
The annual Rhino Rally motorcycle race in the Arizona Strip FO would be allowed, but restricted primarily to roads	No motorized speed events would be authorized.	Motorized speed events would only be authorized in the Motorized Speed Event Area in the St. George Basin and	Motorized speed events could be authorized on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative C (See Motorized Speed Event Area on Map 2.19)

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
and washes and limited to 300 entrants.		limited to 300 entrants. (See Motorized Speed Event Area on Map 2.19)		
D. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
a. Recreation Management Actions				
<i>i. Resources</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Wilderness management objectives as expressed in individual wilderness management plans would be complemented by recreation management activities adjacent to wilderness areas.	N/A			
<i>ii. Signing and Recreation Facilities</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
All recreation facilities and signs would be made consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1973, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968.				
Sign plans that address present and future needs involving road information, interpretation, and public safety, and coordinate the plans with the Arizona Strip visitor map would be written. Generally, signing would be the minimum necessary to provide for public safety and information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sign plan for each planning area that addresses present and future needs involving road information, interpretation, and public safety would be written. The plans would be coordinated with the development of maps and access guides for all three planning areas. • Implementation plans would include outreach efforts to actively recruit service-oriented volunteers, organizations, and schools to assist with accomplishing appropriate implementation projects. 			

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	BLM and NPS sign standards would be incorporated to create a joint identity and sign design for the Monument.			
b. Recreation Marketing Actions				
<i>i. Visitor Services and Information</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Accurate information regarding recreation opportunities, interpretation of natural and human history, and specific rules and regulations pertaining to their use of BLM/NPS lands would be provided to visitors.				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Interagency Information Center and partnerships with cooperating associations would continue to be used to distribute resource information to the public. The BLM Arizona Strip Visitor Center and outlying visitor contact facilities (not necessarily BLM) would sell or provide free, maps, resource brochures, and safety information so that visitors would have a safe and enjoyable experience. A web site would continue to be maintained for online inquiries. 			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	The comprehensive interpretive plan developed in the Interpretation and Environmental Education section would also include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel, orientation, and safety information, as appropriate to each TMA. A variety of driving tour route guides would be developed to enhance motorized sightseeing. 			
c. Recreation Administration Actions				
<i>i. Permits and Fees</i>				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Public input and coordination and consultation with affected Federal and State agencies would be sought prior to instituting any new permit or fee programs.				
N/A	Annual training would be provided to SRP holders concerning appropriate use ethics, such as <i>Leave No Trace</i> and <i>Tread Lightly</i> .	Appropriate land-use ethics publications and materials, such as <i>Leave No Trace</i> and <i>Tread Lightly</i> , would be provided to SRP holders.	Same as Alternatives B & C	
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	BLM and NPS permitting processes would be consolidated to provide the public with a simplified procedure for obtaining permits.			

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
II. INTERPRETATION AND EDUCATION				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Arizona Strip’s interpretation and environmental education program would be grounded in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arizona Strip natural and cultural resources, including Monument objects in Parashant and Vermilion, ▪ Themes related to both Monuments’ purpose, significance, and mission statements and Arizona Strip FO significance and mission statements, and ▪ BLM and NPS missions and goals • The public would understand and appreciate the purposes and significance of the Monuments and their resources for this and future generations. • The public would understand the importance of natural and cultural resources in the Planning Area through interpretive, watchable wildlife, and other environmental education programs. 			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
<i>Common to All Planning</i>				
N/A	Outreach efforts would be established, such as field institutes or elder hostels, to focus on interpretive and environmental educational niches not previously addressed.			
N/A	Visitors would be provided with environmental educational opportunities that are appropriate for each RMZ or for the ERMA, allowing them to enjoy the variety of challenges that are presented when visiting these areas.			
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	“Views,” a program that provides multimedia based educational experience opportunities available through visitor centers and online, would be created.			
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning</i>				
N/A	Arizona Strip and Monument staff would seek partnerships with other state and federal agencies, educational institutions, and other organizations to enrich interpretation and environmental educational opportunities			
N/A	Outreach programs would be developed through organizations, schools, and partnerships to build emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with the area and its cultural and natural heritage.			

TABLE 2.14: RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES/ INTERPRETATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Education and outreach programs like <i>Tread Lightly</i> and <i>Leave No Trace</i> would continue to be supported.			
N/A	Monument and Arizona Strip staff would remain informed of changing visitor demographics to better tailor interpretive media to visitor needs and desires.			
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Comprehensive interpretive plans (CIPs) would be completed, creating a long-range vision and basis for decision-making related to interpretation and education of the Monuments.			
N/A	The CIPs would address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretive goals, objectives, and associated management actions necessary for interpreting themes to target audiences. • Interpretive goals, objectives, and associated management actions necessary for meeting the needs of the public as identified in the Recreation Marketing Actions section of various RMZs within the SRMAs. • Interpretive publications that would need to be developed for public use. • Outreach environmental education programs (interactive computer, workshop, and classroom) that would need to be developed to enhance knowledge of natural and cultural resources and promote stewardship. • Partnerships with other state, national parks, educational institutions, and other organizations to enrich interpretation and environmental education opportunities that would need to be developed. 			

Map 2.12: Special Recreation Management Areas - Proposed Plan

Map 2.13: Recreation Management Zones - Proposed Plan

Map 2.14: Recreation Settings (Physical) - Proposed Plan

Map 2.15: Recreation Settings (Social) - Proposed Plan

Map 2.16: Recreation Settings (Administrative) - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.14a: SPECIAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS

<i>Parashant</i>	
A. Mount Trumbull and Parashant RCAs/SRMAs (Alternative A only)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Zones	None identified under current management.
Recreation Niche	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Objectives (Mt. Trumbull RCA/SRMA)	Recreation would be managed to meet the objectives of the RCA and ACECs. Conservation of natural and human resource values would be promoted through various means in the Mt. Trumbull RCA for the purposes of education, scientific study, and recreational opportunities. (See Mt. Trumbull RCA Plan for more specific objectives.)
Recreation Management Objectives (Parashant RCA/SRMA)	The area would be managed in coordination with the NPS Lake Mead NRA to ensure continued public use and enjoyment for a variety of recreational activities, which do not impair the natural values of the area. Visitor services would be improved related to information, interpretation, facility development and maintenance, and safety. Remote characteristics would be protected. (See Parashant RCA Plan for more specific objectives.)
Primary Activities	Recreation opportunities associated with motorized vehicle use in roaded natural settings, such as exploring backcountry roads, vehicle camping, sightseeing, picnicking, aircraft use. Recreation opportunities associated with non-motorized use in semi-primitive non-motorized settings, such as primitive camping, backpacking, hiking, horseback riding, mountain bike riding, hunting, photography.
Experiences	In roaded natural settings, there would be about equal probability to experience affiliation with other user groups and for isolation from the sights and sounds of humans. There would be opportunity to have a high degree of interaction with the natural environment. Challenge and risk opportunities associated with more primitive type of recreation would not be very important. Practice and testing of outdoor skills might be important. Opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized forms of recreation would be possible. In semi-primitive non-motorized settings, there would be a high, but not extremely high, probability of experiencing isolation from the sights and sounds of humans, independence, closeness to nature, tranquility, and self-reliance through the application of woodsman and outdoor skills in an environment that offers a high degree of challenge and risk.
Benefits	None defined under current management.
Setting Character Conditions	The RCA/SRMA would be managed to provide recreation opportunities in settings generally ranging from Roaded Natural to Semi-Primitive, Non-Motorized. (see Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions.)

B. Mount Trumbull and Mount Logan Wilderness, Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness, and Paiute Wilderness SRMAs (Alternatives A and B only)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	None defined under current management.
<i>1. No Recreation Management Zone Identified</i>	
Recreation Niche	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Objectives	Complement wilderness management plans where appropriate - See Wilderness Section (See Mt. Trumbull/Mt. Logan Wilderness, Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness, and Paiute-Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness Management Plans for more specific objectives.)
Primary Activities	Recreation opportunities associated with non-motorized use such as primitive camping, backpacking, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, photography.
Experiences	Extremely high probability of experiencing isolation from the sights and sounds of humans, independence, closeness to nature, tranquility, and self-reliance through the application of woodsman and outdoor skills in an environment that offers a high degree of challenge and risk.
Benefits	None defined under current management.
Setting Character Conditions	The SRMAs would be managed to provide recreation opportunities in Primitive physical, social, and administrative settings. (See Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions; see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)
C. Parashant SRMAs/NPS SMA (Alternatives C, D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for the Parashant SRMA/NPS SMA would be to target a demonstrated undeveloped recreation-tourism market demand from local community and regional/national visitors for trophy hunting opportunities, guided back country tours, hiking, viewing and appreciating wildland landscapes and cultural sites, canyoneering and motorized/mechanized/non-mechanized exploring. This demand is supported by the area’s distinctive remote, rugged landscape, its proximity to Grand Canyon, its vast size and the largely open and undeveloped character of its recreation settings. Regional and local recreation-tourism visitors value this area for the distinctive kinds of dispersed recreation it produces. (See Appendix 2.R for more information.)
<i>1. Shivwits Frontier Recreation Management Zone</i>	
Recreation Niche	Sustainable access for scenic, natural, open-space appreciation, and exploration recreation adventure somewhat close to nearby communities.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2010, this zone would be managed to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy sustainable, multiple travel mode access to scenic, natural, open-space settings for both day and overnight recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Vehicle exploring, camping, hunting, hiking, viewing scenery.

Experiences	Enjoying going out exploring on my/our own; feeling good about solitude, being isolated and independent; developing your skills and abilities.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Improved skills for outdoor enjoyment; greater self-reliance; closer relationship with the natural world; greater sense of adventure; improved mental well-being; greater sensitivity to/awareness of outdoor aesthetics, nature’s art and its elegance. • <i>Environmental</i>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ to would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to remoteness and Primitive to Roded Natural, with regard to naturalness and recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to group size; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to evidence of use and contacts. • <i>Administrative</i>: Primitive to Roded Natural, with regard to visitor services; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Rural, with regard to mechanized/motorized use (see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses).
2. Parashant Wildlands Recreation Management Zone	
Recreation Niche	Extreme, world class, deep wildlands exploration in remote and rugged Grand Canyon country.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2010, this zone would produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy, by various travel modes, remote wildland recreation adventure in the rugged, canyons and cliffs adjacent to Grand Canyon, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4= total realization). A separate NPS wilderness management plan would be developed to address resource conditions and visitor experience in NPS proposed wilderness areas.
Primary Activities	Hiking, backpacking, hunting, canyoneering, vehicle exploring.
Experiences	Enjoying Risk Taking Adventure; savoring the total sensory--sight, sound, and smell--experience of natural landscape.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Improved outdoor knowledge, skills, and self-confidence; improved appreciation of nature’s splendor; enhanced sense of personal freedom; greater sensitivity to/awareness of outdoor aesthetics, nature’s art and its elegance. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Increased independence/autonomy. • <i>Environmental</i>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Primitive to Roded Natural, with regard to remoteness and naturalness and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to and recreation facilities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized regard to group size, evidence of use, and contacts. • <i>Administrative</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to visitor services, management controls and Primitive to Rural, with regard to mechanized/motorized use, with regard to mechanized/motorized use. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)
Vermilion	
D. Canyons & Plateaus of the Paria RCA/SRMA (Alternative A only)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	None defined under current management.
1. No Recreation Management Zone Identified	
Recreation Niche	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Objectives	Manage the RCA in a manner that would 1) ensure, through various means, continued opportunities in the Canyons and Plateaus of the Paria RCA for the public to enjoy a variety of backcountry, recreational activities, and for the possibility of scientific studies and 2) provide visitors to the Canyons and Plateaus of the Paria RCA with accurate information regarding recreation opportunities, interpretation of natural and human history, and specific rules and regulations pertaining to their use of the area.
Primary Activities	Recreation opportunities associated with non-motorized use in semi-primitive non-motorized settings, such as primitive camping, backpacking, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, and sightseeing. However, vehicle exploring and limited off-highway travel (RN) would be recognized as essential components of most activities and, while being activities in and of themselves, they would not be promoted in these areas.
Experiences	In roaded natural settings, there would be about equal probability to experience affiliation with other user groups and for isolation from the sights and sounds of humans. There would be opportunity to have a high degree of interaction with the natural environment. Challenge and risk opportunities associated with more primitive type of recreation would not be very important. Practice and testing of outdoor skills might be important. Opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized forms of recreation would be possible. In semi-primitive non-motorized settings, there would be a high, but not extremely high, probability of experiencing isolation from the sights and sounds of humans, independence, closeness to nature, tranquility, and self-reliance through the application of woodsman and outdoor skills in an environment that offers a high degree of challenge and risk.
Benefits	None defined under current management.
Setting Character Conditions	The RCA/SRMA would be managed to provide recreation opportunities in settings generally ranging from Roaded Natural to Semi-Primitive, Non-Motorized. (See Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions.)

E. Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness SRMA (Alternatives A and B only)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	None defined under current management.
<i>1. No Recreation Management Zone Identified</i>	
Recreation Niche	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Objectives	Complement wilderness management plans where appropriate - See Wilderness Section. (See Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Management Plan for more specific objectives.)
Primary Activities	Recreation opportunities associated with non-motorized use such as primitive camping, backpacking, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, photography.
Experiences	Extremely high probability of experiencing isolation from the sights and sounds of humans, independence, closeness to nature, tranquility, and self-reliance through the application of woodsman and outdoor skills in an environment that offers a high degree of challenge and risk.
Benefits	None defined under current management.
Setting Character Conditions	The SRMAs would be managed to provide recreation opportunities in Primitive physical, social, and administrative settings. (See Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions.)
F. Gateways SRMA (Alternatives C, D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for Gateways SRMA would be to target a demonstrated destination recreation-tourism market demand from regional, national and international visitors for viewing spectacular geology, driving an Arizona State Scenic Road, viewing natural/cultural sites and exhibits, viewing California Condors, and hiking. This demand is supported by the area’s distinctive pathways through a spectacular Northern Arizona landscape of scenic and historic values; its connectivity to other world-class sites (Grand Canyon, GSENM, Lees Ferry); and its potential for interpretive facility development by partnering with local recreation providers. Recreation-tourism visitors, ranging from local to international, highly value these public lands as recreation-tourism destinations. (See Appendix 2.R for more info.)
<i>1. Vermilion Cliffs RMZ</i>	
Recreation Niche	Old scenic highway driving and roadside access to interpretation.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2010, manage this zone to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy scenic highway driving and roadside natural/cultural history appreciation and education-type recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Viewing scenic vistas, historic sites, and interpretive exhibits, driving for pleasure.
Experiences	Feeling good about the way our cultural heritage is being protected; enjoying easy access to natural landscapes.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Greater respect for my own cultural heritage; diminished mental anxiety; increased appreciation of the area’s cultural history; greater awareness that this is a special place. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Greater community involvement in recreation and other land-use decisions. • <i>Economic</i>: Increased local tourism revenue; maintenance of community’s distinctive recreation-tourism market niche.

Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Rural, with regard to remoteness; Roded Natural, with regard to naturalness; and Roded Natural to Rural, with regard to recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to group size; Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to contacts; and Rural, with regard to evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Rural, with regard to visitor services and mechanized/motorized use and Roded Natural, with regard to management controls (see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions on administrative use access).
2. House Rock RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Scenic backroads driving with access to interpretation, wildlife viewing, and hiking.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2010, manage this zone to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy “back road” driving, roadside natural/cultural history interpretation, hiking, and wildlife viewing opportunities, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Visiting scenic vistas, historic sites, interpretive exhibits, and wildlife, including California Condors, driving for pleasure, and hiking.
Experiences	Enjoying access to environmental learning; savoring the natural landscape.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Improved sense of personal responsibility for acting responsible on public lands; improved appreciation of nature’s splendor; improved outdoor stewardship ethic. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Maintenance of community’s distinctive recreation-tourism market niche; enlarged sense of community dependency on public lands. • <i>Environmental</i>: Greater protection of wildlife and plant habitat; increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes; improved soil, air, and water quality.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Roded Natural, with regard to remoteness and Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to naturalness and recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to group size; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to contacts; and Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to visitor services; Rural, with regard to mechanized/motorized use; and Roded Natural, with regard to management controls (see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses).

G. Sand Hills SRMA (Alternatives C, D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for the Sand Hills SRMA would be to target a demonstrated undeveloped recreation-tourism market demand from local community and regional/national visitors for hunting opportunities, guided back country tours, hiking, viewing and appreciating wildland landscapes, and motorized/mechanized/non-mechanized exploring. This demand is supported by the area’s distinctive remote, rugged landscape, its vast size, and the largely open, undeveloped character of its recreation settings. Regional and local recreation-tourism visitors value this area for the distinctive kinds of dispersed recreation it produces. (See Appendix 2.R for more information.)
1. The Uplands RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Self-directed motorized recreation with access to non-motorized opportunities.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2012, manage this zone to produce limited and sustainable motorized access for visitors to enjoy day-use adventure activities in natural, scenic landscapes along structured travel routes and areas, accessing non-motorized exploration and challenge recreation in an urban back-yard setting of colorful sandstone abutting the wilderness, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4= total realization).
Primary Activities	Off-highway adventure driving and exploring.
Experiences	Developing skills and abilities; enjoying going exploring on my/our own.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Enhanced sense of personal freedom; greater self-reliance; increased adaptability; greater environmental awareness and sensitivity; enlarged sense of personal accountability for acting responsibly on public lands; a more outdoor oriented lifestyle. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Heightened sense of satisfaction with my community; increased work productivity; greater community involvement in other land-use decisions. • <i>Environmental</i>: Improved understanding of this/our community’s dependence and impacts on public land.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roaded Natural, with regard to remoteness and naturalness and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Roaded Natural, with regard to group size; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to contacts; and Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to visitor services and management controls and Primitive to Roaded Natural, with regard to mechanized/motorized use (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses).
2. Cliffs & Rims RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Self-directed, non-motorized access for remote, primitive adventure.
Recreation Management	By the year 2012, manage this zone to produce opportunities for local/regional visitors to enjoy primitive-mode recreation

Objectives	adventure through natural-appearing shallow valleys and sandstone mesas, pinnacles, and slick rock erosion features, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4= total realization). Other management objectives would continue to be established through the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Management plan, as amended by this Plan.
Primary Activities	Hiking, scrambling, hunting, and rock climbing.
Experiences	Enjoying risk-taking adventure; enjoying strenuous physical exercise.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Improved outdoor recreation skills; improved muscle strength; improved cardiovascular health; improved teamwork and cooperation; a more holistic sense of wellness. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Better sense of place within my community. • <i>Economic</i>: Reduced health maintenance costs/
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Primitive to Roaded Natural, with regard to remoteness; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to naturalness; and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to group size and evidence of use and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to contacts. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to visitor services; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to management controls; and Primitive, with regard to mechanized/motorized use (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses).
H. Paria SRMA (Alternatives C, D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for the Paria SRMA would be to target a demonstrated destination recreation-tourism market demand from community resident, regional, national, and international visitors for viewing unique geology and enjoying world class slot canyon backpacking and hiking. This demand is supported by the area’s distinctive landscape of spectacular geology and scenery, challenging terrain, and its connectivity to other world-class sites (GSENM, Glen Canyon NRA, Kanab FO). Recreation-tourism visitors, ranging from local to international, highly value these public lands as recreation-tourism destinations. (See Appendix 2.R for more information.)
1. Coyote Buttes RMZ	
Recreation Niche	International adventure tourism.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2008, manage this zone to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy rugged, world-class, day-hiking adventure in a spectacular geologic showcase of colorful cliffs and eroded formations, while preserving it’s rustic character, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4= total

	realization). Other management objectives would continue to be established through the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Management plan, as amended by this Plan.
Primary Activities	Hiking and scrambling; viewing and photographing scenic vistas.
Experiences	Enjoying the artistic expression of nature; escaping everyday responsibilities for awhile.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Increased capacity for artistic expression; restored mind from unwanted stress; greater sensitivity to/awareness of outdoor aesthetics—nature's art and elegance. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Improved physical fitness and health maintenance; maintenance of community's distinctive recreation tourism market. • <i>Economic</i>: Reduced health maintenance costs. • <i>Environmental</i>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roaded Natural, with regard to remoteness; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to naturalness, Primitive to Roaded Natural, with regard to recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized with regard to group sizes and evidence of use and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized with regard to contacts. • <i>Administrative</i>: Primitive to Roaded Natural, with regard to visitor services and mechanized/motorized use and Semi-Primitive Motorized to Rural, with regard to management controls (see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses).
2. Paria Canyon RMZ	
Recreation Niche	World-class wilderness trekking adventure.
Recreation Management Objectives	<p>By the year 2008, manage this zone to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy world-class, long-distance wilderness trekking in a spectacular geologic showcase of colorful, deep canyons, cliffs and narrow slots, while preserving its wilderness character, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a "moderate" realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).</p> <p>Other management objectives would continue to be established through the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Management plan as amended by this Plan.</p>
Primary Activities	Hiking, backpacking, viewing scenic vistas.
Experiences	Enjoying risk-taking adventure; feeling good about solitude, being isolated, and independent.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Improved outdoor knowledge, skills, and self-confidence; enhanced sense of personal freedom and awareness; greater appreciation for my wildland/parkland heritage and how managers care for it; greater sense of independence. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Enlarged sense of community dependency on public lands.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environmental</i>: maintenance of distinctive recreation setting character.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to naturalness and Primitive, with regard to recreation facilities and remoteness. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized with regard to group size and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized with regard to contacts and evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Routed Natural, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Rural, with regard to management controls; and Primitive, with regard to mechanized/motorized use (see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses).
Arizona Strip FO	
A. Mount Trumbull RCA/SRMA (Alternative A only)	
See DFCs for this SRMA in the discussion under Parashant (table Section A above).	
B. Canyons & Plateaus of the Paria RCA/SRMA (Alternative A only)	
See DFCs for this SRMA in the discussion under Vermilion (table Section D above).	
C. Virgin River Corridor ACEC/SRMA (Alternative A only)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	Primary Market-Based Strategy
1. No Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) Identified	
Recreation Niche	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Objectives	Recreation would be managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC. Ensure greater recreation emphasis and investment. Provide a variety of visitor uses in the Virgin River Campground and surrounding areas including longer term visitor use, tent and self-contained camping, river running and recreation and wilderness use.
Primary Activities	River floating, viewing wildlife, geology, hiking, camping
Experiences	In rural settings, chances of experiencing affiliation with individuals and groups would be common, as would convenience of sites and opportunities. This would generally be more important than physical environment setting. Opportunities for wildland challenges, risk-taking/testing of outdoor skills would generally be unimportant except for specific activities like competitive/spectator events. In routed natural settings, there would be about equal chance to experience affiliation with other user groups and isolation from human sights and sounds. There would be opportunity for a high degree of interaction with natural environment. Challenge/risk opportunities associated with more primitive recreation would not be important. Practice/testing outdoor skills might be important. Opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized recreation possible.
Benefits	None defined under current management.
Setting Character Conditions	The SRMA would be managed to provide recreation opportunities ranging from Routed Natural to Rural settings. (See Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions.)

D. Little Black Mountain ACEC/ SRMA (Alternative A only)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	None defined under current management.
<i>1. No Recreation Management Zone Identified</i>	
Recreation Niche	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Objectives	Recreation would be managed to meet the objectives of the Cultural ACEC. Ensure greater recreation emphasis and investment. This site would be targeted for public involvement in research, interpretation, and tours.
Primary Activities	Viewing cultural sites.
Experiences	None defined under current management.
Benefits	None defined under current management.
Setting Character Conditions	None defined under current management.
E. Paiute Wilderness and Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness, Cottonwood Point Wilderness, and Kanab Creek Wilderness SRMAs (Alternatives A & B)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	None defined under current management.
<i>1. No Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) Identified</i>	
Recreation Niche	None defined under current management.
Recreation Management Objectives	Complement wilderness management plans where appropriate - See Wilderness Section (See Paiute-Beaver Dam Mountains and Cottonwood Point Wilderness Management Plans for more specific objectives.)
Primary Activities	Recreation opportunities associated with non-motorized use such as primitive camping, backpacking, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, photography.
Experiences	Extremely high probability of experiencing isolation from the sights and sounds of humans, independence, closeness to nature, tranquility, and self-reliance through the application of woodsman and outdoor skills in an environment that offers a high degree of challenge and risk.
Benefits	None defined under current management.
Setting Character Conditions	The SRMAs would be managed to provide recreation opportunities in Primitive physical, social, and administrative settings. (See Appendix 3.H for setting descriptions; see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)
F. St. George Basin SRMA (Alternatives C, D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for the St. George Basin SRMA would be to target a demonstrated community recreation-tourism market demand from primarily local communities (dependent on public lands recreation and/or related tourism use, growth, and/or development), as well as some other seasonal regional visitors, for motorized/mechanized/non-mechanized exploring, technical sports, fitness activities, guided tours, sightseeing, equestrian, hiking, competitive and organized events, viewing and appreciating natural landscapes and cultural sites. This demand is supported by the area's distinctive

	landscape, warm winters, and its close proximity to the rapidly growing communities of St. George, Santa Clara, Middleton, Washington, Hurricane, and Toquerville, Utah. Local recreation-tourism visitors value these public lands as their own ‘back-yard’ recreation settings. (See Appendix 2.R for more information.)
1. St. George Basin Rural Park RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Quick, easy access from town to sustainable day-use adventure, challenge, exercise, social, and outdoor recreation.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2011, manage this zone to produce close-to-town opportunities for community residents and seasonal, regional visitors to enjoy directed day-use adventure activities in natural, scenic landscapes along structured travel routes and areas, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Exploring activities (i.e., <i>OHV driving, ATV and motorcycle riding, equestrian, hiking</i>); personal challenge activities (i.e., <i>rock climbing, rock crawling, mountain biking, competitive events</i>); social activities (i.e., <i>organized group/family events</i>); and fitness activities (i.e., <i>walking, running, hiking</i>).
Experiences	Enjoying going exploring on my/our own; enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes; developing your skills and abilities; enjoying getting some needed physical exercise; enjoying participating in group outdoor events; enjoying having access to close-to-home outdoor amenities.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal: Greater freedom from urban living; Improved appreciation of nature’s splendor; Improved understanding of how this community’s rural-urban interface impacts its quality of life; Improved skills for outdoor enjoyment; Improved physical fitness and health maintenance; Greater self-reliance; Restored mind from unwanted stress; Improved mental well-being; stronger ties with my family and friends. • Household & Community: Increased nurturance of others; Improved functioning of individuals in family and community. • Economic: Reduced health maintenance costs. • Environmental: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Rural, with regard to remoteness; Semi-Primitive Motorized to Rural, with regard to recreation facilities; and Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roaded Natural, regarding naturalness. • Social: Semi-Primitive Motorized to Rural, with regard to group size and evidence of use; Primitive to Rural, with regard to contacts; portions may spike to Urban-like settings during special use activities. • Administrative: Rural, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roaded Natural, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Urban, with regard to mechanized/motorized use. May spike to Urban-like management controls during special use activities or for protection of listed species. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)

2. Canyons and Mesas RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Self-directed, primitive, adventure in a natural setting close to town.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2011, manage this zone to produce close-to-town recreation opportunities for community resident and regional visitors to enjoy self-directed, primitive day-use adventure in rugged, trackless canyons, cliffs, bajadas, and mesas, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4= total realization).
Primary Activities	Hiking, equestrian, hunting, viewing nature.
Experiences	Enjoying going exploring on my/our own; enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes; feeling good about solitude, being isolated, and independent.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Greater freedom from urban living; improved appreciation of nature’s splendor; closer relationship with the natural world. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Greater appreciation for my wildland/parkland heritage and how managers care for it; Enlarged sense of community dependency on public lands. • <i>Environmental</i>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Rural, with regard to remoteness; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to naturalness; and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized with regard to recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to group size and evidence of use and Primitive to Rural, with regard to contacts. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roaded Natural, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Urban, with regard to mechanized/motorized use. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)
G. Virgin River SRMA (Alternatives C, D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for the Virgin River SRMA would be to target a demonstrated destination recreation-tourism market demand from mainly local community residents and regional visitors for day-use and overnight hiking, family outings, rock climbing, school group field outings, and white water activities. Similarly, there is market demand from local, regional, and national visitors for sightseeing, appreciation of geologic resources, rest from travel and escaping the cold winter weather of other locations. This demand is supported by the area’s distinctive location along high traffic volume Interstate Highway 15, its place in the Grand Canyon-like landscape of Virgin River Gorge, and ease of access for day and overnight recreation. National, regional, and local recreation-tourism visitors value these public lands as recreation-tourism destinations. (See Appendix 2.R for more information.)

1. Virgin River RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Group-oriented white-water and climbing adventures amidst rugged and stunning geologic features.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2010, manage this zone to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy white-water boating adventure for social group affiliation, water-play for family affiliation, and challenging rock climbing within a naturally-appearing ‘mini Grand Canyon’ landscape, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Kayaking, river floating, water play, viewing geology, rock climbing.
Experiences	Enjoying the closeness of friends and family; participating in group outdoor events and strenuous physical exercise.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Personal</u>: Greater personal enrichment through involvement with other people; confirmation/development of my own values; improved muscle strength; improved cardiovascular health; a more holistic sense of wellness. • <u>Household & Community</u>: Stronger ties with my family and friends. • <u>Economic</u>: Reduced health maintenance costs.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Physical</u>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Rural, with regard to remoteness; Primitive to Roded Natural, with regard to naturalness; and Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to recreation facilities. • <u>Social</u>: Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to group size; Primitive to Rural, with regard to contacts; and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to evidence of use. • <u>Administrative</u>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Urban, with regard to mechanized/ motorized uses (See Table 2.15: Travel Management for decisions regarding administrative uses).
2. Virgin River Gorge Scenic Gateway RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Self-sustaining, recreation gateway between the Colorado Plateau and Basin and Range regions, nestled within a ‘Grand Canyon-like’ landscape.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2010, manage this zone to produce safe day-use and overnight opportunities for community residents and regional and national travelers passing through the Virgin River Gorge to appreciate geologic and riparian resources and structured environmental education within a stunning gateway between geologic provinces, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Camping, picnicking, nature study, viewing geology, hiking, walking, viewing education presentations, group events.
Experiences	Savoring the total sensory—sight, sound, and smell—experience of a natural landscape; Learning more about things here; Enjoying the closeness of friends and family; Enjoying participating in group outdoor events.

Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Improved appreciation of nature’s splendor; greater sensitivity to/awareness of outdoor aesthetics, nature’s art and its elegance; greater personal enrichment through involvement with other people; confirmation/development of my own values. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Stronger ties with my family and friends. • <i>Environmental</i>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Rural, with regard to remoteness and recreation facilities and Rooded Natural, with regard to naturalness. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to group size---frequently spiking to Urban for group activities; Rooded Natural, with regard to contacts; and Rooded Natural to Rural, with regard to evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Rooded Natural to Urban, with regard to visitor services; Rural to Urban, with regard to mechanized/motorized uses; and Rooded Natural to Rural, with regard to management controls (see Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses).
3. The Motorways RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Interpretive respites for travelers at pull-out sites along primary highways.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2015, collaborating with ADOT and Mohave County, manage this zone to produce safe day-use opportunities for primarily regional and national travelers along Interstate Highway 15 and community residents along Old Highway 91 to enjoy roadside access to geologic and riparian resource appreciation and education recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Viewing geology, viewing wildlife, viewing nature, viewing roadside exhibits.
Experiences	Learning more about things here; releasing or reducing some built-up mental tensions.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Enhanced awareness and understanding of nature; closer relationship with the natural world; restored body from fatigue; diminished mental anxiety. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Increased compassion for others. • <i>Environmental</i>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Rural, with regard to remoteness; Rooded Natural to Rural, with regard to naturalness; and Semi-Primitive Motorized to Rooded Natural, with regard to recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to group size; Primitive to Rural, with regard to contacts; and Rooded Natural to Rural, with regard to evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Rooded Natural, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Urban, with regard to mechanized/motorized uses.

	(See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)
H. Virgin Ridge SRMA (Alternatives D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for the Virgin Ridge SRMA would be to target a demonstrated community recreation-tourism market demand from primarily local communities (dependent on public lands recreation and/or related tourism use, growth, and/or development), as well as some other regional visitors, for motorized/mechanized/non-mechanized exploring, world-class rock climbing, and guided touring in close-to-town natural settings. This demand is supported by the area’s distinctive landscape, its close proximity to the rapidly growing communities of Mesquite, Bunkerville, Logandale, and Overton, NV and Beaver Dam, Scenic and Littlefield, AZ. Local recreation-tourism visitors value these public lands as their own ‘back-yard’ recreation settings. (See Appendix 2.R for more information.)
1. Lime Kiln Cliffs RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Close-to-town world class rock climbing in a natural setting.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2009, manage this zone to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy easy-to-access, world class rock climbing, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Rock climbing (sport climbing on bolted routes).
Experiences	Enjoying risk taking adventure; enjoying strenuous physical exercise.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Enhanced sense of personal freedom and awareness; improved outdoor knowledge, skills, and self-confidence; improved muscle strength; improved cardiovascular health; a more holistic sense of wellness. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Greater sense of independence. • <i>Economic</i>: Reduced health maintenance costs.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roaded Natural, with regard to remoteness; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to naturalness and recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to group size and contacts and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Roaded Natural, with regard to mechanized/motorized uses. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management for administrative use access.)

2. Virgin Ridge RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Self-directed, rugged, adventure in a natural setting close to town with opportunities for scenic, natural and historic appreciation.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2009, manage this “close-to-town” zone to produce close-to-town recreation opportunities for community resident and regional visitors to enjoy self-directed, day and overnight adventure recreation in natural settings, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4= total realization) to enjoy “close-to-home” access to sustainable day/overnight, motorized/mechanized adventure.
Primary Activities	Hiking, scrambling, equestrian, hunting, OHV exploring, mountain bike riding.
Experiences	Enjoying risk-taking adventure; feeling good about solitude, being isolated, and independent; developing skills and abilities; enjoying going exploring on my/our own.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Personal</u>: Improved outdoor knowledge, skills, and self-confidence; enhanced sense of personal freedom and awareness; greater sense of independence; closer relationship with the natural world; enhanced sense of personal freedom; greater self-reliance; enlarged sense of personal accountability for acting responsibly on public lands; a more outdoor oriented lifestyle. • <u>Household & Community</u>: Greater appreciation for my wildland/parkland heritage and how managers care for it; enlarged sense of community dependency on public lands; increased work productivity. • <u>Environmental</u>: Improved understanding of this/our community’s dependence and impacts on public land.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Physical</u>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roaded Natural, with regard to remoteness; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to naturalness and recreation facilities. • <u>Social</u>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to group size; Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to contacts; and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to evidence of use. • <u>Administrative</u>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Roaded Natural, with regard to mechanized/motorized uses. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management for administrative use access.)
I. Fredonia SRMA (Alternatives D, & E)	
Primary Market-Based Strategy	The primary strategy for the Fredonia SRMA would be to target a demonstrated community recreation-tourism market demand from primarily local communities (dependent on public lands recreation and/or related tourism use, growth, and/or development), as well as some regional visitors, for motorized/mechanized/non-mechanized exploring, managed target shooting, fitness activities, sightseeing, equestrian, hiking, competitive and organized events, viewing and appreciating natural landscapes and cultural sites. This demand is supported by the area’s distinctive landscape and its

	close proximity to the communities of Fredonia, AZ and Kanab, Utah, local recreation-tourism visitors value these public lands as their own ‘back-yard’ recreation settings. (See Appendix 2.R for more information.)
1. Fredonia Rural Park RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Quick, easy access from town to sustainable day-use adventure, challenge, exercise, social, and outdoor recreation.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2011, manage this zone to produce close-to-town opportunities for community residents and seasonal, regional visitors to enjoy directed day-use adventure activities in scenic landscapes along structured travel routes and open space areas associated with Woodhill Road, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Exploring activities (i.e., <i>OHV driving, ATV and motorcycle riding, equestrian, hiking</i>); personal challenge activities (i.e., <i>rock climbing, rock crawling, mountain biking, BMX riding, target shooting, competitive events</i>); social activities (i.e., <i>organized group/family events</i>); and fitness activities (i.e., <i>walking, running, hiking</i>).
Experiences	Enjoying going exploring on my/our own; enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes; developing your skills and abilities; enjoying getting some needed physical exercise; enjoying participating in group outdoor events; enjoying having access to close-to-home outdoor amenities.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Personal</u>: Greater freedom from urban living; Improved appreciation of nature’s splendor; Improved understanding of how this community’s rural-urban interface impacts its quality of life; Improved skills for outdoor enjoyment; Improved physical fitness and health maintenance; Greater self-reliance; Restored mind from unwanted stress; Improved mental well-being; stronger ties with my family and friends. • <u>Household & Community</u>: Increased nurturance of others; Improved functioning of individuals in family and community. • <u>Economic</u>: Reduced health maintenance costs. • <u>Environmental</u>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Physical</u>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Rural, with regard to remoteness and Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to naturalness and recreation facilities. • <u>Social</u>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized Roded Natural, with regard to group size and evidence of use and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to contacts. May spike to Rural to Urban-like setting during special use activities. • <u>Administrative</u>: Rural, with regard to visitor services; Semi-Primitive Motorized to Roded Natural, with regard to management controls; and Primitive to Urban, with regard to mechanized/motorized uses. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)

2. Shinarump Cliffs RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Close-to-home, self-directed motorized/mechanized adventure for scenic, natural and historic appreciation.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2011, manage this zone to produce opportunities for visitors to enjoy “close-to-home” access to natural, scenic landscapes along structured travel routes and areas for motorized/mechanized adventure recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4=total realization).
Primary Activities	Off-highway adventure driving and exploring, mountain bike riding.
Experiences	Developing skills and abilities; enjoying going exploring on my/our own.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Enhanced sense of personal freedom; greater self-reliance; increased adaptability; greater environmental awareness and sensitivity; enlarged sense of personal accountability for acting responsibly on public lands; a more outdoor oriented lifestyle. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Heightened sense of satisfaction with my community; increased work productivity; greater community involvement in other land-use decisions. • <i>Environmental</i>: Improved understanding of this/our community’s dependence and impacts on public land.
Setting Character Conditions	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to remoteness, naturalness, and recreation facilities. • <i>Social</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to group size and evidence of use and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to contacts. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to visitor services, management controls, and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to mechanized/motorized uses. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)
3. The Badlands RMZ	
Recreation Niche	Self-directed, primitive, adventure, challenge, exploration in a natural setting close to town.
Recreation Management Objectives	By the year 2011, manage this zone to produce close-to-town recreation opportunities for community resident and regional visitors to enjoy self-directed, primitive day-use adventure in rugged, trackless, highly eroded and colorful formations, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a “moderate” realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=moderate, 4= total realization).
Primary Activities	Hiking, equestrian, viewing nature.
Experiences	Enjoying going exploring on my/our own; enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes; feeling good about solitude, being isolated, and independent.

<p>Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal</i>: Greater freedom from urban living; improved appreciation of nature’s splendor; closer relationship with the natural world. • <i>Household & Community</i>: Greater appreciation for my wildland/parkland heritage and how managers care for it; Enlarged sense of community dependency on public lands. • <i>Environmental</i>: Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.
<p>Setting Character Conditions</p>	<p>The RMZ would be managed to produce recreation opportunities in the following essential settings (see Appendix 3.H for more information and Maps 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 for setting allocations.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Physical</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Roaded Natural, with regard to remoteness; Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard recreation facilities; and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to naturalness. • <i>Social</i>: Primitive to Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to group sized, contacts, and evidence of use. • <i>Administrative</i>: Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, with regard to visitor services and management controls and Primitive to Semi-Primitive Motorized, with regard to mechanized/motorized uses. (See Table 2.15: Travel Management Section for decisions regarding access for administrative uses.)

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. TRAVEL MANAGEMENT				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The region’s remoteness, scenic beauty, open spaces, and Monument objects would be maintained by careful travel management. • A variety of existing motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized trail and travel opportunities would be sustained, where needed, to meet public and administrative needs. • Compatible traditional, current, and future use of the land would be sustained by establishing a transportation system that contributes to protection of sensitive resource, promotes dispersed recreation, and minimizes user conflicts. • Public use, resource management, regulatory needs, and Monument objects would be considered through travel management planning, incorporating consideration of the effects of, and interactions among all forms of travel including motorized, mechanized, non-motorized/non-mechanized, equestrian and other livestock, walking, mountain biking, and other travel modes. 				
1. Specific Desired Future Conditions for Travel Management Areas (TMAs)				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Where TMAs would be delineated, DFCs would be described more specifically as follows:			
N/A	<p><u>Rural TMA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives: The Rural TMA would provide for the widest variety of motorized, non-motorized, and mechanical travel modes to serve existing and future recreational, traditional, casual, commercial, educational, and private needs adjacent to communities, but not to the detriment or exclusion of the protection of resources. It would also facilitate linking existing and future regional travel corridors to local communities. • Primary Travelers: The Rural TMA would serve the day-to-day needs of those with permits for the use of resources, such as grazing, fuelwood and mineral materials, as well as private, state, and other land ownership needs and a variety of local, state, and federal agency resource management needs. It would also serve the “after work and on weekends” motorized and non-motorized needs of local and regional visitors engaged in activities such as viewing scenery and cultural resources, exploring, camping, picnicking, hunting, studying nature, and participating in organized events. • Setting Characteristics: Settings would be maintained within the Rural TMA that typically provide for community growth and development and widest variety of recreation opportunities in near-urban, moderately developed areas with motorized and mechanized use. 			
N/A	<p><u>Backways TMA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives: The Backways TMA would provide for a variety of motorized, non-motorized, and mechanical travel modes to serve existing and future recreational, traditional, casual, commercial, educational, and private needs, but not to the 			

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<p>detriment or exclusion of the protection of resources. It would also supply the primary travel system that would provide public entry from communities to the more remote and semi-primitive TMAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Travelers: The Backways TMA would serve the day-to-day needs of those with permits for the use of resources, such as grazing, fuelwood, and mineral materials, as well as private, state, and other land ownership needs and a variety of local, state, and federal agency resource management needs. It would also serve the motorized and non-motorized needs of local, regional, national, and international visitors engaged in activities such as viewing scenery, visiting cultural resources and interpretive sites, exploring by vehicle, camping, picnicking, hunting; studying nature, and participating in organized events. It would also provide the best opportunities for day-use recreation activities related to motor touring. • Setting Characteristics: Settings would be maintained within the Backways TMA that typically provide entry to more remote areas, interpretive developments, and administrative facilities in mostly natural-appearing areas with motorized and mechanized use. 			
N/A	<p><u>Specialized TMA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives: The Specialized TMA would provide for a variety of motorized, non-motorized, and mechanical travel modes to serve existing and future recreational, traditional, casual, commercial, and private needs in remote, rustic settings, but not to the detriment or exclusion of the protection of resources. It would also be characterized by low to moderate densities of improved roads and primitive roads that would provide public entry portals from Backways corridors to the more remote Primitive TMAs. • Primary Travelers: The Specialized TMA would serve the day-to-day needs of those with permits for the use of resources, such as grazing, fuelwood, and mineral materials, as well as private, state, and other land ownership needs and a variety of local, state, and federal agency resource management needs. It would also serve the motorized and non-motorized needs of primarily local, regional, and national visitors engaged in activities such as viewing scenery and cultural resources, exploring, camping, hiking, picnicking, hunting, gathering, and studying nature. • Setting Characteristics: Settings would be maintained within the Specialized TMA that typically provide for motorized and mechanized entry to the most remote areas on lower standard, primitive roads with few and widely scattered, rustic developments in mostly natural-appearing areas. Rudimentary facilities could be present when necessary to protect resources or educate visitors. 			
N/A	<p><u>Primitive TMA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives: The Primitive TMA would provide for adequate, but limited motorized travel to serve existing and future traditional, casual, some commercial, private, and emergency needs and for non-motorized, non-mechanized travel to serve existing and future recreational needs in the most remote, rustic settings, for the enhancement and protection of important resource values. It would also range from large areas containing no routes to areas characterized by low densities of 			

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	primitive roads that would provide entry to authorized management facilities for administrative users. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Travelers: The Primitive TMA would serve the occasional needs of those with permits for the use of resources, such as grazing or research, as well as private, state, and other land ownership needs and a variety of local, state, and federal agency resource management needs. It would also serve the non-motorized/non-mechanized needs of primarily local, regional, and national visitors engaged in activities such as viewing scenery and cultural resources, backcountry exploring, and hunting. • Setting Characteristics: Settings would be maintained within the Primitive TMA that provide for limited motorized entry for administrative users on a small number of primitive roads in the most remote areas. Few and widely scattered, rustic management facilities could be present in mostly natural-appearing areas where they would be necessary to protect and/or administer important resources. Remote settings, natural landscapes, solitude, and opportunities for primitive recreation would be minimally impacted by human activity. 			
B. LAND USE ALLOCATIONS				
1. TMAs				
TMAs would not be formally allocated or designated. Per Land Use Planning Handbook, H-1601-1, TMAs would be delineated as follows (see Appendix 2.S):				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	Backways: 90,965 ac. 9% Specialized: 43,477 ac. 4% Primitive: 913,875 ac. 87%	Backways: 91,103 ac. 9% Specialized: 204,703 ac. 19% Primitive: 752,510 ac. 72%	Backways: 91,024 ac. 9% Specialized: 259,620 ac. 25% Primitive: 697,673 ac. 66%	Backways: 90,948 ac. 9% Specialized: 257,354 ac. 24% Primitive: 700,015 ac. 67%
<i>Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Rural: 0 ac. 0% Backways: 5,855 ac. 2% Specialized: 35,893 ac. 12% Primitive: 251,940 ac. 86%	Rural: 27 ac. >1% Backways: 5,817 ac. 2% Specialized: 89,804 ac. 31% Primitive: 198,040 ac. 67%	Rural: 27 ac. 1% Backways: 5,829 ac. 2% Specialized: 95,078 ac. 32% Primitive: 192,754 ac. 66%	Rural: 27 ac. >1% Backways: 5,829 ac. 2% Specialized: 96,142 ac. 31% Primitive: 191,689 ac. 65%
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	Rural: 169,832 ac. 9% Backways: 286,450 ac. 14% Specialized: 801,742 ac. 40% Primitive: 723,030 ac. 37%	Rural: 227,584 ac. 11% Backways: 274,624 ac. 14% Specialized: 796,178 ac. 40% Primitive: 682,678 ac. 35%	Rural: 227,584 ac. 11% Backways: 274,627 ac. 14% Specialized: 804,083 ac. 41% Primitive: 674,771 ac. 34%	Rural: 226,542 ac. 11% Backways: 275,608 ac. 14% Specialized: 805,008 ac. 41% Primitive: 673,906 ac. 34%

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Entire Planning Area</i>				
N/A	Rural: 169,832 ac. 5% Backways: 383,270 ac. 12% Specialized: 881,112 ac. 26% Primitive: 1,888,846 ac. 57%	Rural: 227,611 ac. 7% Backways: 371,545 ac. 11% Specialized: 1,090,685 ac. 33% Primitive: 1,633,228 ac. 49%	Rural: 227,611 ac. 7% Backways: 371,480 ac. 11% Specialized: 1,158,780 ac. 35% Primitive: 1,565,197 ac. 47%	Rural: 226,570 ac. 7% Backways: 372,386 ac. 11% Specialized: 1,158,504 ac. 35% Primitive: 1,565,611 ac. 47%
2. Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Area Designations				
The following OHV area (polygons) designations would be subject to valid existing rights and administrative purposes (see Glossary). They are required land use plan decisions and cover area (polygon) designations. Specific route designations are implementation level decisions and can be found below in Section 2.b., Route Designations. Prior to the full implementation of OHV area designations, bureau policy would be followed regarding compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA.				
<i>Parashant</i>				
On BLM and NPS land, 285,629 acres would be closed to motorized and mechanized vehicle use, which includes BLM designated wilderness and NPS proposed wilderness.				
Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails on 762,688 acres on BLM and NPS land.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
On BLM land, 89,828 acres would be closed to motorized and mechanized vehicle use, which includes designated wilderness.				
Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails on 203,859 acres of BLM land.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be closed on 123,100 acres, which includes designated wilderness and Marble Canyon ACEC, St. George basin area soils and ACEC, Grama Canyon, Kanab Creek.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be closed on 92,648 acres, which includes designated wilderness. (See Map 2.19 at end of Table 2.15).		Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be closed on 80,829 acres, which includes designated wilderness. (See Map 2.19).	
Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails on 282,019 acres of BLM land.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails on 1,888,405 acres of BLM land.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails on 682,153 acres of BLM land.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails on 369,582 acres of BLM land.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails on 1,899,260 acres of BLM land.

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and trails on 1,575,140 acres of BLM land.	No areas limited to existing roads and trails would be designated.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and trails on 1,204,782 acres of BLM land.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and trails on 1,511,652 acres of BLM land.	Same as Alternative B
Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be open on 803 acres of BLM lands, which includes an area east of Fredonia	No open areas would be designated	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be open on 1,481 acres of BLM land (following archeological survey and Section 106 compliance), which includes 2 small areas south of St. George and 1 small area south of Fredonia.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be open on 7,186 acres of BLM land (following archeological survey and Section 106 compliance), which includes a 628-acre area south of St. George and a 348-acre area east of Fredonia.	Motorized and mechanized vehicle use would be open on 976 acres of BLM land (following archeological survey and Section 106 compliance), which includes a 628-acre area south of St. George and a 348-acre area east of Fredonia.
An OHV event area would be designated on 179,551 acres	No motorized speed event areas would be designated. Motorized speed events would not be authorized.	A motorized speed event area would be designated on 151,161 acres (following archeological survey and Section 106 compliance).	No motorized speed event areas would be designated but would be authorized on a case-by-case basis.	A motorized speed event area would be designated on 156,902 acres (following archeological survey and Section 106 compliance).
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Designated Transportation System				
(See Section II, Transportation Facilities, in this table for prescriptions related to the management of the transportation system.)				
b. Preliminary Route Network Management				
(See Section II, Transportation Facilities, in this table for prescriptions related to the management of preliminary route network.)				
2. Allowable Uses				
a. Conditions of Use				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
State of Arizona traffic law statutes would continue to apply to all motorized vehicle use on State, County, BLM, and NPS routes. Motor vehicle “registration requirement would not apply on lands under BLM jurisdiction to an all-terrain vehicle or an off-road recreational motor vehicle operating on a dirt road that is				

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
located in an unincorporated area of this state. For the purposes of this paragraph, “dirt road” means an unpaved or ungraveled road that is not maintained by this state or a city, town, or county of this state” (ARS 28-2153, D).				
N/A	Motorized, mechanized, or non-motorized/non-mechanized use of routes that are designated as “limited” would be restricted to the specific users, seasons, or vehicle types as identified on a route-by-route evaluation and designation. (See Route Designations and Appendix 2.T.)			
N/A	Motorized or mechanized use of administrative routes would be subject to the terms of an appropriate authorization instrument, such as ROW, permit, lease, maintenance agreement, or transportation plan that specifies the authorized administrative user, routes, destinations, potential frequencies, and acceptable intensities maintenance (see Appendix 2.S).			
N/A	Motorized or mechanized use of administrative routes in “closed” areas would be minimum necessary for the administration of the area or the exercise of the right or permitted use (see Glossary for definition of “administrative routes”).			
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
All vehicular travel in the Monuments would be allowed only on routes designated as part of the transportation system. To protect Monument objects, no areas would be authorized for driving off these designated routes (e.g., cross-country) except for authorized administrative and emergency purposes.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific requests and approval by the authorized officer would be required prior to most off-road vehicle use on BLM lands. Use of vehicles off-road would be prohibited on NPS lands. • Vehicle parking must be within 50 feet of designated roads on BLM lands, and only in currently existing disturbed areas on NPS lands within the wilderness setback. 	In areas designated as “limited” in National Monuments and along national trails, motorized use would keep within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside, allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping, or parking, unless otherwise posted.			
For routes that are designated open, management discretion to limit or close a route could be exercised where necessary through emergency closure to protect Monument objects.				
Use of non-motorized, wheeled game carriers to retrieve kills would be allowed in all areas of the Monument except designated and NPS proposed wilderness.				
<i>Parashant</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On NPS lands, per the 1979 Wilderness Proposal and the 1986 GMP, designated roads would be cherry-stemmed through proposed wilderness. 			

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On roads adjacent to NPS proposed wilderness and within the wilderness boundary setback, visitors could park only on the road shoulder and immediate roadside, allowing for vehicle passage and emergency stopping, unless otherwise posted. 			
N/A	Routes designated for motorized/mechanized vehicle use by administrative users only, would allow only the minimum motorized or mechanized use necessary for the administration of the area or the exercise of the right or permitted use.			
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<p>All authorized public land users that hold a permit or license (i.e., grazing permittees; ROW holders; persons with hunting license, wood permits, mining claims) would be allowed to drive off-road, if necessary, in order to fulfill requirements of their permit or license (in a limited to existing roads and trails area). Specific requests and approval by the authorized officer would continue to be required prior to most off-road vehicle use in these (limited to designated roads and trails) areas. Hunters would not be able to use motorized vehicles off the design. roads to retrieve animals.</p>	<p>All cross-country (off-transportation system) motorized or mechanized travel would be prohibited, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any designated open OHV areas. Minimum necessary for administration of the area. For emergency purposes. Minimum necessary for the exercise of a valid existing right or authorized use; In Areas allocated as “limited,” motorized-vehicles may be allowed to pull off a designated route 100 feet either side of centerline. This use shall be monitored on a continuing basis. If monitoring results show effects that exceed limits of acceptable change, motorized vehicles would not be allowed to pull off a designated route 100 feet either side of centerline. <p>In areas designated as ACECs and along national trails, motorized use would keep within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside, allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping, or parking, unless otherwise posted.</p>			
Use of non-motorized, wheeled game carriers to retrieve game kills would be allowed in all areas except designated wilderness.				
Use of non-motorized, mechanized vehicles (including bicycles) would be prohibited in designated wilderness.	Use of non-motorized, mechanized vehicles (including bicycles) would be prohibited in designated wilderness, ACECs designated for cultural or listed species values, and areas managed for	Use of non-motorized, mechanized vehicles (including bicycles) would be prohibited off the transportation system in ACECs designated for cultural or listed species values and in designated wilderness.		

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	maintaining wilderness characteristics.			
D. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Designated Transportation System				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	A route inventory database would be maintained using standard collection and information storage methods.			
N/A	The areas would be monitored to detect unauthorized route creation.			
b. Preliminary Route Network Management				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A variety of funding mechanisms and partnerships would be sought for completing the route inventory. • Standard data collection and storage methods would be used to complete the route inventory. 			
E. IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Route Designations (See Maps 2.17a-c and Route Evaluation Reports© and Sub-region Maps on CD version of the FEIS)				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Prior to the full implementation of route designations, the requirements of AZ IM 2006-043, Attachment 19, would be met regarding compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA.				
<p><i>Routes would be designated as follow (See Designated Transportation System & Preliminary Route Network Proposed Plan Maps 2.17a, 2.17b, 2.17c and Route Evaluation Reports© and Sub-region Maps on CD version of the FEIS):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O: open to all users for motorized/mechanized travel (various special mitigating measures designed to ensure Monument objects or other sensitive or important resources are protected may apply. Route Evaluation Report© designations = O or MO) (See Appendix 2.T: Transportation.) • A: administrative use only (open to administrative motorized uses and non-motorized public uses; public mechanized use limits may vary. Route Evaluation Report© designations = L or ML)(see Glossary for definition of administrative users). • NM: open to all users for non-motorized uses only (such as, horseback, foot or mechanized vehicles; mechanized use limits may vary) (Route Evaluation Report© designations = ML) 				

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Parashant-BLM</i>				
<i>O:</i> 1558 miles	<i>O:</i> 542 miles	<i>O:</i> 1189 miles	<i>O:</i> 1379 miles	<i>O:</i> 1283 miles
<i>A:</i> 25 miles	<i>A:</i> 631 miles	<i>A:</i> 179 miles	<i>A:</i> 75 miles	<i>A:</i> 140 miles
<i>NM:</i> 12 miles	<i>NM:</i> 25 miles	<i>NM:</i> 25 miles	<i>NM:</i> 25 miles	<i>NM:</i> 28 miles
<i>Parashant-NPS</i>				
<i>O:</i> 157 miles	<i>O:</i> 84 miles	<i>O:</i> 131 miles	<i>O:</i> 149 miles	<i>O:</i> 121 miles
<i>A:</i> 0 miles	<i>A:</i> 61 miles	<i>A:</i> 20 miles	<i>A:</i> 11 miles	<i>A:</i> 27 miles
<i>NM:</i> 2 miles	<i>NM:</i> 4 miles	<i>NM:</i> 4 miles	<i>NM:</i> 3 miles	<i>NM:</i> 5 miles
<i>Vermilion</i>				
<i>O:</i> 446 miles	<i>O:</i> 172 miles	<i>O:</i> 374 miles	<i>O:</i> 416 miles	<i>O:</i> 377 miles
<i>A:</i> 14 miles	<i>A:</i> 211 miles	<i>A:</i> 72 miles	<i>A:</i> 51 miles	<i>A:</i> 67 miles
<i>NM:</i> 0 miles	<i>NM:</i> 2 miles	<i>NM:</i> 8 miles	<i>NM:</i> 3 miles	<i>NM:</i> 6 miles
<i>Arizona Strip FO (Ferry Swale Sub-region Only)</i>				
<i>O:</i> 52 miles	<i>O:</i> 34 miles	<i>O:</i> 48 miles	<i>O:</i> 51 miles	<i>O:</i> 49 miles
<i>A:</i> 0 miles	<i>A:</i> 14 miles	<i>A:</i> 5 miles	<i>A:</i> 3 miles	<i>A:</i> 5 miles
<i>NM:</i> 0 miles	<i>NM:</i> 0 miles	<i>NM:</i> 0 miles	<i>NM:</i> 0 miles	<i>NM:</i> 0 miles
b. Trail System Designations				
<i>Parashant</i>				
State Trails System: Mt. Trumbull Trail would continue to be managed as an Arizona State Trail System component.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
State Trails System: Paria Canyon Trail would continue to be managed as an Arizona State Trail System component.				
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
State Trails System: Temple Trail (lower section) would continue to be managed as an Arizona State Trail System component.				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
State Trails System: Old Arizona Road/Honeymoon Trail and Old Spanish Trail would continue to be managed as Arizona State Trail System components.				
National Historic Trails: Old Spanish Trail would continue to be managed as a NHT (See Table 2.16: Special Area Designations).				

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
State Trails System: Virgin River Interpretive Trail, Little Black Mountain Trail, Mokaac Trail (main segment and upper loop), Arizona Trail (Segment 34), and Paiute Wilderness Trails would continue to be managed as Arizona State Trail System components.				
Millennium Trails: Arizona Trail (Millennium Legacy Trail) and Great Western Trail (National Millennium Trail) would continue to be managed as Millennium Trails.				
Other: Vermilion Cliffs Highways would continue to be managed as a multi-partner interpretation and education transportation initiative. Establishment of new trail/road systems (motorized, mechanized, or non-motorized) such as the High Desert Trail, Arizona section; Hurricane ATV Trails; and Kanab-Fredonia Trails System could be considered where appropriate for targeted market strategies in SRMAs and/or where public safety, user conflict, or resource protection issues could be resolved by establishing trails in the ERMAs.				
c. Preliminary Route Network				
<i>Arizona Strip FO (Undesignated Sub-regions Only)</i>				
In the Colorado City, Main Street, Uinkaret, Yellowstone Mesa, Kanab Plateau, Grama Can., Buckskin, White Sage, and House Rock sub-regions, a preliminary route network would be based on existing routes as documented by the Arizona Strip RMP & 1992 aerial photography.	Until such time as route designations would be completed for the Arizona Strip FO (within 5 years of the ROD), a preliminary route network would be based initially on existing routes in the Littlefield, St. George Basin, Colorado City, Main Street, Uinkaret, Yellowstone Mesa, Kanab Plateau, Grama Canyon, Buckskin, White Sage, House Rock sub-regions, as documented by 2002 aerial photography. Following completion of the route inventory, the preliminary route network would be based on the completed inventory until route designations for the sub-regions are complete. (See Appendix 2.S-2 for more information about the preliminary route network.)			
N/A	Any existing vehicle type and size restrictions or seasonal limitations would remain in effect pending final route designations that may alter or remove such restrictions and/or limitations.			
O: 4,934 miles A: 23 miles NM: 7 miles				
MO: 8 miles of the higher elevation segment of the Black Rock Road would remain closed to vehicle use each year from approximately December 1 to March 15 for public safety and to	MO: 13 miles of the higher elevation segment of the Black Rock Road would be temporarily closed to vehicle use from approximately December 1 to March 15 for public safety as rain or snow conditions warrant.			

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
prevent resource and road damage during the heavy rainfall/snowfall period in the winter.				
Improved road access from the east to Little Black Mountain would be maintained. (See Table 2.7: Cultural Resources.)	An easement across state of Arizona lands from Quail Hill Road to Little Black Mountain ACEC would be acquired to provide legal entry from the west. (See Table 2.11: Lands and Realty.)			
d. Route Closures				
<i>Routes would be closed as follows (See Designated Transportation System & Preliminary Route Network Proposed Plan Maps 2.17a, 2.17b, 2.17c and Route Evaluation Reports© and Sub-region Maps on CD version of the FEIS):</i>				
• C: closed to all motorized and mechanized use (with an objective of future natural and/or project rehabilitation. Route Evaluation Report© designations = C)				
Parashant-BLM				
C:	61 miles	C: 424 miles	C: 209 miles	C: 140 miles
Parashant-NPS				
C:	10 miles	C: 21 miles	C: 15 miles	C: 8 miles
Vermilion				
C:	105 miles	C: 179 miles	C: 110 miles	C: 93 miles
Arizona Strip FO (Ferry Swale Sub-region Only)				
C:	3 miles	C: 7 miles	C: 2 miles	C: 1 miles
II. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
The building of new roads, or altering or upgrading of existing roads, would be minimized to the greatest extent possible, except as needed to protect natural resources on public lands or support achieving other resource management objectives identified in this Plan.				
1. Specific Desired Future TMA Conditions				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Transportation facilities that would be available, suitable, and appropriate in the Planning Area would vary by TMA. See Table 2.15.I.A.1 above for Specific DFCs for TMAs.			

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Management of Transportation Facilities				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Prior to the full implementation of route designations, the requirements of I.M. No. AZ-2006-043, Attachment 19, would be met regarding compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA.				
A travel management plan would be developed and maintained that supports resource protection and uses identified in this Plan. (See Appendix 2.S, TMAs for transportation plan contents.)				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routes created by unauthorized use would be immediately obscured and rehabilitated. • Implementation plans would include outreach efforts to actively recruit service-oriented volunteers, organizations, and schools to assist with accomplishing appropriate implementation projects. 			
N/A	Installations/structures (e.g., unobtrusive barriers, gates, signs) on or along routes would be allowed when they would be the minimum necessary to control unauthorized use and when consistent with TMA objectives.			
N/A	Routes causing resource damage or with safety concerns would be rerouted and natural processes would be allowed to rehabilitate the original route.	Routes causing resource damage or with safety concerns could be rerouted and/or reclaimed. Minor rerouting of roads into areas where wilderness characteristics would be maintained could be considered when it is determined that: 1) it would resolve the concerns previously mentioned; 2) the road is an important travel link for public and administrative uses; 3) topography and engineering capabilities require consideration of such a reroute; and 4) public motorized and mechanized travel would remain on the road through the area.		
N/A	Rehabilitation of closed routes would only occur after completion of NEPA and Section 106.			
Newly constructed temporary routes (i.e. routes intended to serve a short-term purpose only,) would be reclaimed after termination of the specific need.				
No new roads would be allowed in BLM designated wilderness areas (265,869 acres) or on NPS proposed wilderness (190,478 acres).				
N/A	Routes where motorized/mechanized vehicle use would be authorized for administrative use only may be designated as trails for non-motorized public use.			
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
N/A	Trail construction (non-motorized) would be authorized only when needed to protect sensitive resources.	Trail construction (non-motorized) would be the minimum necessary to achieve Plan provisions.	Trail construction (non-motorized) would occur to support protection and/or enhancement of Monument objects, RMZ objectives or to resolve issues of public safety, user conflicts, or resource protection.	

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing material sites on BLM lands would continue to be used for BLM, NPS, and county route maintenance needs. New material sites would not be authorized on BLM and NPS lands. 				
<p>Activities that maintain, as opposed to enhance, existing roads may be permissible. In general, improvements should be minimal and designed solely to correct those conditions that are unsafe or hazardous. Management discretion should be exercised, where necessary, through emergency closures or other actions to protect Monument resources.</p>	<p>Route maintenance would occur only within the existing disturbed surface area as of the dates of the proclamation. No widening, passing lanes, realignments, or travel surface upgrades could occur.</p>	<p>Route maintenance would occur within standard widths based on route type. Widening, passing lanes, realignments, or travel surface upgrades could occur if they were needed for resource protection or public safety.</p>	<p>Route maintenance would occur within standard widths based on route type. Widening, passing lanes, realignments, or travel surface upgrades could occur if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection and/or enhancement of Monument objects would be ensured. They would be needed to achieve route standards. They would be consistent with Table 2.15 and Appendix 2.S: Appropriate Route Construction and Maintenance Standards by TMA. They would be needed for public safety. 	
<i>Parashant</i>				
<p>Existing roads where no public or administrative need exists would be closed and rehabilitated.</p>	<p>Existing routes would be closed and rehabilitated where public or administrative needs cease to exist or where there would be unacceptable impacts to resources/Monument objects.</p>			
<p>New permanent routes would not be constructed adjacent to or within designated wilderness or NPS proposed wilderness.</p>				
<p>On NPS lands, travel corridors would be restricted to existing roads established according to the Lake Mead NRA GMP (1986).</p>				
<p>No new permanent motorized route construction would be authorized.</p>	<p>New permanent motorized route construction on BLM lands would be the minimum necessary to achieve Plan provisions and to produce targeted recreation opportunities and benefits in RMZs if protection and/or enhancement of Monument objects would be ensured. However, new permanent roads would not be constructed in areas</p>		<p>New permanent motorized route construction on BLM lands would be the minimum necessary to achieve Plan provisions and to enhance recreation opportunities and benefits if protection and/or enhancement of Monument objects would be ensured.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C</p>

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
		managed to maintain wilderness characteristics.		
N/A	On NPS lands, roads would be maintained only within the existing disturbed travel surface. If needed for resource protection and/or visitor safety, minor modifications outside of existing corridors may occur with appropriate documentation and compliance.			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
No new permanent motorized route construction would be authorized.		New permanent motorized route construction would be the minimum necessary to achieve Plan provisions. However, new permanent roads would not be constructed in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics.	New permanent motorized route construction would be the minimum necessary to achieve Plan provisions and to enhance recreation opportunities and benefits if protection and/or enhancement of Monument objects would be ensured.	
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
N/A	New routes on BLM lands, once authorized and constructed, would become part of the designated transportation system; closed routes would be removed from the transportation system and plan.			
<i>Parashant and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
For other parameters concerning route maintenance intensities in desert tortoise habitat, see Table 2.5: Special Status Species.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
N/A	No new permanent motorized route construction would be authorized in listed species habitat.	New permanent motorized route construction on BLM lands would be the minimum necessary to achieve Plan provisions and to produce targeted recreation opportunities and benefits in RMZs. However, new permanent roads would not be constructed in areas managed to maintain wilderness characteristics.		
N/A	New routes and any associated ROWs, once authorized, would become part of the designated transportation system; closed routes would be removed from the transportation plan.			
N/A	Trail construction (non-motorized) would be authorized only when needed to protect sensitive resources.	Trail construction (non-motorized) would be the minimum necessary to achieve Plan provisions.	Trail construction (non-motorized) could occur to support RMZ objectives or to resolve issues of public safety, user conflicts, or resource protection in ERMAAs.	

TABLE 2.15: TRAVEL MANAGEMENT				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Route maintenance would occur for existing transportation plan routes only, using existing route types, maintenance levels, and frequencies.	Route maintenance would occur within standard widths based on route type. Widening, passing lanes, realignments, or travel surface upgrades could occur if needed to achieve route standards consistent with Appendix 2.S, TMAs, Appropriate Route Construction, and Maintenance Standards by TMA or for public safety.			
N/A	In ACECs (see Table 2.5: Special Status Species): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some rerouting of existing roads may occur. • Criteria must be met for modifications to existing roads. • Establishment of new permanent roads and/or upgrades may be restricted. • Speed limits may apply. 			
b. Management of Preliminary Route Network				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Existing locations, types, and maintenance intensities of the preliminary route network would be maintained until formal route designations are complete.				
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
a. Management of Preliminary Route Network				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps and portal signing would be developed and installed to inform public land users of the preliminary route network. • The BLM/NPS would actively recruit service-oriented volunteers, organizations, and schools to assist with accomplishing appropriate implementation projects. 			

Map 2.17: Designated Transportation System & Preliminary Route Network - Proposed Plan

Map 2.17: Designated Transportation System & Preliminary Route Network - Proposed Plan

Map 2.17: Designated Transportation System & Preliminary Route Network - Proposed Plan

Map 2.18: Travel Management Areas - Proposed Plan

Map 2.19: Off-Highway Vehicle Designations - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. CONGRESSIONAL DESIGNATED WILDERNESS (BLM) AND PROPOSED WILDERNESS (NPS)				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
1. Goals				
<i>Common To All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first and dominant goal would be to provide for the long-term protection and preservation of the areas' wilderness character under a principle of non-degradation. The areas' natural condition, opportunities for solitude, opportunities for primitive and unconfined types of recreation, and any ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value present would be managed so that they remain unimpaired. • The second goal would be to manage the wilderness areas for the use and enjoyment of visitors in a manner that leave the areas unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness. The wilderness resource would be a dominant factor in all management decisions where a choice must be made between preservation of wilderness character and visitor use. • The third goal would be to manage the areas using the minimum tools, equipment, and/or structures necessary to accomplish the objective successfully, safely, and economically. The chosen tools, equipment, or structures would be the ones that least degrade wilderness values temporarily or permanently. Management would seek to preserve spontaneity of use and as much freedom from regulation as possible. • The fourth goal would be to manage non-conforming but accepted uses permitted by the Wilderness Act and subsequent laws in a manner that would prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the areas' wilderness character. Nonconforming uses are the exception rather than the rule; therefore, emphasis would be placed on maintaining wilderness character. 				
2. Objectives				
<i>Common To All Planning Areas</i>				
<p>The wilderness character of the eight designated BLM wilderness areas and seven NPS Proposed Wildernesses would be protected and enhanced. Wilderness character is defined by (from Section 2(c), Wilderness Act):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naturalness: An area that generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable. • Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude: Superior or excellent condition favorable for avoiding the sights, sounds, and evidence of other people in the area or for attaining a state of being alone or remote from others. A lonely or secluded place. • Outstanding Opportunities for Primitive and Unconfined Recreation: Superior or excellent situations favorable for non-motorized, non-mechanical (except as provided by law), and undeveloped types of recreation activities. Provides dispersed, undeveloped recreation, either through the diversity in the number of primitive and unconfined recreational activities possible in the area or the outstanding quality of a singular opportunity. • Supplemental Values: Ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. <p>BLM wilderness areas and NPS proposed wilderness would be managed to be ecologically sustainable and resilient to natural and human-caused perturbations. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management.) The NPS and BLM would strive to preserve or restore the natural quiet and natural sounds associated with the physical and biological resources of designated and proposed wilderness.</p>				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
N/A	Ecological DFCs would be adopted as objectives for wilderness areas. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Mgmt.)			
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Wilderness Management				
<i>Common To All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lands within BLM wilderness areas and NPS proposed wilderness could be restored where ecological integrity is outside the range of natural variability and where compatible with wilderness objectives. (See Table 2.3: Vegetation Management.) The Minimum Requirement Decision Guide (Arthur Carhart National Wilderness Training Center, most recent version) would be used by the BLM and NPS in all decisions, giving greatest weight to accomplishing objectives via natural processes and non-mechanized/non-motorized means. When fire would be managed in designated BLM wilderness areas or NPS proposed wilderness, MIST would be used. Fire management actions would be consistent with the wilderness management objectives and guidelines described in the BLM and Lake Mead Fire Management Plans. 			
<i>Parashant</i>				
NPS proposed wilderness would be as described and delineated in the Lake Mead NRA 1979 Wilderness Proposal.				
Per NPS Management Policies and Wilderness Management Policies (Director’s Order 41), proposed wilderness would continue to be managed as designated wilderness, allowing no actions that would diminish its wilderness characteristics until the legislative process of wilderness designation has been completed.				
Subsurface mineral rights would be acquired from willing sellers on NPS lands where NPS manages the surface estate.				
b. Wilderness Management Plan				
<i>Common To All Planning Areas</i>				
The BLM wilderness areas would continue to be managed in accordance with their existing wilderness management plans.	Existing BLM wilderness management plans would be revised to place higher emphasis or dependence on allowing natural processes to maintain or restore natural conditions.	Existing BLM wilderness management plans would be evaluated and amended where necessary to conform to new management direction where appropriate, such as Monument proclamations, DFCs, or listed species recovery plans.		
<i>Parashant</i>				
A wilderness management plan would be developed to guide the preservation, management, and use of NPS wilderness resources (NPS-WD-3).				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
A joint BLM/USFS wilderness management plan would be written with the North Kaibab Ranger District for Kanab Creek Wilderness.				
c. Wilderness Restoration				
<i>Common To All Planning Areas</i>				
N/A	Prescribed fire and fire use could be used in areas classified as Wildland Fire Use within BLM wilderness areas and NPS proposed wilderness to achieve DFCs and wilderness area management objectives described in each agency’s Fire Management Plan. Vegetation could also be treated manually.			
Portions of Cottonwood Point and Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wildernesses that exist in an unacceptable condition due to past human activities would be restored to a natural condition, where restoration is feasible, and where natural processes would not be likely to succeed.	Natural processes would be relied upon to restore wilderness conditions where they are degraded.	Natural processes would be primarily relied on to restore areas of pre-existing human imprints in BLM wilderness and NPS proposed wilderness. Where proactive restoration of wilderness conditions is desirable, BLM and NPS would require conformance with BLM wilderness policy (BLM Manual 8560), and may require restoration plans to address restoration of pre-existing human impacts.		
Rehabilitation project plans would be developed for areas documented as unacceptable in the Cottonwood Point and Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wildernesses.	Only fire (natural and prescribed) would be used to restore ecological functions and structure in BLM wilderness areas and NPS proposed wilderness.	In conformance with BLM wilderness policy (BLM Manual 8560) for BLM wilderness areas and NPS policies for proposed wilderness, the best mix of mechanical means, with fire and natural processes, would be determined in order to restore ecological functions and wilderness values.	In conformance with BLM wilderness policy (BLM Manual 8560) for BLM wilderness areas and NPS policies for proposed wilderness, the best mix of manual, chemical, biological, or mechanical means, with fire and natural processes, would be determined in order to restore ecological functions and structure in wilderness.	

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
II. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS (ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATION)				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
1. Wild and Scenic Rivers Interim Management				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
<p>The viability of wild and scenic river candidates for congressional consideration would be ensured through effective interim management.</p> <p>Until Congress acts to designate or release from further consideration rivers determined to be eligible and suitable through the previous RMP process and the subsequent Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic River LEIS, the following desired conditions would be maintained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of the stream’s free-flowing nature. • Preservation, protection, and, to the greatest extent practicable, enhancement of identified outstandingly remarkable values, which area as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Paria River: scenic, recreational, geologic, riparian, fish and wildlife, and cultural values. ▪ Virgin River: scenic, geologic, aquatic and riparian values. • Preservation of characteristics that establish the potential classifications as Wild, Scenic, or Recreational: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wild: free of impoundments, generally inaccessible except by trail, with shorelines essentially primitive and waters unpolluted. ▪ Scenic: free of impoundments and generally inaccessible except by trail. However, shoreline disturbance from highway construction is apparent at several points. ▪ Recreational: several access points and noticeable human developments. 				
2. Potential Congressional Designation				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
If congressionally designated, water quality would be maintained or improved.				
3. Congressional Release				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Should Paria River and Virgin River study area lands not be included by Congress in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System but instead be released from further consideration and/or interim management, those lands would be managed by the BLM using the goals, guidance and prescriptions described for the corresponding land use allocations.				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
B. SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS				
1. Wild and Scenic River Suitability Recommendation				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
The Paria River, including the portion through the Glen Canyon NRA to the confluence of the Colorado River, would continue to be tentatively classified as wild and scenic.				
The entire 27-mile Paria River study area (BLM portion) would continue to be recommended for designation as wild.				
The Paria River study area would continue to be determined as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The Virgin River would retain its tentative classification as wild from the Utah state line to the first I-15 bridge; scenic from the I-15 bridge to the Virgin River Campground; and recreational from the campground to the Nevada state line.				
The Virgin River would retain its designation as the Virgin River Corridor ACEC to protect important wild and scenic river characteristics.				
The Virgin River study area would retain its suitability determination for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.				
The Virgin River study area would retain its recommendation for designation as a Study River under Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (PL 90-542).				
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
<i>Vermilion & Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Implementation of the recommendations for Paria River and Virgin River would continue the protective status (interim management) associated with the eligibility findings defined in the Arizona Strip District RMP until Congress makes a decision about wild and scenic river designations.				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
Wild and scenic river designation would continue to require certain management actions to be initiated in connection with the designation of the Paria River study area as wild. Where wild and scenic river management actions overlap ongoing management actions, the more stringent action would be implemented.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The Virgin River would be studied in conjunction with Utah and Nevada to determine suitability under the Wild and Scenic River Act.				
The recommendation for designation of the Virgin River study area to be designated as a study river would preclude there being any wild and scenic river management actions associated with implementation.				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
2. Allowable Uses				
a. Restrictions of Uses from a Potential Congressional Designation				
<i>Vermilion</i>				
Developed campgrounds, interpretive centers, or administrative headquarters within the river corridor would continue to be prohibited. Simple comfort and convenience facilities could be permitted.				
New transmission lines, natural gas lines, and water lines would continue to be prohibited.				
Woodcutting would continue to not be permitted except when needed to clear trails, for visitor safety, or to control fire.				
Livestock grazing would continue to be managed to protect outstandingly remarkable values within the area.				
Instream flows would continue to be quantified and protected. An instream flow assessment would continue to be made in order to secure instream flow water rights for applicable outstandingly remarkable values.				
No new flood control dams, levees, or other water works would be permitted.				
Hydroelectric power facilities would continue to be prohibited.				
All water supply dams and major diversions would continue to be prohibited.				
Construction of new roads or trails for motorized travel would continue to be prohibited.				
b. Restrictions on Uses Under Interim Management				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Potential actions that may affect Virgin River wild and scenic values would be subject to interim protection. Management activities would not be allowed to damage the existing eligibility, classification, or suitability. The free-flowing characteristics of the river segment cannot be modified.				
III. NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL (CONGRESSIONAL DESIGNATION)				
The Old Spanish Trail Recognition Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-325) designated approximately 3,000 miles of trail routes from Santa Fe, New Mexico to Los Angeles, California (December 4, 2002).				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS (Old Spanish NHT Interim Management)				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The following DFCs would apply to the Old Spanish NHT:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitors seeking to experience the NHT would understand and appreciate the trail’s history and significance • Visitors would appreciate and respect the rights of landowners in the area. • High-potential NHT segments and historic sites would be protected from over-use, inappropriate use, and vandalism. • Scenic values related to historical resources would be protected. • The viability of NHT resources for comprehensive planning would be ensured through effective interim management. 				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum protection of historic and prehistoric properties within the trail corridor would be provided. • The trail would be managed using the interim provisions of this Plan until a Comprehensive Management Plan/EIS is produced by the Old Spanish NHT planning team. 				
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
1. Actions to Achieve				
a. Visitor Information and Education				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Trail resources (natural, cultural, and historical) would be identified, recorded, and protected on federal land. The BLM would gather new information on known or additional high-potential historic sites and segments and cooperate with other federal managers, trail associations, trail scholars, and state historic preservation offices in adding, deleting, or modifying the list of sites and trail segments.				
The following criteria, based on the NRHP and the National Trails System Act, would be used to begin to identify high-potential sites or high-potential route segments resources on public lands:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significance to the trail (based on documentation and/or archeological research). • Integrity of the physical remains. • Integrity and quality of the setting including scenic quality and relative freedom from intrusion. • Opportunity for high-quality recreation evoking the historic trail experience. • Opportunity to interpret the primary period of trail use. 				
b. Resource Protection				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Where significant trail corridor segments and associated sites are documented, viewsheds, as observed from these areas, would be maintained.				
When high potential trail sites and/or trail segments on BLM lands are documented, existing routes that may adversely affect these resources may be limited or closed.				
Any changes to the characteristic landscape must be low in the Old Spanish NHT corridor on public lands. (See Table 2.8: Visual Resources.)				
Recreational development of the trail would not occur prior to the development of the Comprehensive Management Plan/EIS.				
2. Allowable Uses				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
Valid existing rights and existing land use authorizations would be recognized on public lands.				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Vermilion and Arizona Strip FO</i>				
The BLM and local partners would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a supply of existing interpretive and educational materials about the Old Spanish NHT and NHT system. • Provide, to the extent feasible, trip-planning and other information about the trail to support visitation to trail-related sites. • Work with the Old Spanish Trail Association to provide brochures at regional visitor centers and museums to promote education about the trail. 				
Scheduled site monitoring of significant sites and trail segments on BLM lands would be provided.				
IV. RESOURCE CONSERVATION AREAS (RCAs; ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATION)				
A. LAND USE ALLOCATION				
<i>Parashant</i>				
Mt. Trumbull RCA would retain its designation at 102,307 acres to protect wilderness, wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, recreation, ponderosa forest, cultural resources, scenic values, and watershed resources	The Mt. Trumbull RCA (102,307 acres) designation would be revoked because the Monument provides protection of resources.			
Parashant RCA would retain its designation at 39,868 acres to protect wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, recreation, and watershed resources.	The Parashant RCA (39,868 acres) designation would be revoked because the Monument provides protection of resources.			
<i>Vermilion</i>				
Canyons/Plateaus of the Paria RCA would retain its designation at 293,689 acres to protect cultural resources, recreation, scenic values, wilderness, recreation, and wildlife habitat.	The Canyons/Plateaus of the Paria RCA (293,689 acres) designation would be revoked because the Monument provides protection of resources.			

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
V. AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATION)				
ACECs would be designated where special management is needed to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, fish or wildlife, and plant resources and their context or habitat (See Map 2.20 at end of Table 2.16, See Table 2.7: Cultural Resource and Table 2.5: Special Status Species for specific ACEC designations proposed. See Appendix 2.K for specific ACEC values, relevance, and importance criteria).				
A. Desired Future Conditions				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
ACECs would provide protection for special status plant and animal species, scenic values, riparian values, wilderness characteristics, and significant cultural resources.				
ACECs would be managed for information, protection, conservation, interpretation, and education.				
B. Special Designations				
<i>Parashant</i>				
1. Nampaweap ACEC				
The Nampaweap ACEC would be maintained at 535 acres to protect cultural resources.	The Nampaweap ACEC would be revoked because Monument status provides additional protection of resources beyond ACEC designation.			
2. Witch Pool ACEC				
The Witch Pool ACEC would be maintained at 279 acres to protect cultural resources	The Witch Pool ACEC would be revoked because Monument status provides additional protection of resources beyond ACEC designation.			
3. Pakoon ACEC				
The Pakoon DWMA/ACEC would be maintained at 76,014 acres for protection of the threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values. Activities administered by the Arizona Strip on Lake Mead NRA and on public lands in Nevada	The Pakoon ACEC for protection of the threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone would be revoked because Monument status provides additional protection of resources beyond that afforded by ACEC designation.			

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
would be managed in accordance with DWMA/ ACEC prescriptions.				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
1. Beaver Dam Slope ACEC				
The Beaver Dam Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert values would be maintained at 51,197 acres.	The Beaver Dam Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 52,753 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC.	The Beaver Dam Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 51,985 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat, desert tortoise habitat previously in the Virgin River Corridor ACEC, and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC.		
2. Little Black Mountain ACEC				
The Little Black Mountain ACEC for the protection of cultural resources would be maintained at 241 acres.				
3. Marble Canyon ACEC				
The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus would be maintained at 11,012 acres.	The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus and cultural resources would be enlarged to 102,141 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of most of the lower portion of House Rock Valley for additional protection afforded to Fickeisen plains cactus, pronghorn antelope, and House Rock Valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat.	The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus and cultural resources would be enlarged to 11,926 acres. Changes in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas of occupied habitat, removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated the cactus is not present, and removal of portions of House Rock Valley with Fickeisen plains cactus, pronghorn antelope, and House Rock Valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat.	The Marble Canyon ACEC for the protection of Brady pincushion cactus and cultural resources would be enlarged to 12,105 acres Changes in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas of occupied habitat, removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated the cactus is not present, and removal of portions of House Rock Valley with Fickeisen plains cactus,	

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
				pronghorn antelope, and House Rock Valley chisel-toothed kangaroo rat.
4. Virgin River Corridor ACEC				
The Virgin River Corridor ACEC for protection of Virgin River fishes and threatened desert tortoise would be maintained at 8,075 acres.	The Virgin River Corridor ACEC for protection of Virgin River fishes and threatened desert tortoise would be modified to include only the 100-year floodplain (approx. 2,065 acres). Boundary adjustments would eliminate areas outside of the 100-year floodplain previously included in the ACEC. Desert tortoise habitat previously included within this ACEC would be incorporated into and managed as a part of the Beaver Dam Slope or Virgin Slope ACEC. The Virgin River Corridor ACEC would then be managed for Virgin River fishes and riparian values only.			
5. Virgin Slope ACEC				
The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert values would be maintained at 39,931 acres.	The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 40,287 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC.	The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 40,206 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat, desert tortoise habitat previously in the Virgin River Corridor ACEC, and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC.		The Virgin Slope ACEC for protection of threatened desert tortoise and Mojave Desert Ecological Zone values would be enlarged to 39,514 acres. Boundary adjustments would incorporate areas of critical habitat, desert tortoise habitat previously in the Virgin River Corridor ACEC, and lower quality habitat not previously included in the ACEC.
6. Fort Pearce ACEC				
The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 916 acres.	The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be enlarged to 5,498 acres. Increases in the ACEC size would be due to incorporating areas with known populations of Siler pincushion cactus not previously included within the ACEC boundary.	The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus designation would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection.		The Fort Pearce ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be enlarged to 5,724 acres. Increases in the ACEC size would be due to incorporating areas with known populations of Siler pincushion cactus not

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
				previously included within the ACEC boundary.
7. Johnson Spring ACEC				
The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 2,464 acres.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 2,058 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 1,986 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	The Johnson Spring ACEC designation for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection.	The Johnson Spring ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 3,444 acres. Increases in the ACEC size would be due to incorporating areas with known populations of Siler pincushion cactus not previously included within the ACEC boundary.
8. Lost Spring Mountain ACEC				
The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 8,262 acres	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 17,744 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 4,431 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC designation for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be revoked because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	The Lost Spring Mountain ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 19,248 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.
9. Moonshine Ridge ACEC				
The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be maintained at 5,095 acres.	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 9,231 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be reduced to 2,575 acres. Decreases in ACEC acreage	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC designation for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be revoked because route designation	The Moonshine Ridge ACEC for protection of cultural resources and threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be increased to 9,310 acres. Increases in ACEC acreage

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.	would be due to removal of areas where repeated surveys have indicated these resource values are not present.	provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	would be due to inclusion of areas with significant resource values not previously included.
10. Black Knolls ACEC				
N/A	The Black Knolls ACEC for the protection of endangered Holmgren milkvetch would be designated at 80 acres		The Black Knolls ACEC for the protection of endangered Holmgren milkvetch would not be designated because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	The Black Knolls ACEC for the protection of endangered Holmgren milkvetch would be designated at 428 acres and would include proposed critical habitat for the species
11. Kanab Creek ACEC				
N/A	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of endangered SW Flycatcher habitat and riparian, scenic, and cultural resources would be designated at 13,148 acres.	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of endangered SW Flycatcher habitat and riparian, scenic, and cultural resources would be designated at 9,211 acres.	The Kanab Creek ACEC for the protection of endangered SW Flycatcher habitat and riparian, scenic, and cultural resources would not be designated because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.	Same as Alternative B
12. Coyote Valley ACEC				
N/A	The Coyote Valley ACEC for protection of special status Paradine pincushion cactus would be designated at 776 ac.	The Coyote Valley ACEC for protection of special status Paradine pincushion cactus would not be designated because recent inventories revealed that the Paradine pincushion cactus was located within Vermilion, therefore, Monument status already provides additional protection of resources.		
13. Lone Butte ACEC				
N/A	The Lone Butte ACEC for protection of scenic resources and threatened Jones Cycladenia would be designated at 1,900 acres.		The Lone Butte ACEC for protection of threatened Jones Cycladenia would not be designated.	The Lone Butte ACEC for protection of threatened Jones Cycladenia and scenic values would be designated at 1,762 acres.

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
14. Shinarump ACEC				
N/A	The Shinarump ACEC for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus would be designated at 3,619 acres.	The Shinarump ACEC would not be designated.		The Shinarump ACEC would be relocated southwest of the originally proposed location and would be designated for protection of threatened Siler pincushion cactus at 3,237 acre.
15. Buckskin ACEC				
N/A	The Buckskin ACEC for protection of the Cliff milkvetch would be designated at 160 acres.	The Buckskin ACEC for protection of the Cliff milkvetch would not be designated because this species is not recognized as being rare and therefore is not regionally significant.		
16. Clayhole ACEC				
N/A	The Clayhole ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would be designated at 7,362 acres.	The Clayhole ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would not be designated because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.		
17. Grey Points ACEC				
N/A	The Grey Points ACEC for protection of desert bighorn sheep habitat and Gierisch globe mallow would be designated at 12,881 acres.	The Grey Points ACEC for protection of desert bighorn sheep habitat would not be designated because this area, while locally important for bighorn, is not considered regionally unique or significant.		
18. Hurricane Cliffs ACEC				
N/A	The Hurricane Cliffs ACEC for protection of desert bighorn sheep habitat and riparian values would be designated at 23,464 acres.	The Hurricane Cliffs ACEC for protection of desert bighorn sheep habitat would not be designated because this area, while locally important for bighorn, is not considered regionally unique or significant. The isolated nature of this area is adequate protection for riparian values.		

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
19. Lime Kiln/Hatchet Canyon ACEC				
N/A	The Lime Kiln/Hatchet Canyon ACEC for protection of desert bighorn sheep habitat would be designated at 11,731 acres.	The Lime Kiln/Hatchet Canyon ACEC for protection of desert bighorn sheep habitat would not be designated because this area, while locally important for bighorn, is not considered regionally unique or significant.		
20. Twist Hills ACEC				
N/A	The Twist Hills ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would be designated at 1,255 acres.	The Twist Hills ACEC for protection of the candidate Fickeisen plains cactus would not be designated because route designation provides sufficient protection from OHV impacts.		
C. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
General Management Decisions (Apply to all existing and proposed ACECs)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM would retain the ACECs in public ownership. • The BLM would seek to acquire non-federal lands and interests in lands within the ACECs, from willing sellers by purchase, exchange, or donation. Acquisitions would include surface and subsurface rights, and water rights, whenever possible. • New land use authorizations would be discouraged within ACECs and would be authorized only when no reasonable alternative exists and impacts to cultural resources or listed species and their habitat can be mitigated with special terms and conditions. New ROWs would be routed away from high-density listed species' populations, and along the edges of avoidance areas. • Vegetation diversity would be maintained or improved in accordance with ecosite guides. • Restoration and vegetation treatments would be authorized only where the doing so would result in benefits for resources and values protected by the ACEC. • ACECs would be closed to all vegetative product sales. • ACECs designated for the protection of plants would be closed to the collection of vegetative materials. In other ACECs, collection of dead and down wood would be allowed for personal campfire use only, subject to fire restrictions. • ACECs would remain open to locatable mineral exploration and development. A Mining Plan of Operation with special mitigation measures would be required to avoid impacts to critical resources or proposed or designated critical habitat. • ACECs would remain open to leasable mineral exploration and development. Special mitigation would be required to avoid impacts to special status species and proposed or designated critical habitat and cultural resources. • New mineral material disposal sites in ACECs would not be authorized. Existing material sites would be evaluated and closed if found to be impacting significant resources. 				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM would not authorize or renew material site ROWs in ACECs • Motorized and mechanized vehicle use in ACECs would be limited to designated roads or trails (see Table 2.15: Travel Management). For the purpose of protecting the resources and values of the ACEC, no areas would be authorized for cross-country, off-road vehicular use except for authorized administrative and emergency purposes. Motorized use would keep within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside, allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping, or parking, unless otherwise posted. • New roads would be authorized on a temporary basis only or when beneficial for relevant resources. • The BLM would authorize only temporary upgrading of existing roads. 				
<p>1. Beaver Dam Slope and Virgin Slope ACECs (Desert Tortoise Management)</p>				
<p>Fire management in desert tortoise habitat would include conservation measures for desert tortoise as described in Appendix 2.E.</p>				
<p>Vegetation management within the desert tortoise ACECs would include the following management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation management in desert tortoise habitat would include conservation measures for desert tortoise as described in Appendix 2.E. • No mechanical treatment or conversion would be allowed unless the project benefits or improves tortoise management and condition of habitat. • Habitat restoration in desert tortoise habitat could include planting or seeding of nonnative plants. • Desert tortoise ACECs would be closed to live vegetation harvest, except salvage in areas where surface disturbance has been authorized. • Collection of dead and down wood would be allowed for personal camp use only. 				
<p><i>Arizona Strip FO Desert Tortoise ACECs (Beaver Dam Slope and Virgin Slope ACECs; see also Table 2.16. Special Designations.)</i></p>				
<p>Desert Tortoise Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM would seek funding and cooperate with Mojave County, ADOT, FHA, and others on opportunities to erect tortoise barrier fencing along Highway 91 on the Beaver Dam Slope and along other routes where desert tortoise mortality is or becomes significant. 				
<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Beaver Dam, Highway, and Mormon Well Allotments would be available for livestock grazing from October 15 to March 15. • The Littlefield Slope Pasture of the Littlefield and Mesquite Community Allotments would 	<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Beaver Dam Slope, Highway, and Mormon Well Allotments would be unavailable for livestock grazing. The Littlefield Slope Pasture of the Littlefield and Mesquite Community Allotments would be 	<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Beaver Dam, Highway, and Mormon Well Allotments would be available for livestock grazing from October 15 to March 15. • The Littlefield Slope Pasture of the Littlefield and Mesquite Community Allotments would be available for livestock grazing from October 15 to March 15. 		

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
be available for livestock grazing from October 15 to March 15.	unavailable for livestock grazing.			
<p>Grazing Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grazing utilization levels would be set at 45% of current year’s growth on allotments in desert tortoise habitat. 				
<p>Travel management actions within the desert tortoise ACECs would include the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized and mechanized travel would be limited to designated roads and trails. BLM would complete a proposal to close roads and designate routes in the desert tortoise ACECs. Roads targeted for closure would include those that 1) have no purpose, 2) are duplicative or redundant, or 3) are causing high levels of mortality of tortoises. Vehicles would be restricted to existing roads and trails prior to route designation. After designation, vehicles would be restricted to designated routes only. Implementation of the closure/designation plan would include the following actions 1) sign entry portals/major intersections with signs that read "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails", 2) sign all designated routes as open, 3) and sign along designated routes indicating that driving off of designated routes is not permitted. New paved roads would not be authorized in desert tortoise ACECs. Temporary upgrading of existing roads and construction of new unpaved roads in ACECs could be authorized only where positive benefits would result for desert tortoise or their management. New paved roads and highways or major reconstruction or modifications of existing paved roads along the edges of the ACECs would be fenced with desert tortoise barrier fencing. Culverts, to allow safe passage of tortoises, would be constructed in coordination with ADOT, FHA, and USFWS. Use of new roads constructed for specific non-public purposes, such as access routes to microwave towers, would be limited to administrative use only. Temporary access routes in desert tortoise habitat created during project construction would be modified as necessary to prevent further use. The BLM would maintain or authorize maintenance of existing roads in desert tortoise habitat, except that non-emergency maintenance activities would be conducted from October 15 to March 15. Operators of road graders and other maintenance equipment would be required to attend an education class prior to performing the work. Maintenance activities would be limited to previously disturbed areas, unless cleared by a qualified biologist. Vehicles associated with BLM-authorized projects traveling on unpaved roads in ACECs would be required to keep speeds at or below 40 mph during the active season to protect desert tortoises. Speed limits may be less on specific roads through high-density tortoise areas. 				
<p>Recreation management within the desert tortoise ACECs would include the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BLM would restrict vehicle-based camping in the desert tortoise ACECs to within 50 ft of designated routes. Before route designation, vehicle-based camping would be limited to within 50 ft of existing routes. No camping would be authorized for longer than 14 consecutive days in any one area within the desert tortoise ACECs. Camping would be allowed, but vehicles must keep motorized use within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside. Backpacking, horseback riding, and mountain biking would be allowed throughout the area, providing tortoise habitats or populations are not adversely impacted. 				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competitive speed events would be prohibited within the desert tortoise ACECs. Organized non-speed events would be restricted to designated roads within the desert tortoise ACECs. Activities that could adversely affect the desert tortoise during their active season within tortoise habitat may be limited to the period between October 15 and March 15. The BLM may restrict season of use, number of visitors, and/or close an area to recreational activities. 				
<p>Minerals management within the desert tortoise ACECs would include the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACECs would remain open to mineral entry under the mining laws. Mineral material disposals would not be authorized within the desert tortoise ACECs. Special mitigation would be required in mining plans of operation to avoid impacts to desert tortoise within the desert tortoise ACECs. ACECs would be closed to authorization or renewal of material site ROWs. Mineral leasing in the desert tortoise ACECs would only be authorized with the stipulation of waivable no surface occupancy or no surface occupancy. All activities associated with surface occupancy for mineral leasing within DWMA/ACECs would be limited to the period October 15 to March 15 and subject to all other conservation measures. The desert tortoise ACECs would be closed to mineral sales. In regard to locatable minerals in DWMA/ACECs, the Bureau would require plans of operation and bonding for any activity above the level of casual use, pursuant to the surface management regulations (43 CFR 3809). The Bureau would approve plans of operation that reduce the chance of take occurring in accordance with these terms and conditions. BLM would close the desert tortoise ACECs to authorization or renewal of material site ROWs. Non-commercial hand collection of rocks within 100 feet of designated open roads would be permitted in desert tortoise ACECs. 				
<p>Lands and Realty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All lands within desert tortoise ACECs and within all other desert tortoise designated critical habitat would be retained. Exchanges or sales of desert tortoise habitat out of public ownership would be limited to parcels identified in the RMP. The BLM would not authorize any land uses under 	<p>Lands and Realty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific parcels of low density (former category 3) desert tortoise habitat that have little to no potential for self-sustaining tortoise populations have been identified in Appendix 2.M. as eligible for disposal. These parcels occur in the area between the impassable barriers of Interstate 15 and the Virgin River, outside of any ACEC, and would allow for regional growth near Littlefield and Beaver Dam with the least disturbance to desert tortoise. Parcels would be surveyed for special status species and other sensitive resources prior to disposal. The effects of future development on water quality and flows in the Virgin River would be addressed in NEPA documents and ESA consultation prior to disposal. Up to 200 acres not listed in Appendix 2.M or identified for specific purposes in these alternatives would be retained in public ownership unless needed for recreation or public purposes. Disposal proposals under the R&PP Act on lands not identified for disposal would be considered on a case-by-case basis. (See Appendix 2.M and Map 2.7. Also see <i>Acquisitions/Retentions</i> section above for lands exempt from disposals.) Revenues generated from the sale of FLTFA parcels could be used to acquire adjacent lands with high resource values in accordance with the Arizona Statewide Interagency Implementation Agreement. 			

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>the R&PP Act within the desert tortoise ACECs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfills, airports, or sewage treatment ponds would not be authorized within the desert tortoise ACECs. Unauthorized dumpsites would be cleaned up as funding allows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BLM would seek to acquire non-Federal lands in the desert tortoise ACECs from willing sellers through sale or exchange. New ROWs through desert tortoise habitat would be routed away from high-density tortoise populations. Linear ROWs would be placed adjacent or parallel to existing ROWs and share vehicular access. Utilities would be co-located with other utility projects whenever feasible. Utility lines on BLM lands would be designed, located, and constructed to avoid attracting desert tortoise predators. No new landfills or sewage treatment ponds would be authorized in the desert tortoise ACECs. 			
<p>Surface-disturbing activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reclamation would be required for activities that result in loss or degradation of tortoise habitat within ACECs. Habitat would be restored or reclaimed to as close a pre-disturbance condition as practicable. Mitigation measures may be included in decision documents to offset the loss of quality or quantity of desert tortoise habitat. Compensation may be required to mitigate residual impacts from authorized actions. The BLM would assess compensation at the category 1 rate for any proposed projects in the Beaver Dam Slope or Virgin Slope ACEC. The BLM would not authorize any military maneuvers within special status species ACECs. Authorized actions that may result in adverse effects to desert tortoises would require implementation of project stipulations including personnel education programs, pre-construction clearances, defined construction areas, operational restrictions, and procedures for moving tortoises out of harm's way. (See Appendix 2.E for a list of stipulations.) Proposed actions would be evaluated to ensure they do not contribute to the proliferation of natural predators within desert tortoise habitat. Where proposed waters or other developments may lead to adverse effects to the desert tortoise, specific actions would be taken to reduce or eliminate the adverse effects. Such actions include, but are not limited to redesign, incorporation of new features, movement, or abandonment. Proposed actions would be evaluated to ensure they do not adversely impact cultural resources. Where proposed waters or other developments may lead to adverse effects to the cultural resources, specific actions would be taken to reduce or eliminate the adverse effects. Such actions include, but are not limited to complete recordation, excavation to obtain information, redesign, relocation, incorporation of new features, or abandonment. Utility lines would be designed, located, and constructed to avoid attracting desert tortoise predators. Surface disturbing activities would be limited to the period from October 15 through March 15. 				
<p>Other management actions in desert tortoise habitat would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BLM would cooperate with agencies and private land owners on a case-by-case basis to relocate tortoises from previously conveyed federal lands within the planning area that are slated for development to public lands. No translocations of desert tortoises from private to public lands would occur without completion of a Section 7 consultation or Section 10 (a) habitat conservation plan. 				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BLM would cooperate with other agencies and groups to identify areas where uncontrolled dogs are causing desert tortoise mortality. 				
<p>2. Virgin River Corridor ACEC</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Virgin River Gorge Scenic Withdrawal area (6,736 acres) would continue on lands outside wilderness. The Virgin River Gorge Scenic Withdrawal area would continue to be closed to mineral entry, otherwise plan of operation required. Fire management within the Virgin River Corridor ACEC would include conservation measures for SW Flycatchers and native fishes as described in Appendix 2.E. Vegetation management within the Virgin River Corridor ACEC would include conservation measures for SW Flycatchers and native fishes as described in Appendix 2.E. Riparian areas would be managed to achieve and/or maintained in proper functioning condition in accordance with prescriptions described in the vegetation management section of this document. Suitable Flycatcher habitat would be managed so that its suitable characteristics are not eliminated or degraded. Potential Flycatcher habitat would be managed to allow natural regeneration (through natural processes) into suitable habitat as rapidly as possible. The ACEC would be open to fluid mineral leasing subject to no surface occupancy in the Virgin River Gorge Scenic Withdrawal area and subject to standard terms and conditions in other areas. Livestock would be excluded from suitable Flycatcher habitat (whether occupied or unoccupied) during the growing season (bud break to leaf drop). The River Pasture of the Lambing Allotment would be unavailable for grazing during the growing season. Stream bank alteration due to recreational activities and livestock grazing within the Virgin River Corridor ACEC would be limited to 25% annually. Utilization levels of native riparian trees within the Virgin River Corridor ACEC would be limited to 30% of the apical stems per growing season. 				
<p>3. Little Black Mountain ACEC</p>				
<p>The ACEC would be closed to OHV travel.</p>	<p>Motorized and mechanized travel would be limited to designated roads and trails.</p>			
<p>4. Marble Canyon ACEC</p>				
<p>The ACEC would be closed to OHV travel.</p>	<p>Motorized and mechanized travel would be limited to designated roads and trails.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing material sites would be evaluated for retention. The ACEC plan would be updated to insure that management of Brady pincushion cactus is consistent with the recovery plan. 				

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
5. Fort Pearce, Johnson Springs, Lost Spring Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed actions within the ACEC would be evaluated to ensure they do not adversely impact cultural resources. Where proposed waters or other developments may lead to adverse effects to the cultural resources, specific actions would be taken to reduce or eliminate the adverse effects. Such actions include, but are not limited to complete recordation, excavation to obtain information, redesign, relocation, incorporation of new features, or abandonment. The feasibility of relocating existing corrals or water developments outside the ACEC boundary would be considered. 			N/A	Same as Alternatives A-C
6. Kanab Creek ACEC				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire management within the Kanab Creek ACEC would include conservation measures for SW Flycatchers as described in Appendix 2.E. Vegetation management within the Kanab Creek ACEC would include conservation measures for SW Flycatchers as described in Appendix 2.E. Riparian areas would be managed to achieve and/or maintained in proper functioning condition in accordance with prescriptions described in Table 2.3: Vegetation Management. Suitable Flycatcher habitat would be managed so that its suitable characteristics are not eliminated or degraded. Potential Flycatcher habitat would be managed to allow natural regeneration (through natural processes) into suitable habitat as rapidly as possible. Livestock would be excluded from suitable Flycatcher habitat (whether occupied or unoccupied) during the growing season (bud break to leaf drop). The Kanab Creek Allotment would be unavailable for grazing during the growing season. No new corrals or water developments would be authorized or constructed within the ACEC boundary. The feasibility of relocating existing corrals or water developments outside the ACEC boundary would be considered. 				
7. Shinarump ACEC				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new corrals or water developments would be authorized or constructed within the ACEC boundary. The feasibility of relocating existing corrals or water developments outside the 	N/A	N/A	Same as Alternative B

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	ACEC boundary would be considered.			
D. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Arizona Strip FO</i>				
1. Beaver Dam Slope, Little Black Mountain, Marble Canyon, Virgin River Corridor, and Virgin Slope ACECs (General Administrative Actions; also apply to all new ACECs under the alternatives they are proposed)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Steward patrols would be implemented in all ACECs with cultural values. • Opportunities for scientific research would be sought and encouraged for all ACECs. • Protective measures would be taken to protect cultural resources in ACECs from further damage because of natural or human causes. 				
2. Virgin River Corridor ACEC				
a. Native Fishes				
N/A	In cooperation with the USFWS, AGFD, and the Virgin River Fishes Recovery Team, The BLM would assist in monitoring efforts for native Virgin River fish populations.			
b. Southwestern Willow Flycatcher				
The BLM would continue to maintain updated maps of SW Flycatcher habitat in the Planning Area, which would include:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location, size, shape, and spacing of habitat areas. • Habitat stage with respect to Flycatchers (suitable occupied, suitable unoccupied, suitable unsurveyed, potential or regenerating). • Status of Flycatcher surveys for each area of suitable habitat. 				
The BLM would continue to maintain a database of SW Flycatcher observations.				
3. Fort Pearce, Johnson Spring, Lost Spring Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs				
Same as D-1 (General Administrative Actions)			N/A	Same as Alternative B
4. Johnson Spring, Lost Spring Mountain, and Moonshine Ridge ACECs				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These ACECs would be inventoried for cultural resources at Class II or III level, as funding allows. • Upon completion of cultural resource inventories, minor boundary adjustments may be refined, if appropriate, based on acquired data. 			N/A	Same as Alternatives A-C
5. Black Knolls and Kanab Creek ACECs				
N/A	Same as D-1 (General Administrative Actions)		N/A	Same as Alternative B and C

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
6. Kanab Creek ACEC				
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This ACEC would be inventoried for cultural resources at a Class II or III level, as funding allows. Upon completion of cultural resource inventories, boundary adjustments may be refined, if appropriate, based on acquired data. An ACEC plan would be developed for management of SW Flycatchers and associated riparian values consistent with current recovery, conservation, and strategic planning documents. 	N/A	N/A	Same as Alternative B and C
a. Southwestern Willow Flycatcher				
N/A	The BLM would continue to maintain updated maps of SW Flycatcher habitat in the Planning Area, which would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location, size, shape, and spacing of habitat areas Habitat stage with respect to Flycatchers (suitable occupied, suitable unoccupied, suitable unsurveyed, potential or regenerating) Status of Flycatcher surveys for each area of suitable habitat. 	N/A	N/A	Same as Alternative B and C
N/A	The BLM would continue to maintain a database of SW Flycatcher observations.	N/A	N/A	Same as Alternative B and C
7. Coyote Valley ACEC				
N/A	Same as D-1 (General Administrative Actions)	N/A	N/A	Same as Alternative B
8. Lone Butte and Shinarump ACECs				
N/A	Same as D-1 (General Administrative Actions.)	N/A	N/A	Same as Alternative B
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These ACECs would be inventoried for cultural resources at a Class II or III level, as funding allows. 	N/A	N/A	Same as Alternative B

TABLE 2.16: SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon completion of cultural resource inventories, minor boundary adjustments may be completed, if appropriate, based on acquired data. 			
9. Clayhole and Twist Hill ACECs				
N/A	Same as D-1 (General Administrative Actions)		N/A	
E. IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS				
1. Beaver Dam Slope and Virgin Slope ACECs				
A signing and fencing plan would be developed. Signing and fencing would occur as funding allows.				
2. Marble Canyon ACEC				
Rock or similar barriers to off-road vehicle travel would be installed in areas where cacti are adjacent to canyon rim overlooks.				

Map 2.20: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern - Proposed Plan

TABLE 2.17: PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All hazardous or potentially hazardous sites and situations, including hazardous materials, hazardous or solid wastes, abandoned mine sites, abandoned well sites, and other potential hazards on public lands, would be mitigated or eliminated. • The potential for intentional or accidental releases of hazardous materials or wastes and solid waste onto BLM and NPS lands would be minimized or eliminated. 				
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Areas known to have hazardous materials, hazardous wastes, or solid wastes, including abandoned mine lands, would be cleaned up, restored, or corrected.				
N/A	Responsible parties would be actively sought to reimburse hazardous materials cleanup costs.			
N/A	Public access to abandoned mine and well sites would be controlled by providing warning signage and barriers, as appropriate.			
N/A	On BLM lands, recreational shooting would be allowed within the context of the law. Recreational shooting would not be authorized on NPS lands.			
N/A	As funding allows, abandoned mines would be identified and prioritized for cleanup, restoration, or corrections as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those that are public safety hazards. • Those that may contain high levels of heavy metals in waste rock or tailings. • Those that may be degrading water quality. 			
C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
The Arizona Strip District Hazardous Material Response Plan would continue to be followed on BLM lands.				
N/A	Hazardous sites or locations that affect or could affect public health or safety would be inventoried and monitored.			
N/A	All authorized or permitted activities would adhere to hazardous materials regulations for storage, use, and disposal.			

TABLE 2.18: SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH				
A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Approved scientific research would contribute to management of natural and cultural resources and achieving DFCs.				
B. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS				
<i>Common to All Planning Areas</i>				
Permits would be required for approved scientific research to insure compatibility and reporting of results.				
<i>Parashant and Vermilion</i>				
The collection of any objects in the Monuments would not be authorized except by permit for scientific research or use.				

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

IMPLEMENTATION

Land use plan decisions are generally implemented or become effective upon approval of the Plan and signing of the Record of Decision (ROD). These decisions include the effective date of land health standards and desired future or resource condition decisions, land use allocation decisions, and all special designations such as ACECs.

Management actions that require additional site-specific project planning, as funding becomes available, would require further environmental analysis. Implementation-level decisions in this Proposed Plan/FEIS, such as routes designated open for OHV use, are contingent upon completion of Section 106 compliance for cultural resources. Decisions to implement site-specific projects would be subject to administrative review at the time such decisions are made.

The BLM and NPS would continue to involve and collaborate with the public during implementation of this Plan. Opportunities to become involved in plan implementation and monitoring would include development of partnerships and community-based citizen working groups. The BLM and NPS invite citizens and user groups within the Planning Area to become actively involved in the implementation of plan decisions. The BLM, NPS, and citizens can collaboratively develop site-specific goals and objectives that mutually benefit public land resources, local communities, and the people who live, work, or play on the public lands.

MONITORING

Monitoring of actions related to implementing land use plans is an important part of adaptive management. Tracking the progress of actions and measuring changes resulting from these activities is important in either determining success or the need for a different management approach.

Many activities and events are monitored on Parashant, Vermilion, and the Arizona Strip FO. Grazing utilization and vegetation trends are measured to support decisions on allotment Standards and Guideline evaluations. OHV events are monitored to determine that permit stipulations are followed and needed site rehabilitation is taken. This Proposed Plan/FEIS recognizes many monitoring needs that would require further effort to design and plan. Public participation in developing effective monitoring and evaluation plans and in conducting the monitoring is invited and would be sought when these plans are developed and monitoring occurs. A more detailed monitoring strategy will be included in the Approved RMP.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND INTERRELATIONSHIPS

REQUIREMENTS FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The Proposed Plan/FEIS is an environmental document describing the impacts of implementing the proposed decisions and associated management actions to resources, resource uses, and human elements within the Planning Area. Proposed Plan/FEIS decisions that are implemented upon approval of the EIS do not require any further environmental analysis or documentation.

Land use plans and planning decisions are the basis for every on-the-ground action the BLM and NPS undertake. Land use plans are guiding documents that present both land use plan decisions as well as implementation or activity level decisions. They address resources and values to be protected, uses, and public health issues within the Planning Area and must be consistent with resource management objectives, activities of the area, and environmental laws and regulations. Whenever implementation or activity level plans (e.g., wilderness plans, HMPs, etc.) are prepared, additional environmental analysis and documentation would be required. Environmental analysis of site-specific projects at the watershed, project, or activity level may analyze specific proposed actions or management.

Site-specific environmental analyses and documentation (including the use of categorical exclusions and determinations of NEPA adequacy, where appropriate) may be prepared for one or more individual projects, in accordance with management objectives, DFCs, and decisions established in the approved land use plan. In addition, the BLM and NPS will ensure that the environmental review process includes evaluation of all critical elements. Cultural resources and threatened and endangered species will be identified and considered in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA and Section 7 of the ESA, respectively.

Interdisciplinary impact analysis will be based on this and other applicable environmental documents. The BLM and/or NPS may be required to draft a new EA or EIS, or supplement to an existing EIS, if the analysis prepared for site-specific projects finds potential for significant impacts not already described in an existing EA or EIS.

Upon providing public notice of a decision, supporting environmental documentation will be sent to all affected interests and made available to others upon request. Decisions to implement site-specific projects are subject to administrative review at the time such decisions are made.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS

The BLM and NPS coordinate their management activities with the actions of related Federal and State agencies responsible for land or resource management. This Proposed Plan/FEIS is a collaborative effort between the Arizona Strip BLM District and the NPS portion of Parashant and Lake Mead NRA. It also includes participation by the BLM in Utah and Nevada; Kaibab

National Forest (North Ranger District); Grand Canyon National Park; Pipe Spring National Monument; Glen Canyon NRA; USFWS; FHA; Kaibab Paiute Tribe; counties in Arizona and Utah; communities in Arizona, Utah, and Nevada; State agencies; AGFD; ADOT; and Arizona State Land Department.

As part of the planning process, the BLM and NPS have requested formal consultation with the USFWS on potential impacts to federally listed, proposed, and candidate species and designated or proposed critical habitat. In April 2003, the BLM, NPS, and USFWS finalized a Consultation Agreement to establish an effective and cooperative ESA Section 7 consultation process. The Agreement defines the process, products, actions, schedule, and expectations of the BLM and USFWS regarding project consultation. The Agreement also considers effects to, and management for, candidate species. A biological assessment (BA) was prepared and submitted to determine the effect of the Proposed Plan on all relevant listed, proposed, and candidate species, and associated critical habitat. All anticipated environmental effects, conservation actions, mitigation, and monitoring were disclosed in the BA, including analysis of all direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Plan analyzed in this FEIS.

The Proposed Plan/FEIS will also be provided to the Arizona SHPO to comply with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA. The BLM and NPS actions will also comply with other Federal environmental legislation and land use plans, such as the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act, and with applicable State and local government regulations, such as the Sikes Act (16 U.S. Code, 670 et seq., as amended; see Section 1.4 and Appendix 1.D: Relevant Laws, Executive Orders, and Memorandums). The Sikes Act authorizes the Department of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies responsible for administering fish and game laws, to plan, develop, maintain, and coordinate programs for conserving and rehabilitating wildlife, fish, and game on public lands within its jurisdiction. The plans must conform to overall land use and management plans for the lands involved. The plans could include habitat improvement projects and related activities, and adequate protection for species of fish, wildlife, and plants considered endangered or threatened. BLM must also coordinate with the appropriate State agencies in managing State-listed plant and animal species when the State has formally made such designations.

The BLM and AGFD work cooperatively to manage resources within the Arizona Strip planning area. The BLM is responsible for managing wildlife habitat on BLM land and AGFD, through the authority of the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, has public trust responsibility to manage fish and wildlife. Throughout the Proposed Plan/FEIS, the close, cooperative nature of the relationship is cited. At the writing of the Proposed Plan/FEIS, the BLM and AGFD are revising the current Master Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU establishes protocols that direct the cooperative working relationship between the agencies. The MOU will provide context to better enable both agencies to work in partnership and to make decisions in a consistent manner across the state. The guidelines established in the MOU apply to

implementation of this RMP. In addition, a MOU has been signed giving AGFD cooperating agency status on BLM planning efforts in Arizona.

Any permit system or restriction of use or access would include coordination with other state and federal entities that issue use permits on federal lands to assure that authorized permittees have fair and reasonable access to their permitted activity. For example, should a permit system be implemented, the BLM will coordinate with AGFD to enable coordination of access for hunters with valid hunting licenses and permits for the affected hunting unit. Coordination with AGFD during development of management plans and enhancement of wildlife habitat, species diversity, riparian health, and other activities to achieve the optimum health of wildlife species and populations will continue. Administrative access may be allowed for AGFD staff for law enforcement, natural resource management, and other purposes. AGFD's use of motorized and mechanized equipment off designated routes is considered an administrative use and will be allowed in suitable locations (as agreed to by AGFD and the BLM) for such purposes including, but not limited to the following: law enforcement activities, wildlife water supplementation (i.e. water hauling and maintenance, repair, building, or rebuilding of wildlife waters), collar retrieval, capture and release of wildlife, habitat manipulation (forage enhancement, burning, vegetation clearing, planting, etc.), fence construction (enclosures/exclosures), and research activities.

Administrative access for AGFD staff (as agreed to by AGFD and NPS) will be allowed in suitable locations for law enforcement, natural resource management, and other purposes and will conform with NPS Management Policies generally, as well as minimum impact requirements in proposed wilderness.

The AGFD, BLM, and NPS work cooperatively to manage habitat and wildlife on NPS lands within the Parashant. On NPS lands, wildlife decisions and specific actions would be developed through cooperative planning, focusing on management that perpetuates a natural distribution of native wildlife in a mosaic of associated habitats in accordance with NPS Management Policies.

On BLM lands, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services (APHIS-WS) and the AGFD manage animal damage control, predator management, control of exotic wildlife species, and feral, non-permitted livestock on BLM lands. A 1995 MOU recognizes the legal authority of APHIS-WS to conduct wildlife damage management on BLM lands. The BLM acknowledges that authority and would continue close coordination with APHIS-WS and AGFD, as well as the USFWS, USFS North Kaibab Ranger District, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, State Land Department, State Brand Inspector, and other affected agencies on animal damage control efforts within the Planning Areas. AGFD predator management would continue under AGFD strategic plans as well as species management plans.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2.19 provides a summary of the moderate or major impacts that would occur from implementing the No Action and four action alternatives. Chapter 4 provides more detailed impact analysis.

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
I. MONUMENT OBJECTS				
N/A	See summary of impacts to Monument objects in the following sections of this table: Water Resources, Geology and Paleontology, Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management, Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species, Cultural Resources, and Visual Resources			
II. RESOURCES				
IMPACTS TO AIR QUALITY				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Impacts (fugitive dust) from travel on unpaved roads would be localized, short-term, and negligible to minor . Impacts most widespread among the alternatives due to the miles of routes left open.	Impacts (fugitive dust) from travel on unpaved roads would be localized, short-term, and negligible to minor , although the lease widespread among the alternatives due to the miles of routes closed.	Impacts (fugitive dust) from travel on unpaved roads would be localized, short-term, and minor to moderate along specific routes . Impacts would be less widespread than Alternatives A, D, and E due to miles of closed routes, but more widespread compared to Alternative B.	Impacts (fugitive dust) from travel on unpaved roads would be localized, short-term, and minor to moderate along specific routes . Impacts would be less widespread than Alternative A due to miles of closed routes, but more widespread compared to Alternatives B, C, and E.	Impacts (fugitive dust) from travel on unpaved roads would be similar to Alternative C. Impacts would be less widespread than Alts A and D due to miles of closed routes, but more widespread compared to Alternatives B, and C.
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO. Short-term impacts would occur from smoke and dust; long-term impacts would be the reduced chance of wildfire and associated air quality impacts.	Minor impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; less intense short-term impacts than Alternatives A, C-E due to fewer treatments. Greatest potential for long-term impacts from wildfire.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternative B due to more acres and treatment methods allowed, but potential for long-term impacts would be reduced.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternatives B and C due to more acres and treatment methods allowed, but potential for long-term impacts would be reduced.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternative B due to more acres and treatment methods allowed, but long-term impacts reduced. Short- and long-term impacts would be similar to Alternatives C or D, depending upon ecological zone.

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>From Recreation</i>				
Short-term, localized, moderate impacts could be experienced during and near OHV races and rallies	Impacts from OHV races and rallies would be eliminated.	Impacts from OHV races and rallies may be more concentrated albeit less widespread than under Alternative A	Impacts from OHV races and rallies would be similar to Alternative A.	Impacts from OHV races and rallies would be similar to Alternative A.
IMPACTS TO WATER RESOURCES				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts in Monuments from road closures and no new permanent roads contributing to water quality protection	Minor to moderate impacts; road closures/rehabilitation would contribute most to water quality protection among the alternatives	Minor to moderate impacts; road closures/rehabilitation would contribute more to water quality protection than Alternative A, D, and E, but less than Alternative B.	Minor to moderate impacts; road closures/rehabilitation would contribute more to water quality protection than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C	Minor to moderate impacts, road closures/rehabilitation would contribute more to water quality protection than Alternatives A and D but less than Alternatives B and C in the Monuments and more than Alternatives A, C & D but less than B in the Arizona Strip FO
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO. Short-term impacts would occur from erosion and runoff; long-term impacts would be the reduced chance of wildfire and associated water quality impacts.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; less intense short-term impacts than Alternatives A, C-E due to fewer treatments. Greatest potential for long-term impacts from wildfire.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternative B due to more acres and treatment methods allowed, but potential for long-term impacts would be reduced.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternatives B and C due to more acres and treatment methods allowed, but potential for long-term impacts would be reduced.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and AZ Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alt. B as more acres and treatment methods allowed, but long-term impacts reduced. Short- and long-term impacts similar to Alts C or D, depending upon ecol. zone.
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts resulting from water quality	Minor to moderate impacts; greatest potential for water	Minor to moderate impacts; reduction in total AUMs by	Minor to moderate impacts. reduction in total AUMs by	Minor to moderate impacts, reduction in total AUMs by

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
improvements to lands not available for grazing and season of use restrictions	quality improvements among the alts as total AUMs in the Planning Area reduced 9,220	682 would create less improvements than Alts B and E, but more than Alts. A and D	382 would create less improvements than Alts B, C and E, but more than Alt. A	726 would create less improvements than Alt. B, but more than Alts A, C, and D
IMPACTS TO SOILS				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from road closures and no new, permanent roads contributing to protection of soils. Direct impacts in terms of increased erosion and runoff would occur on 803 acres of open areas.	Minor to moderate impacts; road closures/rehabilitation would contribute most among the alternatives to protection of soils. Direct impacts in terms of increased erosion and runoff would be eliminated due to no open areas.	Minor to moderate impacts; road closures/rehabilitation would contribute more to water quality protection than Alternative A and D but less than Alternatives B and E. Direct impacts in terms of increased erosion and runoff would occur on 84% more acres than under Alternative A.	Minor to moderate impacts; road closures/rehabilitation would contribute more to water quality protection than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C. Direct impacts in terms of increased erosion and runoff would occur on 795% more acres than under Alternative A, the most widespread among the Alternatives.	Minor to moderate impacts; road closures/rehabilitation would contribute more to water quality protection than Alternatives A, C-D, but less than Alternative B. Direct impacts in terms of increased erosion and runoff would occur on slightly (22%) more acres than under Alternative A
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuels Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO. Short-term impacts would occur from compaction and erosion; long-term impacts would be the reduced chance of wildfire and associated impacts to soils.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; less intense short-term impacts than Alternatives A, C-E due to fewer treatments. Greatest potential for long-term impacts from wildfire.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternative B due to more acres and treatment methods allowed, but potential for long-term impacts would be reduced.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternatives B and C due to more acres and treatment methods allowed, but potential for long-term impacts would be reduced.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO; more intense short-term impacts than Alternative B as more acres and treatment methods allowed, but long-term impacts reduced. Short- and long-term impacts similar to Alternatives C or D, depending upon ecological zone.
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts	Minor to moderate impacts;	Minor to moderate impacts;	Minor to moderate impacts.	Minor to moderate impacts,

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
resulting from improvements to soils on lands not available for grazing and season of use restrictions.	greatest potential for soil improvements among the alternatives due to total AUMs in the Planning Area being reduced by 9,220	reduction in total AUMs by 682 would create less soil improvements than Alternatives B and E, but more than Alternatives A and D	reduction in total AUMs by 382 would create less soil improvements than Alternatives B, C and E, but more than Alternative A	reduction in total AUMs by 726 would create less soil improvements than Alternative B, but more than Alternatives A, C, and D
IMPACTS TO GEOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts due to damage by motorized/mechanized travel along open roads and OHV use. Most intense because more miles routes open; Parashant 1715, Vermilion 446. Provides for most access for research.	Negligible to minor impacts due to damage by motorized/mechanized travel and OHV use; least impacts among the alternatives. Least intense because least miles routes open; Parashant 626miles, Vermilion 172). Most limitation on access for research.	Negligible to minor impacts due to damage by motorized/mechanized travel and OHV use; less intensive than Alternative A, but more intensive than Alternative B. Less routes open under this alternative than A, D or E; Parashant 1320 miles, Vermilion 374 miles.	Minor to moderate impacts, more intensive than Alts B-C & E but less than Alternative A due to miles of open roads, and most impacts due to OHV use. Less routes open under this alternative than A, more than all other alternatives; Parashant 1528 miles, Vermilion 416 miles.	Minor to moderate impacts due to damage by motorized/mechanized travel and OHV use, less intense than Alternatives A, C - D, more intense than Alternative B. Less routes open under this alternative than A or D, more than B and C; Parashant 1401 miles, Vermilion 377 miles.
IMPACTS TO VEGETATION				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate short-term impacts due to loss of vegetation from new, temporary roads. Moderate short- and long-term impacts from rehabilitation of closed roads, mainly beneficial.	Minor to moderate short-term impacts from loss of vegetation from new, temporary roads, similar to Alternative A. Moderate short- and long-term impacts from rehabilitation of closed roads, most under this Alternative.	Minor to moderate short-term impacts from loss of vegetation from new, temporary roads, similar to Alternative A. Moderate short- and long-term impacts from rehabilitation of closed roads, more than Alternative A but less than Alternative B	Minor to moderate short-term impacts from loss of vegetation from new, temporary roads, similar to Alternative A. Moderate short- and long-term impacts from rehabilitation of closed roads, more than Alternative A but less than Alternatives B, C & E	Minor to moderate short-term impacts from loss of vegetation from new, temporary roads, similar to Alternative A. Moderate short- and long-term impacts from rehabilitation of closed roads, more than Alternatives A & D but less than Alternatives B & C

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Minor to major short- and long-term impacts damaging/altering vegetation in areas where grazing occurs, more widespread under this Alternative due to fewest allotments not available to grazing/ seasonal restrictions.	Minor to major impacts damaging/altering vegetation in areas where grazing occurs, least widespread under this Alternative due to most allotments not available to grazing/seasonal restrictions.	Minor to major impacts damaging/altering vegetation in areas where grazing occurs, less widespread than Alternative A due to more allotments not available to grazing/ seasonal restrictions, but more widespread than Alternative B.	Minor to major impacts damaging/altering vegetation in areas where grazing occurs, less widespread than Alternative A due to more allotments not available to grazing/ seasonal restrictions, but more widespread than Alternative B & C.	Minor to major impacts damaging/altering vegetation in areas where grazing occurs, similar than Alternative D, although slightly less widespread.
IMPACTS TO FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
<i>From Vegetation Management</i>				
Moderate impacts as treated areas would burn less intensely	Moderate impacts, less than other alternatives as fewer acres would be treated	Moderate impacts, more intense than Alternative B as more acres treated, less intense than Alternative D, similar to Alternative E	Moderate impacts, more intense than Alternatives B, C, & E as most acres would be treated	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative C, depending upon ecological zone
<i>From Visual Resource Management</i>				
Negligible to minor impacts in Parashant due to restrictions from VRM class assignments. Moderate in Arizona Strip FO.	Major impacts in Parashant due to restrictions from VRM class assignments. Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO.	Moderate impacts in Parashant due to restrictions from VRM class assignments. Moderate in Arizona Strip FO.	Moderate in Parashant due to restrictions from VRM class assignments. Minor in Arizona Strip FO.	Moderate in Parashant due to restrictions from VRM class assignments. Moderate in Arizona Strip FO.
<i>From Wilderness Characteristics</i>				
N/A	Moderate impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO due to fuel management restrictions, natural processes for treatments, and most acreage for lands managed to	Moderate impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO due to fuel management restrictions. Acres managed to maintain wilderness characteristics under this	Minor in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO due to fuel management restrictions. Acres managed to maintain wilderness characteristics under this alternative;	Minor in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO due to fuel management restrictions. Acres managed to maintain wilderness characteristics under this alternative;

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	maintain wilderness characteristics under this alternative; 411,256 acres, Vermilion 96,796 acres, AZ Strip FO 46,135 acres	alternative; Parashant 226,394 acres, Vermilion 40345 acres, AZ Strip FO 77,575 acres (more acres because ACECs do not provide protection	Parashant 140,949 acres, Vermilion 0 acres, AZ Strip FO 34,628 acres	Parashant 226,394 acres, Vermilion 37,566 acres, AZ Strip FO 34,942 acres
IMPACTS TO FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Moderate impacts from road rehabilitation and/or construction, resulting in disturbance, displacement, loss of habitat, injury, or death	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A, less widespread than other alternatives.	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A.	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A but would occur over a wider area.	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A but a decrease of 18% open miles over Alternative A in Parashant, and 15% in Vermilion. AZ Strip FO route evaluation would be completed in 3-5 years.
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from reclamation actions that injure or kill individual animals. Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation use and/or sale due to disturbance, loss of habitat, or death. Minor to major impacts from wildlife inventories from disturbance.	Minor to moderate impacts from reclamation actions, vegetation use and/or sale, and noxious weed management, similar to Alternative A but not as widespread due to limits of techniques used and acres managed.	Minor to moderate impacts from reclamation actions, vegetation use and/or sale, and noxious weed management, similar to Alternative A but not as widespread. More widespread than Alternative B.	Minor to moderate impacts from reclamation actions, vegetation use and/or sale, and noxious weed management, similar to Alt. A, either more, less, or similarly widespread, depending upon ecological zone. More widespread than Alternative B and C.	Minor to moderate impacts from reclamation actions, vegetation use and/or sale, and noxious weed management, most similar to Alternative D, with a few exceptions in Parashant in some ecological zones.
<i>From Fish and Wildlife</i>				
Minor to major impacts due to disturbance from wildlife inventories. Minor impacts due to disturbance from existing Watchable Wildlife area (Parashant only)	Minor to major impacts from wildlife inventories, same as Alternative A. Minor impacts from existing Watchable Wildlife area (Parashant only), same as Alternative A	Minor to major impacts from wildlife inventories, same as Alternative A. Minor to moderate impacts from disturbance due to additional Watchable Wildlife areas	Minor to major impacts from wildlife inventories, same as Alternative A. Minor to moderate impacts from additional Watchable Wildlife areas, same as Alternative C	Minor to major impacts from wildlife inventories, same as Alternative A. Minor to moderate impacts from additional Watchable Wildlife areas, same as Alternative C

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from disturbance, habitat alteration, litter, etc., due to camping	Minor to moderate impacts caused by camping, same as Alternative A	Minor to moderate impacts caused by camping, same as Alternative A	Minor to moderate impacts caused by camping, same as Alternative A	Minor to moderate impacts caused by camping, same as Alternative A
IMPACTS TO SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Negligible to moderate short-term impacts to desert tortoises caused by injury, death, or displacement from road construction, maintenance, and rehabilitation. Magnitude of impacts greatest under this alternative because of largest mileage of open routes.	Moderate impacts to desert tortoise, least under all alternatives because impacts would occur over a smaller area than any other alternative.	Moderate impacts to desert tortoise, greater magnitude than Alternative B. Magnitude of impacts would be less than Alternatives A, D, and E but greater than Alternative B.	Moderate impacts to desert tortoise, greater magnitude than Alternatives B, C and E.	Moderate impacts to desert tortoise, greater magnitude than Alternatives B and C but less than Alternatives A and D.
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
Negligible to moderate short-term impacts from noxious weed treatments and fire suppression. Long-term beneficial effects from noxious weed treatments.	Negligible to minor short-term impacts from noxious weed treatments and fire suppression. Long-term beneficial effects from noxious weed treatments.	Negligible to moderate short-term impacts from noxious weed treatments and fire suppression, same as Alternative A. Long-term beneficial effects from noxious weed treatments.	Negligible to moderate short-term impacts from noxious weed treatments and fire suppression, same as Alternative A. Long-term beneficial effects from noxious weed treatments.	Negligible to moderate short-term impacts from noxious weed treatments and fire suppression, same as Alternative A. Long-term beneficial effects from noxious weed treatments.
<i>From Air, Water, and Soils</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts to desert tortoise from watershed restoration projects. Moderate	No impacts from watershed restoration projects as none would occur.	Minor to moderate impacts from watershed restoration projects, great than Alternative	Minor to moderate impacts from watershed restoration projects, less than Alternative	Minor to moderate impacts from watershed restoration projects, same as Alternative

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
impacts to California Condor.		B but less than other alternatives.	A, but more than Alternative C.	D.
<i>From Special Status Species</i>				
N/A	Minor to moderate short-term impacts on special status birds due to introducing relict leopard frogs.	Minor to moderate short-term impacts from introducing relict leopard frogs, similar to Alternative B but more intense.	Minor to moderate short-term impacts from introducing relict leopard frogs, same as Alternative C.	Minor to moderate short-term impacts from introducing relict leopard frogs, same as Alternative C.
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts on sensitive plants and desert tortoise from trampling. Most impacts among the alternatives.	Minor to moderate impacts on sensitive plants and desert tortoise, least among the alternatives.	Minor to moderate impacts on sensitive plants and desert tortoise, greater than Alt B but less than Alts A, D & E.	Minor to moderate impacts on sensitive plants and desert tortoise, greater than Alt B, D & E, but less than Alt A.	Minor to moderate impacts on sensitive plants and desert tortoise, greater than Alts B & C, less than Alts A & D.
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from vehicles colliding with desert tortoise during competitive events.	Minor to moderate impacts, same as Alternative A.	Minor to moderate impacts, same as Alternative A.	Minor to moderate impacts, same as Alternative A.	Minor to moderate impacts, same as Alternative A.
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Long-term beneficial effects from designation of ACECs for special status species resulting from increased management attention, OHV restrictions, and other intensified management, on 127,192 acres.	Long-term beneficial effects from ACEC designations similar to Alternative A with greatest ACEC acreage of all alternatives at 308,390 acres.	Long-term beneficial effects from designation of ACECs similar to Alternative A but on fewer acres than Alt B at 132,101 acres.	Long-term beneficial effects from designation of ACECs similar to Alternative A. Alt D has least amount of acreage of all alternatives with 106,420 acres.	Long-term beneficial effects from designation of ACECs similar to Alternative A. Alternative E with 150,105 acres has more acres than Alternatives A, C, and D but fewer acres than Alternative B.
IMPACTS TO Wild Burros				
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
IMPACTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Increased vulnerability of sites to vandalism and recreational access. Moderate impacts from motorized vehicle use on/near sites and access for vandalism. Most intense under this alternative with 1715 miles open for motorized use in Parashant and 446 miles open in Vermilion.	Moderate impacts from motorized vehicle, least intense and widespread among the alternatives with 626 miles open for motorized use in Parashant and 172 miles in Vermilion.	Moderate impacts from motorized vehicle, less intense than Alternative A but more than Alternative B with 1320 miles open for motorized use in Parashant and 374 miles in Vermilion.	Moderate impacts from motorized vehicle, less intense than Alternative A but more than all other alternatives except Alternative A with 1528 miles open to motorized use in Parashant and 416 miles open in Vermilion.	Moderate impacts from motorized vehicle, less intense than Alternatives A & D but more than Alternatives B & C with 1404 miles open for motorized use in Parashant and 377 miles open in Vermilion.
<i>From Wilderness Characteristics</i>				
N/A	Minor to moderate impacts due to protection from access and damage, most intense and widespread under this Alternative.	Minor impacts, less intense and widespread than Alternative B.	Moderate impacts, less intense and widespread than Alternatives B & C, similar to Alternative E.	Moderate impacts, less intense and widespread than Alternatives B & C, similar to Alternative E.
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
Negligible to moderate impacts from fire and fuels management and vegetative treatments	Minor impacts from fire and fuels management, least under this Alternative. Moderate impacts from Pakoon Springs restoration	Minor impacts from fire and fuels management. Moderate impacts in Parashant from Pakoon Springs restoration	Minor to moderate impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO. Minor impacts in Vermilion	Similar to Alternative C
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Minor impacts due to protection offered by VRM Class 1 and II as 42% of Parashant, 100 % of Vermilion,	Minor impacts from VRM Class 1 and II in Monuments, minor in Arizona Strip FO with less Class I and II than	Minor impacts from VRM Class 1 and II in Monuments, minor in Arizona Strip FO, less than Alternative B, more	Moderate impacts from VRM Class 1 and II, less than Alternative B, more than Alternative A with fewest acres	Moderate impacts from VRM Class 1 and II in Monuments, same as Alternative B, minor impacts in AZ Strip FO, same

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
and 33% of AZ Strip FO designated VRM Class I or II.	under Alt A, most protection under this Alternative as nearly 100% of both Monuments designated Class I and II.	than Alternative A with 75% of Parashant Class I-II, 99% of Vermilion Class I-II and AZ Strip FO similar to Alt A.	under any alternative other than Alternative A proposed for designation as Class I-II.	as Alternative D
<i>From Minerals</i>				
Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO from ground disturbance.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO, least among the alternatives.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO, same as Alternative A.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO, most intense under this alternative.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO.
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Moderate impacts overall, moderate to major impacts in AZ Strip FO due to public access affecting the integrity of specific sites/areas.	Moderate impacts, least intense under this Alternative.	Moderate to major impacts, similar to Alternative A.	Moderate impacts overall, major impacts in Arizona Strip FO, similar to Alternative A but more intense/widespread.	Same as Alternative A
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO due to protection afforded by ACECs.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO due to larger ACECs, more acreage than other alternatives.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO, less ACEC acreage than Alternative B.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO, least ACEC protection among the alternatives.	Moderate impacts in Arizona Strip FO, similar to Alternative B.
<i>From Lands and Realty</i>				
Moderate impacts from land disposals, use authorizations.	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A.	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A.	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A.	Moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A.
IMPACTS TO VISUAL RESOURCES				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Negligible to moderate short-term impacts from dust. Minor to moderate from road maintenance. Negligible to	Impacts from dust, road maintenance, and material sites, and to night skies similar to Alternative A, but less	Impacts from dust, road maintenance, and material sites, and to night skies similar to Alternative A. Minor to	Impacts from dust, road maintenance, and material sites, and to night skies similar to Alternative A. Minor to	Impacts from dust, road maintenance, and material sites, and to night skies similar to Alternative A. Minor to

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<p>moderate impacts from new material sites. Moderate short-term impacts to night skies from roadwork.</p>	<p>intense. Moderate to major impacts from reduced viewing opportunities. Negligible to moderate impacts from vehicles pulling off roads.</p>	<p>moderate impacts from reduced viewing opportunities, less intense than Alternative B. Minor to moderate impacts from OHV open areas.</p>	<p>moderate impacts from reduced viewing opportunities, less intense than Alternatives B, C & E. Minor to major impacts from open OHV areas and speed events.</p>	<p>moderate impacts from reduced viewing opportunities, less intense than Alternatives B, C but more intense than Alternative D. Impacts from OHV closed areas same as Alternative A.</p>
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
<p>Minor to moderate impacts from treatments creating visual changes. Potential for major impacts if entire planning area is treated. Minor to moderate impacts from reducing human-caused fire. Minor to moderate impacts from post fire rehabilitation, wildland fires, and prescribed burns.</p>	<p>Minor impacts from treatments, less intense/widespread than all other alternatives. Potential for major impacts from total treated areas eliminated. Impacts from fire reduction, post-fire rehabilitation, wildland fires, and prescribed fires same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Minor impacts from treatments, less intense than Alternative A, more intense than Alternative B. Potential for major impacts from total treated areas reduced. Minor to moderate impacts from Pakoon Springs restoration. Impacts from fire reduction, post-fire rehabilitation, wildland fires, and prescribed fires same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Minor impacts from treatments, less intense than Alternative A, more intense than Alternatives B & C. Potential for major impacts from total treated areas reduced. Impacts from Pakoon Springs restoration same as Alternative C, with additional minor to moderate impacts from facility development. Impacts from fire reduction, post-fire rehab, wildland fires, and prescribed fires same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative D</p>
<i>From Air, Water, and Soil</i>				
<p>Moderate to major impacts protecting visual resources due to restrictions on surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alternative A from surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alternative A from surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alternative A from surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alternative A from surface disturbing activities.</p>

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>From Fish and Wildlife</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from water developments.	Impacts from wildlife water developments similar to Alternative A.	Impacts from wildlife water developments similar to Alternative A.	Impacts from wildlife water developments similar to Alternative A.	Impacts from wildlife water developments similar to Alternative A.
<i>From Special Status Species</i>				
Minor to Moderate impacts from restoration efforts. Negligible to moderate impacts from reduced public access/ viewing opportunities.	Impacts from restoration same as Alt A. Minor to moderate impacts from reduced public access/ viewing opportunities, most intense under this Alt.	Impacts from restoration efforts and reduced public access/viewing opportunities similar to Alternative A.	Impacts from restoration efforts and reduced public access/viewing opportunities similar to Alternative A.	Impacts from restoration efforts and reduced public access/viewing opportunities similar to Alternative A.
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Major impacts in Parashant threatening visual resources by managing Class II & II lands under Class IV standards. Major impacts in Vermilion protecting visual resources by managing Class III & IV lands under Class II standards.	Major impacts in Parashant protecting visual resources by managing Class III & IV lands under Class I & II standards. Moderate impacts in Vermilion protecting visual resources by managing Class III & IV lands under Class I & II standards.	Minor to moderate impacts in Parashant protecting visual resources by managing Class III lands under Class I & II standards. Moderate impacts in Vermilion, but less intense than Alternative B.	Minor to moderate impacts in Parashant protecting visual resources by managing Class III lands under Class I & II standards, less intense than Alternative C. Moderate impact in Vermilion from Class IV assignments.	Impacts in Parashant and Vermilion from Class assignments similar to Alternative C.
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Major to moderate impacts protecting BLM wilderness visual resources through Class I assignment.	Major to moderate impacts, same as Alternative A, but would also apply to NPS proposed wilderness.	Impacts similar to Alternative B in wilderness areas.	Impacts similar to Alternative B in wilderness areas.	Impacts similar to Alternative B in wilderness areas.
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Negligible to moderate impacts in areas under heavy utilization/high grazing concentrations. Minor to	Negligible to moderate impacts from grazing, same as Alternative A but the least widespread among the	Negligible to moderate impacts from grazing, slightly less than Alternative A but more widespread than	Impacts similar to Alternative A in Parashant and Alternative C in Arizona Strip FO and Vermilion. Impacts from	Impacts similar to Alternative A in Parashant and Alternative C in Arizona Strip FO and Vermilion. Impacts from

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
moderate impacts from using BLM Standards and Guidelines and NPS Vital Signs.	alternatives. Impacts from Stands and Guides/Vial Signs same as Alternative A.	Alternative B. Impacts from Stands and Guides/Vial Signs same as Alternative A.	Stands and Guides/Vial Signs same as Alternative A.	Stands and Guides/Vial Signs same as Alternative A.
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Minor impacts from recreation management. Negligible to minor impacts from marketing	Minor to moderate impacts from recreation management and marketing	Negligible to moderate impacts from recreation management. Impacts from recreation marketing same as Alternative B.	Impacts from recreation management same as Alternative C. Impacts from recreation marketing same as Alternative B.	Impacts from recreation management same as Alternative C. Impacts from recreation marketing same as Alternative B.
<i>From Lands and Realty</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from land-use authorizations in Monuments. Potential major impacts from land disposals in Arizona Strip FO.	Impacts same as Alt. A for Parashant and AZ Strip FO. Minor to moderate impacts in Vermilion from ADOT drainage area/structures.	Impacts similar to Alternative A for Parashant and Arizona Strip FO. Impacts similar to Alternative B for Vermilion.	Impacts similar to Alternative A for Parashant and Arizona Strip FO. Impacts similar to Alternative B for Vermilion.	Impacts similar to Alternative A for Parashant and Arizona Strip FO. Impacts similar to Alternative B for Vermilion.
IMPACTS TO LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Moderate impacts from vehicle traffic degrading wilderness characteristics. Major impacts from 71 miles road closures in Parashant and 105 road closures in Vermilion.	Negligible impacts from vehicle traffic degrading wilderness characteristics. Major impact in Monuments from route closures enhancing wilderness characteristics, 445 miles in Parashant and 179 miles in Vermilion.	Minor to moderate impacts from vehicle traffic degrading wilderness characteristics. Minor to moderate impacts from route closures enhancing wilderness characteristics, 224 miles in Parashant and 110 miles in Vermilion.	Similar impacts to Alternative C, although less widespread/intense because this alternative has the least miles of route closures other than Alternative A, 148 miles in Parashant and 93 miles in Vermilion.	Minor impacts from vehicle traffic degrading wilderness characteristics. Minor to moderate impacts from route closures enhancing wilderness characteristics with 188 miles in Parashant and 113 miles in Vermilion.
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from restoration degrading wilderness characteristics	Minor impacts from restoration degrading wilderness characteristics	Minor to moderate impacts from restoration degrading wilderness characteristics.	Impacts same as Alternative C	Impacts same as Alternative C

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Minor to major impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO from VRM Class III and IV designation which overlap wilderness characteristics lands 229,927 acres in Parashant, approximately 100,000 in Vermilion, and 70,107 in AZ Strip FO, thus threatening wilderness characteristics.	Negligible to minor impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO because virtually all acres designated VRM Class II-II overlap lands with wilderness characteristics.	Minor to moderate impacts in Parashant FO from VRM Class III designation threatening wilderness characteristics as 52,391 acres in Parashant, all acres in Vermilion, and AZ Strip FO overlap VRM Class I-II designation. Impacts in Arizona Strip FO same as Alternative B.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative C, although more widespread/intense because 38,569 more acres designated VRM Class III under this alternative.	Impacts in Parashant same as Alternative C. Impacts in Arizona Strip FO and Vermilion same as Alternative B.
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts threatening wilderness characteristics from presence of livestock and construction/maintenance of livestock fence and water structures.	Impacts similar to Alternative A but less widespread due to more allotments not available to grazing/restrictions. Least impacts under this Alternative.	Impacts same as Alternative B but less widespread due to more allotments not available for grazing/restrictions, more widespread than Alternative B.	Impacts same as Alternative B.	Impacts in the Monuments same as Alternative B and same as Alternative C in the Arizona Strip FO.
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Moderate to major impacts from natural restoration.	Impacts from restoration projects same as Alternative A.	Impacts from restoration projects same as Alternative A.	Impacts from restoration projects same as Alternative A.	Impacts from restoration projects same as Alternative A.
III. RESOURCE USES				
IMPACTS TO VEGETATION PRODUCTS				
Negligible				
IMPACTS TO LANDS AND REALTY				
<i>From Special Status Species</i>				
Moderate impacts limiting	Moderate in Arizona Strip FO,	Moderate in Arizona Strip FO,	Moderate impacts, same as	Same as Alternative D but

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
community growth, ROWs, and affecting land values, 25,188 acres available for disposal.	most intense under this alternative because less acreage available for disposal than under Alternative A (17,974 acres).	less intense than Alternatives A and B because less acreage available for disposal (19,743 acres) .	Alternative C.	slightly less acres available for disposal (19,663 acres).
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Negligible to minor impacts in Parashant, least limitations under this Alternative. Minor in Arizona Strip FO due to limitations.	Negligible to minor impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO, most limitations under this Alternative.	Minor impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO, more limitations than Alternative A but less than Alternative B because more acres designated Class III which is less restrictive.	Minor impacts in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO, similar to Alternative C.	Same as Alternative C
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Minor to moderate along NHT may affect landowners. Moderate impacts from ACECs adding stipulations/restrictions (127,192 acres ACECs).	Impacts from NHT same as Alternative A. Moderate impacts from ACECs, most widespread of any Alternative (308,390 acres ACECs).	Impacts from NHT and ACECs same as Alternative A (132,101 acres ACECs).	Impacts from NHT same as Alternative A. Moderate impacts from ACEC, less than Alternatives A-C (106,420 acres ACECs).	Same as Alternative D for NHT. Moderate impacts from ACECs with 150,105 acres designated under this alternative.
<i>From Lands and Realty</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from land acquisitions, use authorizations, and disposals.	Minor impacts from widening the Navajo-McCullough ROW.	Impacts from land acquisitions, use authorizations, and disposals same as Alternative A. Impacts from widening the ROW same as Alternative B.	Impacts from land acquisitions, use authorizations, and disposals same as Alternative A. Minor impacts from widening the ROW, less limiting than Alternative B.	Same as Alternative D

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
IMPACTS TO LIVESTOCK GRAZING				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Moderate impacts to livestock operations – Alternative A would cause the least impacts	Moderate to major impacts to livestock operations from number of roads closed to motorized access and limited road maintenance – Alternative B would cause the most impacts	Moderate to major impacts to livestock operations from number of roads closed to motorized access and limited road maintenance – Alternative C impacts would be less than Alternative B but more than Alternatives A, D, E.	Moderate to major impacts to livestock operations from number of roads closed to motorized access and limited road maintenance – Alternative D impacts would be less than Alternatives B, C and E and more than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C.
<i>From Wilderness Characteristics</i>				
N/A	Largest area of lands of all alternatives, affecting almost every allotment in Monuments. Major impacts to livestock operations. This is the most restrictive alternative.	Similar to Alternative B because of less acres and fewer allotments affected. Impacts to livestock operations would be moderate.	Minor to moderate impacts to livestock operations in Parashant and AZ Strip FO. Same as Alt. A for Vermilion because no acres maintained for wilderness characteristics.	Moderate impacts to livestock operations in the Monuments, most similar to Alternative C. Minor to moderate in AZ Strip FO, similar to Alternative D.
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
Moderate short-term and long-term impacts.	Moderate to major impacts to livestock operators because of fewer acres restored/treated and fewer tools available.	Moderate impacts to livestock operators – more vegetation and fuels treatments allowed.	Minor to moderate impacts to livestock operations; most number of acres allowed for vegetation treatments.	In Parashant same as Alternative C, in Vermilion and AZ Strip FO same as Alternative D.
<i>From Special Status Species</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts overall. Major impact in Parashant in desert tortoise ACECs/DWMAs, due to lands not available to grazing. Major impacts in Arizona Strip FO where areas are not available	Greater and higher intensity impacts than any other alternative, ranging from moderate to major impacts due to more lands not available to livestock grazing.	Fewer and less intense impacts than Alternative B, ranging from minor to major impacts.	Fewer and less intense impacts than Alternatives B and C, ranging from minor to moderate impacts.	In Parashant similar to Alternatives C and D; in Vermilion same as Alternative A; in Arizona Strip FO same as Alternative D.

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
seasonally for grazing in desert tortoise habitat.				
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Negligible to moderate ; least impacting alternative.	Negligible to moderate ; more intensive impacts than any other alternative because this alternative has the most acres designated VRM Class I-II, nearly 100% of Monuments.	Negligible to moderate ; less intense than Alternative B and E.	Negligible to moderate ; less intense than Alternatives B, C, or E. This is the least impacting of all the alternatives.	Negligible to moderate ; in Monuments to those in Alternative D; In Arizona Strip FO, similar to Alternative B except less acres designated Class I-II.
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Moderate to major impacts; more impacts than Alternative D, fewer than Alternatives B,C, and E, affecting 29 allotments.	Moderate to major impacts; most impacting alternative to due to largest number of acreage of proposed ACECs, affecting 56 allotments.	Moderate to major impacts; less impacting than Alternatives B and E.	Moderate to major impacts; least impacting alternative to livestock grazing due to fewest acreage proposed for ACECs, affecting 17 allotments.	Moderate to major impacts; fewer impacts than Alternative B, more than Alternatives A, C and D, still affecting same number of allotments as Alternative B but with fewer acres than Alternative B.
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Moderate impacts	Moderate to major impacts; most intense among alternatives.	Moderate to major impacts, less intense than Alternative B.	Moderate to major impacts, less intense than Alternatives B, C and E.	Similar to Alternative C
IMPACTS TO MINERALS				
<i>From Special Status Species</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts to seasonal restrictions may limit oil & gas exploration/development. Major impacts from mineral material disposal closures.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, except fewer seasonal restrictions for fluid leasable minerals.	Impacts similar to Alternative B	Impacts similar to Alternative B	Impacts similar to Alternative B

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>From Air, Water, and Soils</i>				
Moderate impacts on locatable minerals from dust control expenses.	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Moderate to major impacts to fluid mineral leasing from no surface occupancy restrictions.	Minor to moderate impacts as no surface occupancy restrictions same as Alternative A and Mineral Materials have fewer acres of restrictions than Alternative A	Same as Alternative B	Leasable minerals same as Alternative B, Locatable minerals same as Alternative A, and Mineral Materials less impacts than Alternative A because fewer acres designated VRM Class II.	Leasable minerals similar to Alternative A. Locatable minerals same as Alternative A and Mineral Materials less than Alternative B and more impacting than Alternatives A, C, and D.
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Negligible to major to fluid leasable minerals from ACECs, with 127,192 acres. Negligible to minor impacts to locatable minerals. Moderate to major impacts to mineral materials in ACECs.	Minor to moderate to fluid leasable minerals from ACECs, with 308,390 acres. Impacts to locatable minerals same as Alternative B. Impacts to mineral materials in ACECs same as Alternative A.	Impacts to fluid leasable minerals and mineral materials from ACEC similar to Alternative B, but less widespread. Impacts to locatable minerals same as Alternative A.	Impacts to fluid leasable minerals and mineral materials from ACEC similar to Alternative B, but less widespread than Alternatives B and C. Impacts to locatable minerals same as Alternative A.	Similar to Alternative D
<i>From Wilderness Characteristics</i>				
N/A	Moderate on fluid leasable minerals from no surface occupancy.	Impacts similar to Alternative B on fluid leasable minerals, more widespread than Alternative B.	Moderate to major on fluid leasable minerals, less widespread than Alternatives B and C.	Impacts same as Alternative D
<i>From Lands and Realty</i>				
Moderate to major impacts from land acquisitions and	Impacts similar to Alternative A, except less acres	Impacts similar to Alternative A except less acres	Same as Alternative C	Impacts similar to Alternative A, except less acres

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
disposals, 25,188 acres.	with available for disposal, 17,974 acres.	available for disposal, 19,743 acres.		available for disposal, 19,663 acres.
IMPACTS TO RECREATION				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
<p>Restricting all vehicles to designated roads would allow OHV users continued access to the existing road network until route designations were made, while non-motorized users could experience minor to moderate impacts due to potential increases in motorized use. Maintaining an 803-acre “open” area in the Arizona Strip FO would allow for very limited off-road opportunities.</p> <p>Keeping 2,183 miles of roads open and closing no roads in the Monuments would preserve existing available opportunities for motorized recreational use and current recreational settings. Non-motorized users would experience minor to moderate impacts due to potential increases in motorized use. Similar impacts would occur on the Arizona Strip FO.</p>	<p>Major impacts, motorized recreational used restricted due to 85% of the Monuments delineated as Primitive TMA. Moderate to major impacts to non-motorized users due to increased opportunities</p> <p>Impacts from restricting all vehicles to designated roads would be the same as under Alternative A. Eliminating “open” areas would only have a slight decrease in off-road opportunities.</p> <p>Moderate to major impacts due to a roughly 60% reduction in open roads compared to Alternative A, decreasing opportunities for motorized recreation in the Monuments. Major impacts to non-motorized users due to increased recreational opportunities. Impacts on the Arizona Strip FO would be the same as Alt. A, but short term.</p>	<p>Minor to moderate impacts limiting OHV use and minor impacts increasing non-motorized opportunities from route designations.</p> <p>Impacts from restricting all vehicles to designated roads would be the same as under Alternative A. Increasing “open” areas by 84% would have a negligible increase in off-road opportunities.</p> <p>Minor to moderate impacts due to a roughly 20% reduction in open roads compared to Alternative A, decreasing opportunities for motorized recreation in the Monuments. Minor impacts to non-motorized users due to increased recreational opportunities. Impacts on the Arizona Strip FO would be the same as Alternative A, but shorter term.</p>	<p>Negligible impacts on OHV use/opportunities and minor to moderate impacts to non-motorized users due to decreasing opportunities.</p> <p>Impacts from restricting all vehicles to designated roads would be the same as under Alternative A. Increasing “open” areas by 795% would have a minor increase in off-road opportunities.</p> <p>Minor impacts due to a less than 10% reduction in open roads compared to Alternative A, decreasing opportunities for motorized recreation in the Monuments. Moderate impacts to non-motorized users due to increased recreational opportunities. Impacts on the Arizona Strip FO would be the same as Alternative A, but shorter term.</p>	<p>Negligible impacts limiting OHV use and minor to moderate impacts decreasing non-motorized opportunities from route designations.</p> <p>Impacts from restricting all vehicles to designated roads would be the same as under Alternative A. Increasing “open” areas by 22% would have a negligible increase in off-road opportunities.</p> <p>Impacts from reduction in open roads most similar to Alternative C. Impacts on the Arizona Strip FO would be the same as Alternative A, but shorter term.</p>

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
<i>From Wilderness Characteristics</i>				
N/A	Major impacts protecting settings and opportunities in the Monuments.	Impacts similar to Alternative B but not as widespread.	Moderate impacts protecting setting and opportunities in the Monuments.	Impacts similar to Alternative C.
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
Negligible to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments affecting recreation settings.	Negligible to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments affecting recreation settings.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments affecting recreation settings.	Minor to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments affecting recreation settings.	Impacts similar to Alternative D.
<i>From Fish and Wildlife</i>				
Negligible to moderate impacts from vegetation treatments affecting recreation settings. Negligible to moderate impacts from increased game/wildlife.	Same as Alternative A	Similar to Alternative A	Similar to Alternative A	Similar to Alternative A
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Minor to major impacts from VRM Class III or IV degrading recreation settings in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO.	Negligible to minor impacts from VRM Class I & II in Monuments. Impacts same as Alternative A in Arizona Strip FO.	Minor to major impacts from VRM Class III degrading recreation settings in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO, less intense than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative C	Impacts similar to Alternative C in Parashant. Impacts similar to Alternative B in Arizona Strip FO, though slightly less protective.
<i>From Cultural Resources</i>				
Major impacts providing recreation opportunities from public use sites.	Impacts similar to Alternative A, but more widespread from additional public use sites.	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts degrading recreation settings, most widespread under this	Minor to moderate impacts degrading recreation settings, least widespread under this	Impacts similar to Alternative B, except that Coyote Buttes and Paria Canyon (Vermilion)	Impacts similar to Alternative B, except for major impacts from removing seasonal	Impacts similar to Alternative B Impacts in Paria Canyon similar to Alternative B;

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Alternative	Alternative. Moderate to major impacts improving recreation settings from unavailability of livestock grazing in Coyote Buttes and Paria Canyon.	not available seasonally to grazing, reducing beneficial impacts to moderate	restrictions from Coyote Buttes and Paria Canyon (Vermilion)	impacts in Coyote Buttes similar to Alternative D
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
<p>Minor to moderate impacts from SRMAs benefiting recreation opportunities and experiences.</p> <p>Minor to moderate impacts protecting recreation settings and opportunities from signing, recreation marketing actions, visitor limits and regulations, and permit and fees.</p> <p>Moderate impacts from SRPs that could limit opportunities. No Interpretation and education decision made.</p> <p>Minor impacts from camping restrictions.</p>	<p>Minor to major impacts from SRMAs. Impacts from signing, marketing, visitor limits/ regulations and permits/fees similar to Alternative A.</p> <p>Moderate impacts from SRPs enhancing efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>Moderate impacts from Interpretation and Education.</p> <p>Moderate to major impacts from camping restrictions reducing opportunities.</p>	<p>Minor to major impacts from SRMAs. Impacts from signing, marketing, visitor limits/ regulations and permits/fees similar to Alternative A.</p> <p>Moderate impacts from SRPs enhancing efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>Moderate impacts from Interpretation and Education.</p> <p>Moderate to major impacts from camping restrictions reducing opportunities.</p>	<p>Impacts from SRMAs, recreation marketing actions, and interpretation and education similar to Alternative B. Impacts from signing, marketing, visitor limits/ regulations and camping similar to Alternative C.</p> <p>Impacts from Permit and Fees and SRPs similar to Alternative A.</p>	<p>Impacts from SRMAs, recreation marketing actions, and interpretation and education similar to Alternative B. Impacts from signing, marketing, visitor limits/ regulations, SRPs, and camping similar to Alternative C. Impacts from Permit and Fees similar to Alternative A.</p>
IMPACTS TO TRAVEL MANAGEMENT				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
<p>Moderate to major long-term impacts in Monuments along designated roads from increases in traffic and conflicts among users.</p>	<p>Moderate impacts in the short-term and major impacts long term from concentrating increasing public use on fewer roads, most intense impacts</p>	<p>Moderate long-term impacts in Monuments along designated roads from closed roads and increased traffic.</p> <p>Moderate long-term impacts</p>	<p>Minor to moderate impacts long-term in Monuments along designated roads from closed roads and increased traffic.</p> <p>Moderate long-term impacts</p>	<p>Moderate long-term impacts in Monuments along designated roads from closed roads and increased traffic, slightly more intense than Alternative C.</p>

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Minor to moderate long-term impacts in Arizona Strip FO due to increases in traffic and conflicts among users, Moderate impacts to OHV users in Arizona Strip FO from limited open areas	under this Alt. Major long-term impacts in AZ Strip FO due to increases in traffic and conflicts among users, most under this Alt. Major impacts to OHV users in Arizona Strip FO from no open areas.	in Arizona Strip FO. Minor impacts to OHV users in Arizona Strip FO due to additional open areas increasing OHV-use opportunities.	in Arizona Strip FO. Moderate impacts to OHV users in Arizona Strip FO due to additional open areas increasing OHV-use opportunities.	Moderate long-term impacts in Arizona Strip FO. Impacts to OHV users in Arizona Strip FO same as Alternative D.
<i>From Fish and Wildlife</i>				
No impacts	Negligible to major impacts in Monuments from reduced motorized access for hunting and wildlife watching.	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Minor impacts from existing SRMAs constricting travel.	Minor to moderate localized impacts to public access from designations of new SRMAs.	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B
IV. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS				
IMPACTS TO WILDERNESS AREAS				
<i>From Wilderness Characteristics</i>				
N/A	Moderate impacts Planning Area-wide due to areas identified for maintaining wilderness characteristics adjacent to Wilderness Areas, acting as a “buffer” from non-wilderness resource uses and practices. Moderate to major	Moderate impacts Planning Area-wide; similar to Alternative B, although slightly less widespread as slightly fewer acres identified for maintaining wilderness characteristics would be directly adjacent to wilderness	Minor to moderate impacts, similar to Alternative B in Arizona Strip FO, less widespread in Parashant. No impacts in Vermilion due to no acres identified for maintaining wilderness characteristics. 140,949 acres (13%) Parashant	Impacts similar to Alternative B in Arizona Strip FO. Impacts similar to Alternative C in Parashant. Impacts minor in Vermilion. 215,345 (21%) Parashant 37,566 acres (13%) Vermilion 34,942 acres (2%) AZ Strip FO

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	impacts in Vermilion. Areas managed for wilderness characteristics; 411,256 acres (39%) Parashant 96,796 acres (33%) Vermilion 46,135 acres (2%) AZ Strip FO	areas. Moderate to major impacts in Vermilion. 226,394 acres (22%) Parashant 40,345 acres (14%) Vermilion 77,575 acres (4%) AZ Strip FO	0 acres Vermilion 34,628 acres (2%) AZ Strip FO	
<i>From Vegetation and Fire and Fuel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate short-term impacts threatening wilderness character. Minor to moderate long-term impacts improving naturalness	Impacts similar to Alternative A, except long-term impacts may not be successful and ability to control invasive species would be ineffective.	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A
<i>From Fish and Wildlife</i>				
Minor to Moderate impacts from construction/maintenance of water developments in Parashant and Arizona Strip FO.; localized. Moderate to major impacts in Vermilion.	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from livestock affecting wilderness character	Minor impacts, less widespread among all alternatives due to areas made unavailable to grazing or seasonal restrictions.	Minor impacts, less widespread than Alternative A, but more widespread than Alternative B	Minor to moderate impacts, similar to Alternative A in Parashant; most intense in Vermilion and the Arizona Strip FO among the alternatives	Minor to moderate impacts, similar to Alternative C or D in Parashant, depending upon allotment; similar to Alternative B in Vermilion; and similar to Alternative B or D in the Arizona Strip FO, depending upon allotment.

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
IMPACTS TO WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS				
No moderate or major impacts to Wild and Scenic Rivers				
IMPACTS TO NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS				
<i>From Visual Resources</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from VRM Class III designation allowing some visual intrusions.	Minor impacts protecting the NHT from VRM Class II. Minimal moderate to major impacts from VRM Class IV.	Moderate to major impacts from VRM Class III and IV designations allowing visual intrusions.	Impacts same as Alternative C	Impacts same as Alternative B
<i>From Cultural Resources</i>				
No Impacts	Minor to moderate impacts affecting site integrity from Public Use Site designation which could increase visitation, use, and vandalism.	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B	Impacts same as Alternative B
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts from off-road trails.	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A
<i>From Lands and Realty</i>				
Moderate impacts from ROW compromising historic setting.	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A	Impacts same as Alternative A
IMPACTS TO AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN				
<i>From Special Status Species</i>				
ACECs to protect Special Status Species;	ACECs to protect Special Status Species;	ACECs to protect Special Status Species;	ACECs to protect Special Status Species;	ACECs to protect Special Status Species;

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Parashant: 76,014 total acres Arizona Strip FO: 126,951 total acres	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 221,994 total acres, most under this Alternative	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 120,669 total acres	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 106,179 total acres, least under this Alternative	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 138,636 total acres – 11,684 more acres than Alternative A
IMPACTS TO RESOURCE CONSERVATION AREAS (RCAs)				
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Parashant: 159,000 total acres Vermilion: 227,000 total acres	Parashant: No RCAs Vermilion: No RCAs RCAs are now within the Monuments so there would be no impacts to these resources because the Monuments would provide protection of these resources.			
V. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS				
IMPACTS TO SOCIOECONOMICS				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impact to local economies from increased recreation opportunities/travel on roads	Minor to moderate impact to local economies from decreased recreation opportunities	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
183,000 active AUMs would result in \$7,118,900 in direct economic impacts in the area. Least impacts among the alternatives.	Impacts area wide would be negligible due to a 5% reduction in active AUMs throughout the Planning area resulting in a \$358,658/year reduction in direct economic contributions compared to Alternative A. Impacts to specific ranch operations would be minor to moderate . Most	Impacts area wide would be negligible due to a 0.4% reduction in active AUMs throughout the Planning area resulting in a \$26,530/year reduction in direct economic contributions compared to Alternative A. Impacts to specific ranch operations would be negligible to minor .	Impacts area wide would be negligible due to a 0.2% reduction in active AUMs throughout the Planning area resulting in a \$14,860/year reduction in direct economic contributions compared to Alternative A. Impacts to specific ranch operations would be negligible .	Impacts similar to Alternative C

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	intense impacts among the alternatives.			
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Negligible impacts overall from recreation decisions	Minor to moderate long-term impacts due to restrictions and limits placed on recreation	Minor to moderate long-term impacts due to recreation decisions increasing visitation	Impacts similar to Alternative C	Impacts similar to Alternative C
<i>From Lands and Realty</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts in FO from land disposals benefiting local economies	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A
IMPACTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE				
No moderate or major impacts to Environmental Justice				
IMPACTS TO HEALTH AND SAFETY				
No moderate or major impacts to Health and Safety				

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
Parashant: 76,014 total acres Arizona Strip FO: 126,951 total acres	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 221,994 total acres, most under this Alternative	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 120,669 total acres	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 106,179 total acres, least under this Alternative	Parashant: no ACECs Arizona Strip FO: 138,636 total acres – 11,684 more acres than Alternative A
IMPACTS TO RESOURCE CONSERVATION AREAS (RCAs)				
<i>From Special Designations</i>				
Parashant: 159,000 total acres Vermilion: 227,000 total acres	Parashant: No RCAs Vermilion: No RCAs RCAs are now within the Monuments so there would be no impacts to these resources because the Monuments would provide protection of these resources.			
V. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS				
IMPACTS TO SOCIOECONOMICS				
<i>From Travel Management</i>				
Minor to moderate impact to local economies from increased recreation opportunities/travel on roads	Minor to moderate impact to local economies from decreased recreation opportunities	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A
<i>From Livestock Grazing</i>				
183,000 active AUMs would result in \$7,118,900 in direct economic impacts in the area. Least impacts among the alternatives.	Impacts area wide would be negligible due to a 5% reduction in active AUMs throughout the Planning area resulting in a \$358,658/year reduction in direct economic contributions compared to Alternative A. Impacts to specific ranch operations would be minor to moderate . Most	Impacts area wide would be negligible due to a 0.4% reduction in active AUMs throughout the Planning area resulting in a \$26,530/year reduction in direct economic contributions compared to Alternative A. Impacts to specific ranch operations would be negligible to minor .	Impacts area wide would be negligible due to a 0.2% reduction in active AUMs throughout the Planning area resulting in a \$14,860/year reduction in direct economic contributions compared to Alternative A. Impacts to specific ranch operations would be negligible .	Impacts similar to Alternative C

TABLE 2.19 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS				
ALTERNATIVE A NO ACTION	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E PROPOSED PLAN
	intense impacts among the alternatives.			
<i>From Recreation and Visitor Services/Interpretation and Environmental Education</i>				
Negligible impacts overall from recreation decisions	Minor to moderate long-term impacts due to restrictions and limits placed on recreation	Minor to moderate long-term impacts due to recreation decisions increasing visitation	Impacts similar to Alternative C	Impacts similar to Alternative C
<i>From Lands and Realty</i>				
Minor to moderate impacts in FO from land disposals benefiting local economies	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A	Impacts similar to Alternative A
IMPACTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE				
No moderate or major impacts to Environmental Justice				
IMPACTS TO HEALTH AND SAFETY				
No moderate or major impacts to Health and Safety				