




U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Arizona State Office

Kingman Resource Area

August 1995



Wabayuma Peak & Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan, Environmental Assessment, and Decision Record



The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the balanced management of the public lands and resources and their various values so that they are considered in a combination that will best serve the needs of the American people. Management is based upon the principles of multiple use and sustained yield; a combination of uses that take into account the long term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources. These resources include recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, fish and wildlife, wilderness and natural, scenic, scientific and cultural values.

BLM/AZ/PL-95/018



United States Department of the Interior
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Kingman Resource Area
2475 Beverly Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401



In reply refer to:
8561(025)

August, 1995

Dear Reader:

The document attached to this letter is the final Wabayuma Peak/Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan, Environmental Assessment, and Finding Of No Significant Impact/Decision Record. The plan will direct BLM management in the area for a ten year planning period. The Environmental Assessment analyzes the impacts expected from implementing the proposed action. Based on this analysis, the Finding Of No Significant Impact indicates that impacts will not be significant. The Decision Record documents the BLM's final decision.

The Draft Plan was released for public review in September, 1994. Comments were received and analyzed and resulted in minor modifications to the plan and environmental assessment. A summary of the comments can be found in part VII of the plan.

The Environmental Assessment and Decision Record are subject to appeal in accordance with procedures contained in 43 Code of Federal Regulations, part 4. Implementation of this plan will begin 30 days after the release date of this document.

Thanks to all those who participated in the planning process and contributed to the final document. It is only through public participation that the Bureau's planning efforts are successful.

Sincerely,

Ken Drew
Ken Drew
Area Manager

**Wabayuma Peak
and
Mount Tipton**

**Wilderness Management Plan, Environmental
Assessment, and Decision Record
EA #AZ-025-94-044**

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Phoenix District Office
Kingman Resource Area**

Recommended by: *Ken Drew*
Area Manager, Kingman Resource Area

5/10/95
Date

Recommended by: *G. S. Chems*
District Manager, Phoenix District

5-16-95
Date

Approved by: *[Signature]*
State Director, Arizona

5-25-95
Date

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| SUMMARY | 1 |
| PART I - INTRODUCTION | |
| Background and Purpose | 3 |
| Wilderness Overview - Mount Tipton/Wabayuma Peak | 3 |
| Location/Access/Boundaries | 3 |
| Wilderness Values & Attributes | 6 |
| General Management Situation | 7 |
| Vegetation | 7 |
| Water | 8 |
| Wildlife | 9 |
| Livestock Grazing | 10 |
| Wild Horses | 10 |
| Threatened, Endangered, and Special Status Species | 11 |
| Inholdings | 11 |
| Recreation | 12 |
| Existing Development | 12 |
| Fire | 12 |
| Cultural Resources | 12 |
| Minerals | 14 |
| Search and Rescue | 14 |
| Law Enforcement | 14 |
| Approved Motorized and Mechanized Uses | 15 |
| Other Administration | 15 |
| PART II - NATIONAL WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT GOALS | 17 |
| PART III - ISSUES | 19 |
| PART IV - MANAGEMENT STRATEGY | 21 |
| PART V - WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT | 23 |
| Objective 1 | 23 |
| Management Actions | 23 |
| Monitoring | 29 |
| Objective 2 | 29 |
| Management Actions | 29 |
| Monitoring | 31 |
| Objective 3 | 31 |
| Management Actions | 31 |
| Monitoring | 31 |
| Objective 4 | 31 |
| Management Actions | 31 |
| Monitoring | 31 |
| Objective 5 | 36 |
| Management Actions | 37 |
| Monitoring | 38 |

| | |
|--|----|
| PART VI - PLAN EVALUATION | 39 |
| PART VII - PLAN IMPLEMENTATION/COST ESTIMATES | 41 |
| PART VIII - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT | 47 |
| PART IX - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS | 63 |
| PART X - APPENDICES | 65 |
| Appendix A - Private Inholdings within Wilderness | 67 |
| Appendix B - Range Developments within Wilderness | 69 |
| Appendix C - Cover Class Evaluation Criteria | 73 |
| Appendix D - Steps to Full Fire Suppression | 75 |
| Appendix E - Special Status Species In and Around Wilderness | 77 |
| Appendix F - Bibliography | 79 |
| PART XI - ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT | 81 |
| FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/DECISION RECORD | 87 |
| LIST OF TABLES | |
| TABLE 1 - Wilderness Area Overview | 4 |
| TABLE 2 - Wilderness Grazing Allotments | 10 |
| TABLE 3 - Existing Developments | 13 |
| TABLE 4 - Approved Motorized and Mechanized Uses | 15 |
| TABLE 5 - Allowed New Developments | 25 |
| TABLE 6 - Wilderness Management Classes | 32 |
| TABLE 7 - Monitoring Standards for Wilderness Classes | 33 |
| TABLE 8 - Key Areas and Key Species | 37 |
| LIST OF MAPS | |
| MAP 1 - General planning area | 5 |
| MAP 2 - Parking areas/visitor registers and motor vehicle access restrictions: Mount Tipton Wilderness | 26 |
| MAP 3 - Parking areas/visitor registers and motor vehicle access restrictions: Wabayuma Peak Wilderness | 27 |
| MAP 4 - Mount Tipton Management Zones | 34 |
| MAP 5 - Wabayuma Peak Management Zones | 35 |

Summary

Background

- The Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 designated both the Mount Tipton and Wabayuma Peak Wilderness.
- The plan will be implemented over a 10 year period. It has been developed with extensive public input and focuses on protection and enhancement of wilderness resources while providing for the needs of visitors.

Main Features of the Plan

- Seeks to acquire all private inholdings. Recreational access will be sought through key parcels.
- Calls for construction of motor vehicle access barriers at 19 locations.
- Prescribes management of closed motor vehicle access routes totaling 36.7 linear miles through completely reclaiming 6.0 miles, partially reclaiming 11 miles to allow for their use as hiking/equestrian trails, allowing 9 miles of potential access to private inholdings to naturally revegetate, and conducting further study on 10.7 miles to determine the need for partial or total reclamation.
- Calls for removal of three abandoned or non-functional developments and reclamation of two other human imprints inconsistent with wilderness.
- Allows for construction of four spring projects to protect and enhance wilderness conditions. Four other projects will be evaluated as their need arises.
- Establishes a range development and wildlife operations and maintenance policy that permits the use of aerial flights to conduct wildlife census and restricts all maintenance to non-motorized/non-mechanized means.
- Establishes six motor vehicle parking areas with visitor registers outside of wilderness.
- Seeks to obtain access easements through four corridors to provide legal access to the wilderness.
- Allows non-commercial recreation to occur with little restriction; limits will be placed only on feeding and overnight control of packstock.
- Establishes a policy that permits commercial recreation but limits group sizes and camping alternatives.
- Maintains outstanding opportunities for solitude through a zoning concept designed to preserve this key wilderness characteristic.
- Determines a need for water quality assessment in the Mackenzie Creek drainage with actions to return the ecosystem to a natural condition.
- Prescribes study for the ponderosa pine community to determine its natural extent and management requirements.
- Calls for suppression of all wildfires in the short term. Allows fire to play a more natural role in the ecosystem as other actions are taken during the management period.
- Limits forage plant utilization at 50% at key areas to maintain or improve vegetative conditions and establishes management actions to take if utilization level is exceeded.

Part I — Introduction

Background & Purpose

The Wilderness Act of 1964 laid the foundation for the National Wilderness Preservation System. On November 28, 1990, Public Law 101-628, the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act designated 39 areas in Arizona as wilderness and added them to the system. The Wabayuma Peak Wilderness and the Mount Tipton Wilderness are two of eight located in the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Phoenix District, Kingman Resource Area. Because of the similarity of the resources and issues in the two areas, the decision was made to combine them for management purposes into one planning area. The Wabayuma Peak-Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan results from this decision and is the subject of this document.

The purpose of the wilderness plan is to provide management guidance to solve specific issues in the wilderness. It will supplement other management guidance including BLM manuals, the Code of Federal Regulations, and other state and federal laws.

When finalized, this plan will amend the Cerbat-Music Habitat Management Plan (1983), the Hualapai Habitat Management Plan (1987), and all previously completed Allotment Management Plans that overlap the wilderness areas including the Cane Springs, Dolan Springs, and Quail Springs allotments. In addition, the Mount Tipton Range Improvement Maintenance Plan and the Wabayuma Peak Range Improvement Maintenance Plan are superseded as is the Wabayuma Peak-Mount Tipton Wildlife Operations and Maintenance Plan and the Phoenix District Interim Guidance for Fire Suppression in Wilderness.

Wilderness Overview

The following narratives describe components of the wilderness. Table 1 summarize pertinent aspects for each wilderness. Information summarized reflects existing management direction and may be amended by changes initiated by this plan.

Location/Access/Boundaries

Mount Tipton Wilderness

Mount Tipton Wilderness is located about fifteen air miles north and slightly west of Kingman. The community of Dolan Springs is located immediately adjacent to the west boundary of the wilderness (maps 1 and 2). The wilderness is located in Townships 24, 25, and 26 North and Ranges 17, 18, and 19 West of the Gila and Salt River Meridian.

Legal public access to the wilderness can be made in several locations. First, the Big Wash Road (BLM #2114) taken from US Highway 93 reaches the boundary after following it for a distance of approximately four miles. The road is usually passable by any two-wheel drive vehicle but can be nearly impassable when wet. BLM possesses a right-of-way for the road across state lands (#16-72670) and performs necessary maintenance. Second, the southwest corner of the wilderness can be reached via jeep trail known as the Putnam Road (BLM # 2263) across public land from Highway 93 to the area of Marble Canyon. Motor vehicle travel across this road may require four wheel drive. Third, the town streets of Dolan Springs provide access to several points along the west side of the wilderness. High clearance vehicles are recommended. Fourth, the north end can be accessed by town streets in combination with BLM's Antelope Springs Road (#2217) that bring the visitor to the Antelope Canyon area.

Legal access to the east boundary of the wilderness does not exist due to the checkerboard nature of the public and private surrounding lands. The Stockton Hill Road from Kingman will lead the visitor to within about two miles of the wilderness. The general public sometimes uses other area roads that cross private lands. BLM does not endorse the public use of these roads.

The west and northwest boundaries of the wilderness follow section lines that are generally boundaries between private and public land. Poor condition dirt roads are sometimes present on these section lines near the community of Dolan Springs. The northeast and east boundaries also

TABLE 1. Wilderness Area Overview

| Comparative Parameters | Wilderness Area | |
|--|---|--|
| | Mount Tipton | Wabayuma Peak |
| Total acreage | 33,000 | 40,129 |
| Public acreage | 31,320 | 38,754 |
| Private acreage | 1,680 | 1,375 |
| Private landowners | 29 | 32 |
| Approved access points to inholdings | 0 | 0 |
| Legal access points to boundary | 7 | 2 |
| Cherry stem roads/miles | 3 (3.5 miles) | 3 (6 miles) |
| Closed vehicle trails in wilderness | 12.1 miles | 24.6 miles |
| Hualapai Mexican Vole habitat | under study | confirmed under study |
| Existing wildlife developments | none | two exclosures |
| Planned wildlife developments (habitat management plan) | one spring project two water catchments | three spring projects two water catchments one prescribed burn |
| Wildlife census | overflights | overflights |
| Mining activities | two claims | none |
| Grazing allotments (see table 3) | 5 | 3 |
| Existing range developments | see appendix B | see appendix B |
| Proposed range developments | none | none |
| Fire suppression | full | full |
| Wild horses | 35-50 | none |
| Maintenance of range & wildlife develop. | non-motorized | non-motorized |
| Annual visitor days (estimated) | 400 | 1500 |
| Recreational opportunities | backpacking, equestrian use, hiking, camping, rockhounding, hunting, photography, wildlife observation, solitude, and sightseeing | |

follow section lines in most locations. The two exceptions to this include the Antelope Canyon area where the boundary follows a jeep trail and the Cane Springs Wash which forms the boundary for about a mile. The south and southwest sides of the wilderness parallel existing roads. A well maintained dirt road known as the Big Wash Road forms most of the south boundary, while unnamed jeep trails make up the southwest boundary.


Where boundaries follow a road or trail, the boundary is generally described as being parallel to the road at 30' or 100' offsets from the center-

line. The distance depends on the nature or legal status of the road. For Mount Tipton, only the Big Wash Road has a 100' offset while all other roads have 30' offsets. Where boundaries are along section lines dividing public and private land, the boundary will be the section line with no setback, as intended by Congress.

Wabayuma Peak Wilderness

The Wabayuma Peak Wilderness is located approximately ten air miles south of Kingman, Arizona in Mohave County. The nearest commu-

Map 1 General Planning Area





Road from Dolan Springs leading to the Mount Tipton Wilderness. Vegetation changes from desert shrub in the lowest elevations to ponderosa pine at the highest elevations.

nity is Yucca, Arizona about seven miles to the southwest (maps 1 and 3). It is about 160 miles northwest of downtown Phoenix, Arizona's capital city. The wilderness is located in Townships 17, 18, and 19 North and Ranges 15, 16, and 17 West, of the Gila and Salt River Meridian.

Legal access is available in two locations. First, the Hualapai Mountain Road leads the visitor from Kingman south to Hualapai Mountain County Park. This is an improved, surfaced, all-weather road. From here the Hualapai Ridge Road (BLM Road #2123) can be followed approximately 20 miles to the wilderness. This road requires high clearance or four-wheel drive vehicles.

A second legal access can be obtained using the Borianna Mine Road (BLM #2167). It can be accessed from I-40 about 25 miles south of Kingman. Mohave County maintains the road for the first 14 miles to the Cavalliere ranch headquarters and conducts maintenance. Beyond the ranchhouse, the road receives intermittent maintenance by the BLM and high clearance vehicles are recommended. This road also joins with road #2123 on the east side of the wilderness.

A route from I-40's Griffith Interchange about 12 miles south of Kingman is often used although it legally does not reach the boundary. Unmarked private sections at the railroad crossing and at the wilderness boundary prevent the public from legal

access via this road without permission from the landowners.

The north boundary of the wilderness follows the Walnut Creek Road (BLM #2116). In the northeast corner, the boundary follows a series of jeep trails. The east and south boundaries consist of the Borianna Mine Road, section lines, and private-public land divisions. The west side is almost entirely bordered by unnamed jeep trails, except for two locations where the boundary follows private-public land interfaces.

Where boundaries follow a road or trail, the boundary is generally described as being parallel to the road at 30' or 100' offsets from the centerline. The distance depends on the nature or legal status of the road. For Wabayuma Peak, the Borianna Mine and Walnut Creek Roads have a 100' offset while all other roads have 30' offsets. Where boundaries are along section lines dividing public and private land, the boundary will be the section line with no setback, as intended by Congress.

Wilderness Values & Attributes

Mount Tipton Wilderness

The wilderness takes in the entire northern half of the Cerbat mountain range, a 30 mile long

north-south trending range that is also a part of the Basin and Range Province. At the center of the wilderness is Mount Tipton Peak, the highest point in the Cerbat range at 7148'. The low point of the wilderness is 3440' located on the east side on Twenty-six Wash. An area of immense, eroded spires known as the Cerbat Pinnacles dominates the wilderness north of Mount Tipton Peak. The pinnacles are tertiary aged formations formed by violent eruptions that spewed out volcanic fragments followed by mudflows that covered the fragments. The resulting unstable material eroded to form the pinnacles. The remainder of the range is composed primarily of precambrian and mesozoic age granite, gneiss, and schist.

The extreme elevational variability and aspect changes work to produce a diverse vegetative community in the wilderness. Mohave desert shrub vegetation makes up the lowest elevations with small stands of juniper in sheltered areas. Middle elevations are more variable depending on aspect. Here vegetation ranges from juniper-grassland, blackbrush, singleleaf pinyon stands, pinyon-juniper forest, to Arizona interior chaparral. The pinyon-juniper stands and the chaparral extend into the highest elevations where they mix with small stands of ponderosa pine on the north and east sides of Mount Tipton Peak and surrounding unnamed peaks.

There are over 230 vertebrate wildlife species known to utilize the wilderness. Many of these retain special state and federal status and are of concern to managers. The peregrine falcon is known to inhabit the region and nesting occurs in the pinnacles. The area also provides habitat for desert tortoise and several game species. The Hualapai Mexican Vole may inhabit the area and is under study by the Arizona Game and Fish Department. The Cerbat Wild Horse Herd Area overlaps the wilderness, covering most of the western half of the wilderness unit.

Wabayuma Peak Wilderness

The area is characterized by steep, rugged terrain dominated by Wabayuma Peak. The elevation ranges from 2480' on the westernmost edge of the wilderness to 7601' at the top of Wabayuma Peak. The wilderness is a part of the Hualapai Mountain Range, a 50 mile long northwest-southeast trending range. It is typical of the Basin and Range Province which extends into southern Nevada, southeastern California, and into the Mexican states of Sonora and Chihuahua. The Hualapai Mountains are mostly made up of older precambrian rocks, primarily granite, gneiss, and phyllite.

Because of the broad range of elevation in the wilderness, the vegetative components are extremely diverse. The lower elevations of the area are a unique combination of Sonoran and Mohave Desert ecosystems. The unit contains the northernmost stand of saguaro cactus in Arizona. Moving up the 5000' elevation gradient through the unit, five distinct vegetative types are encountered. At the upper elevation, small areas of Ponderosa Pine forest are present.

The diverse vegetative ecosystem provides habitat for a wide variety of wildlife species, including several that warrant special management consideration. A small amount of suitable habitat supports a population of desert tortoise. Another species of note is the Hualapai Mexican Vole, a federally listed endangered species which occupies areas within the ponderosa pine-gambel oak habitat on the west end of the wilderness. A small herd of transplanted elk roam the Hualapai range and can occasionally be found in the wilderness area.

The area's rugged topography and dense vegetative cover combine to provide excellent opportunities for isolation and solitude. A full range of recreational opportunities including hunting, day hiking, equestrian use, overnight backpacking trips, and photography can be experienced. Vistas from the area's upper elevations include the surrounding Sacramento and Big Sandy River Valleys as well as the Black, Cerbat, and Aquarius mountain ranges.

General Management Situation

In general, the two wildernesses are administered under authority and provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the Wilderness Act of 1964, and the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990. Additional guidance is found in Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations part 8560, and in BLM Manual 8560. These directives guide the management of activities that occur in the wilderness. The current management situations for these activities is described in the following sections.

Vegetation

Vegetative communities are extremely varied within the planning area. Riparian habitats are limited, but are valuable for wildlife and recreational use. These areas receive no special management. Ponderosa pine and pinyon-juniper forest also are important areas. Ponderosa pine trees have never

been logged commercially due to their location, quality, and limited distribution.

Vegetative communities have been inventoried as part of the range management program.

Inventory data consists of both ocular reconnaissance and soil and vegetative inventory (SVIM) information. Inventory for the area that includes the Wabayuma Peak was done in 1979 using a modified SVIM approach. Most of the area is classed as a granitic hills range site with ecological condition being mostly fair to good. Smaller acreages of upland and bottom range sites are present and are generally in poor condition with a few areas rated fair. The ecological rating system used with SVIM is a measure of the potential natural plant community (PNC) currently present. A poor condition rating reflects a relatively small percentage of the PNC while an excellent condition site reflects a high percentage of the PNC.

Inventory for the area that includes Mount Tipton wilderness was done using an ocular reconnaissance method from 1976-78. The results of the inventory showed range conditions to be mostly fair with smaller amounts of poor and good condition areas. Condition classifications under this inventory technique are not based on ecological site potential but are based on ability of the range to support livestock.

Vegetative monitoring occurs at six permanently located transects in the wilderness under

the range management program. Three sites are located on the Quail Springs allotment, two on the Walnut Creek allotment and one on the Boriana A allotment. Some monitoring sites are visited annually to assess forage utilization and some are visited only at 5 year intervals to monitor range trend.


Water

Water rights are adjudicated for each watershed by the state. The state agency responsible for this is the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR). Both wilderness areas are located within the Colorado River Watershed which to date has not been adjudicated. With the passage of the Desert Wilderness Act, Congress reserved a quantity of water sufficient to fulfill the purpose of the Act, with a priority date established as the date of the Act's passage (11-28-90). BLM must quantify the water and submit documentation to ADWR to protect federal rights. BLM filings will not affect existing rights.

A partial water inventory has been completed in the Kingman Resource Area. Most of the waters have been identified by air with on the ground data yet to be collected. Inventory will include verification of location, beneficial uses, quality and quantity measurements, and a detailed description of the source and its development.



The relatively small islands of ponderosa pine provide important recreation areas in both wildernesses.



A spring development on a private inholding is typical of those found in wilderness designed for watering domestic livestock.

Most of the field work has now been completed for the Mount Tipton area.

Discolored water in the Mackenzie Creek drainage has been a concern. The source of contamination has not been identified although it is speculated that the Boriana Mine tailings could be a contributory source.

Wildlife

Two habitat management plans (HMPs) have been written that currently guide habitat management in the wilderness areas. The Hualapai HMP was completed in 1987 and includes the Wabayuma Peak area; the Cerbat-Music HMP was completed in 1983 and includes the Mount Tipton area. Both plans identified several projects that would improve habitat conditions. The Cerbat-Music HMP proposed three developments in Mount Tipton including two apron water catchments with 10,000 gallon storage tanks and one spring development. All three projects were designed to enhance mule deer habitat.

The Hualapai HMP proposed eight projects in the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness. One project, the Deadman water catchment was dropped from further consideration in the Upper Sonoran Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement. The seven remaining projects include two exclosures designed to exclude livestock from Hualapai

Mexican Vole habitat, four spring developments, and one prescribed burn. The exclosures have been completed. As outlined in the HMP, the spring developments are designed to protect source areas from continuous horse and livestock use and will include the following:

1. Fencing the spring source with 2-7 acre exclosures
2. Piping water to a trough at least .25 miles from the source for livestock.
3. Enhancing vegetative cover either naturally or artificially.
4. Maintaining at least two-thirds of the original wet area.

The prescribed burn was designed to improve mule deer habitat in an area of dense chaparral.

A wildlife operations and maintenance plan was initiated as an interim guide for wildlife management activities conducted by the BLM and Arizona Game and Fish. The plan was completed in 1994 and specified how aerial census would be completed and how project maintenance would occur. Aerial census is conducted for a small (35-50) elk herd in the Hualapai Mountains as well as for mule deer and javelina. A summary of approved motorized activities is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 2. Wilderness Grazing Allotments

| Allotment Name | Preference (AUMs) | AMP Status | % of Wilderness | % of Allotment Acres in Wilderness |
|---|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Mount Tipton | 618 | no plan | 29 | 92 |
| Cane Springs | 2661 | written, not implemented | 34 | 24 |
| Cedar Canyon | 4012 | no plan | 5 | 3 |
| Dolan Springs | 1752 | written, not implemented | 6 | 5 |
| Quail Springs | 2556 | implemented | 25 | 25 |
| Turkey Track | 62 | no plan | 1 | 20 |
| TOTAL : Mount Tipton Wilderness | | | 100% | |
| Boriana A | 2279 | no plan | 38 | 53 |
| Walnut Creek | 5843 | no plan | 61 | 30 |
| Happy Jack Wash | 1082 | no plan | Trace | <1 |
| Unallotted | | | 1 | |
| TOTAL : Wabayuma Peak Wilderness | | | 100% | |

Livestock Grazing

Portions of eight grazing allotments are in the two areas. Five are within the Mount Tipton Wilderness and three are within the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness. A sixth allotment in Mount Tipton (Turkey Track) was cancelled in 1994. A fourth allotment in Wabayuma Peak (Hibernia Peak) has been amended to exclude the wilderness portion from grazing due to resource conflicts between the Hualapai Mexican Vole and domestic livestock.

Allotment management plans (AMPs) are written to guide grazing. AMP status is summarized along with other grazing information in Table 2 for each wilderness. Written AMPs have not identified any new developments in the wilderness.

Range improvement maintenance plans were signed and implemented for Wabayuma Peak in May, 1993 and for Mount Tipton in February, 1994. These plans were developed as interim guidance for maintenance procedures. Both documents specify that no motorized or mechanized use will occur in routine inspection and maintenance.

Wild Horses

Part of the Cerbat Wild Horse Herd Area lies within the Mount Tipton Wilderness. It encompasses about 60% of the wilderness. A herd of

about 80-120 horses inhabit the herd area, while about 25-35 of these reside in the wilderness. Most of the herd area lies out of wilderness to the south.

The Kingman Resource Management Plan (1995) states that wild horses will be retained in the area that includes the wilderness. The herd area will be managed for a genetically viable population. Within the herd area, a herd management area (HMA) will be defined by a team composed of interested publics and BLM personnel. A herd area management plan will be developed following designation of the HMA. New waters or other developments needed to manage the horses will be considered in and out of wilderness as part of the plan.

The herd has been relatively stable according to BLM census figures. Predation of the herd by mountain lions has been reported, but the affects have not been quantified. Census is taken at approximately three year intervals using a helicopter as a primary tool. Removal of animals has occurred one time since the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971. Eight animals were water trapped at an existing facility in Marble Canyon in 1990 due to the drought conditions. No motorized or mechanized equipment was used in the area that is now wilderness.

Threatened, Endangered, and Special Status Species

The Hualapai Mexican Vole is a listed endangered species and is known to occupy the ponderosa pine-gambel oak habitat in Wabayuma Peak wilderness. Aerial surveys for additional habitat have been conducted with potential habitat identified. Ground surveys utilizing foot or horseback access have been conducted. Inventory flights with followup ground surveys have been conducted in the Mount Tipton wilderness in an attempt to identify further habitat.

Sonoran desert tortoise are category 2 candidate species. Habitat is classified in three categories. Category I and II habitats contain the highest tortoise densities with good habitat made up primarily of public land. Category III habitat has fewer tortoises with habitat that has generally been degraded or consists of lower proportions of public land. Wabayuma Peak contains category II and III habitat while Mount Tipton does not contain tortoise habitat. No monitoring or habitat evaluation is being completed in either wilderness.

Peregrine falcon seasonal nesting habitat is present in the pinnacles of Mount Tipton Wilderness. The birds use the area in the spring of the year. Peregrine are classified as an endangered species. No special management of this species currently occurs in wilderness.

A species of Indian paintbrush (*Castilleja stenantha*) is suspected to be present in Wabayuma Peak wilderness. It inhabits riparian areas and has been located elsewhere in the Hualapai Mountains. It is classified as a BLM sensitive species.

A list of special status species is found in Appendix E.

Inholdings

Acreage within the boundaries of both areas is predominantly public land managed by BLM. Private inholdings make up the remainder. Subsurface throughout both wildernesses is publicly held on all lands. Mount Tipton contains 1680 acres of privately owned land while Wabayuma Peak contains 1375 acres. The lands are divided into 79 separate parcels and are held by approximately 65 different landowners. Locations of these lands are shown in Appendix A. A rating system has been used to rank the parcels for acquisition priorities. The ranking considers the development potential, ecological sensitivity, and societal considerations for each parcel.

There have been no rights-of-way issued for access to any of the private inholdings. Jeep trails to some of the lands exist. Some owners have informally discussed vehicular access to their properties with BLM and some have expressed interest in developing their lands.



A view from the Wabayuma Peak trail shows the interspersing of the chaparral and ponderosa pine vegetative zones.

Recreation

Very little information is available on recreational use within the wilderness. The two wilderness environmental impact statements done for the planning area estimated use levels at 400 visitor days/year in Mount Tipton (1989) and 1500 days/year in Wabayuma Peak (1987). Most visitors are believed to be Mohave County residents. BLM personnel have observed that use levels have increased annually with increased local population. Hunting and trapping account for a large part of visitor use. Dispersed camping, equestrian use, and hiking also occur. Evidence of visitors is not easily detected. Popular destinations include Mount Tipton, the Cerbat pinnacles, and Wabayuma Peak, where a short trail leads to the summit. A summit register on Mount Tipton logs an average of 10-20 visitors per year.

The Wabayuma Peak trail is the only designated trail in the planning area. There are several closed jeep trails and canyon corridors that provide recreational routes into parts of the wilderness. Many of these routes lead to or cross private lands necessitating that the visitor acquire the permission of a private landowner prior to use. There are two legal access routes to Wabayuma Peak and seven to Mount Tipton. There are no designated parking areas or visitor registers for any of these access points.

No permit system is used within the two wildernesses for individual, non-commercial uses. One special recreation permit (SRP) has been issued in the Mount Tipton Wilderness. It allows the permittee to guide lion and deer hunts. No commercial base camps are allowed in the wilderness and group size is limited to 10 people. No other SRPs have been issued for wilderness.

A limited amount of visitor use information is available to the public. Maps showing topographic features and wilderness boundaries are available, but resolution is poor and very little additional information is present on the maps. A booklet is also available showing all of BLM's wilderness areas in Arizona at one half inch/mile scale. Although the maps do not contain topographic features, they do indicate land status, roads (including non-legal access), topographic map references, and safety information.

Existing Developments

Table 3 lists existing developments and other human impacts to the wilderness areas. Other human impacts include range and wildlife man-

agement developments that are described in appendix B and the preceding wildlife section.

Fire

In the thirteen years that accurate records have been kept, fire has not played a significant role in either wilderness. Since 1980, there have been five fires responded to by BLM that have burned a total of 9.7 acres in the Wabayuma Peak wilderness. All fires occurred in June or July. In the Mount Tipton wilderness, two fires have been reported since 1980 that have burned a total of less than one acre. All reported fires have been lightning caused. Records prior to 1980 are unavailable. Fire scars on standing pines and fallen trunks indicate that other fires have occurred in recent history.

Vegetative types in both wilderness areas are conducive to large wildfires. Areas of dense chaparral and black brush as well as the presence of fine fuels in the form of annual grasses and forbs at lower elevations provide continuous fuels. In years where climate and vegetative conditions are conducive, wildfire can effect a significant change to wilderness vegetation. Regional fire research has shown that fire is very cyclic in chaparral and is believed to return at about forty year intervals.

Current policy is to suppress all wildfires in these wilderness areas.

Cultural Resources

Limited systematic surveys have been completed in both wildernesses. A total of 485 acres was surveyed in the Mount Tipton Wilderness. Most of this (480 acres) was done in 1978-79 as part of the Cerbat/Black Mountains Class II inventory. Two sites, both prehistoric seasonal camps, were located. No cultural resource allocations have been made for the Mount Tipton Wilderness.

A total of 645 acres was intensively surveyed in the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness. Most of this (560 acres) was done in 1978-79 as part of the Hualapai/Aquarius Class II inventory. Two sites including a lithic quarry and a prehistoric seasonal camp were located. No cultural resources allocations have been made for the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness.

As part of the public participation process identified in Part VIII of this plan, notifications were sent to Indian tribes in Arizona. No Native American religious concerns were identified during this process.

TABLE 3. Existing Developments

| WABAYUMA PEAK WILDERNESS | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Closed Vehicle Routes | Length (miles) | Location |
| WP1 | 2.5 | T19N R17W sec. 14, 23, 24 |
| WP2 | .9 | T19N R17W sec. 13 |
| WP3 | 1.2 | T19N R16W sec. 18, 19 |
| WP | 1.0 | T19N R16W sec. 20, 29 |
| WP5 | .3 | T19N R16W sec. 21, 28, 29 |
| WP6 | 1.8 | T18N R17W sec. 1; T18N R16W sec. 6; T19N R16W sec. 31 |
| WP7 | 1.8 | T18N R16W sec. 5; T19N R16W sec. 32 |
| WP8 | .6 | T18N R16W sec. 6, 7 |
| WP9 | .3 | T18N R16W sec. 7 |
| WP10 | 1.0 | T18N R16W sec. 7 |
| WP11 | .8 | T18N R16W sec. 7 |
| WP12 | 1.4 | T18N R16W sec. 7, 8 |
| WP13 | .2 | T18N R16W sec. 8 |
| WP14 | .3 | T18N R16W sec. 8 |
| WP15 | 1.5 | T18N R16W sec. 7, 17, 18 |
| WP16 | .3 | T19N R16W sec. 34 |
| WP17 | .7 | T19N R16W sec. 26 |
| WP18 | 2.6 | T18N R16W sec. 1, 2 T19N R16W sec. 36 |
| WP19 | .6 | T18N R16W sec. 12 |
| WP20 | 1.0 | T18N R16W sec. 12 |
| WP21 | 1.5 | T18N R16W sec. 1, 12 |
| WP22 | 1.5 | T18N R16W sec. 14, 15 |
| WP23 | .3 | T18N R16W sec. 34 |
| WP24 | .3 | T18N R16W sec. 34 |
| WP25 | .2 | T18N R16W sec. 12 |
| Other Human Impacts | Impacted Areas | Location |
| Helispot | .2 acres | T18N R16W sec. 2 |
| Unauthorized excavation | 1.0 acre | T18N R16W sec. 24 |

| MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Closed Vehicle Routes | Length (miles) | Location |
| MT1 | .2 | T25N R18W sec. 17 |
| MT2 | .5 | T25N R18W sec. 16 |
| MT3 | 1.2 | T25N R18W sec. 17, 18 |
| MT4 | .8 | T25N R18W sec. 20 |
| MT5 | 1.3 | T25N R18W sec. 32 |
| MT6 | 1.2 | T24N R18W sec. 15, 16 |
| MT7 | .5 | T24N R18W sec. 6 |
| MT8 | .2 | T24N R18W sec. 8 |
| MT9 | 1.6 | T25N R18W sec. 5, 6 |
| MT10 | 4.0 | T25N R18W sec. 1, 2, 11, 12 |
| Other Human Impacts | Impacted Areas | Location |
| Pine Canyon locked cable | | T25N R18W sec. 5 |
| Water tank at 7th street corral | .1 acre | T25N R18W sec. 18 |
| Abandoned butyl rubber water storage tanks | .1 acre | T26N R18W sec. 28 |

Minerals

There is no active mining in either area. A total of two claims are present in the Marble Canyon area of the Mount Tipton Wilderness, section 34, T25N R18W. There are no mining claims in the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness.

Search and Rescue

Search and rescue responsibilities are delegated from the Governor of Arizona to the County Board of Supervisors and to the respective sheriff's departments. Each county operates independently in search and rescue operations. The Mohave County Sheriff's Office has the primary responsibility for operations in Mohave County including both wildernesses. Operations have historically occurred on public lands with little or no involvement by BLM.

In May 1992, BLM's Phoenix District completed its search and rescue plan covering public lands within its jurisdiction. The Bureau's policy is to assume a supportive role for operations involving non-bureau personnel. A lead role shall not be initiated by BLM unless clearance is first obtained by the State Director or the State Search

and Rescue Coordinator and will not be assumed unless the local sheriff defers action to BLM. If an operation involves a BLM employee, notification of the sheriff may be waived if the situation is known to be non-critical and not requiring emergency action.

Law Enforcement

Law enforcement activities are carried out by BLM rangers, with one permanently assigned to the resource area. Rangers enforce all laws on public lands. A major responsibility in wilderness is enforcement of the motorized/mechanized vehicle restrictions. An estimated 10 violations of this restriction occurs annually in each wilderness. Other law enforcement activities are carried out by the Arizona Game and Fish Department including the enforcement of game laws and OHV restrictions. The Mohave county sheriff's office also has jurisdiction in each wilderness. Motorized entrance can only be used in emergency situations involving violations of criminal law including pursuit of fugitives and requires approval from the District Manager.

Approved Motorized and Mechanized Uses

Table 4 summarizes all approved motorized and mechanized uses in the wilderness that have been approved and that are conducted by the Bureau, its agents and permittees, and the state.

Other Administration

The official boundaries will be surveyed by BLM cadastral survey crews. It is anticipated that it will be several years before both areas are fully surveyed.

Boundary signs are being installed in a three-phased approach along the perimeter of the wilderness areas. The first phase involved place-

ment of signs in areas where motorized access into the wilderness had historically been gained. In the second phase, signs are being placed along roads which parallel the wilderness boundary. The final phase will involve packing into the more remote boundary areas and placing signs where vehicle access cannot be attained. Density of signs is at a minimum of one every half-mile, with additional signs placed in problem areas.

A domestic water line brings water from a spring down the Mackenzie Creek drainage to a residence on private land just south of the Wabayuma Peak wilderness. The line is partially within the wilderness. It has been used for an extended time without benefit of a right-of-way.

TABLE 4. Approved Motorized and Mechanized Uses

| Program | Description of Activity | Frequency | Season/Duration |
|---|--|---|--|
| Wildlife | Helicopter census flights for elk, deer, and javelina at 100-200' | Annually | 5 hours over each wilderness over a 1-3 day period between 11/1 and 1/31 |
| Wildlife | Helicopter census flight for elk at 100-200' above ground level | Annually | 5 hours over Wabayuma Peak over a 1-3 day period in August. |
| Wild Horse and Burro | Helicopter census flight for wild horses at 100-200' above ground level | Every three years | A maximum of 3 hours/day over a 2 day period in June |
| Fire Law Enforcement Search & Rescue Range Mgmt. | Entry by helicopter or ground vehicle to protect resources, public health and safety, or pursuit of criminal law violators, or emergencies involving livestock | On an as needed basis generally expected to occur not more than twice annually per wilderness | |

Part II — National Wilderness Management Goals

Wilderness management goals have been established to obtain consistency in the BLM wilderness management program. Goals apply to all BLM administered wilderness areas. The underlying concepts that form the basis of these goals are **wilderness preservation, wilderness use, minimum tool management, and management of land uses specifically provided for in the Wilderness Act.**

1. To provide for the long term protection and preservation of the area's wilderness character under a principle of non-degradation. The area's 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 will be managed so that they will remain unimpaired.
2. To manage the wilderness area for the use and enjoyment of visitors in a manner that will leave the area unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness. The wilderness resource will be dominant in all management decisions where a choice must be made between preservation of wilderness character and visitor use.
3. To manage the area using the minimum tool, equipment, or structure necessary to successfully, safely, and economically accomplish the objective. The chosen tool, equipment, or structure should be the one that least degrades wilderness values temporarily or permanently. Management will seek to preserve spontaneity of use and as much freedom from regulation as possible.
4. To manage nonconforming but accepted uses permitted by the Wilderness Act and subsequent laws in a manner that will prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the area's wilderness character. Nonconforming uses are the exception rather than the rule; therefore, emphasis is placed on maintaining wilderness character.

Part III — Issues

Wilderness management issues were gathered from BLM resource specialists, other agencies, and the public. Following identification, the issues were divided into categories. One category included those issues that could be resolved through guidance from BLM manual 8560 or those that were matters of federal or state law that allowed no flexibility in management by BLM. These issues are summarized in section B of this part and will not be addressed further in this plan. Another category of issues are those that the manual alone cannot resolve. These issues are found in section A of this part. They have been sorted into six major categories and are the focus of the rest of the plan.

A. Activity plan issues

1. **Management of visitor use.**

The Wilderness Act provides for the use of wilderness by visitors in a way that does not degrade wilderness values. Decisions will be made to answer the following questions:

 - Will restrictions be placed on visitor use?
 - What level of access is needed for public and administrative purposes?
 - To what extent are visitor facilities including trails and parking areas needed?
 - How will recreation management occur to assure that outstanding opportunities for solitude continue?
2. **Long term protection of naturalness.**

All uses of wilderness are managed with the underlying principle that wilderness characteristics will be protected. To ensure this, the following questions will be answered:

 - What new developments will be allowed?
 - How will private inholdings be addressed to contend with their potential impacts to naturalness?
 - What existing human impacts will be mitigated to enhance naturalness?
 - What actions will be taken to prevent unauthorized motor vehicle use?
 - How will wild horses be managed to minimize naturalness impacts?
3. **Management of land uses specifically provided for by the Wilderness Act.**

Certain uses of wilderness have been given special authorization by the Wilderness Act but they must be managed to protect wilderness values. The plan will answer the following questions:

 - How will livestock grazing be managed?
 - How will access to inholdings be granted when requested?
4. **Management of vegetation.**

Many of BLM's programs will affect the vegetation. Decisions will be made to answer the following questions:

 - What plant communities are desired throughout the wilderness to achieve wilderness and other resource objectives?
 - How will the following vegetative communities be managed: spring sites, riparian areas, ponderosa pine, Arizona chaparral, pinyon-juniper, and Arizona desert shrub?
 - How will fire, wild horse grazing, and domestic livestock grazing be used or allowed to affect vegetative communities?
5. **Mackenzie Creek water quality (Wabayuma Peak Wilderness).**

Concern over water quality in Mackenzie Creek stems from its color downstream from the Borianna Mine during spring runoff. The question must be answered:

 - Is water quality safe for contact with humans, and if not, what is the nature and magnitude of contamination, what is the source, and what is needed to mitigate the condition?
6. **Management of commercial use**

Commercial recreation use is authorized in wilderness by the Wilderness Act where it is needed to realize the recreational or wilderness purpose of the area.

- To what extent should commercial use be allowed within the planning area?

B. Issues resolved through existing laws, regulations, or policies

The following issues were raised during the scoping process and are resolved through the existing laws, policies, manuals, and federal regulations cited below.

1. Use of wilderness by the physically challenged

Rationale: Section 507 (c) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 reaffirms that nothing in the Wilderness Act is to be construed as prohibiting the use of a wheelchair in a wilderness area by an individual whose disability requires use of a wheelchair. The Americans with Disabilities Act does not require agencies to provide special facilities, accommodations, or modifications to facilitate use of wilderness by the disabled.

2. Cultural resource management

Rationale: There are no significant sites identified that pose specific management problems. Management is addressed in BLM Manual 8560.

3. Minerals management

Rationale: There is no significant mining activity in either wilderness area. Management of any future mining will be guided by 43 CFR 8560 and BLM Manual 8560.

4. Management of new non-point source (NPS) pollution

Rationale: Most new activities that could increase NPS pollution and sedimentation are not compatible with wilderness and will not be allowed. Recreation and livestock grazing management will continue and are managed to minimize NPS pollution.

5. Infestations of insects, disease, and noxious plants

Rationale: No current problems exist. If future infestations occur, control measures taken will be guided by BLM Manual 8560.

6. Animal damage control

Rationale: There are no current problems that require animal damage control. The policy in Manual 8560 and the Phoenix District's animal damage control plan will be adequate in addressing problems that may occur in the future.

7. Emergency services

Rationale: These activities are guided by the 8560 manual and the Phoenix District's Search and Rescue Plan completed in May 1992. The BLM will assume a supportive role to the Mohave County Sheriff's Department in all search and rescue activities that are needed in the wilderness.

8. Access to Private Inholdings

Rationale: Access to inholdings is adequately guided by Arizona Instruction Memorandum No. AZ-94-048.

9. Wild horse management including removal from private lands and clarification on which animals are subject to management and protection.

Rationale: The Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971 gives guidance in these areas

10. New trail construction

Rationale: The BLM policy defined in manual 8560.31 calls for trail construction only when necessary for protection of wilderness resources. New trails must be adequately justified and cannot be built merely for visitor comfort and convenience.

Part IV — Management Strategy

Three elements of strategy are mentioned here that are key to the development of this plan. These include:


1. Use of issues in plan development
2. Use of the public throughout the planning process
3. Use of a zoning concept for management purposes

The issues carried forward to this plan described in Part III are the focus of this management plan. The issues were evaluated along with the goals of wilderness management by an interdisciplinary team. A group of objectives were then developed by the team to address the issues in a way that is consistent with the goals. Finally, a series of management actions designed to achieve the objectives were generated.

As part of the planning process, public meetings were held to provide input to the plan and to comment on the work of BLM's interdisciplinary team. Meetings were held at key stages in the planning process. A brief summary of the meetings including the recommendations can be found in Part VIII of this plan.

The interdisciplinary team used a zoning concept in the development of this plan. A set of desired resource and social conditions has been developed by the team for each zone or opportunity class. Management criteria are established for each class as a way to achieve or maintain the desired resource and social conditions.

Opportunity classes are not separated by rigid, on-the-ground boundaries, but represent areas where because of management, visitors experience a different range of conditions provided in that portion of the wilderness. The zoning concept helps assure that outstanding opportunities for solitude are protected.



Rugged cliffs delineate Antelope Canyon in the Mount Tipton Wilderness.

Part V — Wilderness Management

This section of the plan will present a means to resolve the issues that have been identified in Part III of the plan. Established objectives can be linked back to the issues.

Objective 1

Maintain or enhance the natural untrammelled appearance of landscapes within the Mount Tipton and Wabayuma Peak Wilderness areas by:

For Mount Tipton

- Reclaiming 8.0 miles of vehicle routes by 2004
- Reducing the visual impacts of existing developments by 1996

For Wabayuma Peak

- Reclaiming 19.7 miles of vehicle routes by 2004

For both areas

- Requiring new developments to be built with a “none” to “weak” visual resource management contrast rating (as defined in BLM handbook 8431-1)
- Removing all abandoned developments by 2002
- Reducing unauthorized vehicle usage from 10 instances/year/wilderness to zero by 2002
- Eliminating potential impacts due to private inholdings by 2004

Rationale: This objective has been established to address management issues 2 and 3 and is also consistent with achieving national goals #1 and #4.

Management Actions

1. Attempt to acquire all private inholdings within the two wilderness areas by donation, exchange or sale in the priority order shown in Appendix A, based on the development potential of the inholding, its ecological importance, and social impact. An 80 acre parcel size will be used as a minimum when considering exchange as a method of acquisition.

Rationale: Acquisition will prevent potential impacts to the area’s naturalness and solitude.

2. Construct 19 access barriers or restrictors at known motor vehicle intrusion areas including but not limited to the following locations: (Maps 2 and 3)

Mount Tipton

- Twenty-six Wash
- Pine Canyon (two locations)
- Indian Springs
- Putnam Wash
- Big Wash Reservoir
- Antelope Canyon

Wabayuma Peak

- Old Camp Well
- Rock Creek (two locations)
- Cottonwood Spring Jeep Trail
- Grapevine (two locations)
- Walnut Creek (three locations)
- Junction Spring Cherrystem
- Hackberry Spring Jeep Trail
- Section 31 Jeep Trail

Rationale: Access barriers have proven to be the only feasible way to eliminate motorized vehicle trespass in wilderness.

3. Manage closed vehicle routes in the Mount Tipton Wilderness according to the following categories (road numbers and locations are shown in Table 3):

Total reclamation taking advantage of natural processes when possible (2.2 miles)

MT2 - .5 miles

MT7 - .5 miles

MT8 - .2 miles

MT6 - 1.0 miles above Big Wash Reservoir

Partial reclamation to primitive travel corridor (5.8 miles)

MT3 - 1.2 miles

MT10 - 4.6 miles

Allow natural revegetation (4.1 miles)

MT1 - .2 miles for access to private inholding


MT4 - .8 miles for access to private inholding

MT5 - 1.3 miles for access to private inholding

MT6 - .2 miles for access to Big Wash Reservoir

MT9 - 1.6 miles for access to private inholding

Rationale: Vehicle routes are human impacts that do not fit the most absolute description of wilderness as defined by the Wilderness Act and in



Administratively closed motor vehicle route representative of those that will be either completely reclaimed or turned into hiking/equestrian routes.

many cases these routes no longer serve a purpose. Plans for routes to inholdings may be reconsidered if inholdings are acquired.

4. Manage closed vehicle routes in the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness area according to the following categories (road numbers and locations are shown in Table 3):

Total reclamation taking advantage of natural processes when possible (3.8 miles)

- WP2 - .9 miles
- WP8 - .6 miles
- WP11 - .8 miles
- WP13 - .2 miles
- WP14 - .3 miles
- WP17 - .7 miles
- WP23 - .3 miles

Partial reclamation to primitive travel corridor or stocktrail (5.2 miles)

- WP3 - 1.2 miles
- WP5 - .3 miles
- WP6 - 1.8 miles
- WP12 - 1.4 miles
- WP16 - .3 miles
- WP25 - .2 miles

Determine need for partial/total reclamation (10.7 miles)

- WP1 - 2.5 miles
- WP4 - 1.0 miles
- WP7 - 1.8 miles

- WP9 - .3 miles
- WP10 - 1.0 miles
- WP18 - 2.6 miles
- WP21 - 1.5 miles

Allow natural revegetation (4.9 miles)

- WP15 - 1.5 miles for access to private inholding
- WP19 - .6 miles for access to private inholding
- WP20 - 1.0 miles for access to private inholding
- WP22 - 1.5 miles for access to private inholding
- WP24 - .3 miles for access to private inholding

5. Remove the following abandoned/non-functional developments or items from Mount Tipton wilderness. Locations are shown in Table 3 or Appendix B.

- Visible traces of plastic pipeline north of North Big Wash Reservoir
- Rusted water storage tank at 7th Street corral
- Thompson Spring fence
- Butyl rubber water storage tanks

Rationale: These items are not necessary for management and detract from the area's naturalness.

6. Complete the Pine Canyon pipeline modification project in the Mount Tipton wilderness. Relocate the existing storage tank outside wilderness and the existing water trough within wilderness away from the canyon bottom.

Rationale: This will reduce the visual impacts of developments and livestock concentrations in wilderness.

7. Reclaim the following human imprints to a naturally appearing condition within the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness:
- Wabayuma Peak Helispot
 - Unauthorized excavation

Rationale: The Wabayuma Peak helispot is in a saddle that is naturally devoid of trees and could be used for landing a helicopter in an emergency fire or search and rescue operation without being marked in an obtrusive manner. Reclamation will involve turning over white painted rocks. Although an attempt was made to reclaim the unauthorized excavation, it was unsuccessful. Another attempt will be made to promote growth of native vegetation.

8. Allow construction of new developments within wilderness shown in table 5.

Rationale: The projects will consist of a minimum impact fence to keep livestock and wild horses away from spring sources and associated vegetation. Water will be piped from the excluded area for animals. This will improve water quality, the riparian vegetation, and the overall naturalness around these water sources. The long term improvements to naturalness will be greater than the negative impacts associated with the fence and water trough.

Note: Water catchments and prescribed burning identified in habitat management plans not shown in Table 5 and all new proposals will be analyzed on a case by case basis to determine feasibility in wilderness should their need arise. New water developments or facilities necessary to manage the Cerbat wild horse herd and projects to implement grazing management will be evaluated under existing guidance if a need is identified. The specific and cumulative impacts of new proposals will be analyzed according to guidelines established in laws, regulations, manuals, and other policies through the NEPA process.

9. Establish the following range development maintenance policy:

All routine maintenance of range developments listed in Appendix B will be completed using non-motorized and non-mechanized means. All other maintenance will require prior BLM Area Manager approval and additional environmental assessment. Major repairs to range improvements which are considered emergency in nature (constituting a threat to the health or welfare of livestock) and require the use of motorized or mechanized equipment, shall require prior written approval by the BLM Area Manager. The Area Manager shall specify the route to be used for access. It is anticipated that the only project that could potentially need motorized equipment for maintenance would be the north Big Wash reservoir. If required during the ten year planning period, earth moving equipment may be taken in on the existing road one time and used to remove sediments from the tank or repair the dam.


Rationale: The use of non-motorized/mechanized maintenance techniques will minimize wilderness impacts while allowing permittees feasible maintenance alternatives.

TABLE 5. Allowed New Developments

| Project | Legal Description | Wilderness |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Upper Indian Spring Project | T24N R18W Sec 16 | Mount Tipton |
| Whiskey Spring Development | T19N R16W sec 20 | Wabayuma Peak |
| Good Luck Spring Development | T19N R16W sec 20 | Wabayuma Peak |
| Midnight Spring Development | T19N R16W sec 30 | Wabayuma Peak |


Map 2

Mount Tipton Wilderness



LEGEND

- PARKING AREA
- MOTOR VEHICLE BARRIER
- WILDERNESS
- PRIVATE INHOLDINGS
- PRIMARY ROADS
- SECONDARY ROADS
- JEEP TRAILS




UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
PHOENIX DISTRICT
KINGMAN RESOURCE AREA

August 1994




LOCATION DIAGRAM

Map 3 Wabayuma Peak Wilderness



LEGEND

- P** PARKING AREA
- ⊗** MOTOR VEHICLE BARRIER
- PRIVATE INHOLDING
- SECONDARY ROADS
- - JEEP TRAILS



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
PHOENIX DISTRICT
KINGMAN RESOURCE AREA

August 1994



LOCATION DIAGRAM

10. Establish the following wildlife operations and maintenance policy:
- Game surveys - in cooperation with Arizona Game and Fish Department, provide for wildlife census monitoring utilizing low level helicopter flight. Two week advance notification to the BLM Area Manager has been agreed to by the Department.
 - **Elk, mule deer, and javelina** - During the period between November 1 and January 31, a survey is flown that may total 1-3 days per wilderness area. Flight time is usually less than 5 hours per wilderness at altitudes of 100 to 200 feet above ground level. Every effort will be made to schedule flights for weekdays. Occasional landings will be permitted to inspect a dead animal.
 - **Elk** - a summer survey may be completed in Wabayuma Peak wilderness in August over a 1-3 day period in the same way as described above.
 - Maintenance - Vole habitat exclosures and all new construction projects will be maintained using non-motorized, non-mechanized means.

Rationale: Game surveys are needed for the Game and Fish Department to balance wildlife hunting permits with available wildlife. Options to aerial census were evaluated in the Wildlife Operations and Maintenance Policy document (1994) and were not found to be practical.

11. Allow vehicle entrance into the wilderness for law enforcement activities that involve fresh pursuit of suspects believed to be in violation of criminal law. If the suspect is not in sight, pursuit will be by non-motorized means. Where practical, Area Manager approval will be obtained before motor vehicle entry in these situations. Following entry, notification will be given to the area manager within 48 hours.

Rationale: Law enforcement entry is in the best interest of the public if the suspect being pursued poses a danger to human life or safety.

12. Resolve the matter of the unauthorized Mackenzie Creek domestic waterline that brings water from a spring to a private ranch

headquarters south of the wilderness. The line is partially in the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness and has never been authorized. Resolution will seek to reduce visual impacts within the wilderness area. Relocation of the line outside wilderness is the preferred method of resolution. An alternative would allow the line to be temporarily left in its current location, authorized with a temporary use permit for a period not to exceed three years, and mitigated to reduce visual impacts.

Rationale: The line already exists, supplies domestic water to a residence from a privately held water source. Relocation of the line would temporarily impact naturalness but would be the best long term solution. Motorized and mechanized maintenance could occur without wilderness constraint. If authorized with a temporary use permit, exposed sections of the pipeline could be buried to reduce impacts.

13. Allow wild horse census flights over the Mount Tipton Wilderness every three years. Flights will be conducted on weekdays and can occur on three different days for a period of up to 5 hours each day.

Rationale: An accurate census is needed to determine use by horses and to maintain a thriving ecological balance. Aerial survey has proven to be practical and minimizes the duration of impact.

14. If removal of horses becomes necessary, bait/water trapping or helicopter herding of animals will be used depending on time of year, water availability, location of animals to be removed, and other variables. The preferred method will be the one which least impacts the wilderness. Bait/water trapping would be most effective when water or forage is scarce and existing facilities and cherrystem roads could be utilized. If new facilities or motor vehicle use over existing roads is needed to carry out bait/water trapping, the helicopter herding with wingtrap facilities outside wilderness would probably be less impacting.

15. Define a herd management area for the Cerbat horse herd identifying the appropriate population management level and improvements that will be needed for management of the herd.

Rationale: The horse herd is a significant resource in the wilderness. It requires intensive

management to balance the herd with the ecosystem. Effects of predation, particularly by lions, is unknown on the population. Removals may be necessary to keep the ecosystem functioning in a natural condition.

16. Allocate the four known cultural resource sites to the category of scientific use, allowing them to be subject to scientific or historical study. (BLM manual 8111.23)

Rationale: When scientific research is conducted with minimum tool consideration in a way as to not impair wilderness values, information yielded can be helpful in understanding different aspects of the wilderness.

Monitoring

1. Conduct wilderness boundary patrols to check condition of barriers, road closures, and reclamation at a minimum of twice annually.
2. Monitor intermittently the use of approved mechanized uses to ensure compliance.

Objective 2

Provide a spectrum of recreational opportunities including primitive and unconfined recreation

for a variety of recreational users within the Mount Tipton and Wabayuma Peak Wildernesses by:

- Providing motor vehicle parking areas by 2003
- Providing suitable legal access to the wilderness boundaries by 2000
- Establishing visitor use corridors over existing roads, washes, and trails by 1997
- Pursuing legal visitor access across private inholdings by 2003
- Establishing an effective visitor use policy by 1994

Rationale: This objective is designed to address Issues 1 and 6. Meeting this objective will help attain national wilderness goal #2.

Management Actions


1. Establish minimally improved motor vehicle parking areas at the following locations outside wilderness. Establish a visitor register at each location. (Maps 2 and 3)

Mount Tipton

- T26N R18W sec 28 SENW
- T25N R18W sec 18 NWSE
- T25N R17W sec 6 NWSW

Wabayuma Peak

- T18N R16W sec 24
- T18N R16W sec 26
- T19N R17W sec 14



The Mount Tipton summit is an occasional destination.

Rationale: This will help prevent trespass on adjacent privately owned lands and improve safety for visitors. Visitor registers will help to determine wilderness demand and help guide future management decisions.

2. Work to obtain access easements across the following private lands and others that may exist along the indicated route to provide public access to the wilderness boundary:

Wabayuma Peak

- along the Walnut Creek Road (#2116) through T19N R17W secs. 7 and 15 for access to the Walnut Creek area
- along the Rock Creek Road (#2130) through T18N R17W secs. 9 and 11 for access for the Willow and Rock Creek areas

Mount Tipton

- along the Twenty-six Wash Road (#2218) through T26N R17W sec 33 and T25N R17W sec 5 for access to the Twenty-six Wash area (If this proves unfeasible, an alternate access on the east side of the wilderness will be identified and pursued)
- along the Antelope Springs Road (#2217) through T26N R18W sec 28 and 34 for more manageable access to Antelope Canyon

Rationale: This will help prevent the use of roads across privately held lands without owner permission and will enable the public reasonable access to the wilderness.

3. Work to obtain recreational easements that allow public use of private inholdings in the following key areas:

Wabayuma Peak

- Wabayuma Peak trail T18N R16W sec 11
- Willow Creek T18N R16W sec 21
- Unnamed tributary T18N R16W sec 5 & 8
- Unnamed tributary T18N R16W sec 31

Mount Tipton

- Pine Canyon T25N R18W sec 4
- Arizona (Isabelle) Spring T25N R18W sec 20
- Lower Indian Spring T25N R18W sec 17
- Marble Canyon T25N R18W sec 31 & 33

Rationale: These private lands tend to lie in existing canyon or other natural travel corridors. Easements will allow visitor use without trespass.

4. Establish the following non-commercial recreation policy:
 - a. no group size limits will be imposed, but the following visitor guidelines will be strongly encouraged through visitor education:
 - limit horses to 6 per group
 - limit visitors to no more than 10 per group
 - b. no campfire restrictions, except in periods of extreme fire danger.
 - c. dogs must be confined to a leash if not trained by voice command.
 - d. when using recreational packstock, feed must be supplied by the visitor for trips that involve overnight stays. Use of hay will not be allowed.
 - e. packstock must be hobbled, placed in temporary electric corrals, or picketed between trees or other objects during overnight stays.

Rationale: Current visitor use is minimal and does not create significant impact to the wilderness. Dead and down wood supplies are abundant, particularly in the pinyon-juniper vegetative type. Recreational packstock are addressed in the policy to help reduce the spread of non-native vegetation, to eliminate overuse of forage, and to prevent damage to shrubs and trees.

5. Establish the following commercial recreation (including non-profit groups whose activities require a special recreation permit) policy.
 - a. packstock will be limited to 6 per group.
 - b. group size will be limited to 10 people including guides, camp workers, and clients.
 - c. base camps, normally used for periods of up to 14 days, will not be allowed in wilderness.
 - d. spike camps, defined as camps used for 1-2 nights at a time, will be allowed in class II and III areas without limitation as long as human impacts fall within acceptable levels outlined in the monitoring section of objective 3.
 - e. spike camps will be approved in class I areas in advance of their use and will be limited to one or two nights/year at each site.
 - f. items b, c, d and e of the non-commercial recreation policy will also apply to the commercial policy.

Rationale: This policy is consistent with the Wilderness Act in that commercial use will be limited to the extent necessary for realizing the recreational purpose of the area without impairing naturalness or solitude needed by other recreational users. If use degrades the wilderness qualities of naturalness, solitude, or primitive recreation beyond acceptable levels, it must be brought into balance with these qualities.

Monitoring

The following monitoring will be completed to determine the effectiveness of the recreation management program.

1. Visitor registers will be checked monthly. This will yield information on visitors at sub-units within the wilderness as well as total numbers of visitors. This information can guide future actions.
2. Opportunity class indicators and standards will be evaluated annually to determine the recreational impacts to the wilderness resource. These are described in detail in objective 3.
3. The Wabayuma Peak trail will be monitored annually to determine maintenance needs with appropriate actions taken to complete the maintenance.

Objective 3

Maintain outstanding opportunities for solitude in each wilderness area throughout the ten year planning period by managing recreational impacts.

Rationale: This objective helps to resolve Issue #1 and is specific to attaining national goal #1.

Management Actions

1. Adopt a zoning concept in each wilderness area that preserves the outstanding opportunities for solitude by managing recreation and its impacts and by imposing area guidelines on management of other programs. The zones are shown in maps 4 and 5.

Rationale: Zoning allows different sets of criteria to be developed to guide management of human impacts. This will optimize opportunities for solitude and will predetermine when actions will be taken to adjust for human uses which impact the solitude experience.

2. Adopt the management guidelines for each of the three wilderness classes as outlined in table 6.

Monitoring

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the objective by monitoring the conditions outlined in table 7 on an annual basis. If monitoring indicates the standards are being exceeded, measures will be taken to control recreation in affected areas as needed. A permitting procedure will be considered only if necessary to control impacts.

Objective 4

Determine by 1995 if water quality in Mackenzie Creek has been adversely affected from upstream mining or other human activities to a degree that would impact natural biologic processes and human safety.

Rationale: This will resolve Issue #5 and will help achieve Goals #1 and #2.

Management Actions

1. Analyze the water in Mackenzie Creek for metals and organic compounds to determine if water is safe for human contact. If pollutant levels exceed health based guidance levels established by Arizona's Department of Environmental Quality, initiate action to remediate the condition.

Monitoring

1. If cleanup actions are taken, annual water quality monitoring will occur to determine the effectiveness of the actions.

TABLE 6. Wilderness Management Classes

| Descriptor | Class I Most Primitive | Class II Semi-Primitive | Class III High Impact Zone Interface |
|---|---|---|--|
| General Description | Mostly unmodified by actions of man. Modifications not easily detected. | Mostly unmodified by actions of man. Some modifications easily detectable. | Same as Class II but in sight or sound of significant manmade imprints outside wilderness. |
| Influences from outside wilderness | Virtually none. | Some influence from outside. | Moderate influence from outside in many locations. |
| Prevalence and duration of recreational impacts | Loss of vegetation at campsites and as a result of travel negligible and replaced annually. | Minor loss of soil and vegetation where camping occurs. Some sites have persisting impacts from year to year. | Similar to Class II areas with a slightly higher density of impacted sites. |
| Social description | Outstanding opportunities for isolation, solitude and primitive recreation. | Excellent opportunities for isolation, solitude, and primitive recreation. | Moderate to high opportunities for isolation, solitude and primitive recreation. |
| General level of encounters | Extremely infrequent | Low | Low to moderate |
| Outfitter use | No base camps; spike camps allowed with restrictions. | No base camps; unlimited spike camps when impacts are within established standards. | No base camps; unlimited spike camps when impacts are within established standards. |


TABLE 7. Monitoring Standards for Wilderness Classes

| Factor | Indicator | Class I Standard | Class II Standard | Class III Standard |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Campsite condition | Amount of firewood | Generally available within 50' | Generally available within 100' | Generally available within 200' |
| | Difference in vegetative cover between campsite and adjacent area* | No difference | Difference of not more than one cover class | Difference of not more than two cover classes. |
| Interparty contacts contacts | Contacts per day while traveling | 1 or fewer contacts 90% of the time | No more than 3 contacts 90% of the time | Not more than 5 contacts 90% of the time |
| | Number of complaints/ year regarding social conditions | 3 | 5 | 10 |
| Campsite density | Distance between campsites | no campsite evidence | 1/4 mile | >100 yards |








* vegetative cover classes will be measured using the criteria shown in appendix C.


Map 4

Mount Tipton Management Zones



LEGEND


-  CLASS I
-  CLASS II
-  CLASS III
-  PRIVATE INHOLDINGS
-  PRIMARY ROADS
-  SECONDARY ROADS
-  JEEP TRAILS









UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
PHOENIX DISTRICT
KINGMAN RESOURCE AREA
August 1994




Map 5 Wabayuma Peak Management Zones



LEGEND

-  CLASS I
-  CLASS II
-  CLASS III
-  PRIVATE INHOLDINGS
-  SECONDARY ROADS
-  JEEP TRAILS



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
PHOENIX DISTRICT
KINGMAN RESOURCE AREA
August 1994



LOCATION DIAGRAM



Pine Canyon provides a popular access point into the Cerbat pinnacles of the Mount Tipton Wilderness.

Objective 5

Manage vegetative conditions in perpetuity in the following communities:

- Maintain a self-sustaining ponderosa pine community in late seral condition by allowing for natural successional processes.

Rationale: The present plant community's late seral stage provides a substantially natural condition. The structural diversity within the community supports a variety of plant and animal species, including the Hualapai Mexican Vole. The community increases the area's opportunities for primitive recreation and solitude.

- Maintain a self-sustaining pinyon-juniper community in late seral condition by allowing for natural successional processes.

Rationale: This community provides important area for livestock, wildlife habitat, solitude, and primitive recreation. It covers a significant part of the Mount Tipton wilderness and smaller portions of Wabayuma Peak. It is currently in a substantially natural condition.

- Maintain the current natural condition of the Mohave desert shrub including the Sonoran desert transition zone.

Rationale: This ecosystem appears to be in a substantially natural condition. Historically, this community has seen a large increase in non-native annual vegetation that has greatly increased the community's susceptibility to fire. There is no feasible way to eliminate these annuals that will now be managed as part of the existing vegetative community.

- Maintain the Arizona interior chaparral community in its current natural condition.

Rationale: This community undergoes natural change over a forty year cycle. Following fire, burned shrub species resprout. Over the course of the succeeding forty years, decadent material accumulates until fuel conditions are optimized allowing the community to burn again. If fuel conditions are not optimum, fire will not readily spread through the community; when optimum, fire is difficult to control. At times in the cycle when brush is dense, human and animal movements within the ecosystem are naturally restricted.

- Improve native species diversity, and cover around springs and in other riparian areas.

Rationale: These areas have historically been most sensitive to the effects of continuous grazing because they provide good sources of water, cover, and forage desired by grazing animals. They provide important wildlife habitat as well and increase the area's opportunities for primitive recreation and solitude.

Management Actions

1. Study the Ponderosa pine community to determine:
 - age class distribution and stand density
 - condition of the litter layer

Rationale: Age class and stand density indicates susceptibility of the stand to crown fire as well as its reproductive capability. Condition of the litter layer is an indicator of the ability of new seedlings to germinate, and the susceptibility of the community to ground fire. These items will be useful for developing a long term fire management strategy in this community.

2. Gather information during 1995 on the fire history of the ponderosa pine and chaparral communities to determine the natural boundary between the two communities and the historical extent of ponderosa pine.

Rationale: The historical extent of the ponderosa pine is in question. Many believe that it once covered a greater part of the high mountain

zone. A fire history will show the frequency of fire occurrence and will help define the historical extent of the community. Appropriate fire management may allow for natural expansion of the community to a former niche.

3. Fully suppress all fires in and around the ponderosa pine community through 1995 using wilderness fire suppression guidelines (appendix D). Develop a fire prescription for the ponderosa pine community by 1996, determining modified suppression criteria.

Rationale: Full suppression will protect existing communities in the short term. BLM policy requires full suppression in the absence of natural fire prescriptions. A fire prescription may help to maintain the desired condition of the community.

4. Fully suppress all fires in each of the following vegetative communities: Arizona interior chaparral, pinyon-juniper, springs and riparian areas, Mohave desert shrub.

Rationale: Full suppression is chosen as the short term alternative for the ten year planning period in all vegetative zones for the following reasons. First, the presence of scattered inholdings throughout both areas impede modified suppression. If inholdings are acquired or agreements are made that allow fires that start on public lands to escape onto inholdings, modified suppression policy will be reevaluated. Second, fires may be detrimental to Hualapai Mexican Vole populations during their recovery period. Third, the preponderance of non-native annual vegetation at low to mid elevations would allow unrestricted fire to signifi-

TABLE 8. Key Species and Key Areas

| Key Area | Location | Key Species |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Quail Springs #10 | T24N R18W sec. 14 SWSW | Sideoats Grama, Desert Needlegrass |
| Quail Springs #14 | T24N R18W sec. 32 SESW | Sideoats Grama, Threeawn, Desert Needlegrass |
| Quail Springs #16 | T24N R18W sec. 16 SESW | Shrubby Buckwheat, Threeawn, Desert Needlegrass |
| Walnut Creek #3 | T18N R16W sec. 18 NWNW | Twinberry, Flattop Buckwheat |
| Walnut Creek #4 | T18N R16W sec. 18 NENE | Big Galleta, Threeawn, Flattop Buckwheat |
| Boriana A #3 | T18N R16W sec. 16 NWSE | Big Galleta, Black Grama, Threeawn |

cantly alter natural shrub communities to communities dominated by annual grasses and forbs.

5. Manage utilization of key forage plants in key areas not to exceed 50% of current years growth. Key areas and key species are shown in Table 8.

Rationale: Research shows that if utilization levels are kept at 50%, vegetative communities will maintain themselves and in some cases improve when other management practices are incorporated with utilization management.

6. Complete the four projects listed in management action #8, objective #1 to improve native species diversity and vegetative cover in riparian areas.
7. Establish additional vegetative monitoring areas to quantify the effects of wild horse and livestock grazing. At a minimum, at least one key area will be selected in each grazing allotment. Manage for 50% utilization of key forage plants in these areas.

Rationale: Additional monitoring areas will allow animal management decisions to be made on a more site specific basis.

8. If utilization levels on any of the key species are greater than 50%, actions will be taken to protect vegetative resources. Actions could include:

- Relocation of livestock and wild horses within wilderness
- Relocation of livestock and wild horses outside wilderness
- Removal of livestock and wild horses from grazing allotments
- Recommending to Game and Fish that wildlife adjustments be made

9. Work toward combining the cancelled Turkey Track preference with an adjacent grazing allotment.

Rationale: The intent of the Wilderness Act is to not curtail grazing where it existed at the time of wilderness designation. Combining Turkey Track with another allotment will allow perimeter fencing to be removed and a preference of approximately 2 cattle yearlong in wilderness will be retained.


Monitoring

1. Annually monitor forage plant utilization at vegetative key areas to ensure that utilization levels are not exceeding 50%.
2. Monitor long term vegetative trend at key areas over three to five year intervals to determine if 50% utilization levels are allowing vegetative communities to maintain or improve toward ecological potential.

Part VI — Plan Evaluation

The management plan is written to cover a period of 10 years. It will be evaluated annually:

1. to determine if objectives are being met.
2. to determine causes if objectives are not being met.
3. to determine if additional actions are needed to implement objectives.
4. to summarize annual monitoring.
5. to assess the need for plan change.
6. to record actions that have been completed and plan the following year's actions.



A fallen log in the ponderosa forest.

Part VII — Plan Implementation & Cost Estimates

A. Ongoing Activities

These activities represent several areas. Some are actions needed to monitor conditions in the wilderness. Others are taken to meet the goals out-

lined in part II of the plan and are not issue driven. The costs for these projects is shown in terms of workmonths. Costs of many of these projects would be realized even in the absence of the wilderness plan.

| Management Action | BLM Workmonths | Date Completed |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Produce visitor use information including visitor use maps | 4 | |
| Conduct an inventory of surface and ground waters and file necessary quantification documents with ADWR to document federal reserved rights and wilderness values. | 6 | |
| Complete inventory of potential Mexican Vole habitat and evaluate the need to take further actions to protect the species and its habitat and to promote recovery. | undetermined | |
| Complete placement of carsonite boundary signs | 1 | |
| Coordinate with county search and rescue officials concerning BLM's requirements for managing and preserving wilderness. | | |
| Make annual presentations to the Dolan Springs and Yucca Fire Departments concerning fire policies in wilderness. | .25/year | |
| Conduct wilderness boundary patrols | .5/year | |
| Monitor the use of approved mechanized use | .25/year | |
| Check visitor registers monthly and compile data | .5/year | |
| Evaluate opportunity class indicators | .5/year | |
| Maintain the Wabayuma Peak Trail | .25/year | |
| Monitor vegetative utilization at six key areas | .25/year | |
| Monitor long term vegetative trend at six key areas | .1/year | |

B. Special Projects

1. High Priority

Generally, these actions will be taken first and will be substantially completed within five years after the plan is implemented.

| Management Action | Cost Estimate‡ | Date Completed |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|
| Acquire private inholdings° | \$950,000 to \$2,100,000 | |
| Construct 2 motor vehicle access barriers at Pine Canyon | \$2,000 | |
| Partially reclaim vehicle route MT3 | \$3,000 | |
| Partially reclaim vehicle route MT10 | \$10,000 | |
| Totally reclaim vehicle route WP12 | \$5,000 | |
| Totally reclaim vehicle route WP13 | | |
| Totally reclaim vehicle route WP14 | | |
| Assess vehicle routes WP1, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9, WP10, WP11, WP18, and WP21 to determine retention/ reclamation | \$4,000 | |
| Remove visible traces of abandoned water pipeline north of Big Wash Reservoir | \$1,000 | |
| Complete removal of non-functional butyl rubber water storage tanks near Antelope Canyon | <\$1,000 | |
| Remove rusted water storage tank at 7th street corral | <\$1,000 | |
| Complete Pine Canyon pipeline modification | \$1,000 | |
| Reclaim Wabayuma Peak helispot | <\$1,000 | |
| Install visitor register at Wabayuma Peak trailhead | \$1,000 | |
| Construct parking area/visitor register for Cottonwood spring, Wabayuma Peak T18N R16W section 24 | \$4,000 | |
| Construct parking area/visitor register for Antelope Canyon, Mount Tipton T26N R18W section 28 | \$4,000 | |
| Construct parking area/visitor register for in Lower Indian spring, Mt. Tipton T25N R18W sec 18 NWSE | \$4,000 | |

| Management Action | Cost Estimate‡ | Date Completed |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Acquire three public access routes across private lands: | | |
| Along Walnut Creek Road | \$20,000 | |
| Along Antelope Springs Road | \$20,000 | |
| Along Twenty-six Wash Road | \$20,000 | |
| Assess water quality in Mackenzie Creek | \$20,000 | |
| Resolve the matter of the unauthorized Mackenzie Creek domestic waterline | * | |
| Establish additional vegetative monitoring sites | <\$1,000 | |
| Study the ponderosa pine community to obtain information on age class distribution, stand density, litter layer condition, and fire history | \$5,000 | |
| Develop long term fire suppression policy for ponderosa pine community | \$3,000 | |
| Develop comprehensive plan for management of wild horses in the Cerbat Herd Area | * | |

‡ Cost estimates include costs of materials, labor, and administration.

° Acquisition of inholdings probably will be a lengthy process. Although listed under high priority, acquisitions will probably occur throughout the 10 year planning period. Cost range results from acquisitions based on all exchange (lower value) to all purchase (higher value).

* These actions would be taken in the absence of a wilderness plan. No additional costs will be realized from plan implementation.

2. Medium priority
 The following actions will generally be taken after the highest priority items have been completed. Changing priorities or packaging

of projects might move some of these projects up or down on the priorities list. The goal is to have all of these projects completed by year seven of the ten year planning period.

| Management Action | Cost Estimate | Date Completed |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Construct 6 motor vehicle access barriers at the following locations Twentysix Wash T25N R17W sec 6 | \$1,000 | |
| Indian Springs T25N R18W sec 18 | \$1,000 | |
| Rock Creek (2) T18N R17W sec 11 | \$2,000 | |
| Grapevine T18N R16W sec 12 | \$1,000 | |
| Pipeline T18N R16W sec 31 | \$1,000 | |
| Reclaim the following closed vehicle trails | | |
| MT6 | \$3,000 | |
| MT7 | \$2,000 | |
| MT8 | | |
| Remove abandoned Thompson spring fence | \$1,000 | |
| Reclaim excavation trespass T18N R16W sec 24 | \$2,000 | |
| Acquire legal access across private lands to the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness through T18N R17W secs. 9 and 11 | \$20,000 | |

3. Low Priority
 Although these are the lowest priority actions, they are necessary to fully implement the plan. Most of these actions will be taken after

those in the first two groups are completed, although changing priorities could move them up on the priorities list.

| Management Action | Cost Estimate | Date Completed |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Construct 11 motor vehicle access barriers in the following locations Big Wash T24N R18W sec 16 | \$1,000 | |
| Putnam Wash T24N R18W sec 8 | \$1,000 | |
| Antelope Canyon T26N R18W sec 33 | \$1,000 | |
| Old Camp Well T19N R16W sec 32 | \$1,000 | |
| Walnut Creek 1 T19N R17W sec 22 | \$1,000 | |
| Walnut Creek 2 T19N R16W sec 18 | \$1,000 | |
| Walnut Creek 3 T19N R16W sec 31 | \$1,000 | |
| Junction Spring T18N R16W sec 7 | \$1,000 | |
| Cottonwood 1 T18N R16W sec 13 | \$1,000 | |
| Cottonwood 2 T18N R16W sec 14 | \$1,000 | |
| Hackberry T18N R17W sec 13 | \$1,000 | |
| Reclaim the following closed vehicle routes MT2 | \$1,000 | |
| WP2 | \$2,000 | |
| WP5 | \$2,000 | |
| WP16 | \$1,000 | |
| WP17 | \$1,000 | |
| WP23 | \$1,000 | |
| WP25 | \$1,000 | |
| Establish motor vehicle parking areas with visitor registers in the following areas Walnut Creek T19N R17W sec 14 | \$4,000 | |
| Mackenzie Creek T18N R16W sec 26 | \$4,000 | |
| Twentysix Wash T25N R18W sec 6 | \$4,000 | |

Part VIII — Public Involvement

The BLM's public involvement process utilizes the public at several planning stages in various capacities:

1. Scoping of management issues
2. Formation of a public steering committee
3. Review of draft management plan

Two public meetings were held for each wilderness area to help identify what the public perceived as management issues that needed to be addressed in the wilderness management plan. The dates and times of the meetings were as follows:

| Date | Location | Wilderness Area |
|---------|---------------|-----------------|
| 3/18/92 | Kingman | Mount Tipton |
| 3/19/92 | Dolan Springs | Mount Tipton |
| 9/22/92 | Kingman | Wabayuma Peak |
| 9/23/92 | Yucca | Wabayuma Peak |

A public group met beginning in March 1993 to discuss the planning area. Several individuals who had expressed interest in participating were invited. Meetings were held periodically over a five month period and recommendations were provided to BLM. The core group of attendees that provided input at the meetings included:

The first meeting was held on March 3, 1993 at the BLM Office in Kingman to orient attendees and let them know what was needed. Legislation including the Wilderness Act of 1964 and the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 was discussed as was the BLM wilderness policy.

The second meeting was held on March 30, 1993. The steps to wilderness management planning were covered. Attendees started by brainstorming all possible management issues. Then they began working on describing opportunity

classes and selecting indicators pertinent to the resource and social conditions present in the planning area.

The third meeting was a field trip to Wabayuma Peak on April 19, 1993. Access routes to the wilderness, planned acquisitions, and travel corridors within the wilderness were examined and the group took a short hike up Willow Creek.

The fourth meeting was a field trip to Mount Tipton on April 21, 1993. Access routes to the wilderness, possible parking areas, and planned acquisitions were looked at.

The fifth meeting was held at the BLM Office on June 2, 1993. The BLM's proposed general recreation policy was discussed. Attendees agreed with most of the policy but suggested a few changes. They wanted to limit numbers of horses per group at 15-20 for day trips and 10 for overnight trips. They also suggested that the technical rock climbing restriction be dropped from the Cerbat Pinnacles because the rock type was not suitable for this activity.

Commercial recreational activity was also discussed. The group felt that setting an initial carrying capacity could be avoided by monitoring key indicators to define an acceptable level. The group suggested that commercial operators should be limited to group sizes of 10 people and no more than 6 horses. No base camps, but spike camps should be allowed anywhere in wilderness. Horses kept overnight should be kept in portable electric corrals, hobbled, or possibly picketed.

Opportunity class descriptions and delineations were discussed. No firm decisions were reached, but wildlife management as it related to the classes was discussed at length and many in the group felt that there was too much class I or pristine area. People were handed out a flow chart that could be used to evaluate proposed wildlife

| | | |
|-------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|
| Sue Baughman | | Mohave County Trails Association |
| Richard Cavenaugh | | Arizona Game and Fish Department |
| Eric Gardner | | Arizona Game and Fish Department |
| Brian Garrity | | People for the West |
| Richard Hibbard | | Sierra Club; Mohave Community College |
| Dave Knisely | | Livestock permittee, Mount Tipton |
| Bill O'Sullivan | | Team Leader, BLM |
| Shane Stone | | Mohave County Parks Department |
| Loren Wilson | | Arizona Archaeological Society |

projects in wilderness. The meeting ended with a presentation of other proposed actions that will be a part of the plan. The group did not discuss these in much detail, but there were no objections raised to these actions.

The sixth meeting was held at the BLM office on June 24, 1993. The group discussed a list of proposed wilderness actions that would result from plan implementation. They also provided input into the formulation of alternatives that would reflect a range of management strategies.

The seventh meeting was held on July 29, 1993. The group reviewed a draft version of the plan and gave feedback on its contents. Concerns raised included placement of zone boundaries, parking areas, commercial outfitter policy, wildlife management, and fire policy

The Wabayuma Peak/Mount Tipton draft wilderness plan was mailed to approximately 120 interested publics, groups and governmental organizations early September, 1994. A press release was issued to newspapers, and selected radio and television stations informing the general public of the plan's availability. An open house was held in Kingman on October 13, 1994 to answer questions and receive comments on the plan. Of the eight

people attending, three supported the plan as written and five had questions or suggestions and followed up with written comments. Including the written comments received as a result of the open house, a total of ten comments were received by the close of the 45-day public comment period on November 4, 1994. The comments are printed as they were submitted to the BLM. Specific comments that could be addressed have been highlighted in each letter. Responses to the comments follow the letters.

Index to the Comments

1. Mohave County Public Land Use Committee
2. Fred J. Towne
3. Sue Baughman
4. Dave Knisely
5. Ken McReynolds
6. Mohave County Board of Supervisors
7. Arizona Game and Fish Department
8. Ron Fite
9. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
10. Anita Waite

MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
PUBLIC LAND USE COMMITTEE



P.O. Box 7000 ♦ Kingman, Arizona 86402-7000
609 E. Beale St. ♦ Kingman, AZ 86402-7000
Phone (602) 757-0903 Fax (602) 757-0912 TDD (602) 753-0726

Rob Grumbles, Chairman
Ken McReynolds, Vice Chairman
Keith Helmer, Public Relations

MEMBERS/
SUBCOMMITTEES

Rob Grumbles
Timber

Ken McReynolds
Grazing

Keith Helmer
Business & Industry

Paul Pokrasky
Air Quality

Gary Brummelt
Mining

Bryan Corbin
Recreation

Joe Billich
Transportation

Bob Broz
Water

Don Martin
Wilderness,
Wildlife &
Endangered
Species

October 15, 1994

Mr. Ken Drew
Kingman Resource Area Manager
Bureau of Land Management
2475 Beverly Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401

RE: Comments on the draft Wabayuma Peak/ MT. Tipton Wilderness
Management Plan

Mr. Drew:

Here are some comments/concerns on the above Wilderness
Management Plan.

1) Wild Horses: There appears to be problems with wild horses in
the Mt. Tipton Wilderness. It appears that at least some of the
wild horses are currently dependant upon waters and forage that
are located on private lands owned by Mr. Dave Knisely. Mr.
Knisely has requested that these feral animals be removed, or at
the very least that he be compensated for the
forage/water/minerals that they consume. Private landowners
should not have to maintain these feral animals. A solution to
this problem should be actively pursued.

Data from many long time local ranchers indicate that the current
wild horse herd in the Cerbat Mountains are nothing more than
animals that were turned loose by area ranchers with in the last
50 years. These feral horses should be rounded up and adopted
out.

Under no circumstances should there be a reduction in numbers of
native ungulates (deer) in the Cerbats to accomodate the wild
horses.

2) Access to private inholdings. When the boundaries of the Mt.
Tipton Wilderness area were set by Congressional action, they
completely locked in one parcel of property belonging to Mr.
Knisely (T25N R10W sec 4). Under the current regulations, Section
5 (a), applicants are required to pay rental fees for a three-
year period for an Access corridor.

1-1

1-2

MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
PUBLIC LAND USE COMMITTEE



P.O. Box 7000 ♦ Kingman, Arizona 86402-7000
609 E. Beale St. ♦ Kingman, AZ 86402-7000
Phone (602) 757-0903 Fax (602) 757-0912 TDD (602) 753-0726

Rob Grumbles, Chairman
Ken McReynolds, Vice Chairman
Keith Helmer, Public Relations

MEMBERS/
SUBCOMMITTEES

Rob Grumbles
Timber

Ken McReynolds
Grazing

Keith Helmer
Business & Industry

Paul Pokrasky
Air Quality

Gary Brummelt
Mining

Bryan Corbin
Recreation

Joe Billich
Transportation

Bob Broz
Water

Don Martin
Wilderness,
Wildlife &
Endangered
Species

1-3

I believe that private landowners that are locked in by
government action should not be charged for access to their
private properties. In addition, a fair market price should be
offered to private landowners who own property within designated
wilderness areas.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Don Martin

Don Martin
Chairman

Wilderness, Wildlife & Endangered Species Subcommittee

2

COPIES SENT TO ALL OUR U.S. SENATORS +
 CITY MAN IN THE MOUNTAIN REPRESENTATIVES

FOR THE RECORD

KINGMAN RESOURCE AREA MANAGER
 WABAYUMA PEAK + MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS
 EA #AZ-025-94-044. - FIRST I HAVE MANY OB
 JECTIONS TO YOUR PREPARED PLAN. #1 IS THE COST
 B. SPECIAL PROJECTS TOTAL U.S. \$2,297,000.00.

OUR GREAT NATION IS IN DEBT OF EXCESS OF 4 TRILLION
 DOLLARS. HOW CAN YOU POSSIBLY EVEN THINK OF
 GOING THIS ROUTE? ALSO YOU HAVE NOT
 FOLLOWED NEPA IN THAT YOU HAVEN'T CONSIDERED
 THE CULTURE, CUSTOMS OR ECONOMY OF OUR
 COUNTRIES + STATE.

WE WOULD GO FOR ALT. B. NO ACTION
 NEXT WE WOULD OBJECT TO THE WAYS WILDERNESS
 AREAS WERE PUT IN TO START WITH. VERY FEW PEOPLE
 REALIZED WHAT WAS GOING ON AS YOUR SMALL PLEAS
 PUT IN NEWSPAPERS DID NOT STATE IN HEAD LINES
 YOU WERE GOING TO LOCK UP GREAT AREAS OF
 OUR PUBLIC DOMAIN FOR A ELITE + STRONG + ABLE
 TO BACKPACK TO BE ABLE TO ENJOY OUR DESERT
 BACK COUNTRY. YOU ALSO LOCKED OUT OWNERS OF
 PATENTED (OWNED) + TAXED LAND. PLUS PRIVATE WATERS

YOU ARE DISCRIMINATING AGAINST HANDICAPPED - SENIOR
 WHO CANT WALK DISTANCES - FAMILYS WITH CHILDREN.

YOU ARE JUST MANAGING PEOPLE - SINCE STOCKMEN
 CAME + MANAGED LAND THERE IS MORE GAME THAN BEFORE
 MEMBERS:
 YAVAPAI PROPERTY RIGHTS COALITION
 PEOPLE FOR THE WEST
 WEAVER MINING DISTRICT
 YAVAPAI CATTLE GROWERS

FRED J TONNE
 HC 68 BOX 95
 KIRKLAND AZ 86332-9602

10/13/94

3

THE GENERAL STAFF

TEL NO. 602 767 3676

Nov 09 94 9:02 P.01

11-8-94

From: Gus Baughman P. O. Box 634, Dolan Springs, AZ 86441
 To: Bureau of Land Management, Kingman Resource Area,
 2475 Beavary Av, Kingman, Az 86441

Subj: Draft Wabayuma Peak & Mt Tipton Wilderness Plan
 & Environmental Assessment; comments on

Recommendations on Part V Wilderness Management, Objective I

3-1 Rather than a total reclamation on the old vehicle routes
 keep Mt 1, Mt 2, Mt 3, Mt 4, Mt 5, Mt 9 and Mt 10; partially
 reclaimed as trails. See previous recommendations on proposed
 trails in mt Tipton Wilderness Area. Keeping in mind that there
 are some private inholding's which eventually will be purchased
 or exchanged.

The same for Wabayuma Wilderness, do a partial reclamation
 on the old vehicle routes and use them as trails.

3-2 Antelope Canyon should be on the high priority list for
 development as a recreation area and nature trail. This
 canyon is the most accessible for the handicap and is a popular
 area for the local residents. See previous recommendations.

3-3 Pine Canyon is the next popular area and hopefully the inholding
 will be acquired or defined route around the inholding can be
 established. Arizona Springs find a way around the private in
 holding. Keep the old jeep trail as a hiking/equestrian trail
 Mt 4) I'm sure a parking area could be found away from the
 corrals.

Mt 2 starting at the 7th street corral follow the pipe line
 into the wash to Upper Indian Springs from there follow the cow
 trail (NB) to the saddle (at times it looks like a established
 trail) from the saddle look for cow trail head (W) coming into a
 larger drainage (look for cow trail left (B) this will bring you
 to the 7th street pipe line. Or from Upper Indian Springs return
 via old jeep trail to Lower Indian Springs look for cow trail
 left side (W) this will bring you to the 7th street pipe line head
 (W) by (B) to 7th corral. (from Upper Indian Spring you could
 work your way around the private inholding and pickup proposed Mt
 Tipton Trail (old jeep trail). * Note from the saddle you could
 hike into 26 mile wash- you can also hike into Pine Canyon and
 access 26 mile wash.

If you have any questions I would be more than willing to
 show you on the map or show in the field what I'm trying to tell
 you in writing.

See Baughman
 Gus Baughman
 (602) 767-3676

NOV-09-1994 09:03

682 767 3676

P.01

50

4

OCTOBER 30, 1994

ATTENTION: KEN DREW

IN READING THIS WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR W.P.W. AND M.T.W. AND E.A., I FIND FIRST OF ALL, YOU SHOULD HAVE GIVEN RIGHT-OF-WAY TO ALL PRIVATE LAND WITHIN THESE WILDERNESS AREAS, OR ACQUIRED THESE PRIVATE LANDS BEFORE DESIGNATING THIS A WILDERNESS AREA. M.T.W. WAS A WILDERNESS STUDY AREA FOR SOME 10 YEARS. I HAVE HAD THE MT TIPTON ALLOTMENT SINCE 1989. I HAVE NEVER RECEIVED ONE PIECE OF CORRESPONDENCE ON M.T.W. STUDY AREA. IF I HAD, YOU COULD BE SURE I WOULD HAVE BEEN FIGHTING FOR ACCESS TO MY PRIVATE LAND. THERE ARE HISTORICAL ROADS AND SO CALLED JEEP TRAILS TO ALL OF MY PRIVATE LAND. NOW YOU SAY I CAN'T USE THESE ROADS TO ACCESS MY PRIVATE LAND.

NOW THAT YOU HAVE LAND LOCKED ME YOU WOULD LIKE TO TRADE LAND WITH ME. YOUR OWN B.L.M. APPRAISER NOW SAYS MY THREE PARCELS ARE ONLY WORTH \$150.00 TO \$200.00 PER ACRE (WITH TWO LIVE, DEVELOPED SPRINGS THAT HAVE NEVER DRIED UP).

IN APPENDIX A, PG.53 OF THIS BOOK, YOUR PEOPLE RATE MY 40 ACRES IN T25N R18W SEC 4, AS #1 PRIORITY FOR ACQUISITION WITH A SCORE OF 43 OUT OF A POSSIBLE 43, (WHAT EVER THAT MEANS). THE SECOND PARCEL, 40 ACRES, T25N R18W SEC 20, HAS A PRIORITY FOR ACQUISITION OF #6. AND A SCORE OF 38. OUT OF A POSSIBLE PRIORITY OF 79 AND A SCORE AS LOW AS 27. IF THESE MY PARCELS ARE ONLY WORTH \$150.00 TO \$200.00 PER ACRE, I SURE WOULDN'T WANT TO BE THE POOR PRIVATE LAND OWNER THAT OWNS THE PARCEL WITH THE PRIORITY OF 79 AND SCORE OF 27. IN MAP #4 PG.34. YOU SHOW TWO CHERRY STEM ROADS TO PRIVATE LAND IN M.T.W.. AT THE VERY LEAST YOU SHOULD CHERRY STEM A ROAD TO EVERY PIECE OF PRIVATE LAND IN BOTH W.P.W. AND M.T.W.. YOUR TACTICS FOR ACQUIRING THESE PRIVATE LANDS IS UNAMERICAN. AS MY MOTHER WOULD SAY "SHAME ON YOU". ALSO ON PAGE 68, D MITIGATION MEASURES, 1. PROPOSED ACTION. THE LAST ACTION LISTED SHOULD READ: WHEN ACCESS TO PRIVATE INHOLDING IS GRANTED, - NOT IF GRANTED.

4-1

4-2 ACCESS: PAGE 13 & 14, THESE ARE NOT ALL JEEP TRAILS, YOU CAN DRIVE A CAR TO MOST OF THESE PRIVATE LANDS:

4-3

ACCESS TO WILDERNESS BY PUBLIC : MANAGEMENT ACTIONS -#1- YOU DO NOT OWN THE LAND OUTSIDE OF THE WILDERNESS. YOU ARE ENCOURAGING THE PUBLIC TO PARK ON PRIVATE LAND AT PRIVATE LANDOWNERS EXPENSE. NOT TO MENTION THE LIABILITY, JUST ONE MORE THING THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN STUDIED BEFORE DESIGNATION.

4-4

TO TRY AND MANAGE A HERD OF FERAL HORSES IN M.T.W. IS NOT ONLY ABSURD BECAUSE THESE ARE RANCH HORSES AND OTHER HORSES TURNED OUT FOR VARIOUS REASONS, BUT PHYSICALLY IMPOSSIBLE AND FINANCIALLY NOT FEASIBLE, AND SURE AS HELL DOES NOT FIT THE MOST "ABSOLUTE DESCRIPTION" OF WILDERNESS. THERE IS NO WAY YOU CAN MANAGE THESE FERAL HORSES THE WAY CATTLE ARE MANAGED IN ORDER TO IMPROVE THE RANGE, NOT DESTROY IT.


THESE HORSES ARE ALSO TRESSPASSING ON PRIVATE LAND AND USING PRIVATE WATER AND FORAGE.

PAGE 2

4-5

ON PAGE 28 2nd COLUMN AT THE BOTTOM, RATIONAL: IT REQUIRES INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT TO BALANCE THE HERD WITH THE ECO SYSTEM. IT WOULD BE NEXT TO IMPOSSIBLE TO MANAGE THESE FERAL HORSES WITH IN THE WILDERNESS AREA AND KEEP WITHIN THE MOST "ABSOLUTE DESCRIPTION" OF WILDERNESS. IN YOUR BOOK THE CERBAT H.M.A. PLAN, IT MENTIONS IT MAY BE NECESSARY TO PUT TRANSMISSION COLLARS ON THESE HORSES TO MONITOR THEIR MOVEMENT. I REALLY DON'T THINK THAT IS VERY FITTING FOR THE "WILDERNESS" THEME. HOW MUCH VISUAL PLEASURE IS THERE IN SEEING A "WILD AND FREE ROAMING" HORSE OR BURRO (AS THE ACT IMPLYS) WITH A TRANSMITTER COLLAR AROUND IT'S NECK. THINK ABOUT IT.

Dave Knisely
DAVE KNISELY
MT TIPTON RANCH



5

MABAYUMA PEAK AND MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS
MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

TABLE 1- WILDERNESS AREA OVERVIEW:

- 5-1 COMMENTS: THERE ARE NO APPROVED ACCESS POINTS TO INHOLDINGS, THIS APPEARS TO BE A TAKING OF PRIVATE LANDS.
- 5-2 WILDERNESS VALUES AND ATTRIBUTES, LEFT SIDE 3rd PAR. PAGE 7:
"THE HAULAPAT MEXICAN WOLF....."
COMMENTS: THIS SENTENCE SHOULD BE REMOVED ON THE BASIS OF THE LACK OF SCIENTIFIC PROOF THAT THIS COULD EVER HAPPEN.
- 5-3 WILDLIFE: BOTTOM LEFT SIDE TO TOP OF RIGHT SIDE PAGE 9:
"...TWO ENCLOSURES DESIGNED TO EXCLUDE LIVESTOCK FROM..."
COMMENTS: THIS SEEMS NOT TO BE DESIGNED AS A MULTIPLE USE MANAGEMENT PLAN WHEN IT ALSO EXCLUDES ELK, DEER AND OTHER WILDLIFE.
- 5-4 LIVESTOCK GRAZING: LEFT SIDE PAR. 1 PAGE 10:
"MABAYUMA PEAK (MIBBYEYA PEAK) HAS BEEN AMENDED..."
COMMENTS: THIS PARAGRAPH DOES NOT EVEN CONSIDER THE PRIVATE LANDS THAT ARE THERE AND HAVE BEEN FENCED OUT OF THIS ALLOTMENT. ONCE AGAIN THERE IS NO SCIENTIFIC DATA OR PROOF OF MEXICAN WOLF / LIVESTOCK CONFLICTS.
- 5-5 LIVESTOCK GRAZING: LEFT SIDE LAST PAR. PAGE 10:
"YEARLONG GRAZING OF ALLOTMENTS....."
COMMENTS: THIS IS ANOTHER CASE OF THE LACK OF SCIENTIFIC DATA AND PROOF ARE APPARENT THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE REMOVED.
- 5-6 WILD HORSES : RIGHT SIDE - 1st PAR. PAGE 10:
"A HERD OF ABOUT 25-35 horses....."
COMMENTS: WHEN THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO ACT OF 1971 WAS PASSED THERE WERE 14 HORSES ALLOTTED FOR THE ENTIRE HERD MANAGEMENT AREA. THE NEW NUMBERS ARE UNACCEPTABLE, THIS IS NOT GOOD MANAGEMENT ON THE PART OF THE B.L.M..
- THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: RIGHT SIDE TOP OF PAGE 11:
"A SPECIES OF LEBIAN PAINTHORSE....."
COMMENTS: SINCE UBYIAN PAINTHORSE IS FOUND ALL OVER THE ENTIRE RESOURCE AREA, THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT.

MABAYUMA PEAK AND MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS
MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

CONTINUED COMMENTS.....

INHOLDINGS: RIGHT SIDE BOTTOM OF PAGE 11:

- "THERE HAVE BEEN NO RIGHTS-OF-WAY ISSUED...."
5-7 COMMENTS: THIS IS A TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY AND IS VIOLATING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL 65 DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS.

OTHER ADMINISTRATION: RIGHT SIDE LAST PAR. ON PAGE 15:

- "A DOMESTIC WATER LINE BRINGS WATER FROM....."
5-8 COMMENTS: UNLESS THE BLM IS HOLDING THE PRIVATE LANDOWNERS AS A HOSTAGE, THE BENEFIT OF A RIGHT-OF-WAY SHOULD BE GRANTED.

SUMMARY:

THANKYOU FOR ALLOWING US TO REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE MABAYUMA PEAK MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT PLAN. AS A WHOLE WE COULD ONLY SUPPORT AT THIS TIME THE ALTERNATIVE A-NO ACTION PLAN. WE SEEM TO FEEL ITS THE RIGHT OF ALL CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES BE THEM A PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNER OR A PUBLIC PROPERTY USER TO BE ABLE TO MAINTAIN THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS. AND THE TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE PROPOSED ACTION, IS A LARGE VIOLATION OF THOSE CIVIL RIGHTS.

Ken McClayno

6

MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

P.O. Box 7000 809 EAST BEALE KINGMAN, ARIZONA 86402-7000
 Telephone (602) 753-0729 FAX (602) 753-0732 TDD (602) 753-0726

Dist. 1
 Sam Standerfer

Dist. 2
 Joan C. Ward

Dist. 3
 Pat Holt

County Manager
 David J. Grisez, P.E.



Clerk of the Board
 Patsy A. "Pat"
 Chastain



November 3, 1994

Mr. Ken Drew
 Kingman Resource Area Manager
 Bureau of Land Management
 2476 Beverly Avenue
 Kingman, AZ 86401

RE: Comments on the Draft Wabnyuma Peak/Mt. Tipton Wilderness Management Plan

Dear Mr. Drew:

The Mohave County Board of Supervisors and the Mohave County Public Land Use Committee appreciated the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Wabnyuma/Mt. Tipton Wilderness Management Plan. Mohave County is concerned about two issues raised in the Plan: 1) access to private inholdings and 2) maintenance of wild horses. Our detailed comments are as follows:

1. Access to private inholdings. Within the boundaries of the Wabnyuma and Mt. Tipton Wilderness Areas, there are several inholdings. As we understand BLM's policy, the Bureau will first try to acquire these inholdings via donation, trade or fee-simple purchase. Failing to acquire the inholdings, BLM can authorize access through the wilderness areas. However, this access must be applied for by the applicant. Upon receiving an application BLM will review it, submit it for public review and then accept, modify or reject the proposal. Should the access proposal be accepted it is subject to renewal every three years, and the applicant must pay rental fees.

Objective 1 in the Wilderness Management section states that the BLM is to attempt to acquire all private inholdings. Since the creation of the wilderness areas will limit the development potential of these inholdings, the County supports acquisition where preferred by the land owner. Compensation for the inholdings should be based on the land's fair market value.

- 6-1
- 6-2 Also, access to the inholdings should be resolved in the Plan and included as part of the Plan's implementation. Providing for access to inholdings should be the responsibility of the agency and not the landowner. Access should be provided for in perpetuity and landowners should not be charged for rent.

Mr. Ken Drew, BLM
 Wilderness Management Plan
 Page 2

2. Wild Horses. Maintenance of the Cerbat Wild Horse Herd raises several concerns with the County. The herd should not be allowed to adversely affect area wildlife. Reductions in the ungulates (deer) to accommodate the wild horses would inhibit the naturalness of the wilderness area and limit hunting opportunities.

6-3 According to this plan, it is not the intent of the Wilderness Act to curtail grazing where it existed at the time of designation. In keeping with this intent, wild horse populations should be managed such that they do not limit forage areas or water needed to maintain grazing.

6-4 Wild horses also impact inholdings by consuming forage, water and other materials. Wild horses should be removed from private lands. Data from area ranchers suggests that these wild horses are not descendants from the Spanish herd but are descended from animals which have been released within the last 50 years.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this plan. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Christine Ballard, Planning Director, at 767-0903.

Sincerely,

Joan C. Ward

Joan C. Ward, Chairman
 Mohave County Board of Supervisors

JCW:nd

7



THE STATE OF ARIZONA

GAME & FISH DEPARTMENT

2221 West Greenway Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85023-4399 (602) 942-3000

Governor
Fife Symington

Commissioners:
Chairman Elizabeth T. Waudin, Tucson
Arthur Porter, Phoenix
Nancy Johnson, Snowflake
Michael M. Gollighty, Flagstaff
Mark Gussler, Tona

Director
Duane L. Shouff

Deputy Director
Thomas W. Spalding

November 8, 1994

Mr. Ken Drew
Area Manager
Kingman Resource Area
Bureau of Land Management
2475 Beverly Avenue
Kingman, Arizona 86401

Re: Draft Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan (DWMP) and Environmental Assessment (DEA)

Dear Mr. Drew:

The Arizona Game and Fish Department (Department) has reviewed the above-referenced draft documents, and our comments are provided below for your reference. The Department appreciates your staff's approval of additional review time to compile this information.

GENERAL COMMENTS

As outlined in our specific comments, the Department believes that several areas of the DWMP and DEA are generally lacking in detail or factual justification for the conclusions drawn. We recommend that these documents be reviewed by the Kingman Resource Area staff specifically with the intention of providing additional detail or facts to supplement the information currently provided. Similarly, we recommend deleting statements which cannot be justified.

As stated in the Department's letter of February 7, 1994 (attached), we believe that adequate justification for addition wildlife water developments and a prescribed burn has been provided to the Bureau of Land Management (Bureau). The Department requests that the status of the four wildlife waters and the prescribed burn described in the subject letter be formally addressed prior to finalization of the subject DWMP and DEA.

The Department's Heritage Data Management System (HDMS) has been accessed and current records show that the special status species listed below have been documented as occurring in the vicinity of the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness. Only the American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*, LE,S,SC) and desert rosy boa have been documented in HDMS for the Mount Tipton Wilderness area.

7-1

Mr. Ken Drew
November 8, 1994
2

| COMMON NAME | SCIENTIFIC NAME | STATUS |
|--------------------------|---|---------|
| Arizona necklace | <i>Sophora arizonica</i> | S |
| desert rosy boa | <i>Lichanura trivirgata aracia</i> | C2 |
| Hualapai Mexican vole | <i>Microtus mexicanus hualapaiensis</i> | LE,S,SE |
| Mexican spotted owl | <i>Strix occidentalis lucida</i> | LT,S,ST |
| Northern goshawk | <i>Accipiter gentilis</i> | C2,S,SC |
| Sonoran desert tortoise | <i>Gopherus agassizii</i> | C2,S,SC |
| white-margined penstemon | <i>Penstemon albomarginatus</i> | C2,SR |
| zone-tailed hawk | <i>Buteo albonotatus</i> | S |

STATUS DEFINITIONS

- LE - Listed as **Endangered** by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA). Species which are in imminent jeopardy of extinction.
- LT - Listed as **Threatened** by USFWS under ESA. Species which are in imminent jeopardy of becoming Endangered.
- C2 - **Category 2 Candidate** as identified by USFWS under the ESA. Species being considered for listing as Threatened or Endangered, pending more information.
- S - Classified as **Sensitive** by the Regional Forester, when occurring on lands managed by the Forest Service.
- SE - **State Endangered** on the Department's **Threatened Native Wildlife in Arizona** (TNW) list. Species extirpated from Arizona since the mid-1800's, or for which extinction or extirpation is highly probable without recovery efforts.
- ST - **State Threatened** on the Department's TNW list. Species with identified, serious threats and populations which are below historical levels and/or extremely localized and small.
- SC - **State Candidate** on the Department's TNW list. Species with known or suspected threats, but for which substantial population declines from historical levels have not been documented.
- SR - **Salvage Restricted**, as defined by Arizona Native Plant Law (1993).

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Page 9, **Wildlife**. The Deadman water catchment was formally agreed upon in the Hualapai Habitat Management Plan (HMP) and the Department believes this development should be incorporated into the DWMP.

7-2

Mr. Ken Drew
November 8, 1994
3

Page 10. Table 2. The Department encourages the Bureau to proceed as quickly as feasible with the writing and implementation of Allotment Management Plans (AMP) for all allotments which contain Wilderness acreage. We believe that the development of these AMP's may be critical for the protection of springs and areas of riparian habitat.

7-3 Page 10. Wild Horses. It is unclear whether the statement that "The area will be managed for a genetically viable population" refers to the herd area or the area within the Wilderness. In order to minimize any further unnatural competition with wildlife, the Department recommends that all developments which are expected to favor use by horses be located outside the Wilderness boundaries.

7-4 The Department would like to be advised of the source of the reported predation by mountain lion. We are unaware of any documented mountain lion predation on horses within or near the Wilderness, and Kingman Resource Area personnel were previously unable to verify such occurrences.

7-5 Page 12. Recreation. Some indication of how the estimated use levels of 400 and 1500 visitor days/year were determined would be beneficial. Without monitoring, it is not clear how it can be stated that "Use levels have increased annually..."

7-6 It is stated in the third paragraph that no base camps are allowed in the wilderness. However, subsequent sections of the DWMP indicate that only commercial base camps are prohibited.

7-7 Page 12. Fire. It is not immediately clear how the determination was made that fire is believed to occur in chaparral approximately every forty years when records are stated as only being available for the past thirteen years.

7-8 Page 14. Law Enforcement. The Department recommends that enforcement of off-highway vehicle laws be added as an additional responsibility of our agency. The Department recommends clarifying whether ten violations are estimated to occur each year or ten citations are estimated to be issued each year. The final sentence appears to require modification. As worded, immediate emergency use of motorized equipment is stated to require approval from the District Manager. We recommend referring to Page 28, item 11, for wording to clarify this paragraph. In addition, some mention to the overall authority of the County Sheriff would be appropriate.

7-9 Page 25. (6). The Department recommends rewording the rationale statement to indicate that this action is intended to draw livestock and horses away from the canyon bottom and out of the Wilderness. Wildlife species are not believed to pose a threat to the vegetation in the canyon, and they are an enhancement to both the ecosystem and the recreational values of the Wilderness.

Mr. Ken Drew
November 8, 1994
4

7-10 Page 25. (8). The Department requests that the term "large grazing animals" be replaced with wording to indicate that the species under consideration are livestock and horses, and we recommend designing the fences to exclude only these animals. No significant adverse impact to water quality or riparian vegetation would be expected to result from allowing wildlife to access the spring.

7-11 The wildlife habitat improvements outlined in the Hualapai and Cerbat-Music HMP's (Mount Tipton, Nodman, Rock Creek, Deadman and Boriana Canyon) are apparently under discussion in the note in this section. Because these projects were scrutinized during development of the HMP's, were found to be appropriate, and are compatible with Wilderness management guidelines, the Department believes they should be among those considered for implementation and listed in Table 5.

The Department has previously discussed the issue of new wildlife developments in Wilderness at length with staff of the Bureau Phoenix District Office and State Office. These discussions resulted in specific wording being developed regarding the consideration of new wildlife water developments. As stated in the Draft Maricopa Complex Wilderness Management Plan (Lower Gila Resource Area):

"Evaluating the need for new wildlife water developments on a case by case basis. This evaluation will include:

- the current health of the herd in terms of population trend and the overall population viability,
- the availability and size of nearby habitat, the present use of these areas by the current population or the availability of movement corridors to these areas,
- the availability of adequate alternative catchment locations outside the wilderness either within the herd areas or in nearby habitat,
- the likelihood of future threats which would isolate the present herds,
- the effectiveness of existing and/or upgraded water developments in providing water...
- the effectiveness of measures and locations in mitigating wilderness impacts."

As discussed in our general comments, the Department believes that most, if not all, of the evaluation criteria stated above have been previously addressed. Should the Bureau decide that further evaluation is necessary, the Department respectfully requests that such analysis occur prior to finalization of the subject DWMP and DEA.

7-12 Page 28. (10). The requirement for a two week advance notification seems to imply that the Department's ability to conduct aerial surveys is contingent upon Bureau authorization. Because we do not believe the Bureau has any authority over airspace, we request that

Mr. Ken Drew
November 8, 1994
5

wording in the DWMP be modified to reflect that the Department has agreed to provide the Bureau with advance notification of survey flights.

7-13 Page 28. (13). Reference to a "thriving ecological balance" regarding feral horses is misleading, since the presence of these animals can be responsible for an ecological imbalance. The Department recommends that the DWMP employ more accurate language within Management Actions 13 and 14, perhaps indicating that the intent is to maintain herds at a prescribed level, or prevent unnecessary competition for forage or habitat degradation.

Page 28. (14). If the rationale for Management Action 15 is applicable to item 14, we recommend indicating as such.

Page 28. (15). Please refer to our comments regarding Page 10 and predation by mountain lions. The Department recommends that the criteria noted above for evaluating new wildlife water developments be applied to any improvements considered for management of the Cerbat horse herd.

Page 30. (4). The Department suggests reexamination of the relatively strict regulations proposed for use of packstock. Given the stated minimal visitor use, largely related to hunting, such regulations may not be necessary.

7-14 Page 30. (5). The definition of a spike camp is unclear. Most importantly, does a one night stay mean one night per location, with multiple nights allowed for a single excursion, or one night allowed in the Wilderness per excursion? In addition, item 5.d. includes the apparently conflicting terms "limited use" and "without limitation". The Department recommends defining spike and base camps and further clarifying this section.

7-15 Page 31. Objective 3. The Department recommends that the source for the Class criteria in Tables 6 and 7 be identified. More specifically, are these Bureau-wide guidelines, or were they developed by the State or District office?

Page 37. (3) and (4). Fire is an important component in the natural maintenance of most ecosystems in the American Southwest, including those mentioned in these two Management Actions. The Department recommends that the Bureau develop modified fire suppression plans for those areas in which they can safely be applied, and in all other areas as soon as land ownership patterns become compatible with such strategies.

The affects of fire on Hualapai Mexican vole habitat quality are unknown, and this species is known to occur in previously burned areas.

Mr. Ken Drew
November 8, 1994
6

7-16 Page 38. (7). The Department does not believe a single monitoring area will accurately depict forage conditions. Therefore, we suggest that multiple sampling areas be required in all allotments.

7-17 Page 38. (8). The Department requests that the subject animals to be relocated or removed be specified as not addressing any species of wildlife. Management of wildlife is within the purview of the Department and any need for transplants are addressed by existing policy.

Page 38. (9). In order to allow for the evaluation of the environmental consequences of the action, the wilderness in which the Turkey Track allotment is located and the allotment with which Turkey Track is to be combined should be named. In addition, the two animals preferred by the Bureau for the reinstated allotment should be stated.

7-18 Page 65. Purpose and Need. It is stated that the Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses "alternatives", yet only one is actually mentioned. If other alternatives were considered, the Department recommends that they be described in the EA.

7-19 Page 65. Conformance to Land Use Plans. It is the Department's understanding that the Kingman Resource Management Plan has yet to be finalized.

7-20 Page 66. Impacts to Soil, Water, and Air. Please refer to our comments above regarding Page 25, item 8.

Page 68. Impacts to Wildlife. Please refer to our comments regarding Page 30, item 4.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this DWMP and DEA. The Department would appreciate being involved in a review of any subsequent environmental documentation. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Bob Posey, Kingman Regional Habitat Program Manager at 692-7700.

Sincerely,

Ron Christofferson
Ron Christofferson
Project Evaluation Coordinator
Habitat Branch


RAC:GSS:RP:ss

cc: Steve Ferrell, Regional Supervisor, Region III, Kingman

Enclosure

AGFD# 9-16-94(01)

8



Ken Drew
Kingman Resource Area Manager
Bureau of Land Management
2475 Beverly Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401

Dear Ken:

This letter is in response to the Draft, Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan and Environmental Assessment. I appreciate the opportunity to review the plan and to comment, and I especially appreciated the opportunity to attend the open house held at the Kingman office on October 13, 1994.


Overall the plan is fine and it is obvious much thought and work have gone in to preparing it. I have concerns about spending time and money converting what was good enough to be a wilderness into a "Theme Park" groomed into something nicer than real life (page 23). Experience with National Forest Wilderness trailheads or motor vehicle parking areas out here in California where we have had them for several years shows vandalism and theft increase as opportunities increase by putting all the unattended vehicles in centralized locations with easy access.

I own property in Dolan Springs and am interested in helping you folks where I can. Please keep me on your mailing lists and call on me if I can be of help.

Sincerely,

Ron Fite
Ron Fite

Ron Fite
1205 East 25th Street
San Bernardino, CA 92404-4206
Phone-Fax (909) 886-4299
October 28, 1994



9



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
ARIZONA ECOLOGICAL SERVICES STATE OFFICE
2321 W. Royal Palm Road, Suite 103
Phoenix, Arizona 85021-4951



Telephone: (602) 640-2720 FAX: (602) 640-2730
November 17, 1994

In Reply Refer To:
AESO/SE
2-21-94-I-367

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kingman Resource Area Manager, Bureau of Land Management,
Kingman, Arizona

FROM: State Supervisor

SUBJECT: Draft Wabayuma Peak/Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan
and Environmental Assessment

The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the subject document. We generally concur with the wilderness management program objectives, management actions, and monitoring proposed for the Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wilderness Areas. Implementation of proposed management actions would generally promote maintenance and recovery of the area's biotic resources. However, the document needs to address species-specific issues, particularly for endangered, threatened, and candidate species. We offer the following comments on the document:

9-1

Page 11, "Threatened, Endangered, and Special Status Species": In addition to the "sensitive species" mentioned in the document, our records indicate the following Federally-listed species and candidates for Federal listing may also occur in the Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wilderness Areas:

Endangered
American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*)

Threatened
Mexican spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis lucida*)

Category 2 Candidates
Spotted bat (*Euderma maculatum*)
California leaf-nosed bat (*Macrotus californicus*)
Greater western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*)

Hualapai southern pocket gopher (*Thomomys umbrinus hualpaiensis*)
Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*)
Ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*) (winter only)
Rosy boa (*Lichanura trivirgata*)
Chuckwalla (*Sauromalus obesus*)
Lowland leopard frog (*Rana yavapaiensis*)
Arizona toad (*Bufo microscaphus*)
Cervat beard tongue (*Penstemon bicolor roseus*)

The document should acknowledge that these species may occur in the planning areas. The environmental assessment should address how these species might be affected by proposed management actions. Any adverse effects should be mitigated, if possible.

Page 11, "Inholdings": Both the Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wilderness Areas contain a large number of inholdings. We recommend an aggressive program to acquire these properties through purchase or exchange. Possible development of inholdings or granting of rights-of-ways across public lands to inholdings could threaten the integrity of these wilderness areas.

Page 37, Management Action 5: If range condition is currently fair or poor, utilization should be reduced to 30% or less to allow improvement.

Page 67, 2nd paragraph: Desert tortoises will be adversely affected wherever cattle and tortoises occur together. Cattle trample small tortoises and burrows; and construction of water developments, pipelines, fencelines, and other range improvements destroy habitat and increase access that facilitates illegal collection and accidental or intentional killing of tortoises. Furthermore, grazing can cause soil erosion and compaction, reduced water infiltration rates, reductions in cryptogamic crusts, and long-term and often subtle changes in perennial and annual plant communities, particularly in the vicinity of cattle waters. Cumulatively, the habitat changes caused by cattle grazing significantly adversely affect desert tortoise populations (see Appendix D of "Desert Tortoise (Mojave Population) Recovery Plan" Service, 1994).

9-2

Page 68, Mitigation Measures: The Service recommends surveys for candidate and listed species prior to initiating any surface disturbing activities, such as construction of vehicle access barriers, removal of water storage tanks, and construction of parking areas. Only listed species receive protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544), as amended (Act). However, candidate species should be considered in the planning process in the event they become listed or proposed for listing prior to project completion. Preparation of a biological assessment, as described in Section 7(c) of the Act, is not required for candidate species. If early evaluation of a project indicates that it is likely to adversely affect a candidate species, you may wish to request technical assistance from this office.

3

Implementation of any management actions that involve surface disturbance should include measures to reduce adverse effects to special status species and unique or rare biotic communities. The Service is concerned about possible adverse effects to nesting peregrine falcons, Hualapai Mexican vole, Mexican spotted owl, desert tortoise, and wetland or seep communities at natural or developed springs and tanks.

- 9-3 No surface disturbing activities should occur within 0.5 mile of the active peregrine falcon nest between May 15, and July 31. If any surface disturbing activities are scheduled for that period, the Bureau of Land Management (Bureau) should initiate formal consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, pursuant to section 7 of the Act.

Mexican spotted owls may occur in coniferous and/or oak woodlands of both the Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wilderness Areas. Any proposed activities in these woodland habitats should consider possible adverse effects to the Mexican spotted owl. Reclamation of roads, construction of access barriers, fire suppression, and other actions would generally act to improve habitat conditions for this species. However, specific actions could adversely affect Mexican spotted owls, particularly if ground-disturbing activities occur in foraging or nesting areas. In accordance with 50 CFR 402.14(a), the Bureau should evaluate proposed actions in potential Mexican spotted owl habitat to determine whether they may affect this species. If an action may affect the species, the Bureau must initiate section 7 consultation with the Service.


- 9-4
- 9-5 On page 9 of the document management actions in Hualapai Mexican vole habitat are proposed, including fencing, piping water to a trough, enhancing vegetation cover either naturally or artificially, and maintaining at least two-thirds of the original wet area. If the actions may affect the Hualapai Mexican vole, the Bureau is required to initiate formal consultation with the Service. The Service is particularly concerned that piping of water from the spring source may reduce the extent of Hualapai Mexican vole habitat. The text in the document suggests that up to a third of the wetted area may be lost.

- 9-6 The Service recommends that 100% surveys for desert tortoise, consistent with Service protocol (contained in the Service's "Procedures for Endangered Species Act Compliance for the Mojave Desert Tortoise" October 1992), be conducted in any category 2 or 3 habitat areas in the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness Area where surface disturbance is proposed. If desert tortoises are found, project areas should be adjusted, if possible, to avoid adverse effects to desert tortoises, their burrows, and other habitat components. If adverse effects cannot be avoided, the Service recommends that affected animals be relocated to adjacent, undisturbed habitat. Any handling or relocation of desert tortoises should be coordinated with and approved by Arizona and Game and Fish Department, including obtaining any necessary permits.

4

- 9-7 Unusual plant and animal communities often exist in and near tanks and springs. Proposed removal of water pipelines and water storage tanks, piping of water from four springs in the Wabayuma Wilderness Area (page 9 of the document), and modification of the Pine Canyon pipeline may adversely affect plants and animals associated with water sources. Of particular concern are amphibians and wetland plant species. Any proposed activities that alter flows or disturb wetland or riparian habitats should include measures to minimize adverse effects to water-dependent species. If lowland leopard frogs are found at any sites where disturbance is proposed, we recommend that the Bureau contact this office to discuss mitigation measures.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the subject document. In any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to consultation #2-21-94-I-367. If you have any questions, please contact Jim Rorabaugh or Tom Gatz of my staff.



Sam F. Spiller

Attachment

cc: Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM (AES)
State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix, AZ

MABAYUMA PEAK AND MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS
MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

TABLE 1- WILDERNESS AREA OVERVIEW:

COMMENTS: THERE ARE NO APPROVED ACCESS POINTS TO
HOLDINGS, THIS APPEARS TO BE A TAKING
OF PRIVATE LANDS.

WILDERNESS VALUES AND ATTRIBUTES, LEFT SIDE 3rd PAR. PAGE 7:

"THE HUALAPAI MEXICAN WOLF....."
COMMENTS: THIS SENTENCE SHOULD BE REMOVED ON THE
BASIS OF THE LACK OF SCIENTIFIC PROOF
THAT THIS COULD EVER HAPPEN.

WILDLIFE: BOTTOM LEFT SIDE TO TOP OF RIGHT SIDE PAGE 9:

"...THE ENCLOSURES DESIGNED TO EXCLUDE LIVESTOCK FROM..."
COMMENTS: THIS SEEMS NOT TO BE DESIGNED AS A
MULTIPLE USE MANAGEMENT PLAN WHEN IT
ALSO EXCLUDES ELK, DEER AND OTHER
WILDLIFE.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING: LEFT SIDE PAR. 1 PAGE 10:

"MABAYUMA PEAK (HIPPIENIA PEAK) HAS BEEN AMENDED..."
COMMENTS: THIS PARAGRAPH DOES NOT EVEN CONSIDER
THE PRIVATE LANDS THAT ARE THERE AND
HAVE BEEN FENCED OUT OF THIS ALLOTMENT.
ONCE AGAIN THERE IS NO SCIENTIFIC DATA
OR PROOF OF MEXICAN WOLF / LIVESTOCK
CONFLICTS.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING: LEFT SIDE LAST PAR. PAGE 10:

"YEARLONG GRAZING OF ALLOTMENTS....."
COMMENTS: THIS IS ANOTHER CASE OF THE LACK OF
SCIENTIFIC DATA AND PROOF ARE APPARENT
THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE REMOVED.

WILD HORSES : RIGHT SIDE - 1st PAR. PAGE 10:

"A HERD OF ABOUT 25-35 horses....."
COMMENTS: WHEN THE WILD HORSE AND FERRO ACT OF
1971 WAS PASSED THERE WERE 14 HORSES
ALLOTTED FOR THE ENTIRE HERD MANAGEMENT
AREA. THE HERD NUMBERS ARE UNACCEPTABLE,
THIS IS NOT GOOD MANAGEMENT ON THE PART
OF THE B.L.M.

THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES: RIGHT SIDE TOP
OF PAGE 11:

"A SPECIES OF INDIAN PAINTERUSH....."
COMMENTS: SINCE INDIAN PAINTERUSH IS FOUND ALL
OVER THE ENTIRE RESOURCE AREA, THIS
PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT.

MABAYUMA PEAK AND MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS
MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

CONTINUED COMMENTS.....

IN HOLDINGS: RIGHT SIDE BOTTOM OF PAGE 11:

"THERE HAVE BEEN NO RIGHTS-OF-WAY ISSUED...."
COMMENTS: THIS IS A TAKING OF PRIVATE
PROPERTY AND IS VIOLATING THE
CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL 65 DIFFERENT
LANDOWNERS.

OTHER ADMINISTRATION: RIGHT SIDE LAST PAR. ON PAGE 15:

"A DOMESTIC WATER LINE BRINGS WATER FROM....."
COMMENTS: UNLESS THE BLM IS HOLDING THE
PRIVATE LANDOWNERS AS A POSTAGE,
THE BENEFIT OF A RIGHT-OF-WAY
SHOULD BE GRANTED.

SUMMARY:

THANKYOU FOR ALLOWING US TO REVIEW AND COMMENT ON
THE MABAYUMA PEAK MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT PLAN.
AS A WHOLE WE COULD ONLY SUPPORT AT THIS TIME THE
ALTERNATIVE A-NO ACTION PLAN. WE SEEM TO FEEL ITS THE
RIGHT OF ALL CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES BE THEM A
PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNER OR A PUBLIC PROPERTY USER TO
BE ABLE TO MAINTAIN THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS. AND THE TAKING
OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE PROPOSED ACTION, IS A LARGE
VIOLATION OF THOSE CIVIL RIGHTS.

*Anta White
Cane Springs Ranch
P.O. Box 7
Wickenburg, AZ 85360*

Responses to Comments

- 1-1 Wild horse management is guided by the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act (1971), the Public Rangeland Improvement Act (1978), federal regulation, and BLM manual. The text has been modified to reflect the existing guidance for this program. A removal of animals from private lands is planned pursuant to section 4 of the Act.
- 1-2 Under the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act, unbranded and unclaimed horses are protected where they existed at the time of the Act's passage in 1971. There is no requirement under the Act that protected horses be descendants of Spanish mustangs.
- 1-3 Fair market value is determined using standard real estate appraisals in the exchange process (43 CFR 2201.3).
- 2-1 The BLM believes it has complied with NEPA and has considered these items in the existing situation analysis.
- 3-1 These routes are all planned for retention as either potential inholding access or for recreational purposes with the exception of MT2. Because it crosses a private inholding, it was dropped from consideration for retention as a recreational route. Reclamation is identified as a low priority. A change in inholding status could alter plans for reclamation during the annual evaluation process.
- 3-2 Antelope Canyon is high on the priority list for recreational development including acquisition of legal access, a parking area, and a visitor register. BLM manual 8560 offers guidance that restricts new trail construction in wilderness. The text has been modified to reflect this guidance in part III of the plan.
- 3-3 Pine Canyon and Arizona Springs were considered for recreational development but were excluded because of land ownership.
- 4-1 Cherrystem roads are part of the wilderness boundary and can only be designated by Congress.
- 4-2 Text has been modified to refer to these as closed vehicle routes.
- 4-3 Land outside the wilderness where facilities are planned is public land.
- 4-4 Management of the wilderness must conform to other applicable laws including the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act (1971). See response 1-1.
- 4-5 There are no plans to collar and monitor the horse herd at this time. If a need is identified, alternatives will be analyzed to determine which will least impact wilderness values.
- 5-1 Discussion on guidance for access to private inholdings has been added to part III of the plan.
- 5-2 Text has been modified.
- 5-3 The exclosures were completed to exclude only livestock.
- 5-4 There are no private lands that were excluded from grazing in the wilderness under this action.
- 5-5 Text has been modified.
- 5-6 Appropriate management levels for horses will be determined after designation of a suitable herd management area and development of a herd management plan.
- 5-7 See response 5-1.
- 5-8 Actions to resolve the issue are discussed under objective 1, management action 12. By law, new rights-of-way cannot be issued in wilderness (Federal Land Policy and Management Act, PL 94-579, section 501)
- 6-1 See response 1-3.
- 6-2 See response 5-1.
- 6-3 See response 5-6.
- 6-4 See response 1-2.
- 7-1 Text has been modified to show species list in appendix E.
- 7-2 The Department did not express concerns over the removal of this catchment from consideration in the Upper Sonoran Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement. However, the catchment could be reconsidered at a future time if design considerations and biological requirements are consistent with wilderness criteria.
- 7-3 Text has been modified to insert the word "herd".
- 7-4 Predation has been reported by BLM employees and area livestock permittees.
- 7-5 The use levels were estimated using visitor observations and professional judgement. Text has been modified.
- 7-6 Text has been modified to clarify definitions.
- 7-7 Text has been modified.

- 7-8 Text has been modified to add responsibilities of the County Sheriff and the additional responsibilities of the Game and Fish Department.
- 7-9 Text has been modified.
- 7-10 Text has been modified.
- 7-11 Because habitat management plans were developed prior to wilderness designation, proposed new developments were not evaluated under wilderness guidelines. The catchments can be evaluated individually and analyzed under a separate environmental analysis to determine if and how they will be built in wilderness.
- 7-12 Text has been modified.
- 7-13 Guidance for development of new projects for wild horse management is guided by BLM manual 8560.37. As stated in management action #8, objective 1, proposed new developments will be analyzed under a separate analysis at the time they are proposed. At present, none have been approved for Mount Tipton Wilderness.
- 7-14 Text has been modified to define terms.
- 7-15 The guidelines in tables 6 and 7 were developed specifically for the planning area, with direction from BLM Manual 8560.21.
- 7-16 Depending on the area, one monitoring location may be adequate or more may be needed.
- 7-17 Text has been modified.
- 7-18 Text has been modified.
- 7-19 Text has been modified.
- 7-20 Text has been modified.
- 9-1 See response 7-1.
- 9-2 The purpose of the plan is to provide guidance where none exists or to modify existing direction to make it consistent with wilderness guidelines. The draft plan was silent on the matter of surveys because it is existing policy, it conforms wilderness guidelines, and was not proposed to be changed. Because of the confusion on the plan's intent, the text has been modified to add this as a mitigation measure.
- 9-3 Text has been modified to add this recommendation as a mitigation measure in the environmental assessment.
- 9-4 See response 9-2.
- 9-5 Of the projects described, only the two previously constructed exclosures, are in Vole habitat. Text has been modified to clarify this point.
- 9-6 See response 9-2.
- 9-7 See response 9-2.
- 10 This letter is identical to letter #5. All of the responses to letter #5 apply to this letter.

Part IX — List of Participants

The following list includes BLM wilderness planning team members, reviewers, preparers, and contributors.

| Name | Position |
|-----------------------|--|
| Bruce Asbjorn | Outdoor Recreation Planner |
| Joyce Bailey | Realty Specialist |
| Josie Behl | Geographic Information System Specialist |
| Mike Blanton..... | Range Conservationist |
| Rick Colvin | Non Renewable Resource Supervisor |
| Ken Drew | Kingman Resource Area Manager |
| Scott Elefritz | Range Conservationist |
| Lin Fehlmann | Water Rights Specialist |
| Phil Gill | Supervisory Range Tech (Fire) |
| Eddie Guerrero..... | Assistant Kingman Resource Area Manager |
| Bob Hall | Wildlife Biologist/ T & E species |
| Ron Hooper | State Riparian Coordinator |
| Jeff Jarvis | National Wilderness Program Leader |
| Glen Joki | Fire Management Officer |
| Ken Mahoney | State Wilderness Coordinator |
| Steve Markman | Hydrologist |
| Clint Oke..... | Range Monitoring Specialist |
| Bill O'Sullivan | Team Leader |
| Rebecca Peck | Wildlife Biologist |
| Phil Rheiner | Ranger |
| Kirk Rowdabaugh | Fire Management Officer |
| Don Simonis..... | Archaeologist |
| Art Smith..... | Geologist |
| Mike Stamm..... | Wild Horse and Burro Specialist |

Part X — Appendices

Appendix A

Private inholdings Within Wilderness — Acquisition Priorities

| Priority | Township, Range & Section | Subsection | Acreage | Wilderness | Score |
|----------|---------------------------|--------------|---------|------------|-------|
| 1 | T25N R18W sec 4 | SWNW | 40 | MTW | 43 |
| 2 | T18N R16W sec 31 | W2NE | 80 | WPW | 40 |
| 3 | T25N R18W sec 33 | N2 | 320 | MTW | 40 |
| 4 | T18N R16W sec 5 | S2SW | 120 | WPW | 39 |
| | T18N R16W sec 8 | NWNW | | | |
| 5 | T25N R18W sec 17 | NW; NWNE | 200 | MTW | 38 |
| 6 | T25N R18W sec 20 | SESE | 40 | MTW | 38 |
| 7 | T25N R18W sec 17 | E2NE | 80 | MTW | 38 |
| 8 | T18N R16W sec 11 | NENE | 40 | WPW | 37 |
| 9 | T18N R16W sec 31 | NWNW | 40 | WPW | 36 |
| 10 | T18N R16W sec 21 | NWNW | 40 | WPW | 35 |
| 11 | T18N R16W sec 11 | NWNE | 40 | WPW | 35 |
| 12 | T18N R16W sec 15 | NESE | 40 | WPW | 35 |
| 13 | T25N R18W sec 33 | NWSE | 40 | MTW | 35 |
| 14 | T24N R18W sec 9 | W2NW; W2SENW | 100 | MTW | 34 |
| 15 | T18N R16W sec 21 | SESE | 40 | WPW | 34 |
| 16 | T18N R16W sec 17 | N2NW | 80 | WPW | 33 |
| 17 | T18N R16W sec 29 | SENE | 40 | WPW | 33 |
| 18 | T25N R18W sec 33 | NESE | 40 | MTW | 33 |
| 19 | T25N R18W sec 33 | S2NWSW | 20 | MTW | 32 |
| 20 | T24N R18W sec 9 | SESE | 40 | MTW | 32 |
| 21 | T25N R18W sec 31 | SESE | 40 | MTW | 32 |
| 22 | T18N R16W sec 23 | NENW | 40 | WPW | 32 |
| 23 | T18N R16W sec 11 | E2SESWNW | 5 | WPW | 31 |
| 24 | T18N R16W sec 11 | N2SWNW | 20 | WPW | 31 |
| 25 | T18N R16W sec 11 | NENW | 40 | WPW | 31 |
| 26 | T25N R18W sec 33 | S2N2NWSW | 10 | MTW | 31 |
| 27 | T25N R18W sec 33 | NESW | 40 | MTW | 31 |
| 28 | T24N R18W sec 9 | SWNWNE | 10 | MTW | 31 |
| 29 | T24N R18W sec 9 | N2N2NESW | 10 | MTW | 31 |
| 30 | T24N R18W sec 9 | NESENW | 10 | MTW | 31 |
| 31 | T24N R18W sec 9 | NENW | 40 | MTW | 31 |
| 32 | T25N R18W sec 33 | SESW | 40 | MTW | 30 |
| 33 | T25N R18W sec 33 | S2SWSE | 20 | MTW | 30 |
| 34 | T25N R18W sec 33 | SWSW | 40 | MTW | 30 |
| 35 | T25N R18W sec 33 | SESE | 40 | MTW | 30 |
| 36 | T25N R18W sec 33 | N2N2NWSW | 10 | MTW | 30 |
| 37 | T25N R18W sec 33 | N2S2W2SE | 20 | MTW | 30 |

| Priority | Township, Range & Section | Subsection | Acreage | Wilderness | Score |
|----------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------|------------|-------|
| 38 | T24N R18W sec 9 | SWSWSE | 10 | MTW | 30 |
| 39 | T24N R18W sec 9 | SENE | 40 | MTW | 30 |
| 40 | T24N R18W sec 9 | N2N2SESW | 10 | MTW | 30 |
| 41 | T24N R18W sec 9 | SWSW; S2SESW; S2N2SESW | 70 | MTW | 30 |
| 42 | T24N R18W sec 9 | NWNWNE | 10 | MTW | 30 |
| 43 | T24N R18W sec 9 | E2SESENW | 5 | MTW | 30 |
| 44 | T24N R18W sec 9 | N2NWSWSE | 5 | MTW | 30 |
| 45 | T24N R18W sec 9 | NENWNE | 10 | MTW | 30 |
| 46 | T18N R16W sec 11 | S2SENW | 20 | WPW | 30 |
| 47 | T18N R16W sec 11 | NWNW | 40 | WPW | 30 |
| 48 | T18N R16W sec 15 | E2SESWNW | 5 | WPW | 29 |
| 49 | T18N R16W sec 15 | W2SESWNW | 5 | WPW | 29 |
| 50 | T18N R16W sec 15 | E2NWNW | 20 | WPW | 29 |
| 51 | T18N R16W sec 15 | NWSWNW | 10 | WPW | 29 |
| 52 | T18N R16W sec 15 | NWSENW | 10 | WPW | 29 |
| 53 | T18N R16W sec 15 | W2NWNW | 20 | WPW | 29 |
| 54 | T18N R16W sec 15 | NENW | 40 | WPW | 29 |
| 55 | T18N R16W sec 17 | SESESE | 10 | WPW | 29 |
| 56 | T18N R16W sec 17 | NESESE | 10 | WPW | 29 |
| 57 | T18N R16W sec 11 | SESE | 40 | WPW | 29 |
| 58 | T24N R18W sec 9 | SEWNNE | 10 | MTW | 29 |
| 59 | T24N R18W sec 9 | W2SESENW | 5 | MTW | 29 |
| 60 | T24N R18W sec 9 | NENE | 40 | MTW | 29 |
| 61 | T24N R18W sec 9 | NWSW | 40 | MTW | 29 |
| 62 | T24N R18W sec 9 | N2SE | 80 | MTW | 29 |
| 63 | T24N R18W sec 9 | S2NWSWSE | 5 | MTW | 29 |
| 64 | T24N R18W sec 9 | S2NESW;S2N2NESW | 30 | MTW | 29 |
| 65 | T24N R18W sec 9 | E2SWSE | 20 | MTW | 28 |
| 66 | T24N R18W sec 9 | SWNE | 40 | MTW | 28 |
| 67 | T18N R16W sec 15 | W2NESW | 20 | WPW | 28 |
| 68 | T18N R16W sec 15 | E2SWSWNW | 5 | WPW | 28 |
| 69 | T18N R16W sec 11 | S2NWSW | 20 | WPW | 28 |
| 70 | T18N R16W sec 15 | W2SWSWNW | 5 | WPW | 28 |
| 71 | T18N R16W sec 15 | NESWNW | 10 | WPW | 28 |
| 72 | T18N R16W sec 17 | W2SESE | 20 | WPW | 28 |
| 73 | T18N R16W sec 17 | W2SW | 80 | WPW | 28 |
| 74 | T18N R16W sec 17 | NESW | 40 | WPW | 28 |
| 75 | T18N R16W sec 17 | SESW; SWSE | 80 | WPW | 28 |
| 76 | T18N R16W sec 27 | S2SW | 80 | WPW | 28 |
| 77 | T18N R16W sec 17 | NWSE | 40 | WPW | 27 |
| 78 | T18N R16W sec 17 | W2NESE | 20 | WPW | 27 |
| 79 | T18N R16W sec 15 | W2NWSW | 20 | WPW | 27 |

Appendix B

Range Developments Within Wilderness

Range Developments in Wabayuma Peak Wilderness

| Name & Type of Develop. | Project # | Allotment | Location | Cond. |
|---------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| Haystack Pasture fence | 1655 | Walnut Creek | Sections 14,23,24 T19N R17W | fair |
| Whiskey Spring fence | 1206 | Walnut Creek | Sections 8,16,18 T19N R16W | fair |
| Smith-Statler fence | 0064 | Walnut Creek- Hibernia Peak | Section 1 T18N R16W | good |
| Duncan-Herridge fence | 0787 | Walnut Creek- Hibernia Peak | Sections 9,16,18 T18N R16W | good |
| Statler fence | 1142 | Walnut Creek | Sec.1 T18N R17W | poor |
| Rock Creek drift fence | 0465 | Walnut Creek | Sections 3,10 T18N R16W | good |
| Foster-Smith fence | 1096 | Walnut Creek- Boriana A | Section 12 T18N R16W | fair |
| Wabayuma Div. fence | 1866 | Walnut Creek- Boriana A | Section 12 T18N R16W | fair |
| Pasture fence | 0957 | Boriana A | Sec. 36 T18N R17W | fair |
| Higgins-Lyons Boundary fence | 0879 | Boriana A | Sec. 6 T17N R16W | poor |
| Pasture fence | 0954 | Boriana A | Sec.4 T17N R16W | fair |
| Good Luck Spring & Pipeline | 2301 | Walnut Creek | Sec.13,18,19 T19N R16W | poor |
| Whiskey Spring & Pipeline | 2284 | Walnut Creek | Sections 19,20 T19N R16W | fair |
| Unnamed Spring Develop. | none | Walnut Creek | Section 20 T19N R16W | good |
| Unnamed Spring Develop. | none | Walnut Creek | Section 29 T19N R16W | good |
| Wabayuma Spring Develop. | 1659 | Walnut Creek | Section 34 T19N R16W | good |

| Name & Type of Develop. | Project # | Allotment | Location | Cond. |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Big Hackberry Spring Develop. | none | Walnut Creek | Sec 18 T18N R16W | poor |
| Rock Creek Spring Develop. | 1150 | Walnut Creek | Section 7 T18N R16W | poor |
| Unnamed Spring Develop. | none | Walnut Creek | Section 33 T19N R16W | poor |
| Santa Fe Spring | none | Walnut Creek | Sec.31 T19N R16W | un- devel. |
| Deadman Pipeline | 0962 | Boriana A | Section 29,30,31 T18N R16W | poor |
| Deadman Spring Develop. | 4708 | Boriana A | Sec.29 T18N R16W | poor |
| Willow Spring Develop. | 0970 | Boriana A | Section 15,21 T18N R16W | fair |
| Upper Willow Creek Drinker | 4714 | Boriana A | Sec.21 T18N R16W | poor |
| Grapevine Spring | 4412 | Boriana A | Sec.12 T18N R17W | excel. |
| Cottonwood Spring | 4413 | Boriana A | Sec.14 T18N R16W | poor |
| Mud Spring | 4414 | Boriana A | Sec.14 T18N R16W | poor |
| Boundary Corral | 4707 | Boriana A | Sec.24 T18N R17W | fair |
| Willow Creek Corral | 4706 | Boriana A | Sec.21 T18N R16W | fair |

Range Developments in Mount Tipton Wilderness

| Name & Type of Develop. | Project # | Allotment | Location | Cond. |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------|
| J-L boundary Fence | 2317 | Mt. Tipton | Sec. 18 T25N R18W | good |
| Jolo Fence | 2212 | Mt. Tipton | Sec. 5 T25N R18W | fair |
| Boundary Fence | none | Mt. Tipton- Quail Springs | Secs. 28, 29, 31, 32 T25N R18W | good |
| Boundary Fence | 1719 | Mt. Tipton- Dolan Springs | Sec. 30 T25N R18W | good |
| Boundary Fence | 4325 | Quail Springs- Dolan Springs | Sec. 31 T25N R18W | good |
| Unnamed Fences | none | Mt. Tipton | Sec. 6, 18 T25N R18W | good |
| Unnamed Fence | none | Quail Springs | Sec. 1 T24N R19W | good |
| Bonelli-Epperson Fence | 0197 | Quail Springs | Sec. 17 T24N R18W | poor |
| Stegall-Lawrence-Bonelli Fence | 4577 | Quail Springs- Cedar Canyon | Sec. 2, 3, 14 T24N R18W | fair |
| Pasture Fence | none | Cane Springs | Sec. 18 T25N R17W; Sec. 13 T25N R18W | poor |
| Boundary Fence | none | Cane Springs- Cedar Canyon | Sec. 31 T25N R17W; Sec. 35, 36 T25N R18W | good |
| Pasture Fence | 2086 | Cane Springs | Sec. 2, 3 T25N R18W | |
| Pasture Fence | 0923 | Cane Springs | Sec. 1 T25N R18W | good |
| Blue Well & Pipeline | 2316 | Mount Tipton | Sec. 8, 9, 16, 17 T25N R18W | good |
| Pine Canyon Spring Pipeline and Tank | none | Mt. Tipton | Sec. 5, 6 T25N R18W | good |
| Isabelle (a.k.a. Arizona) Spring | none-priv. inholding | Mt. Tipton | Sec. 20 T25N R18W | poor |
| Horse Spring | none-priv. inholding | Quail Springs | Sec. 33 T25N R18W | poor |
| Marble Canyon Spring | none | Quail Springs | Sec. 34 T25N R18W | poor |
| Upper Big Wash Spring | none | Quail Springs | Sec. 15 T24N R18W | aban |

| Name & Type of Develop. | Project # | Allotment | Location | Cond. |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| North Big Wash Reservoir | 4239 | Quail Springs | Sec. 15 T24N R18W | fair |
| Joe Spring | none | Cane Springs | Sec. 10 T25N R18W | fair |
| Sack O' Whiskey Spring | none | Cane Springs | Sec. 11 T25N R18W | fair |

Appendix C

Cover Class Evaluation Criteria

A. Vegetative Cover (Canopy)

At Campsite

- 1 - 0-5%
- 2 - 6-15%
- 3 - 16-25%
- 4 - 26-35%
- 5 - 36-50%
- 6 - >50%

On Unused Adjacent Area

- 1 - 0-5%
- 2 - 6-15%
- 3 - 16-25%
- 4 - 26-35%
- 5 - 36-50%
- 6 - >50%

B. Mineral Soil Exposure

At Campsite

- 1 - 0-20%
- 2 - 20-40%
- 3 - 40-60%
- 4 - 60-80%
- 5 - 80-100%

On Unused Adjacent Area

- 1 - 0-20%
- 2 - 20-40%
- 3 - 40-60%
- 4 - 60-80%
- 5 - 80-100%

Appendix D

Steps to Full Fire Suppression: Mount Tipton & Wabayuma Peak

1. Inform Area Manager or Acting Area Manager of fire in wilderness
2. Designate an initial attack Incident Commander.
3. Using ground or aerial reconnaissance, determine the following:
 - fire location, size, rate of spread, and behavior.
 - current and probable fuels, weather, topography including locations of natural barriers.
 - threats to life, property, or sensitive wilderness resources.Authority is given to the Incident Commander to fly at levels below 2000' in reconnaissance efforts when it is determined to be the minimum tool to assess the fire.
4. Inform District Manager of the fire.
5. Designate and dispatch a Resource Advisor to the fire.
6. Area Manager will consult with Incident Commander and/or Resource Advisor to determine appropriate level of initial attack and fire suppression strategy considering such variables as weather conditions, time of year, current and predicted fire behavior, and other pertinent factors.
7. Take action to suppress the fire utilizing the most effective tactics while considering the concept of minimum tool.
8. Use of temporary structures, chainsaws, portable pumps, initial attack aircraft (below 2000'), retardant aircraft, helicopters, aerial ignition systems, camps in wilderness, motorized vehicles, motorized earth moving equipment, and construction of new helispots may be undertaken with Area Manager approval when they are the minimum tool necessary to meet wilderness fire objectives.
9. Emergency authority is given to the Incident Commander in consultation with the Resource Advisor if available to use power tools and aircraft to build (helicopter or air tanker, fugitive slurry preferred) and hold firelines, and to authorize helicopter landing during initial attack under the following conditions:
 - if imminent danger to structures or people exists.
 - if significant wilderness resources are seriously threatened.
 - if Area Manager or Acting Area Manager cannot be reached within 15 minutes following initial fire reconnaissance.
10. Complete escaped fire situation analysis if fire escapes initial attack as determined by Incident commander. Analysis will be completed by District Fire Management Officer, Area Manager, Incident Commander, and Resource Advisor.
11. Memorandum will be completed by Area Manager describing use of motorized vehicles/mechanized equipment following the fire, with a copy submitted to the State Director.
12. Resource Advisor will consult with Incident Commander to complete wilderness post-fire report.
13. All human impacts created during suppression efforts will be reclaimed following the fire.

Appendix E

Special Status Species In and Around Wilderness

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Category |
|---------------------------------|---|------------|
| Hualapai Mexican Vole | <i>Microtus mexicanus hualapaiensis</i> | Endangered |
| American Peregrine Falcon | <i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i> | Endangered |
| Mexican Spotted Owl | <i>Strix occidentalis lucida</i> | Threatened |
| Spotted Bat | <i>Euderma maculatum</i> | Category 2 |
| California Leaf-nosed Bat | <i>Macrotus californicus</i> | Category 2 |
| Greater Western Mastiff Bat | <i>Eumops perotis californicus</i> | Category 2 |
| Hualapai Southern Pocket Gopher | <i>Thomomysumbrinus hualapaiensis</i> | Category 2 |
| Northern Goshawk | <i>Accipiter gentilis</i> | Category 2 |
| Sonoran Desert Tortoise | <i>Gopherus agassizii</i> | Category 2 |
| Loggerhead Shrike | <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i> | Category 2 |
| Ferruginous Hawk | <i>Buteo regalis</i> | Category 2 |
| Desert Rosy Boa | <i>Lichanura trivirgata gracia</i> | Category 2 |
| Chuckwalla | <i>Sauromalus obesus</i> | Category 2 |
| Lowland Leopard Frog | <i>Rana yavapaiensis</i> | Category 2 |
| Arizona Toad | <i>Bufo microsaphus</i> | Category 2 |
| Cerbat beardtongue | <i>Penstemon bicolor roseus</i> | Category 2 |
| White-margined Penstemon | <i>Penstemon albomarginatus</i> | Category 2 |

Appendix F

Bibliography

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR. Bureau of Land Management.

- 1995 Kingman Resource Management Plan. Kingman Resource Area Office, Kingman AZ.
- 1994 Wildlife Operations and Maintenance Policy for Mount Tipton and Wabayuma Peak. Kingman Resource Area Office, Kingman, AZ.
- 1994 Mount Tipton Range Improvement Maintenance Plan. Kingman Resource Area Office, Kingman, AZ.
- 1994 Phoenix District Animal Damage Control Plan. Phoenix District Office, Phoenix, AZ.
- 1993 Wabayuma Peak Range Improvement Maintenance Plan. Kingman Resource Area Office, Kingman, AZ.
- 1992 Phoenix District Search And Rescue Plan. Phoenix District Office, Phoenix, AZ.
- 1991 Phoenix District Interim Guidance for Fire Suppression in Wilderness. Phoenix District Office, Phoenix, AZ.
- 1989 Arizona Mohave Final Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement. Phoenix District Office, Phoenix, AZ.
- 1987 Upper Sonoran Final Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement. Phoenix District Office, Phoenix, AZ.
- 1987 Hualapai Habitat Management Plan. Kingman Resource Area Office, Kingman, AZ.
- 1983 Cerbat-Music Habitat Management Plan. Kingman Resource Area Office, Kingman, AZ.

U.S DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR. Bureau of Mines.

- 1988 Mineral Resources of the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness Study Area, Mohave County AZ. Intermountain Field Operations Center, Denver CO.
- 1988 Mineral Investigation of the Mount Tipton Wilderness Study Area and Proposed Additions, Mohave County, AZ. Intermountain Field Operations Center, Denver, CO.

Part XI — Environmental Assessment

I. Introduction

A. Purpose and Need

The Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 created the Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wildernesses. This environmental assessment provides an analysis of impacts of both the proposed plan and the alternatives. Specific projects will be analyzed to the degree possible for the level of detail known. If needed, more detailed assessments will be completed when more site specific project information is developed.

The purpose of the management plan is to provide management direction for the two wilderness areas to protect and preserve their wilderness values. The plan fulfills a BLM policy requirement that all wilderness management be guided by a wilderness management plan (BLM Manual 8561.06A). The plan actions are analyzed in this EA to assure compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

B. Conformance to Land Use Plans

The proposed action and the alternatives are in conformance with the Kingman Resource Management Plan, (1995).

C. Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, and Other Plans

The management plan conforms to BLM planning manuals and regulations found in Manual 8560 and Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 8560. The plan conforms to the Phoenix District's Search and Rescue Plan (1992) and the Animal Damage Control Plan (1994).

The plan will amend the Cerbat-Music Habitat Management Plan (1983), the Hualapai Habitat Management Plan (1987), and all previously completed Allotment Management Plans that overlap the wilderness areas including the Cane Springs, Dolan Springs, and Quail Springs plans. In addition, the Mount Tipton Range Improvement Maintenance Plan (1994) and the Wabayuma Peak Range Improvement

Maintenance Plan (1993) are superseded as is the Wabayuma Peak-Mount Tipton Wildlife Operations and Maintenance Plan (1994).

II. Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Two management alternatives including the proposed action are being considered and are presented here. The final decision made to implement this wilderness plan can be composed of either of the individual alternatives in its entirety or can consist of portions of the two alternatives based on public comment.

A. Proposed Action

The proposed action is to implement the draft Wabayuma Peak-Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan as described in the preceding sections. It consists of the 32 management actions that are listed in part V of the plan. The actions were developed through the efforts of the BLM interdisciplinary team with public input. It reflects a policy of maintaining or enhancing existing resource and social conditions. It will protect outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation, while providing for the needs of visitors.

Identified reclamation including rehabilitation of closed motor vehicle roads, cleanups, removals, and project alterations will be by non-motorized, non-mechanized means. It is projected that most of this will be completed with volunteers and BLM personnel utilizing hand tools. Construction of parking areas and motor vehicle access barriers, and installation of visitor registers could employ various types of motorized equipment outside of but adjacent to the wilderness. Section 106 consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office will be completed before ground disturbing activities occur.

B. Alternative A - No Action

Under this alternative, BLM would initiate no actions. Management would continue as outlined

in the existing management situation that is described in part I of this plan. New actions would occur on a reactive basis in response to issues as they arise. Projects designed to enhance wilderness conditions would not be completed. This alternative would represent the minimum interference by man in all aspects of wilderness management.

III. Affected Environment

Kingman, with a current population of about 15,000 is located in northwestern Arizona at the intersection of Interstate 40 and U.S. Highway 93. It lies midway between the Mount Tipton and Wabayuma Peak Wildernesses at an elevation of about 3,400'. It is a regional trade, service, and distribution center for northwestern Arizona. Its location relative to Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Phoenix, Laughlin, and the Grand Canyon have made tourism, manufacturing, and distribution leading industries.

Dolan Springs is located immediately adjacent to the west boundary of the Mount Tipton Wilderness. Its population was estimated at 1300 in 1994. Residents are employed in the Kingman or Laughlin areas, are retired, or work in the service or wholesale/retail trades locally in Dolan Springs. Over the life of the plan, population is projected to increase at 3-4% annually.

For further information on the affected environment, refer to part I of the draft Wabayuma Peak/Mount Tipton wilderness management plan. Additional information can be found in the Arizona Mohave and Upper Sonoran Final Wilderness Environmental Impact Statements.

IV. Environmental Impact

A. Unaffected Resources

The following resources have been reviewed and determined to be unaffected by the proposed action and alternatives:

- prime and unique farmlands
- floodplains
- Native American religious concerns
- cultural resources

- hazardous or solid wastes
- wild and scenic rivers
- areas of critical environmental concern.

B. Affected Resources

1. Proposed Action

Impacts to Vegetation

The proposed action would have a moderately positive effect on vegetation. Fencing of key spring sites would protect riparian areas and encourage revegetation. Developments designed to protect and enhance Hualapai Mexican Vole habitat would positively effect vegetation. Reclamation of selected jeep trails and other sites impacted by human activity would increase vegetative cover. By not allowing feeding of hay to recreational livestock, the potential for introducing non-native weedy species would be reduced. Some small areas of vegetation would be adversely impacted near designated parking areas, along travel corridors, and in camp areas. Management of vegetative utilization would improve overall vegetative conditions. Fire management would protect limited stands of ponderosa pine, but would allow natural fires to play a role in shaping vegetative communities over the long term. Inholding acquisition would preserve vegetation by eliminating the need to clear areas for development and road construction.

Impacts to Soil, Water, and Air

Under the proposed action, water would be inventoried to quantify supplies and ensure its availability for wilderness purposes. Water quality around spring sources that are fenced would be improved by reducing the impacts of livestock and wild horses. A slight decrease in sediment loads, organic matter, and coliforms would be expected. Soils would be slightly impacted due to recreational use. Slight compaction and erosion along trails and travel routes would occur. Motor vehicle access barriers would improve soil conditions along abandoned vehicle routes as revegetation occurs and the routes return to a more natural condition. These access barriers would also work to slightly improve air conditions by reducing airborne particulates caused by motor vehicle passage. Acquisition of inholdings would prevent potential soil erosion and airborne particulates that would be associated with development of the inholdings.

Impacts to Wildlife

Wildlife would benefit as a result of the proposed action which allows for new developments to enhance habitats for the protection of species, including the Hualapai Mexican Vole and riparian dependant species. Protection of the limited ponderosa pine habitat type from fire would aid species that require it. Removal of abandoned developments such as fences could positively affect habitat for some species by reducing barriers to movement. Planned reclamation would improve vegetative cover and wildlife habitat. Acquisition of inholdings would prevent habitat loss.

Impacts to Threatened and Endangered Species

These species will benefit from the proposed action. The Hualapai Mexican Vole's habitat is being inventoried and needed actions would be taken to bring about recovery of the species. Population inventories will be conducted on both plants and animals that are listed or candidate species. If recovery actions are warranted, they would be taken.

Impacts to Recreation and Social Conditions

Expectations of visitors will vary depending on the user. Actions that would benefit users seeking one type of experience may adversely affect users seeking another type. For this reason, recreational and social impacts will not be judged as positive or negative.

Retaining abandoned vehicle routes as recreational travel corridors would increase hiking and equestrian opportunities and concentrate use. Zoning would provide areas of different visitor experience. Removal of abandoned materials and non-functional developments would improve the area's natural appearance. Minimal restrictions on general recreation would emphasize spontaneity. Restrictions on commercial use would reduce interparty conflicts, while still providing for this recreation alternative. Designated trails will be maintained to ensure public safety and resource protection. Established parking areas will direct the public where a motor vehicle can be parked in a safe manner and prevent private land trespass. Visitor registers would monitor human use levels which can aid in determining future management actions. Motor vehicle access barriers would impact social conditions by eliminating the presence of motorized equipment and enhancing prim-

itive conditions. Acquiring public access easements would allow the wilderness to be legally accessed at multiple locations, dispersing visitor use. Acquisition of private inholdings would prevent the construction of access roads through the wilderness, the construction of structures visible within the interior of the wilderness, and would increase the area usable for recreation. Inholding acquisition would also increase the County's payment in lieu of taxes. Exchange of inholdings for more developable lands would increase the County tax base. The wilderness values of naturalness and opportunity for solitude and primitive recreation could be temporarily impaired or diminished by the sights or sound of motorized equipment within wilderness. This impact would likely be of short duration, and would cease upon departure of the equipment. The amount of impact to visitors would vary with the duration and purpose of the intrusion, the size of the wilderness area, the time of year and the sensitivity of the user.

Impacts to Livestock Grazing

Livestock grazing would continue at levels present prior to wilderness designation. The types, amounts, materials, and construction techniques used to construct developments to implement better grazing management would be the minimum necessary and will be evaluated as proposals are made. Because developments would not be built without a net improvement to naturalness, the effect of grazing management should be positive. Inholding acquisition would increase the area available for grazing. The wilderness values of naturalness and opportunity for solitude and primitive recreation could be temporarily impaired or diminished by the sights or sound of motorized equipment within wilderness. This impact would likely be of the short duration, and would cease upon departure of the equipment. The amount of impact to visitors would vary with the duration and purpose of the intrusion, the size of the wilderness area, the time of year and the sensitivity of the user.

Impacts to Administration

Minimum tool requirements would be applied to all administrative activities. Boundary signs would be placed where necessary at minimum intervals of one-half mile. Impacts due to the signs would be insignificant. Production of visitor use information would improve visitor safety and administrative efforts by educating the public on wilderness ethics, safety, and use.

2. Alternative A - No Action

Impacts to Vegetation

Unrestricted and unmitigated recreation could cause moderate to heavy impacts depending on level of use. Allowing the use of hay could increase non-native weedy species. By not requiring visitors to provide feed for their animals, overgrazing may occur in popular camp areas. Less boundary management would encourage unauthorized use with motor vehicles, prolonging use of administratively closed jeep trails. The positive reclamation affects as described in the proposed action would not occur. Range and wildlife projects could have a positive impact on vegetation. Suppressing all wildfires would have some short term benefits to vegetation but will continue to keep vegetative communities from reaching their potential natural condition. Impacts regarding inholding acquisition are the same as in the proposed action.

Impacts to Soil, Water, and Air

Water supplies would be quantified as described under the proposed action. Water quality would be negatively impacted relative to the proposed action due to unmanaged recreation and unplanned assessment of the Mackenzie Creek drainage. Soil conditions would continue to deteriorate along administratively closed but unbarri-caded jeep trails. Unreclaimed camping impacts would lead to increased compaction and erosion in and around primary camp areas. By allowing the use of hay in overnight camp areas, soils would be locally supplemented with organic matter. Impacts regarding inholding acquisition are the same as the proposed action.

Impacts to Wildlife

Wildlife would be slightly impacted due to increased presence of unauthorized motor vehicles. Unmanaged visitor use could cause habitat destruction without reclamation. Unlimited recreational livestock use could create spot shortages of forage for wildlife under unfavorable conditions. Harassment by unleashed pets could occur. Inholding acquisition impacts would be the same as those identified in the proposed action.

Impacts to Threatened and Endangered Species

Impacts would be the same as under the proposed action.

Impacts to Recreation and Social Conditions

Because no monitoring system would be developed, recreational impacts would be allowed to accumulate without management interference. This could include disproportionate use patterns and creation of recreational and social problems without detection. Opportunities for solitude would be reduced. Visitors would have a more unrestricted experience and natural processes would be allowed to dominate to the maximum extent possible. Inholding acquisition impacts would be the same as the proposed action.

Impacts to Livestock Grazing

Impacts will be the same as identified in the proposed action.

Impacts to Administration

Impacts would be similar to the proposed action. Information would be produced to guide visitors in their use of wilderness. More investigations of unauthorized motor vehicle use may be necessary.

C. Cumulative Impacts

1. Proposed Action

There are no significant cumulative impacts for this alternative.

2. Alternative A

There are no significant cumulative impacts for this alternative.

D. Mitigation Measures

1. Proposed action

- Post notices in the Kingman Resource Area Office to notify the public prior to planned motorized or mechanized use within the wilderness.
- Schedule motorized/mechanized use during weekdays, periods of extreme weather, or at other times when visitor use is expected to be low.
- Construct riparian exclosures with natural materials and make them as visually unobtrusive as possible.
- Utilize rocks and other natural materials to the maximum extent possible when constructing access barriers.
- Use hand tools or horse drawn plow only to complete road reclamation.

- Conduct analysis of Mackenzie Creek water during periods of low visitor use.
 - When removing abandoned sections of the Big Wash pipeline, do not disturb ground surface by excavating buried sections imperceptible from the surface.
 - If access to private inholdings is granted, it will be commensurate with the type of development being made.
 - Surveys for candidate and listed species will occur prior to any surface disturbing activities. Assessments and consultations mandated by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 will be completed.
 - No surface disturbing activities will be authorized within one-half mile of the active peregrine falcon nest from May 15-July 31.
 - A 100% survey for desert tortoise will occur in category 2 or 3 habitat areas in the Wabayuma Peak Wilderness where surface disturbance is proposed.
 - Proposed actions in potential Mexican spotted owl habitat will be evaluated to determine their effects on the species.
- 2. Alternative A**
- Post notices in the Kingman Resource Area office to notify the public prior to planned motorized or mechanized use within the wilderness.
 - Schedule motorized/mechanized use during periods of low visitor use such as on

weekdays or during periods of extreme weather.

- Construct riparian enclosures utilizing natural materials to make them as visually unobtrusive as possible.
- If access to private inholdings is granted, it will be commensurate with the type of development being made.

E. Residual Impacts

1. Proposed Action

- Nine miles of abandoned vehicle routes will remain in the wilderness.
- Access may be required to private inholdings.

2. Alternative A

- A total of 36.4 miles of abandoned vehicle routes will remain in the wilderness along with abandoned fence material, water pipeline, and storage tanks.
- Access may be required to private inholdings.

V. Consultation & Coordination

Refer to parts VIII and IX of the Wabayuma Peak/Mount Tipton wilderness management plan.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/DECISION RECORD

WABAYUMA PEAK MOUNT TIPTON WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT PLAN

Environmental Assessment No. AZ-025-94-044

Decision: It is my decision to approve the Wabayuma Peak/Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan. The plan establishes management direction for the two areas for a 10-year period.

Finding of No Significant Impact: Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the environmental assessment, I have determined that impacts are not expected to be significant, therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Rationale for Decision: The plan provides for improvement and maintenance of wilderness values. It provides for present and projected recreational use consistent with wilderness values. Monitoring and evaluations provide for modifications to the plan if required by a change in conditions.

During a 45-day public review period, ten comments were received for the draft Wabayuma Peak/Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan. Minor modifications were made to the plan and environmental assessment as a result of the comments.

Other Alternatives Considered: The proposed action and the no action alternative were considered.

Mitigation/Stipulations: All mitigation measures identified in the environmental assessment are incorporated.

Recommended by: *Ken Drew*
Area Manager, Kingman Resource Area

5/10/95
Date

Recommended by: *L. S. Obermair*
District Manager, Phoenix District

5-16-95
Date

Approved by: *[Signature]*
State Director, Arizona

5-25-95
Date

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Kingman Resource Area
2475 Beverly Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300