
Appendix S

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Evaluation Report

APPENDIX S

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN EVALUATION REPORT

This appendix contains the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Evaluation Report prepared by the BLM Nevada State Office in July 2013.

This page intentionally left blank.



United States Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

Nevada State Office

1340 Financial Blvd

Reno, NV 89502



AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN EVALUATION REPORT

RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE EVALUATIONS

FOR AREAS NOMINATED AS AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL
CONCERN FOR GREATER SAGE-GROUSE AND ITS HABITAT

PREPARED BY THE NEVADA STATE OFFICE
JULY 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	S-1
2. DEFINITION OF AN AREA OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN	S-2
3. CRITERIA REQUIREMENTS FOR ACEC DESIGNATION.....	S-2
3.1 Relevance Criteria.....	S-2
3.2 Importance Criteria.....	S-2
4. THE ACEC EVALUATION PROCESS	S-3
4.1 Identification / Nomination	S-3
4.2 Evaluation of Nominations for Relevance and Importance	S-3
4.3 Consideration of Proposed ACECs	S-3
4.4 Comment on Proposed ACECs.....	S-3
4.5 Designation.....	S-3
5. ACEC EVALUATION	S-4
5.1 Relevance Criteria.....	S-5
5.2 Importance Criteria	S-6
6. RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE EVALUATION OF ACEC NOMINATIONS.....	S-13

FIGURES

	Page
5-1 Northeast California-Nevada Sub-regional Plan Amendment ACEC Process.....	S-12
6-1 Nominated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	S-14
6-2 Alternative C: Areas of Environmental Concern.....	S-15
6-3 Alternative F: Areas of Environmental Concern.....	S-16

TABLES

	Page
5-1 Proposed ACECs Evaluated for Relevance and Importance.....	S-9
6-1 Proposed Areas of Critical Environmental Concern According to Alternative.....	S-13

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Full Phrase

ACEC	area of critical environmental concern
BLM	United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
EIS	environmental impact statement
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act
GIS	Geographic Information System
GRSG	Greater Sage-Grouse
NDOW	Nevada Department of Wildlife
PMU	Population Management Unit
RMP	resource management plan
ROD	record of decision
SRPA	Sub-regional Plan Amendment
US	United States
WSA	wilderness study area

APPENDIX S

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN EVALUATION REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

In December 2011, the United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) initiated the official public scoping period to prepare multiple resource management plan amendments and revisions on a sub-regional basis to address Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) conservation across its entire range west-wide via publication of a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (FR Vol. 76, Number 237, page 77008-77011) (December 9, 2011). As part of the Notice of Intent, the public, stakeholders, and agencies were invited to nominate areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) within the planning sub-regions.

The BLM is required under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (FLPMA), to do land use planning under Title II. Sec. 202 (c) (3) requires the BLM to give priority to the designation and protection of ACECs as part of the land use planning process. Among various land use plan decisions to be addressed in the sub-regional plan amendments for the Great Basin Region, the BLM will address administrative designations such as ACECs.

To be designated as an ACEC, an area must meet both the relevance and importance criteria listed under 43 CFR 1610.7-2(a)(1)(2). Nominations may come from BLM staff, other agencies, or members of the public. In addition to new nominations, the BLM also evaluates any past nominations received that have not previously been considered in a planning process. Nominations that have been received that have gone through land use planning and had decisions made on them will not be re-evaluated in this effort. To date, the Nevada State Office has received a total of 82 nominations for the Northeast California-Nevada Sub-Region.

2. DEFINITION OF AN AREA OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN

BLM regulations (43 CFR part 1601.0-5(a)) define an ACEC as an area “within the public lands where special management attention is required (when such areas are developed or used or where no development is required) to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. The identification of a potential ACEC shall not, of itself, change or prevent change of the management or use of public lands.”

3. CRITERIA REQUIREMENTS FOR ACEC DESIGNATION

To be designated as an ACEC, an area must meet the relevance and importance criteria listed in the regulations and require special management. As part of the sub-regional planning effort, a BLM interdisciplinary team reviewed all ACEC nominations to determine if they met the ACEC criteria to be considered proposed ACECs. The two elements of ACEC criteria are listed below.

3.1 RELEVANCE CRITERIA

Does the area contain one or more of the following:

1. A significant historic, cultural, or scenic value?
2. A fish and wildlife resource?
3. A natural process or system?
4. A natural hazard?

3.2 IMPORTANCE CRITERIA

Does the value, resource, system, process, or hazard described above have substantial significance or value? Does it meet one or more of the following:

1. Is it more than locally significant, especially compared with similar resources, systems, processes, or hazards within the region or nation?
2. Does it have qualities or circumstances that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, unique, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable to adverse change?
3. Has it been recognized as warranting protection in order to satisfy national priority concerns or to carry out the mandates of FLPMA?
4. Does it have qualities that warrant highlighting to satisfy public or management concerns about safety and public welfare?
5. Does it pose a significant threat to human life and safety or property?

4. THE ACEC EVALUATION PROCESS

There are several steps in the identification and evaluation of ACECs (see **Figure 5-1**, page S-12). These steps include nomination of areas that may meet the relevance and importance criteria, evaluation of the nominated areas, and consideration of proposed ACECs in various alternative scenarios. The effects of proposed alternatives including proposed ACECs are analyzed in the Draft Sub-regional Plan Amendment (SRPA)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which is subject to a 90-day public review and comment period. After the close of the 90-day public comment period, public comments are reviewed and adjustments to the proposed SRPA and proposed ACECs are made and included in the Final SRPA/EIS. Designation of ACECs occurs in the record of decision (ROD) approving the SRPA.

4.1 IDENTIFICATION / NOMINATION

ACECs can be nominated at any time but can only be designated through land use plans. Nominations were solicited from the public during the public scoping process.

4.2 EVALUATION OF NOMINATIONS FOR RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE

Nominations were evaluated to determine whether they meet the relevance and importance criteria. The relevance and importance criteria are detailed in the "Evaluation Process" section of this report.

4.3 CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED ACECS

Proposed ACECs are considered as SRPA alternatives are developed. Each ACEC is proposed for designation in at least one management alternative. The need for special management and the resulting effects from applying such management are assessed in the EIS. The Agency Preferred Alternative identifies which ACECs are proposed for designation.

4.4 COMMENT ON PROPOSED ACECS

A notice of any areas proposed for ACEC designation is published in the Federal Register along with a Notice of Availability of the Draft SRPA/EIS requesting public comment. Comments received on the Draft SRPA/EIS will be considered in the preparation of the Final SRPA/EIS. After a 30-day protest period, a ROD is prepared and the plan is approved along with applicable ACECs (see below designation section).

4.5 DESIGNATION

An ACEC is proposed for designation if the area requires special management. Special management is defined as management outside of standard or routine practices, and usually includes more detail than other prescriptions contained within the plan. If analysis determines that special management is required, the area is recommended for designation of an ACEC. Designation of ACECs occurs when the ROD is signed approving the SRPA.

5. ACEC EVALUATION

The BLM is responsible for evaluating a nominated area to determine if it meets the relevance/importance criteria and requires special management. The SRPA evaluation team was comprised of an interdisciplinary team composed of specialists and managers representing different resource backgrounds and agencies. The team evaluated nominations provided by the public, state agencies, and BLM staff. The evaluation considered all current nominations. The SRPA ACEC evaluation team was comprised of the following specialists:

Name	Position and Office
BLM	
Marguerite Adams	Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Nevada State Office
Brian Amme	Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Nevada State Office
Sandy Gregory	Fuels Lead, Nevada State Office
Emily Jennings	Natural Resources Supervisor, Eagle Lake Field Office
Arlene Kosic	Wildlife, Alturas Field Office
Dave Mermejo	GIS, Nevada State Office
Sue Noggles	Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Eagle Lake Field Office
Paul Podborny	Supv. RMS, Elko District Office
Doug Siple	Mining Engineer, Nevada State Office
Joe Tague	Nevada State Office
Leisa Wesch	GIS Specialist Nevada State Office
Forest Service	
David Reis	Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest
Contractors	
Holly Prohaska	Project Manager, Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.
Marcia Rickey	GIS, Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.
Paul Roush	Contractor, Nevada State Office
Randy Sharp	Contractor, Forest Service

The evaluation team analyzed 82 nominations for ACECs (see **Figure 6-1**).

Two nomination evaluation meetings were held. The first meeting was held on May 16, 2012, at the Nevada State Office. The second meeting was held August 15 and 16, 2012, at the Nevada State Office. All nominations were reviewed in each meeting. The first meeting was held to determine if relevance and importance criteria were met. The second meeting was held to develop a spatial component to where these relevant and important values were believed to exist within the state regardless of land ownership. The evaluation process was conducted through the use of geographic information systems (GIS) tools projected on a screen for the team to review. All the ACEC nominations received were encompassed within Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) Population Management Units (PMUs). Each PMU has been mapped by NDOW into five habitat categories (March 2012).

For interim management and planning purposes, in March 2012 the BLM adopted the NDOW Categories 1 and 2 to as preliminary priority habitat (PPH), the most important and irreplaceable habitat for GRSG. The BLM used NDOW Category 3 to represent preliminary general habitat (PGH).

The ACEC interdisciplinary team agreed that relevance criterion 2, a fish or wildlife resource is present was met for the GRSG. In general, habitat that was considered NDOW Category 1 and 2 were considered to meet importance criterion 2 that it does have qualities or circumstances that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, unique, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable to adverse change. In addition, on a more regional basis, importance criterion 1 is also met for areas considered to be important strongholds for the species. No other relevance or importance criteria were deemed to be met.

The analyses of the ACEC criteria as identified in BLM Manual 1613.1 Characteristics of ACECs are summarized below:

5.1 RELEVANCE CRITERIA

An area meets the “relevance” criterion if it contains one or more of the following:

1. A significant historic, cultural, or scenic value (including but not limited to rare or sensitive archeological resources and religious or cultural resources important to Native Americans).

No. Although historic, cultural and scenic values occur widespread on public lands, the nominations did not highlight any such values as part of the nomination for GRSG habitat. A general reference to the presence of various resource values without specifying why the values are significant in the context of an ACEC does not provide rationale for meeting this criterion.

2. A fish and wildlife resource (including but not limited to endangered, sensitive, or threatened species, or habitat essential for maintaining species diversity).

Yes. The sensitive wildlife resource and essential habitat for GRSG is present within the areas nominated as ACECs.

3. A natural process or system (including but not limited to endangered, sensitive, or threatened plant species; rare, endemic, or relic plants or plant communities which are terrestrial, aquatic, or riparian; or rare geological features)

No. Although natural systems and processes occur on public lands, the sagebrush vegetation community and the various habitat requirements of GRSG across its range are not comprised of plant

species or communities as described in this criterion and were not highlighted as comprising a natural system.

4. A natural hazard (including but not limited to areas of avalanche, dangerous flooding, landslides, unstable soils, seismic activity, or dangerous cliffs). A hazard caused by human action may meet the relevance criteria if it is determined through the resource management planning process that it has become part of the natural process?

No. The public lands nominated as ACECs do not constitute a natural hazard as described in this criterion.

5.2 IMPORTANCE CRITERIA

The value, resource, system, process, or hazard described above has substantial significance or value in order to satisfy the “importance” criteria. This generally means that the value, resource, system, process, or hazard is characterized by one or more of the following:

1. Has more than locally significant qualities which give it special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern, especially compared to any similar resource.

Yes. Although concerns are based on a broad range of threats that vary in scope and intensity across the range of the species regarding habitat fragmentation and disturbances, there are recognized “strongholds” for GRSG habitat and populations that exhibit on a regional or range-wide basis, composition and integrity of habitat and condition as well as strength of populations that are sustainable over the long-term. These qualities give these areas a sense of special worth and cause for concern.

2. Has qualities or circumstances that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, unique, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable to adverse change.

Yes. The areas nominated as ACECs have the following qualities described under this criterion: fragile, sensitive, irreplaceable, and vulnerable to adverse change. The resource on a range-wide basis is not rare, exemplary, unique, or endangered or threatened (i.e. listed species).

3. Has been recognized as warranting protection in order to satisfy national priority concerns or to carry out the mandates of FLPMA.

No. Although conservation of GRSG is of current national concern to the agency due to the warranted but precluded status in regard

to listing by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and initiation of the GRSG planning strategy, the agency has been emphasizing GRSG conservation since the late 1990s. In 2005, the BLM issued WO-IM-2005-024 directing that GRSG conservation measures be included in all resource management plans within the range of the species by 2015. At the time, there existed no secretarial or executive orders or public laws identifying GRSG as a national priority for protection beyond management of the species habitat which falls within the purview of implementation of the Endangered Species Act and FLPMA.

4. Has qualities that warrant highlighting to satisfy public or management concerns about safety and public welfare.

No. Qualities regarding safety and public welfare are not present within the areas nominated as ACECs for GRSG habitat.

5. Poses a significant threat to human life and safety or to property.

No. Areas nominated as ACECs for GRSG habitat do not pose a significant threat to human life and safety or to property.

The interdisciplinary team initially reviewed each nominated ACEC by NDOW PMU across Nevada for presence or absence of GRSG habitat. The evaluation was conducted by PMU rather than by exact nominated ACEC because there were several overlapping nominations with various boundaries. Several factors were considered in determining if an area met the relevance and importance criteria. The non-exhaustive list of factors includes but is not limited to:

- Category 1 and 2 habitat (BLM PPH)
- Potential for connectivity habitat
- Presence/absence of active leks (2007 – 2010 data)
- # of birds counted on leks (2007 – 2010 data)
- Local telemetry data
- Land tenure (inholdings)
- Nesting habitat
- Core breeding habitat
- Local migratory characteristics
- Fire history
- Degraded/transitional habitat
- Artificial habitat (agriculture)
- Degraded habitat through urban and urban interface influences

Through this initial review, the team found that proposed ACECs based upon the PMUs to be unwieldy in that much of the proposed acreage either did not contain any Greater Sage grouse habitat or did not contain PHMA which proved to be the determining factor in identifying the Relevance and Importance values. As part of the review process, the team then restructured the boundaries to define where the Relevance and Importance values were located in relation to the original proposal. A matrix table identifying each proposed area and determination of Relevance and Importance values was developed. See **Table 5-1**. To identify the proposed ACECs for Alternative C and Alternative F, another matrix table details the specific proposals. See **Table 6-1**.

**Table 5-1
Proposed ACECs Evaluated for Relevance and Importance**

DEIS PMU Name	FEIS - BSA/BSU Name	Proposed ACEC Name	Nominator	Proposed Acreage	Acreage With R & I Values*	R & I Value	Comments
Pine Forest / Black Rock	Black Rock	Black Rock	WWP	2,147,742	239,300	Y	Compilation of Vya; Sheldon; Massacre; Buffalo-Skedaddle; Black Rock and Pine Forest ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Butte/Buck/White Pine	Butte/Buck/White Pine	Butte/Buck/White Pine	WWP / NDOW / WEG	2,835,642	669,800	Y	Compilation of Butte; Buck; White Pine and Telegraph Mountain ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
North Fork / O'Neil Basin / Snake / Islands	Central Elko	Central Elko	WWP	3,557,003	1,680,500	Y	Compilation of Islands; O'Neil Basin; North Fork; Islands and Snake ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Cortez / Diamond / Shoshone / Three Bar / Toiyabe	Central Great Basin	Central Great Basin	WWP / NDOW	3,496,360	1,261,500	Y	Compilation of Cortez; Diamond; Cortez Range; Shoshone; Three Bar; Roberts Mountain; Bates Mountain ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
East Valley / Schell / Antelope	East High Desert	East High Desert	WWP	2,827,390	241,500	Y	Compilation of East Valley; Schell; Antelope ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Buffalo / Skedaddle / Virginia -Pahrah / Pahrah	Lassen / South Washoe	Lassen / South Washoe	WWP / Eagle Lake FO	712,181	683,400	Y	Compilation of Horse Lake Unit I & IA; Tunnison; Chalk Bluff Unit 2 & 2A; Shaffer; Shinn Unit 3; Rush Creek; Dry Valley Unit 4; Skedaddle; Virginia-Pahrah ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Lone Willow	Lone Willow	Lone Willow	WWP	480,121	332,200	Y	Only PHMA acreage was determined to have R & I value.
Monitor	Monitor	Monitor	WWP / NDOW / CBD	4,901,831	444,100	Y	Compilation of Toiyabe; Monitor; Bates Mountain, Monitor Valley, Little Fish Lake Valley ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Gollaher	Northeast Elko	Northeast Elko	WWP	942,342	317,600	Y	Compilation of Gollaher ACEC nomination. Only area with PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Sheldon / Massacre / Vya	Northwest Great Basin - NV	Northwest Great Basin - NV	Surprise FO / WWP	199,251	1,086,700	Y	Wall Canyon ACEC nomination. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.

**Table 5-1
Proposed ACECs Evaluated for Relevance and Importance**

DEIS PMU Name	FEIS - BSA/BSU Name	Proposed ACEC Name	Nominator	Proposed Acreage	Acreage With R & I Values*	R & I Value	Comments
Battle Mountain / Fish Creek / East Range / Sonoma / Humboldt	Northwest Interior	Northwest Interior	WWP / NDOW	1,391,957	176,500	Y	Compilation of Limbo, Nightingale, Fish Creek Mountains & 9 other ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Desert / Santa Rosa / Tuscarora	Owyhee	Owyhee	WWP	3,541,344	1,357,900	Y	Compilation of Desert, Santa Rosa, Tuscarora ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
	Pueblo Range	Pueblo Range		6,500	7,200	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
South Fork / Ruby Valley	Ruby	Ruby	WWP	2,954,839	504,200	Y	Compilation of Ruby Valley; South Fork; Piñon Range ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Clan Alpine / Desatoya / Reese River	Smith / Reese	Smith Reese	WWP	2,357,174	283,200	Y	Compilation of Clan Alpine; Desatoya; Reese River ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Lincoln / Spring/Snake Valley / Steptoe Cave	Southeastern Nevada	Southeastern Nevada	WWP	3,371,534	315,900	Y	Compilation of Lincoln; Snake Valley; Spring and Steptoe Cave ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Majuba 3 / Trinity I	Western Pershing	Western Pershing	WWP	198,285	7,200	Y	Compilation of Majuba 3 and Trinity I ACEC nominations. Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
	Likely Tables PMU	Likely Tables PMU	WWP	468,134	9,600	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Toiyabe	Central Great Basin	Bates Mountain	WEG	374,627	242,200	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Cortez	Central Great Basin	Cortez Range	WEG	129,656	76,300	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Fish Creek	Northwest Interior	Fish Creek Mountains	WEG	68,181	39,500	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Monitor	Monitor	Little Fish Lake Valley	WEG	119,780	87,700	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Monitor	Monitor	Monitor	WEG	550,683	53,400	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Monitor	Monitor	Monitor Valley	WEG	247,008	173,600	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Reese River	Smith/Reese	Reese River	WEG	105,655	92,200	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.

**Table 5-1
Proposed ACECs Evaluated for Relevance and Importance**

DEIS PMU Name	FEIS - BSA/BSU Name	Proposed ACEC Name	Nominator	Proposed Acreage	Acreage With R & I Values*	R & I Value	Comments
Three Bar	Central Great Basin	Roberts Mountain	WEG	98,617	74,400	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
Butte/Buck/White Pine	Butte/Buck/White Pine	Telegraph Mountain	WEG	12,780	9,100	Y	Only PHMA acreage determined to have R & I value.
-Not Part of EIS-	Devil's Garden PMU	Devil's Garden PMU	WWP	1,140,074			The Devil's Garden PMU ACEC nomination is being analyzed under Modoc NF document.
Eden Valley			WWP	76,783		N	Only PHMA acreage was determined to have R & I values. Area does not contain PHMA acreage.
Eugenes			WWP	59,407		N	Only PHMA acreage was determined to have R & I values. Area does not contain PHMA acreage.
Kawich			WWP	267,108		N	Only PHMA acreage was determined to have R & I values. Area does not contain PHMA acreage.
Limbo/ Nightingale / Majuba 1, 2, 4 & 5 / Sahwave 1 & 2			WWP	364,029		N	Only PHMA acreage was determined to have R & I values. Area does not contain PHMA acreage.
Quinn			WWP	1,985,719		N	Only PHMA acreage was determined to have R & I values. Area does not contain PHMA acreage.
Stillwater			WWP	249,316		N	Only PHMA acreage was determined to have R & I values. Area does not contain PHMA acreage.
Bodie Hills / Desert Creek / Flales / Mount Grant / Pine Nut / South Mono / White Mountains			WWP	4,527,963		N	Outside of planning area

*Acreage revised to reflect the Relevance and Importance Values in PHMA




Figure 5-1 Northeast California-Nevada Sub-regional Plan Amendment ACEC Process

6. RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE EVALUATION OF ACEC NOMINATIONS

Table 6-1 lists the ACECs by Alternative that were evaluated and found to meet the relevance and importance criteria. All ACECs were assessed for GRSG population and habitat values, and it was determined that all ACECs met relevance criteria #2 (unique population) and importance criteria #2 (irreplaceable habitat).

**Table 6-1
Proposed Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
According to Alternative**

Proposed ACEC	Acres	Proposed ACEC	Acres
Alternative C			
Black Rock	239,300	Northeast Elko	317,600
Butte/Buck/White Pine	669,800	Northwest Great Basin – NV	1,086,700
Central Elko	1,680,500	Northwest Interior	176,500
Central Great Basin	1,216,500	Owyhee	1,357,900
East High Desert	241,500	Pueblo Range	7,200
Lassen / South Washoe	683,400	Ruby	504,200
Likely Tables PMU	9,600	Smith / Reese	283,200
Lone Willow	332,200	Southeastern Nevada	315,900
Monitor	444,100	West Pershing	7,200
Alternative F			
Bates Mountain	242,200	Monitor Valley	173,600
Cortez Range	76,300	Reese River	92,200
Fish Creek Mountains	39,500	Roberts Mountain	74,400
Little Fish Lake Valley	87,700	Telegraph Mountain	9,100
Monitor	53,400		


Devil's Garden PMU	14,600
This ACEC proposal is not being carried forward in the GRSG EIS. The proposal will be analyzed in a separate Forest Service plan amendment by the Modoc National Forest.	



Nominated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern



Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) were nominated by Nevada Division of Wildlife, Western Watersheds Project, Center for Biological Diversity, BLM Eagle Lake Field Office, BLM Surprise Field Office, and BLM Elko District Office.



▨ Nominated ACEC

Figure 6-1



Alternative C: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern



Action C-SD 1: Designate proposed ACEC's to preserve, protect, conserve, restore, and sustain GRSG populations and the sagebrush ecosystem on which the GRSG relies.





Figure 6-2



Alternative F: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern



Action F-SD 1: Designate proposed ACEC's (BLM) and Special Conservation Areas (Forest Service) as sagebrush reserves to conserve GRSG and other sagebrush-dependent species.



- Existing Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)
- Proposed ACEC
- Existing Preliminary Priority Habitat
- Existing Preliminary General Habitat

Figure 6-3