STATUS OF THE SPECIES AND CRITICAL HABITAT RANGEWIDE, SEPTEMBER 23, 2010

The following summarizes the rangewide status of the desert tortoise and its designated critical habitat, which includes information on its listing history, recovery plan, recovery and critical habitat units (CHUs), species account, reproduction, population distribution and monitoring, and threats.

1. Listing History

On August 20, 1980, the Service published a final rule listing the Beaver Dam Slope population of the desert tortoise in Utah as threatened (45 FR 55654). In the 1980 listing of the Beaver Dam Slope population, the Service concurrently designated 26 square miles of BLM-administered land in Utah as critical habitat. The reason for listing was population declines because of habitat deterioration and past over-collection. Major threats to the desert tortoise identified in the rule included habitat destruction through development, overgrazing, and geothermal development, collection for pets, malicious killing, road kills, and competition with grazing or feral animals.

On August 4, 1989, the Service published an emergency rule listing the Mojave population of the desert tortoise as endangered (54 FR 42270). On April 2, 1990, the Service determined the Mojave population of the desert tortoise to be threatened (55 FR 12178). Reasons for the determination included significant population declines, loss of habitat from construction projects such as roads, housing and energy developments, and conversion of native habitat to agriculture. Livestock grazing and off-highway vehicle (OHV) activity have degraded additional habitat. Also cited as threatening the desert tortoise's continuing existence were: illegal collection by humans for pets or consumption; upper respiratory tract disease (URTD); predation on juvenile desert tortoises by common ravens, coyotes, and kit foxes; fire; and collisions with vehicles on paved and unpaved roads.

On February 8, 1994, the Service designated approximately 6.45 million acres of critical habitat for the Mojave population of the desert tortoise in portions of California (4,750,000 acres), Nevada (1,220,000 acres), Arizona (339,000 acres), and Utah (129,000 acres) (59 FR 5820-5846, also see corrections in 59 FR 9032-9036), which became effective on March 10, 1994.

2. Recovery Plan

On June 28, 1994, the Service approved the final Desert Tortoise (Mojave Population) Recovery Plan (1994 Recovery Plan) (Service 1994). The 1994 Recovery Plan divided the range of the desert tortoise into 6 recovery units and recommended establishment of 14 desert wildlife management areas (DWMAs) throughout the recovery units. Within each DWMA, the 1994 Recovery Plan recommended implementation of reserve-level protection of desert tortoise populations and habitat, while maintaining and protecting other sensitive species and ecosystem functions. The design of DWMAs should follow accepted concepts of reserve design. As part of the actions needed to accomplish recovery, the 1994 Recovery Plan recommended that land management within all DWMAs should restrict human activities that negatively impact desert tortoises (Service 1994). The DWMAs/ACECs have been designated by BLM through development or modification of their land-use plans in Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and parts of California.

The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) Report, *Endangered Species: Research Strategy and Long-Term Monitoring Needed for the Mojave Desert Tortoise Recovery Program* (GAO 2002), directed the Service to periodically reassess the 1994 Recovery Plan to determine whether scientific information developed since its publication could alter implementation actions or allay some of the uncertainties about its recommendations. In response to the GAO report, the Service initiated a review of the 1994 Recovery Plan in 2003. In March 2003, the Service impaneled the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan Assessment Committee (Committee) to assess the 1994 Recovery Plan. The charge to the Committee was to review the entire 1994 Recovery Plan in relation to contemporary knowledge to determine which parts of the 1994 Recovery Plan needed updating. The recommendations of the Committee were presented to the Service and Desert Tortoise Management Oversight Group on March 24, 2004 (Tracy *et al.* 2004). The recommendations were used as a guide by a recovery team of scientists and stakeholders to modify the 1994 Recovery Plan.

On November 3, 2004, the Service announced the formation of the DTRO. The DTRO is revising the 1994 Recovery Plan and coordinating with regional recovery implementation work groups to develop 5-year recovery action plans under the umbrella plan. A draft revision of the recovery plan was released to the public on August 4, 2008 (Service 2008). The Service anticipates a final recovery plan in 2010.

The draft recovery plan identifies three recovery objectives:

1. Maintain self-sustaining populations of desert tortoises within each recovery unit into the future.

2. Maintain well-distributed populations of desert tortoises throughout each recovery unit.

3. Ensure that habitat within each recovery unit is protected and managed to support long-term viability of desert tortoise populations.

Recovery objectives and criteria generally will be measured within tortoise conservation areas or other areas identified by Recovery Implementation Teams, and they are not independent of each other but must be evaluated collectively. Recovery does not depend on absolute numbers of tortoises or comparisons to pre-listing estimates of tortoise populations, but rather the reversal of downward population trends and elimination or reduction of threats that initiated the listing.

3. Recovery Units

a. Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit

The 1994 Recovery Plan delineates the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit to occur primarily in Nevada, but it also extends into California along the Ivanpah Valley and into extreme southwestern Utah and northwestern Arizona. Vegetation within this unit is characterized by creosote bush scrub, big galleta-scrub steppe, desert needlegrass scrub-steppe, and blackbrush scrub (in higher elevations). Topography is varied, with flats, valleys, alluvial fans, washes, and rocky slopes. Much of the northern portion of the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit is characterized as basin and range, with elevations from 2,500 to 12,000 feet. Desert tortoises typically eat summer and winter annuals, cacti, and perennial grasses. Since the northern portion of this recovery unit represents the northernmost distribution of the species, desert tortoises are typically found in low densities (about 10 to 20 adults per square mile). The proposed project would be located in the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit.

The Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit includes the Mormon Mesa, Coyote Spring, Beaver Dam Slope and Gold Butte-Pakoon DWMAs; and a portion of the Piute-Eldorado DWMAs. These areas generally overlap the Mormon Mesa, Piute-Eldorado, Beaver Dam Slope, and Gold Butte-Pakoon CHUs.

Using the U.S. Geological Survey habitat model (Nussear *et al.* 2009) and a 0.5 probability threshold based on the prevalence approach (Liu *et al.* 2005), the Service estimates that about one half of the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit contains potential desert tortoise habitat (approximately 4,853,368 acres). Although this analysis likely omits some marginal desert tortoise habitat, it explains the occurrence of 95 percent of the 938 test points used in the model. This analysis does not consider habitat loss, fragmentation, or degradation associated with human-caused impacts.

b. *Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit*

The 1994 Recovery Plan delineates the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit to occur primarily in California, but also extends into Nevada in the Amargosa, Pahrump, and Piute valleys. The Ivanpah, Piute-Eldorado, and Fenner DWMAs are included in the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit which generally overlap the Ivanpah and Piute-Eldorado CHUs in California. In the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit, desert tortoises are often active in late summer and early autumn in addition to spring because this region receives both winter and summer rains and supports two distinct annual floras on which they can feed. Desert tortoises in the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit occupy a variety of vegetation types and feed on summer and winter annuals, cacti, perennial grasses, and herbaceous perennials. They den singly in caliche caves, bajadas, and washes. This recovery unit is isolated from the Western Mojave Recovery Unit by the Baker Sink, a low-elevation, extremely hot and arid strip that extends from Death Valley to Bristol Dry Lake. The Baker Sink area is generally not considered suitable for desert tortoises. Desert tortoise densities in the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit can vary dramatically, ranging from 5 to as much as 350 adults per square mile (Service 1994).

c. *Northern Colorado Recovery Unit*

The 1994 Recovery Plan delineates the Northern Colorado Recovery Unit completely in California. The 874,843-acre Chemehuevi DWMA is the sole conservation area for the desert tortoise in this recovery unit. Desert tortoises in this recovery unit are found in the valleys, on bajadas and desert pavements, and to a lesser extent in the broad, well-developed washes. They feed on both summer and winter annuals and den singly in burrows under shrubs, in intershrub spaces, and rarely in washes. The climate is somewhat warmer than in other recovery units, with only 2 to 12 freezing days per year.

d. Eastern Colorado Recovery Unit

The 1994 Recovery Plan delineates the Eastern Colorado Recovery Unit completely in California. The Chuckwalla DWMA and CHU, and a portion of the Joshua Tree DWMA and Pinto Basin CHU, occur in this recovery unit. This recovery unit occupies well-developed washes, desert pavements, piedmonts, and rocky slopes characterized by relatively species-rich succulent scrub, creosote bush scrub, and Blue Palo Verde-Ironwood-Smoke Tree communities. Winter burrows are generally shorter in length, and activity periods are longer than elsewhere due to mild winters and substantial summer precipitation. The desert tortoises feed on summer and winter annuals and some cacti; they den singly.

e. Western Mojave Recovery Unit

The 1994 Recovery Plan delineates the Western Mojave Recovery Unit completely in California. It is composed of the Western Mojave, Southern Mojave, and Central Mojave regions which are exceptionally heterogeneous and have broad, indistinct boundaries due to gradational transitions among sub-regions and with surrounding areas (Webb *et al*. 2009). The central Mojave is topographically and climatically transitional between the southwestern and eastern Mojave Desert. The south-central Mojave is a transitional region to the Colorado/Sonoran Desert, and the southern half of this region is similar climatically and floristically to the eastern Mojave. Many of the differences in vegetation among these regions can be explained by differences in climate (Rowlands 1995), which varies linearly across the range of the desert tortoise. The most pronounced difference between the Western Mojave and other recovery units is in timing of rainfall and the resulting vegetation. Most rainfall occurs in fall and winter and produces winter annuals, which are the primary food source of desert tortoises. Above ground activity occurs primarily in spring, associated with winter annual production. Thus, desert tortoises are adapted to a regime of winter rains and rare summer storms. Here, desert tortoises occur primarily in valleys, on alluvial fans, bajadas, and rolling hills in saltbush, creosote bush, and scrub steppe communities. Desert tortoises dig deep burrows (usually located under shrubs on bajadas) for winter hibernation and summer aestivation. These desert tortoises generally den singly.

Four DWMAs occur wholly or partially within the Western Mojave Recovery Unit: Fremont-Kramer, Ord-Rodman, Superior-Cronese, and Joshua Tree. These areas approximate the Fremont-Kramer, Ord-Rodman, Superior-Cronese, and Pinto Basin CHUs.

f. Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit

The 1994 Recovery Plan delineates the Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit to encompass all desert tortoise habitat in Washington County, Utah, except the Beaver Dam Slope, Utah population. Only the Upper Virgin River DWMA and CHU occur in this recovery unit. The desert tortoise population in the area of St. George, Utah is at the extreme northeastern edge of the species' range and experiences long, cold winters (about 100 freezing days) and mild summers, during which the desert tortoises are continually active. Here the desert tortoises live in a complex topography consisting of canyons, mesas, sand dunes, and sandstone outcrops where the vegetation is a transitional mixture of sagebrush scrub, creosote bush scrub, blackbush scrub, and a psammophytic community. Desert tortoises use sandstone and lava caves instead of burrows, travel to sand dunes for egg-laying, and use still other habitats for foraging. Two or more desert tortoises often use the same burrow.

4. Species Account

The desert tortoise is a large, herbivorous reptile that occurs in portions of California, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah. It also occurs in Sonora and Sinaloa, Mexico. The Mojave population of the desert tortoise includes those desert tortoises living north and west of the Colorado River in the Mojave Desert of California, Nevada, Arizona, southwestern Utah, and in the Sonoran Desert in California.

Desert tortoises reach 8 to 15 inches in carapace length and 4 to 6 inches in shell height. Hatchlings emerge from the eggs at about 2 inches in length. Adults have a domed carapace and relatively flat, unhinged plastron. Their shells are high-domed, and greenish-tan to dark brown in color with tan scute centers. Desert tortoises weigh 8 to 15 pounds when fully grown. The forelimbs have heavy, claw-like scales and are flattened for digging, while hind limbs are more stumpy and elephantine.

Optimal habitat for the desert tortoise has been characterized as creosote bush scrub in which precipitation ranges from 2 to 8 inches, where a diversity of perennial plants is relatively high, and production of ephemerals is high (Luckenbach 1982; Turner 1982; Turner and Brown 1982). Soils must be friable enough for digging burrows, but firm enough so that burrows do not collapse. Desert tortoises occur from below sea level to an elevation of 7,300 feet, but the most favorable habitat occurs at elevations of approximately 1,000 to 3,000 feet (Luckenbach 1982). Neonate desert tortoises use abandoned rodent burrows for daily and winter shelter; these burrows are often shallowly excavated and run parallel to the surface of the ground.

Desert tortoises are most commonly found within the desert scrub vegetation type, primarily in creosote bush scrub. In addition, they occur in succulent scrub, cheesebush scrub, blackbrush scrub, hopsage scrub, shadscale scrub, microphyll woodland, Mojave saltbush-allscale scrub and scrub-steppe vegetation types of the desert and semidesert grassland complex (Service 1994). Within these vegetation types, desert tortoises potentially can survive and reproduce where their basic habitat requirements are met. These requirements include a sufficient amount and quality of forage species; shelter sites for protection from predators and environmental extremes; suitable substrates for burrowing, nesting, and overwintering; various plants for shelter; and adequate area for movement, dispersal, and gene flow. Throughout most of the Mojave Desert region, desert tortoises occur most commonly on gently sloping terrain with soils ranging from sandy-gravel and with scattered shrubs, and where there is abundant inter-shrub space for growth of herbaceous plants. Throughout their range, however, desert tortoises can be found in steeper, rockier areas (Gardner and Brodie 2000).

The size of desert tortoise home ranges varies with respect to location and year. Desert tortoise activities are concentrated in overlapping core areas, known as home ranges. In the western Mojave Desert, Harless *et al.* (2007) estimated mean home ranges for desert tortoises to be 111 acres for males and 40 acres for females. Over its lifetime, each desert tortoise may require more than 1.5 square miles of habitat and make forays of more than 7 miles at a time (Berry 1986a). In drought years, the ability of desert tortoises to drink while surface water is available following rains may be crucial for desert tortoise survival. During droughts, desert tortoises forage over larger areas, increasing the likelihood of encounters with sources of injury or mortality including humans and other predators.

Desert tortoises spend most of the year in subterranean burrows or caliche caves (Nagy and Medica 1986). Desert tortoises in the west Mojave are primarily active in May and June, with a secondary activity period from September through October. In Nevada and Arizona, desert tortoises are considered to be most active from approximately March 1 through October 31. Their activity patterns are primarily controlled by ambient temperature and precipitation (Nagy and Medica 1986; Zimmerman *et al*. 1994). In the east Mojave and Colorado Deserts, annual precipitation occurs in both summer and winter, providing food and water to desert tortoises throughout much of the summer and fall. Most precipitation occurs in winter in the West Mojave Desert, resulting in an abundance of annual spring vegetation, which dries up by late May or June. Neonate desert tortoises emerge from their winter burrows as early as late January to take advantage of freshly germinating annual plants through the spring. Under certain conditions desert tortoises may be aboveground any month of the year, particularly during periods of mild or rainy weather in summer and winter.

During active periods, they usually spend nights and the hotter part of the day in their burrow; they may also rest under shrubs or in shallow burrows (pallets). Desert tortoises may use an average of 7 to 12 burrows at any given time (Bulova 1994; TRW Environmental Safety Systems Inc. 1997). Walde *et al.* (2003) observed that desert tortoises retreated into burrows when air temperature reached 91.0˚ Fahrenheit (F) ± 3.55˚ F and ground temperatures reached 94.6˚ F ± 6.05˚ F; 95 percent of observations of desert tortoises aboveground occurred at air temperatures less than 91˚ F. The body temperature at which desert tortoises become incapacitated ranges from 101.5˚ F to 113.2˚ F (Naegle 1976; Zimmerman *et al.* 1994).

Although desert tortoises eat nonnative plants, they generally prefer native forbs when available (Jennings 1993; Avery 1998). Consumption of nonnative plants may cause desert tortoises to have a nitrogen and water deficit (Henen 1997). Droughts frequently occur in the desert, resulting in extended periods of low water availability. Periods of extended drought place desert tortoises at even greater water and nitrogen deficit than during moderate or high rainfall years (Peterson 1996; Henen 1997). During a drought, more nitrogen than normal is required to excrete nitrogenous wastes, thus more rapidly depleting nitrogen stored in body tissues. Plants also play important roles in stabilizing soil and providing cover for protection of desert tortoises from predators and heat.

The U.S. Geological Survey modeled desert tortoise habitat across the range of the desert tortoise (Nussear *et al.* 2009). This model, which is based on 3,753 desert tortoise locations, uses 16 environmental variables, such as precipitation, geology, vegetation, and slope. In addition, Nussear *et al.* used 938 additional occurrence locations to test the model's accuracy. Using this model and a 0.5 probability threshold based on the prevalence approach (Liu *et al.* 2005), the Service estimates that there are approximately 20,542,646 acres of potential desert tortoise habitat rangewide. This analysis likely omits some marginal desert tortoise habitat, and it does not consider habitat loss, fragmentation, or degradation associated with human-caused impacts; however, it provides a reference point relative to the amount of desert tortoise habitat.

Further information on the range, biology, habitat, and ecology of the desert tortoise is available in: Bury (1982); Bury and Germano (1994); Ernst *et al.* (1994); Jennings (1997); Service

(2008); Tracy *et al.* 2004; Van Devender (2002); and collected papers in Chelonian Conservation and Biology (2002, Vol. 4, No. 2), Herpetological Monographs (1994, No. 8), and the Desert Tortoise Council Proceedings.

5. Reproduction

Desert tortoises possess a combination of life history and reproductive characteristics that affect the ability of populations to survive external threats. Desert tortoises grow slowly, require 15 to 20 years to reach sexual maturity, and have low reproductive rates during a long period of reproductive potential (Turner *et al*. 1984; Bury 1987; Tracy *et al*. 2004).

Choice of mate is mediated by aggressive male-male interactions and possibly by female choice (Niblick *et al*. 1994). Desert tortoises in the West Mojave Desert may exhibit pre-breeding dispersal movements, typical of other vertebrates, ranging from 1 to 10 miles in a single season (Sazaki *et al*. 1995). The advantage of pre-breeding dispersal may be to find a more favorable environment in which to reproduce. However, risks include increased mortality from predation, exposure, starvation, or anthropogenic factors (e.g., motor vehicle mortality).

The average clutch size is 4.5 eggs (range 1 to 8; on rare occasions, clutches can contain up to 15 eggs), with 0-3 clutches deposited per year (Turner *et al*. 1986). Clutch size and number probably depend on female size, water, and annual productivity of forage plants in the current and previous year (Turner *et a*l. 1984, 1986; Henen 1997). The eggs typically hatch from late August through early October. The ability to alter reproductive output in response to resource availability may allow individuals more options to ensure higher lifetime reproductive success. The interaction of longevity, late maturation, and relatively low annual reproductive output causes desert tortoise populations to recover slowly from natural or anthropogenic decreases in density. To ensure stability or increased populations, these factors also require relatively high juvenile survivorship (75 to 98 percent per year), particularly when adult mortality is elevated (Congdon *et al.* 1993). Bjurlin and Bissonette (2004) determined that 74 percent of desert tortoise nests survived and, over 2 years, 84 and 91 percent of the neonates survived the initial period of post-hatching dispersal. They predicted that 40 percent of eggs produce hatchlings that survive to hibernation at their study site. Desert tortoises generally lay eggs from mid-May to early July, but occasionally as late as October (Ernst *et al.* 1994). Eggs are laid in sandy or friable soil, often at the entrance to burrows. Hatching occurs 90 to 120 days later, mostly in late summer and fall (mid-August to October). Eggs and young are untended by the parents. Desert tortoise sex determination is environmentally controlled during incubation (Spotila *et al*. 1994). Hatchlings develop into females when the incubation (*i.e.*, soil) temperature is greater than 88.7° F and males when the temperature is below that (Spotila *et al*. 1994). Mortality is higher when incubation temperatures are greater than 95.5° F or less than 78.8° F. The sensitivity of embryonic desert tortoises to incubation temperature may make populations vulnerable to unusual changes in soil temperature (e.g., from changes in vegetation cover).

At Yucca Mountain in Nye County, Nevada (Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit), Mueller *et al*. (1998) estimated that the mean age of first reproduction was 19 to 20 years; clutch size (1 to 10 eggs) and annual fecundity (0 to 16 eggs) were related to female size but annual clutch frequency (0 to 2) was not. Further, Mueller suggested that body condition during July to October may determine the number of eggs a desert tortoise can produce the following spring.

McLuckie and Fridell (2002) determined that the Beaver Dam Slope desert tortoise population, within the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit, had a lower clutch frequency (1.33 ± 0.14) per reproductive female and fewer reproductive females (14 out of 21) when compared with other Mojave desert tortoise populations. In the 1990s, Beaver Dam Slope experienced dramatic population declines due primarily to disease, and habitat degradation and alteration (Service 1994). The number of eggs that a female desert tortoise can produce in a season is dependent on a variety of factors including environment, habitat, availability of forage and drinking water, and physiological condition (Henen 1997; McLuckie and Fridell 2002).

6. Population Distribution and Monitoring

Patterns of desert tortoise distribution are available from preliminary spatial analyses in Tracy *et al.* (2004). Their analyses revealed areas with higher probabilities of encountering both live and dead desert tortoises. In the western Mojave Desert, areas with concentrations of dead desert tortoises without corresponding concentrations of live desert tortoises were generally the same areas where declines have been observed in the past, namely the northern portion of the Fremont-Kramer CHU and the northwestern part of the Superior-Cronese CHU. Limited data revealed large areas where dead desert tortoises, but no live desert tortoises, were observed in the Piute-Eldorado Valley and northern Coyote Spring Valley, Nevada, and the western and southern portions of the Ivanpah Valley CHU in California. Most other recently sampled areas (mostly within critical habitat) reveal continued desert tortoise presence, although local population declines are known within some of these areas, such as the Beaver Dam Slope, Arizona.

Rangewide desert tortoise population monitoring began in 2001 and is conducted annually. The status and trends of desert tortoise populations are difficult to determine based only upon assessment of desert tortoise density due largely to their overall low abundance, subterranean sheltering behavior, and cryptic nature of the species. Thus, monitoring and recovery should include a comprehensive assessment of the status and trends of threats and habitats as well as population distribution and abundance. Studies during early research on desert tortoises focused on basic biology and demography and were largely centered in areas with high densities of desert tortoises. These high-density areas were used to establish permanent (long-term) study plots that have been studied at various intervals from 1979 through the present, while some low-density plots were discontinued (Berry and Burge 1984; K. Berry, U.S. Geological Survey, pers. comm. 2003, as reported in Tracy *et al*. 2004). However, historic estimates of desert tortoise density or abundance do not exist at the range-wide or regional level for use as a baseline. While a substantial body of data has been collected from long-term study plots and other survey efforts over the years, plot placement is generally regarded as a factor limiting demographic and trend conclusions only to those specific areas. Tracy *et al.* (2004) concluded that estimating accurate long-term trends of desert tortoise populations, habitat, and/or threats across the range was not feasible based on the combined suite of existing data and analyses. Instead, these data provide general insight into the rangewide status of the species and show appreciable declines at the local level in many areas (Luke *et al.* 1991; Berry 2003; Tracy *et al.* 2004).

In an attempt to refine the long-term monitoring program for the desert tortoise, annual rangewide population monitoring using line distance transects began in 2001 (1999 in the Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit; McLuckie *et al*. 2006) and is the first comprehensive effort undertaken to date to estimate densities across the range of the species (Service 2006). Rangewide sampling was initiated during a severe drought that intensified in 2002 and 2003, particularly in the western Mojave Desert in California. At the time the 1994 Recovery Plan was written, there was less consideration of the potentially important role of drought in the desert ecosystem, particularly regarding desert tortoises. In the meantime, studies have documented vulnerability of juvenile (Wilson *et al*. 2001) and adult desert tortoises (Peterson 1994, Peterson 1996, Henen 1997, Longshore *et al*. 2003) to drought.

The monitoring program is designed to detect long-term population trends, so density estimates from any brief time period (e.g., 2001 to 2005) would be expected to detect only catastrophic declines or remarkable population increases. Therefore, following the first 5 years of the long-term monitoring project, the goal was not to document trends within this time period, but to gather information on baseline densities and annual and regional (between recovery unit) variability (Service 2006). Density estimates of adult desert tortoises varied among recovery units and years. Only if this variability is associated with consistent changes between years will monitoring less than 25 years describe important trends. For instance, considerable decreases in density were reported in 2003 in the Eastern Colorado and Western Mojave recovery units, with no correspondingly large rebound in subsequent estimates (Service 2006). Until the underlying variability that may affect our interpretation of these first years of data can be identified, inferences as to the meaning of these data should not be made. Over the first 5 years of monitoring, desert tortoises were least abundant in the Northeast Mojave Recovery Unit (0.68 to 8.30 desert tortoises per kilometer^2 [0.26 to 3.20 desert tortoises per mile^2] (Service 2009b).

There are many natural causes of mortality, but their extents are difficult to evaluate and vary from location to location. Native predators known to prey on desert tortoise eggs, hatchlings, juveniles, and adults include: coyote, kit fox, badger (*Taxidea taxus*), skunks (*Spilogale putorius*), common ravens, golden eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos*), and Gila monsters (*Heloderma suspectum*). Additional natural sources of mortality to eggs, juvenile, and adults may include desiccation, starvation, being crushed (including in burrows), internal parasites, disease, and being turned over onto their backs during fights or courtship (Luckenbach 1982, Turner *et al*. 1987). Free-roaming dogs cause mortality, injury, and harassment of desert tortoises (Evans 2001). Population models indicate that for a stable population to maintain its stability, on average, no more than 25 percent of the juveniles and 2 percent of the adults can die each year (Congdon *et al*. 1993, Service 1994). However, adult mortality at one site in the western Mojave Desert was 90 percent over a 13-year period (Berry 1997). Morafka *et al*. (1997) reported 32 percent mortality over five years among free-ranging and semi-captive hatchling and juvenile desert tortoises (up to five years old) in the western Mojave Desert. When the 26 that were known to have been preyed on by ravens were removed from the analysis, mortality dropped to 24 percent. Turner *et al*. (1987) reported an average annual mortality rate of 19 to 22 percent among juveniles over a nine-year period in the eastern Mojave Desert.

Declines in desert tortoise abundance appear to correspond with increased incidence of disease in some desert tortoise populations. The Goffs permanent study plot in Ivanpah Valley, California, suffered 92 to 96 percent decreases in desert tortoise density between 1994 and 2000 (Berry 2003). The high prevalence of disease in Goffs desert tortoises likely contributed to this decline

(Christopher *et al*. 2003). Upper respiratory tract disease has not yet been detected at permanent study plots in the Colorado Desert of California, but is prevalent at study plots across the rest of the species' range (Berry 2003) and has been shown to be a contributing factor in population declines in the western Mojave Desert (Brown *et al*. 2002; Christopher *et al*. 2003). High mortality rates at permanent study plots in the northeastern and eastern Mojave Desert appear to be associated with incidence of shell diseases in desert tortoises (Jacobson *et al*. 1994). Low levels of shell diseases were detected in many populations when the plots were first established, but were found to increase during the 1980s and 1990s (Jacobson *et al*. 1994; Christopher *et al*. 2003). A herpesvirus has recently been discovered in desert tortoises, but little is known about its effects on desert tortoise populations at this time (Berry *et al*. 2002; Origgi *et al*. 2002).

The general trend for desert tortoises within the California Desert is one of decline. Tracy *et al.* (2004) concluded that the apparent downward trend in desert tortoise populations in the western portion of the range that was identified at the time of listing is valid and ongoing. Results from other portions of the range were inconclusive, but recent surveys of some populations found too few desert tortoises to produce population estimates (*e.g.*, 2000 survey of the Beaver Dam Slope, Arizona), suggesting that declines may have occurred more broadly. Transects surveyed in the Western Mojave Recovery Unit that did not detect any sign over large areas of previously-occupied habitat, and the numerous carcasses found on permanent study plots provide evidence of a decline. During line distance sampling conducted in 8 DWMAs in California in 2003, 930 carcasses and 438 live desert tortoises were detected; more carcasses than live desert tortoises were detected in every study area (Woodman 2004). In 2004, workers conducting line distance sampling in California detected 1,796 carcasses and 534 live desert tortoises; more carcasses were detected than live desert tortoises in every study area (Woodman 2005). Below, we elaborate on patterns within each recovery unit.

a. Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit

A kernel analysis was conducted in 2003-2004 for the desert tortoise (Tracy *et al*. 2004) as part of the reassessment of the 1994 Recovery Plan. The kernel analyses revealed several areas in which the kernel estimations for live desert tortoises and carcasses did not overlap. The pattern of non-overlapping kernels that is of greatest concern is those in which there were large areas where the kernels encompassed carcasses but not live animals. These regions represent areas within DWMAs where there were likely recent die-offs or declines in desert tortoise populations. The kernel analysis indicated large areas in the Piute-Eldorado Valley where there were carcasses but no live desert tortoises. For this entire area in 2001, there were 103 miles of transects walked, and a total of 6 live and 15 dead desert tortoises found, resulting in a live encounter rate of 0.06 desert tortoises per mile of transect for this area. This encounter rate was among the lowest that year for any of the areas sampled in the range of the Mojave desert tortoise (Tracy *et al*. 2004).

Results of desert tortoise surveys at three survey plots in Arizona indicate that all three sites have experienced significant die-offs. Six live desert tortoises were located in a 2001 survey of the Beaver Dam Slope Exclosure Plot (Walker and Woodman 2002). Three had definitive signs of URTD, and two of those also had lesions indicative of cutaneous dyskeratosis. Previous surveys of this plot detected 31 live desert tortoises in 1996, 20 live desert tortoises in 1989, and 19 live desert tortoises in 1980. The 2001 survey report indicated that it is likely that there is no longer a reproductively viable population of desert tortoises on this study plot. Thirty-seven live desert tortoises were located in a 2002 survey of the Littlefield Plot (Young *et al*. 2002). None had definitive signs of URTD. Twenty-three desert tortoises had lesions indicative of cutaneous dyskeratosis. Previous surveys of this plot detected 80 live desert tortoises in 1998 and 46 live desert tortoises in 1993. The survey report indicated that the site might be in the middle of a die-off due to the high number of carcasses found since the site was last surveyed in 1998. Nine live desert tortoises were located during the mark phase of a 2003 survey of the Virgin Slope Plot (Goodlett and Woodman 2003). The surveyors determined that the confidence intervals of the population estimate would be excessively wide and not lead to an accurate population estimate, so the recapture phase was not conducted. One desert tortoise had definitive signs of URTD. Seven desert tortoises had lesions indicative of cutaneous dyskeratosis. Previous surveys of this plot detected 41 live desert tortoises in 1997 and 15 live desert tortoises in 1992. The survey report indicated that the site may be at the end of a die-off that began around 1996-1997.

b. Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit

The permanent study plot in the Ivanpah Valley is the only such plot in this DWMA; consequently, we cite information from that plot herein, although it is located within the Mojave National Preserve. Data on desert tortoises on a permanent study plot in this area were collected in 1980, 1986, 1990, and 1994; the densities of desert tortoises of all sizes per square mile were 386, 393, 249, and 164, respectively (Berry 1996).

The Shadow Valley DWMA lies north of the Mojave National Preserve and west of the Clark Mountains. It occupies approximately 101,355 acres. Data on desert tortoises on a permanent study plot in this area were collected in 1988 and 1992; the densities of desert tortoises of all sizes per square mile were 50 and 58, respectively (Berry 1996).

The Piute-Fenner DWMA lies to the east of the southeast portion of the Mojave National Preserve. It occupies approximately 173,850 acres. The permanent study plot at Goffs is the only such plot in this DWMA; consequently, we cite information from that plot herein, although it is located within the Mojave National Preserve. Data on desert tortoises on the permanent study plot were collected in 1980, 1990, and 1994; Berry (1996) estimated the densities of desert tortoises of all sizes at approximately 440, 362, and 447 individuals per square mile, respectively. As Berry (1996) noted, these data seem to indicate that this area supported "one of the more stable, high density populations" of desert tortoises within the United States. Berry (1996) also noted that "a high proportion of the desert tortoises (had) shell lesions." In 2000, only 30 live desert tortoises were found; Berry (2003) estimated the density of desert tortoises at approximately 88 desert tortoises per square mile. The shell and skeletal remains of approximately 393 desert tortoises were collected; most of these desert tortoises died between 1994 and 2000. Most of the desert tortoises exhibited signs of shell lesions; three salvaged desert tortoises showed abnormalities in the liver and other organs and signs of shell lesions. None of the three salvaged desert tortoises tested positive for upper respiratory tract disease.

Ivanpah and Piute-Eldorado valleys contained study plots that were analyzed in the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit analysis. While there was no overall statistical trend in adult density over time, the 2000 survey at Goffs and the 2002 survey at Shadow Valley indicate low densities of adult desert tortoises relative to earlier years. Unfortunately, there are no data in the latter years for all five study plots within this recovery unit, and therefore, while there is no statistical trend in adult densities, we cannot conclude that desert tortoises have not experienced recent declines in this area. The probability of finding a carcass on a distance sampling transect was considerably higher for Ivanpah, Chemehuevi, Fenner, and Piute-Eldorado, which make up the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit.

c. Northern Colorado Recovery Unit

Two permanent study plots are located within the Chemehuevi DWMA. At the Chemehuevi Valley and Wash plot, 257 and 235 desert tortoises were registered in 1988 and 1992, respectively (Berry 1999). During the 1999 spring survey, only 38 live desert tortoises were found. The shell and skeletal remains of at least 327 desert tortoises were collected; most, if not all, of these desert tortoises died between 1992 and 1999. The frequency of shell lesions and nutritional deficiencies appeared to be increasing and may be related to the mortalities.

The Upper Ward Valley permanent study plot was surveyed in 1980, 1987, 1991, and 1995; Berry (1996) estimated the densities of desert tortoises of all sizes at approximately 437, 199, 273, and 447 individuals per square mile, respectively.

d. Eastern Colorado Recovery Unit

Two permanent study plots are located within this DWMA. At the Chuckwalla Bench plot, Berry (1996) calculated approximate densities of 578, 396, 167, 160, and 182 desert tortoises per square mile in 1979, 1982, 1988, 1990, and 1992, respectively. At the Chuckwalla Valley plot, Berry (1996) calculated approximate densities of 163, 181, and 73 desert tortoises per square mile in 1980, 1987, and 1991, respectively. Tracy *et al*. (2004) concluded that these data show a statistically significant decline in the number of adult desert tortoises over time; they further postulate that the decline on the Chuckwalla Bench plot seemed to be responsible for the overall significant decline within the recovery unit.

The kernel analysis of the Eastern Colorado Recovery Unit shows that the distributions of the living desert tortoises and carcasses overlap for most of the region. The Chuckwalla Bench study plot occurs outside the study area, which creates a problem in evaluating what may be occurring in that area of the recovery unit. However, the few transects walked in that portion of the DWMA yielded no observations of live or dead desert tortoises. This illustrates our concern for drawing conclusions from areas represented by too few study plots and leaves us with guarded concern for this region. The percentage of transects with live desert tortoises was relatively high for most DWMAs within the Eastern Colorado Recovery Unit. In addition, the ratio of carcasses to live desert tortoises was low within this recovery unit relative to others.

e. Western Mojave Recovery Unit

This recovery unit includes the Pinto Mountains, Ord-Rodman, Superior-Cronese, and Fremont-Kramer DWMAs. Based on areas sampled within the Western Mojave Recovery Unit (Service 2009b), we estimate 43,701 desert tortoises (with a 95 percent confident interval of 24,361 to 79,126 tortoises) occur in this recovery unit.

The 117,016-acre Pinto Mountains DWMA is located in the southeastern portion of the Western Mojave Recovery Unit. No permanent study plots are located in this proposed DWMA. Little information exists on the densities of desert tortoises in this area. Tracy *et al*. (2004) noted that the distribution of carcasses and live desert tortoises appeared to be what one would expect in a "normal" population of desert tortoises; that is, carcasses occurred in the same areas as live desert tortoises and were not found in extensive areas in the absence of live desert tortoises.

The Ord-Rodman DWMA is located to the southeast of the city of Barstow and covers approximately 247,080 acres. The 1994 Recovery Plan notes that the estimated density of desert tortoises in this area is 5 to 150 desert tortoises per square mile (Service 1994). Three permanent study plots are located within and near this proposed DWMA.

The Superior-Cronese DWMA is located north of the Ord-Rodman DWMA; two interstate freeways and rural, urban, and agricultural development separate them. This DWMA covers 629,389 acres. No permanent study plots have been established in this area; the density of desert tortoises has been estimated through numerous triangular transects and line distance sampling efforts. This DWMA supports densities of approximately 20 to 250 desert tortoises per square mile (Service 1994).

The Fremont-Kramer DWMA is located west of the Superior-Cronese DWMA; the two DWMAs are contiguous and cover approximately 511,901 acres. The 1994 Recovery Plan notes that the estimated density of desert tortoises in this area was 5 to 100 desert tortoises per square mile (Service 1994). Berry (1996) notes that the overall trend in this proposed DWMA is "a steep, downward decline" and identifies predation by common ravens and domestic dogs, off-road vehicle activity, illegal collecting, upper respiratory tract disease, and environmental contaminants as contributing factors.

During the summers of 1998 and 1999, BLM funded surveys of over 1,200 transects over a large area of the western Mojave Desert. These transects failed to detect sign of desert tortoises in areas where they were previously considered to be common. Although these data have not been fully analyzed and compared with previously existing information, they strongly suggest that the number of desert tortoises has declined substantially over large areas of the western Mojave Desert. The Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan Assessment Committee also noted that the Western Mojave Recovery Unit has experienced declines in the number of desert tortoises (Tracy *et al*. 2004).

The Western Mojave Recovery Unit has experienced marked population declines as indicated in the 1994 Recovery Plan and continues today. Spatial analyses of this Recovery Unit show areas with increased probabilities of encountering dead rather than live animals, areas where kernel estimates for carcasses exist in the absence of live animals, and extensive regions where there are clusters of carcasses where there are no clusters of live animals. Collectively, these analyses point generally toward the same areas within the Western Mojave Recovery Unit, namely the northern portion of the Fremont-Kramer DWMA and the northwestern part of the Superior-Cronese DWMA. Together, these independent analyses, based on different combinations of data, all suggest the same conclusion for the Western Mojave. Data are not currently available with sufficient detail for most of the range of the desert tortoise with the exception of the Western Mojave Recovery Unit (Tracy *et al*. 2004).

f. Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit

The 1994 Recovery Plan states that desert tortoises occur in densities of up to 250 adult desert tortoises per square mile within small areas of this recovery unit; overall, the area supports a mosaic of areas supporting high and low densities of desert tortoises (Service 1994). The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) has intensively monitored desert tortoises, using a distance sampling technique, since 1998. Monitoring in 2003 indicated that the density of desert tortoises was approximately 44 per square mile throughout the reserve. This density represents a 41 percent decline since monitoring began in 1998 (McLuckie *et al.* 2006). The report notes that the majority of desert tortoises that died within one year (n=64) were found in areas with relatively high densities; the remains showed no evidence of predation.

In the summer of 2005, approximately 10,446 acres of desert tortoise habitat burned in the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve. The UDWR estimated that as many as 37.5 percent of adult desert tortoises may have died as a direct result of the fires (McLuckie *et al.* 2006).

Summary

Density estimates of adult tortoises varied among recovery units and years. Over the first six years of range-wide monitoring (2001-2005, 2007), tortoises were least abundant in the Northeast Mojave Recovery Unit (1 to 3.7 tortoises per kilometer^2 [2 to 10 tortoises per mile^2]; Service 2009b), and the highest reported densities occurred in the Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit
(15 to 27 tortoises per kilometer^2 [38 to 69 tortoises per mile^2]; McLuckie *et al.* 2007). Considerable decreases in density were reported in 2003 in the Eastern Colorado and Western Mojave recovery units (Service 2006). However, the variability between annual estimates among all years is consistent with variability due to sampling between years; only after several years of consistent patterns will the range-wide approach distinguish population trends from the variability due to sampling. Beyond noting that no range-wide population losses or gains were detected, inferences as to the meaning of these first years of data would be premature.

Please refer to *The Status of the Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) in the United States* (Berry 1984) and the *Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan Assessment* (Tracy *et al.* 2004) for a detailed description of the methods and population trend and distribution analyses described above. In addition, *Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Population of the Desert Tortoise: 2007 Annual Report* (Service 2009b) provides information regarding the current monitoring effort.

Based on information in the draft recovery plan (Service 2008), desert tortoise (Mojave population) is classified as a) at a moderate degree of threat, which, although increased since 1994, does not place the species at imminent risk of extinction; b) has a low potential for recovery, adjusted based on current uncertainties about various threats and our ability to manage them; c) is a listed population below the species level; and d) is in potential conflict with development or other forms of economic activity. We anticipate that implementation of the revised recovery plan will resolve key uncertainties about threats and management, thereby improving recovery potential.

7. Threats

The Service identified key threats when the Mojave population of the desert tortoise was emergency listed as endangered and subsequently listed as a threatened species, which remains valid today. The 1994 Recovery Plan discusses threats and developed recovery objectives to minimize their effects on the desert tortoise and allow the desert tortoise to recover. Since becoming listed under the Act, more information is available on threats to the desert tortoise with some threats such as wildfires and nonnative plants affecting large areas occupied by desert tortoises.

Nonnative plants continue to contribute towards overall degradation or habitat quality for the desert tortoise. Land managers and field scientists identified 116 species of nonnative plants in the Mojave and Colorado deserts (Brooks and Esque 2002). The proliferation of nonnative plant species has also contributed to an increase in fire frequency in desert tortoise habitat by providing sufficient fuel to carry fires, especially in the intershrub spaces that are mostly devoid of native vegetation (Service 1994; Brooks 1998; Brown and Minnich 1986). Changes in plant communities caused by nonnative plants and recurrent fire may negatively affect the desert tortoise by altering habitat structure and species composition of their food plants (Brooks and Esque 2002).

Changing ecological conditions as a result of natural events or human-caused activities may stress individual desert tortoises and result in a more severe clinical expression of URTD (Brown *et al*. 2002). For example, the proliferation of non-native plants within the range of the desert tortoise has had far-reaching impacts on desert tortoise populations. Desert tortoises have been documented to prefer native vegetation over non-natives (Tracy *et al*. 2004). Nonnative, annual plants in desert tortoise critical habitat in the western Mojave Desert were identified to compose over 60 percent of the annual biomass (Brooks 1998). The reduction in quantity and quality of forage may stress desert tortoises and make them more susceptible to drought- and disease-related mortality (Brown *et al*. 1994). Malnutrition has been associated with several disease outbreaks in other chelonians (Borysenko and Lewis 1979).

Numerous wildfires occurred in desert tortoise habitat across the range of the desert tortoise in 2005 due to abundant fuel from the proliferation of nonnative plant species after a very wet winter. These wildfires heavily impacted two of the six desert tortoise recovery units, burning almost 19 percent of desert tortoise habitat in the Upper Virgin River and 10 percent in the Northeastern Mojave (Table 1). There were no significant fires from 2007 to 2009 in this area. In the Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit, 19 percent of the Upper Virgin River CHU burned. In the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit, three CHUs were impacted: approximately 23 percent of the Beaver Dam Slope CHU burned, 13 percent of the Gold Butte-Pakoon CHU, and 4 percent of the Mormon Mesa CHU. Although it is known that desert tortoises were burned and killed by the wildfires, desert tortoise mortality estimates are not available. Recovery of these burned areas is likely to require decades.

Table 1. Area (hectares) of desert tortoise Critical Habitat burned in the Northeastern Mojave and Upper Virgin River recovery units unit during 2005*.

Recovery Unit	Critical Habitat Unit	Total Area Burned	Percent Burned
Northeastern Mojave			
	Beaver Dam Slope	53,528	26
	Gold-Butte Pakoon	65,339	13
	Mormon Mesa	12,952	3
	non-Critical Habitat	404,685	-
Upper Virgin River			
	Upper Virgin River	10,557	19

*Complete data sources: NV fire data from BLM as a single 2005 file: *http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/prog/more_programs/geographic_sciences/gis/geospatial_data.html*; AZ fire data from Forest Service, part of historic files [cross referenced against BLM ADSO fire data]: *http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/gis/datasets.shtml*; UT fire data from BLM, as part of historic fires file: *http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/prog/more/geographic_information/gis_data_and_maps.print.html*.

Disease and raven predation have been considered important threats to the desert tortoise since its emergency listing in 1989. What is currently known with certainty about disease in the desert tortoise relates entirely to individual desert tortoises and not populations; virtually nothing is known about the demographic consequences of disease (Tracy *et al*. 2004). Disease was identified in the 1994 Recovery Plan as an important threat to the desert tortoise. Disease is a natural phenomenon in wild populations of desert tortoises and can contribute to population declines by increasing mortality and reducing reproduction. However, URTD appears to be a complex, multi-factorial disease interacting with other stressors to affect desert tortoises (Brown *et al*. 2002; Tracy *et al*. 2004). The disease probably occurs mostly in relatively dense desert tortoise populations, as mycoplasmal infections are dependent upon higher densities of the host (Tracy *et al*. 2004).

From 1969 to 2004 the numbers of common ravens in the West Mojave Desert increased approximately 700 percent (Boarman and Kristan 2006). Population increases have also been noted at other locations particularly in the California Desert. This many-fold increase above historic levels and a shift from a migratory species to a resident species is due in large part to recent human subsidies of food, water, and nest sites (Knight *et al*. 1993, Boarman 1993, Boarman and Berry 1995). While not all ravens may include desert tortoises as significant components of their diets, these birds are highly opportunistic in their feeding patterns and concentrate on easily available seasonal food sources, such as juvenile desert tortoises.

Boarman (2002) identified the following major categories of threats: Agriculture, collection by humans, construction activities, disease, drought, energy and mineral development, fire, garbage and litter, handling and deliberate manipulation of desert tortoises, invasive or nonnative plants, landfills, livestock grazing, military operations, noise and vibration, OHV activities, predation, non-off-road vehicle recreation, roads, highways and railroads, utility corridors, vandalism, and wild horses and burros. For additional information on threats to the desert tortoise refer to Boarman (2002), Tracy *et al.* (2004), and Service (2008).

8. Desert Tortoise Critical Habitat – Rangewide Status

Desert tortoise critical habitat was designated by the Service to identify the key biological and physical needs of the desert tortoise and key areas for recovery, and focuses conservation actions on those areas. Desert tortoise critical habitat is composed of specific geographic areas that contain the primary constituent elements of critical habitat, consisting of the biological and physical attributes essential to the species' conservation within those areas, such as space, food, water, nutrition, cover, shelter, reproductive sites, and special habitats. The specific primary constituent elements of desert tortoise critical habitat are:

a. sufficient space to support viable populations within each of the six recovery units, and to provide for movement, dispersal, and gene flow;

b. sufficient quality and quantity of forage species and the proper soil conditions to provide for the growth of these species;

c. suitable substrates for burrowing, nesting, and overwintering; burrows, caliche caves, and other shelter sites;

d. sufficient vegetation for shelter from temperature extremes and predators; and

e. habitat protected from disturbance and human-caused mortality.

The CHUs were based on recommendations for DWMAs outlined in the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Desert Tortoise (Mojave Population)* (Service 1993). These DWMAs are also identified as desert tortoise ACECs by BLM. Because the critical habitat boundaries were drawn to optimize reserve design, the critical habitat unit may contain both "suitable" and "unsuitable" habitat. Suitable habitat can be generally defined as areas that provide the primary constituent elements.

Although recovery of the desert tortoise will focus on DWMAs/ACECs, section II.A.6. of the 1994 Recovery Plan and section 2(b) of the Act provide for protection and conservation of ecosystems on which federally-listed threatened and endangered species depend, which includes both recovery and non-recovery areas. The Mojave Desert ecosystem, of which the desert tortoise and its habitat are an integral part, consists of a dynamic complex of plant, animal, fungal, and microorganism communities and their associated nonliving environment interacting as an ecological unit (Noss and Cooperrider 1994). Actions that adversely affect components of the Mojave Desert ecosystem may directly or indirectly affect the desert tortoise. The 1994 Recovery Plan further states that desert tortoises and habitat outside recovery areas may be important in recovery of the tortoise. Healthy, isolated desert tortoise populations outside recovery areas may have a better chance of surviving catastrophic effects such as disease, than large, contiguous populations (Service 1994).

The 1994 Recovery Plan recommended DWMAs and subsequently the Service designated CHUs based on these proposed DWMAs (Service 1993). When designated, desert tortoise critical habitat contained all the primary constituent elements of desert tortoise critical habitat. The following seven principles of conservation biology serve as the standards by which the Service determines whether or not the CHUs are functioning properly:

a. *Reserves should be well-distributed across the species' range*. The entire range of the Mojave desert tortoise occurs within one of the six recovery units identified in the 1994 Recovery Plan and at least one DWMA and CHU occurs within each recovery unit. The reserves remain well-distributed across the range of the desert tortoise.

b. *Reserves should contain large blocks of habitat with large populations of target species*. The desert tortoise requires large, contiguous areas of habitat to meet its life requisites. Each DWMA and its associated CHUs that were designated to conserve contiguous blocks of habitat that exceed 500,000 acres, with the exception of the Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit (Table 2). The Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit does not meet the minimum size requirement identified in the 1994 Recovery Plan; however, the Service anticipates that reserve-level management will adequately conserve the desert tortoise within this recovery unit. Designation of CHUs were based largely on transect data and included areas with the largest populations of desert tortoises.

c. *Blocks of habitat should be close together*. This principle was met when CHUs were designated and remains valid.

d. *Reserves should contain contiguous rather than fragmented habitat.* This principle was met when CHUs were designated and generally continue to be met. Desert tortoise-proof fencing has been constructed along major roads and highways that traverse critical habitat including Interstate 15 in Nevada and California (Ivanpah Valley DWMA/CHU), U.S. Highway 95 (US 95) in Nevada (Piute-Eldorado DWMA/CHU), and Highway 58 in California (Fremont-Kramer DWMA/CHU). Major roads and highways alone constitute a barrier to desert tortoise movements without fencing; however, the fencing minimized take of desert tortoises and culverts or underpasses allow for limited desert tortoise movement across the road or highway.

e. *Habitat patches should contain minimal edge-to-area ratios*. This principle was met when CHUs were designated and generally continue to be valid. Notable exceptions include the northern Gold Butte-Pakoon CHU, and the southern termini of the Mormon Mesa, Ivanpah Valley, and Chuckwalla CHUs which have large edge-to-area ratios and further compromised by highways that traverse these relatively narrow areas within the CHUs.

f. *Blocks should be interconnected by corridors or linkages connecting protected, preferred habitat for the target species.* Most CHUs are contiguous with another CHU with the exception of Ord-Rodman, Ivanpah Valley, Gold Butte Pakoon, and Upper Virgin River CHUs. Interstate 15 and the Virgin River separate the Gold Butte-Pakoon CHU from other CHUs in the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit. Similarly, Interstate 40 separates the Piute-Eldorado and Chemehuevi CHUs, and Ord Rodman and Superior-Cronese CHUs.

g. *Blocks of habitat should be roadless or otherwise inaccessible to humans*. Achieving this principle is the most problematic. A 2001 inventory of roads in the western Mojave

Desert suggests that road density increased from the mid-1980s. Further evaluation should be conducted as some of the recently mapped roads were actually historical roads especially with the advent of effective mapping capabilities (Tracy *et al* 2004). Roads are abundant in desert tortoise habitat rangewide and may be increasing in density (Tracy *et al.* 2004).

The 1994 Recovery Plan contains conservation recommendations for desert tortoise critical habitat. The recommendations include the elimination of grazing by livestock, feral burros and horses on desert tortoise critical habitat. Since approval of the 1994 Recovery Plan, livestock grazing in desert tortoise critical habitat has been substantially reduced. BLM and the National Park Service (NPS) manage for zero burros in Nevada in critical habitat and the California Desert Managers Group developed a burro management plan in 2004.

The status of the desert tortoise and its critical habitat has been impacted by decades of human activities. In their 1991 report, the GAO found that livestock grazing practices of the late 1880s and early 1990s badly damaged desert lands in the southwest. Domestic livestock grazing on BLM's hot desert allotments continue to pose the greatest risk of long-term environmental damage to a highly fragile resource. The GAO offered several options for consideration by Congress including the discontinuation of livestock grazing in hot desert areas. They concluded that BLM did not have the resources to properly manage the intensity of livestock grazing in hot deserts. Without sufficient monitoring data, BLM will not have the necessary data to change active preference levels and overgrazing may occur (GAO 1991).

Many of the threats to the desert tortoise exist across broad portions of the species' range. We have developed a prototype decision support system that uses the best data that could be obtained within the planning process and provides a guide as to what additional data are most needed. The initial datasets provide a structure and way to prioritize the next round of data gathering, particularly including impacts to critical habitat. These data, including future updates, will be made publicly available through the Recovery Implementation Team (RIT) process. Data are not readily available to quantify the number of acres of critical habitat that have been degraded; however, we are currently in the process of assembling various spatial data layers, such as aerial photography and satellite-derived land cover data, to complete these sorts of analyses as part of the RITs' prioritization and evaluation of recovery actions. To date, protection of these lands has not been sufficient to recover the species and lands outside critical habitat have become more important for recovery.

Table 2. Desert Tortoise CHUs, DWMAs, and Recovery Units—Size and Location

CHU	SIZE (ac.)	STATE	DWMA	RECOVERY UNIT
Chemehuevi	937,400	CA	Chemehuevi	Northern Colorado
Chuckwalla	1,020,600	CA	Chuckwalla	Eastern Colorado
Fremont-Kramer	518,000	CA	Fremont-Kramer	Western Mojave
Ivanpah Valley	632,400	CA	Ivanpah Valley	Eastern Mojave
Pinto Mtns.	171,700	CA	Joshua Tree	Western Mojave/ Eastern Colorado
Ord-Rodman	253,200	CA	Ord-Rodman	Western Mojave
Piute-Eldorado- CA Piute-Eldorado- NV	453,800 516,800	CA NV	Fenner Piute-Eldorado	Eastern Mojave Northeastern & Eastern Mojave
Superior-Cronese	766,900	CA	Superior-Cronese Lakes	Western Mojave
Beaver Dam:	87,400 74,500 42,700	NV UT AZ	Beaver Dam Beaver Dam Beaver Dam	Northeastern Mojave (all)
Gold Butte-Pakoon	192,300 296,000	NV AZ	Gold Butte-Pakoon Gold Butte-Pakoon	Northeastern Mojave (all)
Mormon Mesa	427,900	NV	Mormon Mesa Coyote Spring	Northeastern Mojave
Upper Virgin River	54,600	UT	Upper Virgin River	Upper Virgin River

Further information on desert tortoise critical habitat can be found in the following documents:

- Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan Assessment Report (Tracy *et al*. 2004)—all CHUs
- Final Environmental Impact Report and Statement for the West Mojave Plan (BLM 2005)— Fremont-Kramer CHU, Superior-Cronese CHU, Ord-Rodman CHU, and Pinto Mountains CHU
- Mojave National Preserve General Management Plan (NPS 2002)—Ivanpah Valley CHU and Piute-Eldorado CHU
- Northern and Eastern Colorado Coordinated Management Plan (BLM 2002a)—Chemehuevi CHU, Pinto Mountains CHU, and Chuckwalla CHU
- Northern and Eastern Mojave Desert Management Plan (BLM 2002b)—Ivanpah Valley CHU, Piute-Eldorado CHU, and Chemehuevi CHU
- Clark County Multiple Species HCP (RECON 2000)—Beaver Dam Slope CHU, Mormon Mesa CHU, Gold Butte-Pakoon CHU, and Piute-Eldorado CHU
- Washington County HCP (Washington County Commission 1995)—Upper Virgin River CHU
- Biological Assessment for the Proposed Addition of Maneuver Training Land at Fort Irwin, CA (U.S. Army National Training Center 2003)—Superior-Cronese CHU
- Desert Tortoise (Mojave Population) Recovery Plan and Proposed Desert Wildlife Management Areas for Recovery of the Mojave Population of the Desert Tortoise (companion document to the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan) (Service 1994)—all CHUs

Literature Cited

Refer to Status of the Species October 28, 2008