



DESERT TORTOISE COUNCIL

3807 Sierra Highway #6-4514

Acton, CA 93510

www.deserttortoise.org

eac@deserttortoise.org

Via email only

16 July 2023

Secretary Wade Crowfoot
California Natural Resources Agency
Attn: Outdoors for All
715 P Street, 20th floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
outdoors@resources.ca.gov

RE: Outdoors for All – Public Comment

Dear Mr. Secretary,

The Desert Tortoise Council (Council) is a non-profit organization comprised of hundreds of professionals and laypersons who share a common concern for wild desert tortoises and a commitment to advancing the public’s understanding of desert tortoise species. Established in 1975 to promote conservation of tortoises in the deserts of the southwestern United States and Mexico, the Council routinely provides information and other forms of assistance to individuals, organizations, and regulatory agencies on matters potentially affecting desert tortoises within their geographic ranges.

Both our physical and email addresses are provided above in our letterhead for your use when providing future correspondence to us. When given a choice, we prefer that you email to us future correspondence, as mail delivered via the U.S. Postal Service may take several days to be delivered. Email is an “environmentally friendlier way” of receiving correspondence and documents rather than “snail mail.”

Given the location for implementation of the proposed strategy in habitats likely occupied by Mojave desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) (synonymous with Agassiz’s desert tortoise), our comments pertain to enhancing protection of this species listed as threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and California Endangered Species Act (CESA) during activities funded, authorized, or carried out by the State of California (State). We assume these comments will be added to the Decision Record/Administrative Record for this strategy. Please accept, carefully review, and include in the relevant project file the Council’s following comments and attachments for the proposed strategy.

The Mojave desert tortoise is among the top 50 species on the list of the world’s most endangered tortoises and freshwater turtles. The International Union for Conservation of Nature’s (IUCN) Species Survival Commission, Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group, now considers the Mojave desert tortoise to be Critically Endangered (Berry et al. 2021) “... based on population reduction (decreasing density), habitat loss of over 80% over three generations (90 years), including past reductions and predicted future declines, as well as the effects of disease (upper respiratory tract disease/mycoplasmosis). *Gopherus agassizii* (sensu stricto) comprises tortoises in the most well-studied 30% of the larger range; this portion of the original range has seen the most human impacts and is where the largest past population losses had been documented. A recent rigorous rangewide population reassessment of *G. agassizii* (sensu stricto) has demonstrated continued adult population and density declines of about 90% over three generations (two in the past and one ongoing) in four of the five *G. agassizii* recovery units and inadequate recruitment with decreasing percentages of juveniles in all five recovery units.”

This status, in part, prompted the Council to join Defenders of Wildlife and Desert Tortoise Preserve Committee (Defenders of Wildlife et al. 2020) to petition the California Fish and Game Commission in March 2020 to elevate the listing of the Mojave desert tortoise from threatened to endangered in California. We submitted this petition because the tortoise meets the definition of endangered in California when examining the population data and ongoing declining numbers, densities, and recruitment.

Summary of California Outdoors for All Strategy

California Outdoors for All includes “expanding parks in communities with little outdoor space, supporting programs to connect people who lack access, fostering a sense of belonging for all Californians in the outdoors.”

The California Outdoors for All strategy has six priorities:

Priority 1: Establish Spaces for People and Nature to Thrive

The State must collaborate internally to envision, design, acquire, renovate, maintain, and open more high-quality outdoor spaces in areas of the state with the most need.

Priority 2: Foster Belonging

Foster public appreciation of and connection to California’s natural and cultural resources. Public outreach and information can be used to break down the elitism within outdoor recreation by promoting a range of recreation options and empowering all Californians to see themselves in the outdoors.

Priority 3: Connect People and the Outdoors

Increase Californians’ awareness of which outdoor spaces are nearby, what recreational activities they can do there, and how to safely reach these spaces by bike, bus, car, or walking.

Priority 4: Co-Create with Communities

The State will seek tribes and community members as true partners in designing and managing parks and outdoor spaces.

Priority 5: Build Equitable Career Pathways and a Representative Workforce

The backgrounds and identities of the people who make up California’s environmental and outdoor workforce affect where outdoor spaces are located, who they are designed for, and where funding is distributed.

Priority 6: Align Funding to Achieve Outdoors for All

Working across all sectors – regional and federal government, philanthropic, private, and more – to galvanize this movement to build more healthy, accessible, and quality outdoor spaces and experiences for all.

Comments on California Outdoors for All Strategy

The Council supports these six priorities. However, we believe they should be implemented in conjunction with the Governor’s executive order (N-82-20) to combat the biodiversity crisis and climate change crisis, and the State’s implementation of the strategy must not conflict with this executive order. This executive order directs state agencies to “protect and restore biodiversity while stewarding natural and working lands, building climate resilience, and supporting economic sustainability” and “conserve at least 30 percent of California’s lands and coastal waters by 2030.” It specifically directs the California Natural Resources Agency to “[i]mplement actions that promote biodiversity protection, habitat restoration, wildfire-resilient sustainably managed landscapes, and other conservation outcomes.”

The first priority “to envision, design, acquire, renovate, maintain, and open more high-quality outdoor spaces in areas of the state with the most need” is aligned with this executive order. However, we are unsure the criteria that would be used to determine “areas of the state with the most need.” We note that only four of the 200+ California state parks occur in the California desert and have habitat for the Mojave desert tortoise even though the population in the California deserts has grown substantiall in the last three decades. This information suggests disparate consideration of the value of desert species, habitats, and landscapes by the State of California in the past. We urge California State Parks to pursue establishing more state parks in the desert ecosystems of California that included tortoise habitat.

Because not all outdoor spaces are equal in their management needs, and not all outdoor recreation activities are compatible with protecting and restoring biodiverity and stewarding natural lands, the California Outdoors for All strategy should include and emphasize an education component that helps people understand their role in practicing conservation as they enjoy nature and the outdoors in their particular spaces (i.e., natural communities). Without this emphasis on educating the people of California on ecology, that is, the *interrelationship* of organisms, including people, and their environments, the California Outdoors for All strategy has a high likelihood of conflicting with executive order (N-82-20) to combat the biodiversity crisis and climate change crisis and decreasing the area of Califonria’s lands that are conserved.

For example, the Mojave desert tortoise, California’s state reptile, is a threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act and Federal Endangered Species Act. In 2014, nine of 11 tortoise populations monitored in California had densities below the viability threshold. By 2021, one population declined to the viability threshold and only one is above this threshold (Please see

Appendix A - Demographic Status and Trend of the Mojave Desert Tortoise including the Western Mojave Recovery Unit). The tortoise is currently being reviewed to be upgraded from threatened to endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

While the tortoise and its habitat face numerous impacts from human activities in the California deserts, one of the most wide reaching impacts is from recreational outdoor use of off-highway vehicles (Please see Appendix B - Partial List of Research Papers on Impacts from Vehicle Use to Desert Ecosystems). Consequently, when looking to Connect People and the Outdoors (Priority 3), the State should ensure that conservation has been adequately balanced with human access and that enforcement of conservation is adequate to prevent abuse/ degradation/destruction of natural and cultural resources, including tortoise habitats.

Therefore, the Council strongly encourages the California Outdoors for All strategy require the development and implementation of a strong and effective education component to understand and appreciate the natural world and that people are a part of it. They should not dominate/degrade/destroy it. This understanding and appreciation should substantially increase their enjoyment of the natural world.

The strategy document has several illustrations of the tortoise under a Joshua tree although we are not sure of their purpose. We hope the purpose is to include the tortoise and the Joshua tree as two species that will benefit from implementation of this initiative and that people would be able to experience and enjoy these two species in their outdoor activities while not adversely impacting them or their habitats.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide comments on this proposed initiative and trust they will help protect tortoises during any resulting authorized activities. Herein, we reiterate that the Desert Tortoise Council wants to be identified as an Affected Interest for this and all other actions funded, authorized, or carried out by the California Natural Resources Agency that may affect desert tortoises, and that any subsequent decisions about this initiative and its implementation are provided to us at the contact information listed above. To the Council, being identified as an Affected Interest means that the Natural Resources Agency will notify us when it is proposing an action that may affect tortoises in California. In addition, we ask that you respond in an email that you have received this comment letter so we can be sure our concerns have been registered with the appropriate personnel and office for this proposed initiative.

Respectfully,



Edward L. LaRue, Jr., M.S.
Desert Tortoise Council, Ecosystems Advisory Committee, Chairperson

Attachment: Appendix A. Demographic Status and Trend of the Mojave Desert Tortoise including the Western Mojave Recovery Unit
Appendix B. Partial List of Research Papers on Impacts from Vehicle Use to Desert Ecosystems

cc: Armando Quintero, Director, California State Parks armando.quintero@parks.ca.gov

Jordan Traverso, Deputy Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
jordan.traverso@wildlife.ca.gov

Trisha A. Moyer, Region 6 – Desert Inland Region, Habitat Conservation Program Supervisor,
California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Bishop, CA Patricia.Moyer@wildlife.ca.gov

Heidi Calvert, Regional Manager, Region 6 – Inland and Desert Region, California Department
of Fish and Wildlife Heidi.Calvert@wildlife.ca.gov

Literature Cited

Berry, K.H., L.J. Allison, A.M. McLuckie, M. Vaughn, and R.W. Murphy. 2021. *Gopherus agassizii*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2021: e.T97246272A3150871.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2021-2.RLTS.T97246272A3150871.en>

Defenders of Wildlife, Desert Tortoise Preserve Committee, and Desert Tortoise Council. 2020.
A Petition to the State of California Fish And Game Commission to move the Mojave
desert tortoise from listed as threatened to endangered. Formal petition submitted 11
March 2020. [https://defenders.org/sites/default/files/2020-
03/Desert%20Tortoise%20Petition%203_20_2020%20Final_0.pdf](https://defenders.org/sites/default/files/2020-03/Desert%20Tortoise%20Petition%203_20_2020%20Final_0.pdf)

Appendix A Demographic Status and Trend of the Mojave Desert Tortoise including the Western Mojave Recovery Unit

Status of the Population of the Mojave Desert Tortoise: The Council provides the following information for resource and land management agencies so that these data may be included and analyzed in their project and land management documents and aid them in making management decisions that affect the Mojave desert tortoise (tortoise).

There are 17 populations of Mojave desert tortoise described below that occur in Critical Habitat Units (CHUs) and Tortoise Conservation Areas (TCAs); 14 are on lands managed by the BLM; 8 of these are in the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA).

As the primary land management entity in the range of the Mojave desert tortoise, the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM's) implementation of a conservation strategy for the Mojave desert tortoise in the CDCA through implementation of its Resource Management Plan and Amendments through 2014 has resulted in the following changes in the status for the tortoise throughout its range and in California from 2004 to 2014 (**Table 1, Table 2**; USFWS 2015, Allison and McLuckie 2018). The Council believes these data show that BLM and others have failed to implement an effective conservation strategy for the Mojave desert tortoise as described in the recovery plan (both USFWS 1994a and 2011), and have contributed to tortoise declines in density and abundance between 2004 to 2014 (**Table 1, Table 2**; USFWS 2015, Allison and McLuckie 2018) with declines or no improvement in population density from 2015 to 2021 (**Table 3**; USFWS 2016, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2022a, 2022b).

Important points from these tables include the following:

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise Range-wide

- Ten of 17 populations of the Mojave desert tortoise declined from 2004 to 2014.
- Eleven of 17 populations of the Mojave desert tortoise are below the population viability threshold. These 11 populations represent 89.7 percent of the range-wide habitat in CHUs/TCAs.

Change in Status for the Western Mojave Recovery Unit – Nevada and California

- This recovery unit had a 51 percent decline in tortoise density from 2004 to 2014.
- Tortoises in this recovery unit have densities that are below viability.

Change in Status for the Superior-Cronese Tortoise Population in the Western Mojave Recovery Unit.

- The population in this recovery unit experienced declines in densities of 61 percent from 2004 to 2014. In addition, there was a 51 percent decline in tortoise abundance.
- This population has densities less than needed for population viability (USFWS 1994a).

Table 1. Summary of 10-year trend data for the 5 Recovery Units and 17 CHUs/TCAs for Mojave desert tortoise. The table includes the area of each Recovery Unit and CHU/TCA, percent of total

habitat for each Recovery Unit and CHU/TCA, density (number of breeding adults/km² and standard errors = SE), and the percent change in population density between 2004 and 2014. Populations below the viable level of 3.9 breeding individuals/km² (10 breeding individuals per mi²) (assumes a 1:1 sex ratio) or showing a decline from 2004 to 2014 are in red.

Recovery Unit: Designated Critical Habitat Unit¹/Tortoise Conservation Area	Surveyed area (km²)	% of total habitat area in Recovery Unit & CHU/TCA	2014 density/km² (SE)	% 10-year change (2004–2014)
Western Mojave, CA	6,294	24.51	2.8 (1.0)	-50.7 decline
Fremont-Kramer	2,347	9.14	2.6 (1.0)	-50.6 decline
Ord-Rodman	852	3.32	3.6 (1.4)	-56.5 decline
Superior-Cronese	3,094	12.05	2.4 (0.9)	-61.5 decline
Colorado Desert, CA	11,663	45.42	4.0 (1.4)	-36.25 decline
Chocolate Mtn AGR, CA	713	2.78	7.2 (2.8)	-29.77 decline
Chuckwalla, CA	2,818	10.97	3.3 (1.3)	-37.43 decline
Chemehuevi, CA	3,763	14.65	2.8 (1.1)	-64.70 decline
Fenner, CA	1,782	6.94	4.8 (1.9)	-52.86 decline
Joshua Tree, CA	1,152	4.49	3.7 (1.5)	+178.62 increase
Pinto Mtn, CA	508	1.98	2.4 (1.0)	-60.30 decline
Piute Valley, NV	927	3.61	5.3 (2.1)	+162.36 increase
Northeastern Mojave	4,160	16.2	4.5 (1.9)	+325.62 increase
Beaver Dam Slope, NV, UT, AZ	750	2.92	6.2 (2.4)	+370.33 increase
Coyote Spring, NV	960	3.74	4.0 (1.6)	+ 265.06 increase
Gold Butte, NV & AZ	1,607	6.26	2.7 (1.0)	+ 384.37 increase
Mormon Mesa, NV	844	3.29	6.4 (2.5)	+ 217.80 increase
Eastern Mojave, NV & CA	3,446	13.42	1.9 (0.7)	-67.26 decline
El Dorado Valley, NV	999	3.89	1.5 (0.6)	-61.14 decline
Ivanpah Valley, CA	2,447	9.53	2.3 (0.9)	-56.05 decline
Upper Virgin River	115	0.45	15.3 (6.0)	-26.57 decline
Red Cliffs Desert	115	0.45	15.3 (6.0)	-26.57 decline
Range-wide Area of CHUs - TCAs/Range-wide Change in Population Status	25,678	100.00		-32.18 decline

¹ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994b. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; determination of critical habitat for the Mojave population of the desert tortoise. Federal Register 55(26):5820-5866. Washington, D.C.

Table 2. Estimated change in abundance of adult Mojave desert tortoises in each recovery unit between 2004 and 2014 (Allison and McLuckie 2018). Decreases in abundance are in red.

Recovery Unit	Modeled Habitat (km²)	2004 Abundance	2014 Abundance	Change in Abundance	Percent Change in Abundance
Western Mojave	23,139	131,540	64,871	-66,668	-51%
Colorado Desert	18,024	103,675	66,097	-37,578	-36%
Northeastern Mojave	10,664	12,610	46,701	34,091	270%
Eastern Mojave	16,061	75,342	24,664	-50,679	-67%
Upper Virgin River	613	13,226	10,010	-3,216	-24%
Total	68,501	336,393	212,343	-124,050	-37%

Table 3. Summary of data for Agassiz’s desert tortoise, *Gopherus agassizii* (=Mojave desert tortoise) from 2004 to 2021 for the 5 Recovery Units and 17 Critical Habitat Units (CHUs)/Tortoise Conservation Areas (TCAs). The table includes the area of each Recovery Unit and CHU/TCA, percent of total habitat for each Recovery Unit and CHU/TCA, density (number of breeding adults/km² and standard errors = SE), and percent change in population density between 2004–2014 (USFWS 2015). Populations below the viable level of 3.9 breeding individuals/km² (10 breeding individuals per mi²) (assumes a 1:1 sex ratio) (USFWS 1994a, 2015) or showing a decline from 2004 to 2014 are in **red**.

Recovery Unit: Designated CHU/TCA &	% of total habitat area in Recovery Unit & CHU/TCA	2004 density/ km ²	2014 density/ km ² (SE)	% 10- year change (2004– 2014)	2015 density/ km ²	2016 density/ km ²	2017 density/ km ²	2018 density/ km ²	2019 density/ km ²	2020 density/ km ²	2021 density/ km ²
Western Mojave, CA	24.51		2.8 (1.0)	-50.7 decline							
Fremont-Kramer	9.14		2.6 (1.0)	-50.6 decline	4.5	No data	4.1	No data	2.7	1.7	No data
Ord-Rodman	3.32		3.6 (1.4)	-56.5 decline	No data	No data	3.9	2.5/3.4*	2.1/2.5*	No data	1.9/2.5*
Superior-Cronese	12.05		2.4 (0.9)	-61.5 decline	2.6	3.6	1.7	No data	1.9	No data	No data
Colorado Desert, CA	45.42		4.0 (1.4)	-36.25 decline							
Chocolate Mtn AGR, CA	2.78		7.2 (2.8)	-29.77 decline	10.3	8.5	9.4	7.6	7.0	7.1	3.9
Chuckwalla, CA	10.97		3.3 (1.3)	-37.43 decline	No data	No data	4.3	No data	1.8	4.6	2.6
Chemehuevi, CA	14.65		2.8 (1.1)	-64.70 decline	No data	1.7	No data	2.9	No data	4.0	No data
Fenner, CA	6.94		4.8 (1.9)	-52.86 decline	No data	5.5	No data	6.0	2.8	No data	5.3
Joshua Tree, CA	4.49		3.7 (1.5)	+178.62 increase	No data	2.6	3.6	No data	3.1	3.9	No data
Pinto Mtn, CA	1.98		2.4 (1.0)	-60.30 decline	No data	2.1	2.3	No data	1.7	2.9	No data
Piute Valley, NV	3.61		5.3 (2.1)	+162.36 increase	No data	4.0	5.9	No data	No data	No data	3.9

Northeastern Mojave AZ, NV, & UT	16.2		4.5 (1.9)	+325.62 increase							
Beaver Dam Slope, NV, UT, & AZ	2.92		6.2 (2.4)	+370.33 increase	No data	5.6	1.3	5.1	2.0	No data	No data
Coyote Spring, NV	3.74		4.0 (1.6)	+ 265.06 increase	No data	4.2	No data	No data	3.2	No data	No data
Gold Butte, NV & AZ	6.26		2.7 (1.0)	+ 384.37 increase	No data	No data	1.9	2.3	No data	No data	2.4
Mormon Mesa, NV	3.29		6.4 (2.5)	+ 217.80 increase	No data	2.1	No data	3.6	No data	5.2	5.2
Eastern Mojave, NV & CA	13.42		1.9 (0.7)	-67.26 decline							
El Dorado Valley, NV	3.89		1.5 (0.6)	-61.14 decline	No data	2.7	5.6	No data	2.3	No data	No data
Ivanpah Valley, CA	9.53		2.3 (0.9)	-56.05 decline	1.9	No data	No data	3.7	2.6	No data	1.8
Upper Virgin River, UT & AZ	0.45		15.3 (6.0)	-26.57 decline							
Red Cliffs Desert**	0.45	29.1 (21.4-39.6)**	15.3 (6.0)	-26.57 decline	15.0	No data	19.1	No data	17.2	No data	
Rangewide Area of CHUs - TCAs/Rangewide Change in Population Status	100.00			-32.18 decline							

*This density includes the adult tortoises translocated from the expansion of the MCAGCC, that is resident adult tortoises and translocated adult tortoises.

**Methodology for collecting density data initiated in 1999.

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise in California

- Eight of 10 populations of the Mojave desert tortoise in California declined from 29 to 64 percent from 2004 to 2014 with implementation of tortoise conservation measures in the Northern and Eastern Colorado Desert (NECO), Northern and Eastern Mojave Desert (NEMO), and Western Mojave Desert (WEMO) Plans.
- Eight of 10 populations of the Mojave desert tortoise in California are below the population viability threshold. These eight populations represent 87.45 percent of the habitat in California that is in CHU/TCAs.
- The two viable populations of the Mojave desert tortoise in California are declining. If their rates of decline from 2004 to 2014 continue, these two populations will no longer be viable by about 2030.

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise on BLM Land in California

- Eight of eight populations of Mojave desert tortoise on lands managed by the BLM in California declined from 2004 to 2014.
- Seven of eight populations of Mojave desert tortoise on lands managed by the BLM in California are no longer viable.

Change in Status for Mojave Desert Tortoise Populations in California that Are Moving toward Meeting Recovery Criteria

- The only population of Mojave desert tortoise in California that is not declining is on land managed by the National Park Service, which has increased 178 percent in 10 years.

Important points to note from the data from 2015 to 2021 in Table 3 are:

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise in the Western Mojave Recovery Unit:

- Density of tortoises continues to decline in the Western Mojave Recovery Unit
- Density of tortoises continues to fall below the density needed for population viability from 2015 to 2021

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise in the Colorado Desert Recovery Unit:

- The population that had the highest density in this recovery unit had a continuous reduction in density since 2018 and fell substantially to the minimum density needed for population viability in 2021.

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise in the Northeastern Mojave Recovery Unit:

- Two of the three population with densities greater than needed for population viability declined to level below the minimum viability threshold.
- The most recent data from three of the four populations in this recovery unit have densities below the minimum density needed for population viability.
- The population that had the highest density in this recovery unit declined since 2014.

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise in the Eastern Mojave Recovery Unit:

- Both populations in this recovery unit have densities below the minimum density needed for population viability.

Change in Status for the Mojave Desert Tortoise in the Upper Virgin River Recovery Unit:

- The one population in this recovery unit is small and appears to have stable densities.

The Endangered Mojave Desert Tortoise: The Council believes that the Mojave desert tortoise meets the definition of an endangered species. In the FESA, Congress defined an “endangered species” as “any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range...” In the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), the California legislature defined an “endangered species” as a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant, which is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes (California Fish and Game Code § 2062). Because most of the populations of the Mojave desert tortoise were non-viable in 2014, most are declining, and the threats to the Mojave desert tortoise are numerous and have not been substantially reduced throughout the species’ range, the Council believes the Mojave desert tortoise should be designated as an endangered species by the USFWS and California Fish and Game Commission. Despite claims by USFWS (Averill-Murray and Field 2023) that a large number of individuals of a listed species and an increasing population trend in part of the range of the species prohibits it from meeting the definitions of endangered, we are reminded that the tenants of conservation biology include numerous factors when determining population viability. The number of individual present is one of a myriad of factors (e.g., species distribution and density, survival strategy, sex ratio, recruitment, genetics, threats including climate change, etc.) used to determine population viability. In addition, a review of all the available data does not show an increasing population trend (please see Tables 1 and 3).

Literature Cited in Demographic Status and Trend of the Mojave Desert Tortoise Including the Western Mojave Recovery Unit

Allison L.J. and A.M. McLuckie. 2018. Population trends in Mojave desert tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii*). Herpetological Conservation and Biology. 2018 Aug 1. 13(2):433–452. http://www.herpconbio.org/Volume_13/Issue_2/Allison_McLuckie_2018.pdf

or

<https://www.fws.gov/media/allison-and-mcluckie2018mojave-desert-tortoise-population-trends>

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994a. Desert tortoise (Mojave population) Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 73 pages plus appendices. https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/940628.pdf

[USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994b. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; determination of critical habitat for the Mojave population of the desert tortoise. Federal Register 55(26):5820-5866. Washington, D.C.

- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011. Revised Recovery Plan for the Mojave Population of the Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California and Nevada Region, Sacramento, California. <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USFWS.2011.RRP%20for%20the%20Mojave%20Desert%20Tortoise.pdf>
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2015. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2013 and 2014 Annual Reports. Report by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada. <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USFWS.2015%20report.%20Rangewide%20monitoring%20report%202013-14.pdf>
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2016. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2015 and 2016 Annual Reporting. Report by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada. <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USFWS.2016%20report.%20Rangewide%20monitoring%20report%202015-16.pdf>
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2018. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2017 Annual Reporting. Report by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada. <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USFWS.2018%20report.%20Rangewide%20monitoring%20report%202017.pdf>
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2018 Annual Reporting. Report by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada. <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USFWS.2019%20report.%20Rangewide%20monitoring%20report%202018.pdf>
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2020. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2019 Annual Reporting. Report by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada. 42 pages. https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2019_Rangewide%20Mojave%20Desert%20Tortoise%20Monitoring.pdf
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2022a. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2020 Annual Reporting. Report by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada. <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USFWS.2022%20report.%20Rangewide%20monitoring%20report%202020.pdf>
- [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2022b. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2021 Annual Reporting. Report by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada.

<https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USFWS.2022%20report.%20Rangewide%20monitoring%20report%202021.pdf>

Appendix B. Partial List of Research Papers on Impacts from Vehicle Use to Desert Ecosystems

- Aber, J.D., K.J. Nadelhoffer, P. Steudler, and J.M. Melillo. 1989. Nitrogen Saturation in Northern Forest Ecosystems. *BioScience* 39(6):8-386
- Allen, E.B., Rao, L.E., Steers, R.J., Bytnerowicz, A., and Fenn, M.E., 2009, Impacts of atmospheric nitrogen deposition on vegetation and soils at Joshua Tree National Pages, in Webb, R.H., Fenstermaker, L.F., Heaton, J.S., Hughson, D.L., McDonald, E.V., and Miller, D.M. (eds.), *The Mojave Desert: ecosystem processes and sustainability*: Reno, University of Nevada Press, .p. 78–100.
- Arnold, R. 2011. Focused desert tortoise survey, Lucerne Valley Desert View Ranch generating facility. APN 0435-083-39 & -435-132-01, San Bernardino County. RCA Associated, Hesperia, CA.
- Avery, H.W. 1997. Effects of cattle grazing on the desert tortoise, *Gopherus agassizii*: Nutritional and behavioral interactions. Pages 13-20 in J. Van Abbema (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Tortoises and Turtles*. New York Turtle and Tortoise Society, New York.
- Avery, H.W. 1998. Nutritional ecology of the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) in relation to cattle grazing in the Mojave Desert. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Beacon Solar. 2008. Application for Incidental Take of Threatened and Endangered Species. Application to California Department of Fish and Game by Beacon Solar, LLC, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, FL.
- Beazley, K.F., T.V. Snaith, F. Mackinnin, and D. Colville. 2004. Road density and potential impacts on wildlife species such as American moose in mainland Nova Scotia. *Proc. N.S. Inst. Sci.* (2004) Volume 42, Part 2, pp. 339-357.
- Belnap, J. 1996. Soil surface disturbances in cold deserts: effects on nitrogenase activity in cyanobacterial-lichen soil crusts. *Biol Fertil Soils* (1996) 23:362-367.
- Berry, K.H. 1974. Desert tortoise relocation project: Status report for 1972. California Department of Transportation
- Berry, K.H. 1990. The status of the desert tortoise in California in 1989. Draft report. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Riverside, California.
- Berry, K.H., and L.L. Nicholson. 1984b. A summary of human activities and their impacts on desert tortoise populations and habitat in California. Chapter 3 in K.H. Berry (ed.), *The status of the desert tortoise (Gopherus agassizii) in the United States*. Desert Tortoise Council Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Order No. 11310-0083-81.

- Berry, K.H., F.G. Hoover, and M. Walker. 1996. The effects of poaching desert tortoises in the western Mojave Desert; evaluation of landscape and local impacts. Proceedings of the Desert Tortoise Council Symposium 1996:45.
- Berry, K.H., K. Keith, and T. Bailey. 2008. Status of the desert tortoise in Red Rock Canyon State Park. California Fish and Game 94(2):98-118.
- Berry, K.H., J. L. Yee, A.A. Coble, W.M. Perry, and T.A. Shields. 2013. Multiple factors affect a population of Agassiz's desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) in the northwestern Mojave Desert. Herpetological Monographs, 27, 2013, 87–109.
- Berry, K.H., L.M. Lyren, J.L. Yee, and T.Y. Bailey. 2014. Protection benefits desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) abundance: the influence of three management strategies on a threatened species. Herpetological Monographs, 28 2014, 66–92.
- Berry, K.H., L.M. Lyren, J.S. Mack, L.A Brand, and D.A.Wood. 2016. Desert tortoise annotated bibliography, 1991–2015: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2016-1023, 312 p., <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20161023>.
- Boarman, W.I. 2002. Threats to desert tortoise populations: a critical review of the literature. Unpublished Report, prepared for the West Mojave Planning Team and the Bureau of Land Management. 86 pp.
- Boarman, W.I., and K.H Berry. 1995. Common ravens in the southwestern United States, 1968-92. In: Our Living Resources: A Report to the Nation on the Distribution, Abundance, and Health of U.S. Plants, Animals, and Ecosystems. Edward T. LaRoe, Gaye S. Farris, Catherine E. Puckett, Peter D. Doran, and Michael J. Mac, editors. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Biological Service.
- Boarman, W.I., R.J. Camp, M. Hagan, W. Deal. 1995. Raven abundance at anthropogenic resources in the western Mojave Desert, California. Report to Edwards Air Force Base, California.
- Boarman, W.I., and M. Sazaki. 1996. Highway mortality in desert tortoises and small vertebrates: success of barrier fences and culverts. Proceedings: Florida Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration Transportation-Related Wildlife Mortality Seminar. Evink, G., Ziegler, D., Garrett, P. and Berry, J. (Eds). pp. 169–173.
- Boarman, W.I., and Sazaki, M., 2006, A highway's road-effect zone for desert tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii*): Journal of Arid Environments, v. 65, p. 94–101.
- Boarman, W.I., Sazaki, M., Jennings, B., 1997. The effects of roads, barrier fences and culverts on desert tortoise populations in California, USA. In: Proceedings: Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Tortoises and Turtles — An International Conference, pp. 54–58.

- Boarman, W.I., M.L. Beigel, G.C. Goodlett, and M. Sazaki. 1998. A passive integrated transponder system for tracking animal movements. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 26, 886-891.
- Boarman, W.I., W.B. Kristan, W.C. Webb, and H.D. Chamblin. 2005. Raven ecology in the Mojave Desert at Edwards Air Force Base: final report. U.S. Geological Survey, Western Ecological Research Center, Sacramento, California.
- Boarman, W.I., and W.B. Kristan. 2006. Evaluation of evidence supporting the effectiveness of desert tortoise recovery actions. *Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5143*. U.S. Geological Survey, Western Ecological Research Center, Sacramento, CA.
- Boarman, W.I., Patten, M.A., Camp, R.J., and Collis, S.J., 2006, Ecology of a population of subsidized predators: common ravens in the central Mojave Desert, California: *Journal of Arid Environments*, v. 67, p. 248–261.
- Bouchard, J., A. T. Ford, F. Eigenbrod, and L. Fahrig. 2009. Behavioral response of northern leopard frogs (*Rana pipens*) to roads and traffic: implications for population persistence. *Ecology and Society* 14(2): 23. <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss2/art23/>.
- Bratzel, S., and R. Tellermann. 2005. Mobilität und Verkehr. *Informationen zur politischen Bildung* 287(2):44-51.
- Brocke, R.H., J.P. O'Pezio, K.A. Gustafson. 1988 A forest management scheme mitigating impact of road networks on sensitive wildlife species. In: R.M. Degraaf and W.M. Healy (eds): *Is forest fragmentation a management issue in the northeast? GTR-NE-140*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experimental Station, Radnor, PA: 13-17.
- Brocke, R.H., J.P. O'Pezio, K.A. Gustafson. 1988 A forest management scheme mitigating impact of road networks on sensitive wildlife species. In: R.M. Degraaf and W.M. Healy (eds): *Is forest fragmentation a management issue in the northeast? GTR-NE-140*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experimental Station, Radnor, PA: 13-17.
- Brooks, M.L., 1995, Benefits of protective fencing to plant and rodent communities of the western Mojave Desert, California: *Environmental Management*, v. 19, p. 65–74.
- Brooks, M.L., 1999, Alien annual grasses and fire in the Mojave Desert: *Madroño*, v. 46, p. 13–19.
- Brooks, M.L., 2003, Effects of increased soil nitrogen on the dominance of alien annual plants in the Mojave Desert: *Journal of Applied Ecology*, v. 40, p. 344–353.

- Brooks, M.L., T.C. Esque, and J.R. Matchett. 2003. Current status and management of alien plants and fire in desert tortoise habitat. Desert Tortoise Council Symposium, February 21-23, 2003.
- Brooks, M.L. 2009, Spatial and temporal distribution of non-native plants in upland areas of the Mojave Desert, in Webb, R.H., Fenstermaker, L.F., Heaton, J.S., Hughson, D.L., McDonald, E.V., and Miller, D.M., eds., *The Mojave Desert—Ecosystem processes and sustainability*: Reno, University of Nevada Press, p. 101–124.
- Brooks, M.L. and K.H. Berry. 1999. Ecology and management of alien annual plants in the California deserts. *Calif. Exotic Pest Plant Newsl.* 7(3/4):4-6.
- Brooks, M.L., and Berry, K.H., 2006, Dominance and environmental correlates of alien annual plants in the Mojave Desert, USA: *Journal of Arid Environments*, v. 67, p. 100–124.
- Brooks, M.L., and Esque, T.C., 2002, Alien plants and fire in desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) habitat of the Mojave and Colorado Deserts: *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*, v. 4, p. 330–340.
- Brooks, M.L., C.M. D’Antonio, D.M. Richardson, J. B. Grace, J.E. Kelley, J. M. Ditomaso, R.J. Hobbs, M. Pellant, And D. Pyke. 2004. Effects of Invasive Alien Plants on Fire Regimes. *Bioscience/ Vol. 54 No. 7: 677-688.* July 2004.
- Brooks, M.L. and B. Lair. 2005. Ecological Effects of Vehicular Routes in a Desert Ecosystem. Report prepared for the United States Geological Survey, Recoverability and Vulnerability of Desert Ecosystems Program (<http://geography.wr.usgs.gov/mojave/rvde>).
- Brooks, M.L. and B. M. Lair. 2009. Ecological effects of vehicular routes in a desert ecosystem. In: R.H. Webb, L.F. Fenstermaker, J.S. Heaton, D.L. Hughson, E.V. McDonald, and D.M. Miller (eds.). *The Mojave Desert: Ecosystem Processes and Sustainability*. University of Arizona Press. Tucson, AZ.
- Brooks, M.L., and Matchett, J.R. 2006. Spatial and temporal patterns of wildfires in the Mojave Desert, 1980–2004. *Journal of Arid Environments* Volume 67, Supplement, 2006, Pages 148-164.
- Brown, D.E., and R.A. Minnich. 1986. Fire and changes in creosote bush scrub of the western Sonoran desert, California. *American Naturalist* 116(2):411-422.
- Bureau of Land Management. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Game. 1989. Environmental assessment for selected control of the common raven to reduce desert tortoise predation in the Mojave Desert, California. Bureau of Land Management, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Game.

- Bureau of Land Management. 1993. Final Rand Mountains–Fremont Valley Management Plan. A Sikes Act Plan. Bureau of Land Management, Ridgecrest Resource Area, California.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1998. The California Desert Conservation Area Plan 1980, as amended. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, California.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1999. Chapter Two - Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*). Working draft for West Mojave Plan. September 22, 1999. https://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/cdd_pdfs/Ch2_9-22-99.pdf
- Bureau of Land Management. 2002. Proposed Northern and Eastern Mojave Desert management plan - Final Environmental Impact Statement – Volumes 1 and 2. California Desert District, Riverside, CA.
- Bureau of Land Management, County of San Bernardino, and City of Barstow. 2005. Proposed West Mojave Plan Final Environmental Impact Report and Statement. BLM/CA/ES-2004-005 + 1790 -1600. Moreno Valley, CA.
- Bureau of Land Management. 2006. Record of decision for the West Mojave Plan. California Desert District, Moreno Valley, CA.
- Bureau of Land Management. 2018a. West Mojave Route Network Project Draft California Desert Conservation Plan Amendment and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the California Desert District. BLM/CA/DOI-BLM-CA-D080-2018-0008-EIS. January 2018. Moreno Valley, CA.
- Bureau of Land Management. 2018b. Stoddard Valley OHV Area. BLM website accessed May 30, 2018. <https://www.blm.gov/visit/stoddard-valley-ohv-area>
- Burge, B.L. 1977. Daily and seasonal behavior, and areas utilized by the desert tortoise, *Gopherus agassizii*, in southern Nevada. Proceedings of the Desert Tortoise Council Symposium 1977:59-94.
- Bury, R.B., and Luckenbach, R.A., 2002, Comparison of desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) populations in an unused and off-road vehicle area in the Mojave Desert: Chelonian Conservation and Biology, v. 4, p. 457–463.
- Caid, N., P. Crist, R. Gilbert, and P. Wiederkehr. 2002. Environmentally sustainable transport: concept, goal and strategy—the OECD’s EST Project. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Transport 153(4):219-226.
- California Turtle and Tortoise Club. 2002. Western Rand Mountains ACEC vehicle closure. <https://tortoise.org/conservation/randacec.html>
- Carr, L. W., and L. Fahrig. 2001. Effect of road traffic on two amphibian species of different vagility. Conservation Biology 15(4):1071-1078.

- Charis Corporation. 2005. Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement - Proposed Addition of Maneuver Training Land at Fort Irwin, CA. August 2005. Prepared for the U.S. Army National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California.
- D'Antonio, C.M., and Vitousek, P.M., 1992, Biological invasions by exotic grasses, the grass-fire cycle, and global change: *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, v. 23, p. 63–87.
- DeFalco, L.A., Detling, J.K., Tracy, C.R., and Warren, S.D., 2001, Physiological variation among native and exotic winter annual plants associated with microbiotic crusts in the Mojave Desert: *Plant and Soil*, v. 234, p. 1–14.
- Desert Gazette. 2018. El Paso Mountains. <http://digital-desert.com/el-paso-mountains/> (accessed 2018-5-30)
- Doak, D., P. Kareiva, and B. Klepetka. 1994. Modeling population viability for the desert tortoise in the western Mojave Desert. *Ecological Applications* 4:446–460.
- Edwards T., A.E. Karl, M. Vaughn, P.C. Rosen, C.M. Torres, and R.W. Murphy. 2016. The desert tortoise trichotomy: Mexico hosts a third, new sister-species of tortoise in the *Gopherus morafkai*–*G. agassizii* group. *ZooKeys* 562: 131– 158. doi: 10.3897/Zookeys. 562.6124.
- Esque, T.C. 1992. Diet selection of the desert tortoise in the northeast Mojave Desert – FY 1991 update. *Proceedings of the Desert Tortoise Council Symposium 1992*:64-68.
- Esque, T.C. 1994. Diet and diet selection of the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) in the northeastern Mojave Desert. Master's Thesis. Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
- Esque, T.C., Schwalbe, C.R., DeFalco, L.A., Duncan, R.B., and Hughes, T.J., 2003, Effects of desert wildfires on desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) and other small vertebrates: *Southwestern Naturalist*, v. 48, p. 103–111.
- Estrada, J. 2017. Events. *Tortoise Tracks* 37:2 page 1, Summer 2017.
- Fahrig, L., and T. Rytwinski. 2009. Effects of roads on animal abundance: an empirical review and synthesis. *Ecology and Society* 14(1): 21. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss1/art21/>
- Federal Highway Administration and California Department of Transportation. 2017. Olancho/Cartago Four-Lane Project on U.S. Highway 395 in Inyo County from 2.1 miles south of LA Aqueduct Bridge (#48-068R) to 0.2 mile south of Ash Creek Bridge (#48-11). Final Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Assessment with Finding of No Significant Impact and Section 4(f) Evaluation.
- Forman, R. T. T. 2000. Estimate of the area affected ecologically by the road system in the United States. *Conservation Biology* 14(1):31-35.

- Forman, R. T. T., D. Sperling, J. A. Bissonette., A. P. Clevenger, C. D. Cutshal, V. H. Dale, L. Fahrig, R. France, C. R. Goldman, K. Haenue , J. A. Jones, F. J. Swanson, T. Turrentine, and T. C. Winter. 2002. Road ecology—science and solutions. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Forman, R.T.T., D.S. Friedman, D. Fitzhenry, J.D. Martin, A.S. Chen, and L.E. Alexander. 1997. Ecological effects of roads: toward three summary indices and an overview of North America. In: Canter K (ed) Habitat fragmentation and infrastructure. Minister of Transport and Public Works and Water Management, Delft, Netherlands, p 40-54.
- Gelbard, J. L., and J. Belnap. 2003. Roads as conduits for exotic plant invasions in a semiarid landscape. *Conservation Biology* 17:420-432.
- Gibbs, J.P., and W.G. Shriver. 2002. Estimating the effects of road mortality on turtle populations. *Conserv. Biol.* 16, 1647–1652.
- Goodlett, G. O. and G. C. Goodlett. 1993. Studies of unauthorized off-highway vehicle activity in the Rand Mountains and Fremont Valley, Kern County, California. *Proc. 1992 Desert Tort. Counc. Symp.* 1993:163-187.
- Gucinski, H., M. Furniss, R. Ziermer, and M. Brookes. 2001. Forest Service roads: a synthesis of scientific information. Gen Tech Rep PNW-GTR-509.1, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR.
- Henen, B.T. 1992. Desert tortoise diet and dietary deficiencies that may limit egg production at Goffs, California. *Proceedings of the Desert Tortoise Council Symposium 1992*:97.
- Hessing, Mark. Botanist for Fort Irwin. E-mail sent to Connie Rutherford, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ventura Office, regarding off-road vehicle activity on Coolgardie Mesa. June 3, 2006. Cited in: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2008. Lane Mountain milk-vetch (*Astragalus jaegerianus*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, Ventura, California. June 2008.
- Jaeger, J.A.G., L. Fahrig, and K.C. Ewald. 2005a. Does the configuration of road networks influence the degree to which roads affect wildlife populations? *International Conference on Ecology and Transportation 2005 Proceedings, Chapter 5 - Integrating Transportation and Resource Conservation Planning - Landscapes and Road Networks*, pages 151-163. August 29, 2005.
- Jaeger, J.A.G., J. Bowman, J. Brennan, L. Fahrig, D. Bert, J. Bouchard, N. Charbonneau, K. Frank, B. Gruber, K. Tluk von Toschanowitz. 2005b. Predicting when animal populations are at risk from roads: an interactive model of road avoidance behavior. *Ecological Modelling* 185 (2005) 329–348.

- Jalkotzy, M.G., P.I. Ross, and M.D. Nasserden. 1997. The effects of linear developments on wildlife: a review of selected scientific literature. Arc Wildlife Services Ltd, prepared for Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Calgary, Alberta.
- Jennings, B. 1992. Observations on the feeding habits and behavior of desert tortoises at the Desert Tortoise Natural Area, California. Proceeding of the Desert Tortoise Council Symposium 1992:69-81.
- Jennings, W. B. 1993. Foraging ecology of the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) in the western Mojave desert. Master's thesis. Arlington, University of Texas: 101 pp.
- Jennings, W. B. 1997. Habitat use and food preferences of the desert tortoise, *Gopherus agassizii*, in the western Mojave Desert and impacts of off-road vehicles. In J. Van Abbema (ed.), Proceedings: Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Tortoises and Turtles-An International Conference, pp. 42-45. New York Turtle and Tortoise Society, New York.
- Karraker, N.E., and J.P. Gibbs. 2011. Contrasting road effect signals in reproduction of long-versus short-lived amphibians. *Hydrobiologia* 664, 213–218.
- Kemp, P.R., and Brooks, M.L., 1998, Exotic species of California deserts: *Fremontia*, v. 26, p. 30–34.
- Kilgo, J.C., R.F. Labisky, and D.E. Fritzen. 1998. Influences of hunting on the behavior of white-tailed deer: implications for conservation of the Florida panther. *Conservation Biology* 12:1359-1364.
- Knight, R.L., and Kawashima, J.Y., 1993, Responses of raven and red-tailed hawk populations to linear right-of-ways: *Journal of Wildlife Management*, v. 57, p. 266–271.
- Knight, R.L., Camp, R.J., Boarman, W.I., and Knight, H.A.L., 1999, Predatory bird populations in the east Mojave Desert, California: *Great Basin Naturalist*, v. 59, p. 331–338.
- LaBerteaux, D.L. 2006. Mustard removal at the Desert Tortoise Research Natural Area, Kern County, California. Report to the Desert Tortoise Preserve Committee, Inc.
- LaRue, E. 1992. Distribution of desert tortoise sign adjacent to Highway 395, San Bernardino County, California. Proceedings of the 1992 Symposium of the Desert Tortoise Council.
- LaRue, E. 1994. Follow-up monitoring report for Stoddard Valley-to-Johnson Valley Point-to-Point Corridor Run. Unpublished report prepared on behalf of the American Motorcyclists Association for the Barstow Resource Area of the Bureau of Land Management.
- LaRue, E. 2008. Latest information on tortoises and other special-status species in Morongo Basin. Morongo Tortoise Update.7-18-2008. Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, Wrightwood, CA. http://www.yucca-valley.org/pdf/general_plan/mb_tortoise_update_july2008.pdf

- LaRue, E. 2014. Mohave Ground Squirrel Trapping Results for Phacelia Wildflower Sanctuary, Los Angeles County, California. <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Mammals/Mohave-Ground-Squirrel/TAG/BlogPage/4/Month/4/Year/2018>
- Lei, S. A. 2004. Soil compaction from human trampling, biking, and off-road motor vehicle activity in a blackbrush (*Coleogyne ramosissima*) shrubland. *Western North American Naturalist* 64:125-130.
- Loughran, C.L., J.R. Ennen, and J.E. Lovich. 2011. *Gopherus agassizii* (desert tortoise). Burrow collapse. *Herpetological Review* 42(4), 593.
- Lovich, J.E., and Bainbridge, D., 1999, Anthropogenic degradation of the southern California desert ecosystem and prospects for natural recovery and restoration: *Environmental Management*, v. 24, p. 309–326.
- Lovich, J.E., C.B. Yackulic, J. Freilich M. Agha, M. Austin, K.P. Meyer, T.R. Arundel, J. Hansen, M.S. Vamstad, S.A. Root. 2014. Climatic variation and tortoise survival: Has a desert species met its match? *Biological Conservation* 169 (2014) 214–224.
- McLellan, B.N., and D.M Shackleton, 1988. Grizzly bears and resource extraction industries: effects of roads on behavior, habitat use and demography. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 25, 451–460.
- McLuckie, A.M., M.R.M. Bennion, and R.A. Fridell. 2007. Tortoise mortality within the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve following the 2005 wildfire. Utah Division of Wildlife Resource Publication 07-05.
- Medica, P.A., R.B. Bury, and F.B. Turner. 1975. Growth of the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) in Nevada. *Copeia* 1975:639-643.
- Minnich, J.E. 1970. Water and electrolyte balance of the desert iguana, *Dipsosaurus dorsalis*, in its native habitat. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology* 35:921-933.
- Minnich, J.E. 1979. Comparison of maintenance electrolyte budgets of free-living desert and gopher tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii* and *G. polyphemus*). *Proceedings of the Desert Tortoise Council Symposium 1979* Pp.166-174.
- Murphy, R.W., Berry, K.H., Edwards, T., Leviton, A.E., Lathrop, A., and Riedle, J.D., 2011, The dazed and confused identity of Agassiz's land tortoise, *Gopherus agassizii* (Testudines, Testudinidae) with the description of a new species, and its consequences for conservation: *ZooKeys*, v. 113, p. 39–71.
- Nafus, M.G., T.D. Tuberville, K. A. Buhlmann, and B.D. Todd. 2013. Relative abundance and demographic structure of Agassiz's desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) along roads of varying size and traffic volume. *Biological Conservation* 162 (2013) 100–106.
- Nagy, K.A. 1972. Water and electrolyte budgets of a free-living desert lizard, *Sauromalus obesus*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology* 79:93-102.

- Nagy, K.A., and P.A. Medica. 1986. Physiological ecology of desert tortoises. *Herpetologica* 42:73-92.
- Nagy, K.A., Henen, B.T., and Vyas, D.B., 1998, Nutritional quality of native and introduced food plants of wild desert tortoises: *Journal of Herpetology*, v. 32, p. 260–267.
- Noss, R. F. 1993. Wildlife corridors. Pages 43-68 in D. S. Smith and P. C. Hellmund, editors. *Ecology of Greenways*. University of Minneapolis Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Noss, R. F. 1995. Maintaining ecological integrity in representative reserve networks. World Wildlife Fund, Canada.
- [OECD] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2002. OECD guidelines towards environmentally sustainable transport. OECD Publications, Paris, France.
- Oftedal, O.T. 2002. The nutritional ecology of the desert tortoise in the Mojave and Sonoran deserts. Pages 194-241 in T.R. Van Devender (ed.), *The Sonoran Desert Tortoise; Natural History, Biology and Conservation*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona.
- Oftedal, O.T., L.S. Hillard, and D.J. Morafka. 2002. Selective spring foraging by juvenile desert tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii*) in the Mojave Desert—Evidence of an adaptive nutritional strategy: *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*, v. 4, p. 341–352.
- Oftedal, O.T. and M.E. Allen. 1996. Nutrition as a major facet of reptile conservation. *Zoo Biology* 15:491-497.
- Parendes, L.A., and J.A. Jones. 2000. Role of light availability and dispersal in exotic plant invasion along roads and streams in the H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest, Oregon. *Conservation Biology* 14:64.
- Rytwinski, T., and L. Fahrig. 2011. Reproductive rate and body size predict road impacts on mammal abundance. *Ecol. Appl.* 21, 589–600.
- Rytwinski, T., and L. Fahrig. 2012. Do species life history traits explain population responses to roads? A meta-analysis. *Biol. Conserv.* 147, 87–98.
- Roedenbeck, I.A., L. Fahrig, C. S. Findlay, J. E. Houlahan, J.A.G. Jaeger, N. Klar, S. Kramer-Schadt, and E. A. van der Grift. 2007. The Rauschholzhausen Agenda for Road Ecology. *Ecology and Society* 12(1): 11. <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss1/art11/>
- Rudis, V.A. 1995. Regional forest fragmentation effects on bottomland hardwood community types and resource values. *Landscape Ecology* 10:291-307.

- Sanson, L. 2016. Marines seek plan to move tortoises from Johnson Valley. Hi-Desert Star September 8, 2016. http://www.hidesertstar.com/news/article_c51696c6-7609-11e6-847d-03224974e42a.html
- Sazaki, M., W.I. Boarman, G. Goodlett, and T. Okamoto. 1995. Risk associated with long-distance movement by desert tortoises. Proceedings of the Desert Tortoise Council 1994 Symposium. pp. 33–48.
- W.H. Schlesinger, and C.S. Jones. 1984. The Comparative Importance of Overland Runoff and Mean Annual Rainfall to Shrub Communities of the Mojave Desert. Botanical Gazette 1984 145(1): 116-124.
- Sharifi, M.R., A.C. Gibson, and P.W. Rundel. 1997. Surface Dust Impacts on Gas Exchange in Mojave Desert Shrubs. Journal of Applied Ecology, 34(4)(Aug., 1997):837-846.
- Sherwood, B., D. Cutler, and J. A. Burton. 2002. Wildlife and roads—the ecological impact. Imperial College Press, London, UK.
- Spellerberg, I. F. 2002. Ecological effects of roads. Land Reconstruction and Management Series, Volume 2. Science Publishers, Enfield, UK.
- Tierra Madre Consultants. 1991. Biological assessment for Lancaster City and Planning Area: Relative density surveys for desert tortoises and cumulative human impact evaluations for Mohave ground squirrel habitat. Report prepared by Ed LaRue for City of Lancaster. Tierra Madre Consultants, Riverside, CA.
- Tracy, C.R., L.C. Zimmerman, C. Tracy, K.D. Bradley, and K. Castle. 2006. Rates of food passage in the digestive tract of young desert tortoises: Effects of body size and diet quality. Chelonian Conservation and Biology: December 2006, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 269-273.
- Tratz, W.M. 1978. Postfire vegetational recovery, productivity and herbivore utilization of a chaparral-desert ecotone. Master's Thesis. California State University, Los Angeles.
- Tratz, W.M., and R.J. Vogl. 1977. Postfire vegetational recovery, productivity and herbivore utilization of a chaparral-desert ecotone. Pages 426-430 in H.A. Mooney and C.E. Conrad (eds.), Proceedings of Symposium on Environmental Consequences of Fire and Fuel Management in Mediterranean Ecosystems. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report WO-3.
- Trombulak, S. C., and C. A. Frissell. 2000. Review of ecological effects of roads on terrestrial and aquatic communities. Conservation Biology 14:18–30.
- Turner, F.B., P. Hayden, B.L. Burge, and J.B. Roberson. 1986. Egg production by the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) in California. Herpetologica 42:93-104.

- Turner, F.B., K.H. Berry, D.C. Randall, and G.C. White. 1987. Population ecology of the desert tortoise at Goffs, California, 1983-1986. Report to Southern California Edison Co., Rosemead, California.
- Turtle Conservation Coalition. 2018. Turtles in Trouble: The World's 25+ Most Endangered Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles. www.iucn-tftsg.org/trouble
- Umweltbundesamt (UBA). 2003. Reduzierung der Flächeninanspruchnahme durch Siedlung und Verkehr. Materialienband. Umweltbundesamt Texte 90/03. Berlin, Germany. Available online at: <http://www.umweltdaten.de/publikationen/fpdf-l/2587.pdf>.
- Underhill, J. E., and P. G. Angold. 2000. Effects of roads on wildlife in an intensively modified landscape. *Environmental Reviews* 8:21-39.
- U.S. District Court. 2011. Order re: remedy. Case 3:06-cv04884-SI. Center for Biological Diversity, et al., Plaintiffs v. BLM. United States District Court for the Northern District of California, USA. As cited in Berry, K.H., L.M. Lyren, J.L. Yee, and T.Y. Bailey. 2014. Protection benefits desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) abundance: the influence of three management strategies on a threatened species. *Herpetological Monographs*, 28 2014, 66–92.
- U.S. Ecology. 1989. Proponent's Environmental Assessment. California Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site. Appendices K and M, Volume II.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994a. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; determination of critical habitat for the Mojave population of the desert tortoise. *Federal Register* 55(26):5820-5866. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994b. Desert tortoise (Mojave population) Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 73 pages plus appendices.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Lane Mountain milk-vetch (*Astragalus jaegerianus*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, Ventura, California.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011a. Revised recovery plan for the Mojave population of the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento, California. 222 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011b. Biological Opinion on Mojave Solar, LLC's Mojave Solar Project, San Bernardino County, California (8-8-11-F-3). Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, Ventura, CA.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2014a. 12-month finding on a petition to reclassify *Astragalus jaegerianus* as a threatened Species. 79 *Federal Register* 25084-25092, Friday, May 2, 2014.

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2014b. Determination of threatened status for the western distinct population segment of the yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*); Final Rule. 79 Federal Register 59992-60038.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2014c. Designation of critical habitat for the western distinct population segment of the yellow-billed cuckoo; Proposed Rule. 29 Federal Register 48548-48652.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2015. Range-wide Monitoring of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*): 2013 and 2014 Annual Reports. Report prepared by Linda Allison for the Desert Tortoise Recovery Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno, Nevada.
- van der Ree R., J. A. G. Jaeger, E. A. van der Grift, and A. P. Clevenger. 2011. Effects of roads and traffic on wildlife populations and landscape function: Road ecology is moving toward larger scales. *Ecology and Society* 16(1): 48. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss1/art48/>
- von Seckendorff Hoff, K., and Marlow, R.W. 2002. Impacts of vehicle road traffic on desert tortoise populations with consideration of conservation of tortoise habitat in southern Nevada. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* 4:449–456.
- Zimmerman, L.C., Espinoza, R.E., and Barber, A.M., 2006a, The importance of physiological ecology in conservation biology: *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, v. 46, p. 1,191–1,205.