



CHAPTER 2

ALTERNATIVES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

Page

2.	ALTERNATIVES.....	2-1
2.1	Introduction	2-1
2.2	Selection of the Proposed RMP	2-1
2.3	Types of BLM Decisions.....	2-2
2.3.1	Planning-level Decisions	2-2
2.3.1.1	Goals and Objectives	2-2
2.3.1.2	Management Actions and Allowable Uses	2-3
2.3.1.3	Special Designations	2-3
2.3.1.4	Land Use Allocations	2-3
2.3.2	Implementation-level Decisions	2-3
2.3.3	Administrative Actions	2-4
2.4	Summary of the Alternatives	2-4
2.4.1	No Action Alternative Summary	2-4
2.4.2	Lower Sonoran Decision Area Alternatives Summary.....	2-4
2.4.2.1	Alternative A (No Action).....	2-5
2.4.2.2	Alternative B.....	2-5
2.4.2.3	Alternative C.....	2-7
2.4.2.4	Alternative D	2-8
2.4.2.5	Alternative E (Proposed RMP).....	2-9
2.4.3	Sonoran Desert National Monument Alternatives Summary	2-10
2.4.3.1	Alternative A (No Action).....	2-10
2.4.3.2	Alternative B.....	2-10
2.4.3.3	Alternative C.....	2-11
2.4.3.4	Alternative D	2-12
2.4.3.5	Alternative E (Proposed RMP).....	2-13
2.5	Alternatives Considered but Not Further Analyzed.....	2-14
2.5.1	Public Safety	2-14
2.5.2	Travel Management.....	2-14
2.5.2.1	Driving in Washes.....	2-14
2.5.3	Recreation	2-15
2.5.4	Land Tenure.....	2-15
2.5.4.1	Land Disposal.....	2-15
2.5.5	Livestock Grazing.....	2-15
2.6	Existing Management Decisions	2-16
2.6.1	Existing Plans and Environmental Impact Statements	2-16
2.7	Management Common to All Alternatives	2-17
2.7.1	Wilderness	2-17
2.7.2	Arizona Land Health Standards	2-17

2.8	Alternatives	2-18
2.9	Standard Operating Procedures and Best Management Practices.....	2-19
2.10	Resources	2-19
2.10.1	Air Quality.....	2-19
2.10.1.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) Air Quality.....	2-20
2.10.1.2	Action Alternatives for Air Quality.....	2-20
2.10.2	Cave Resources.....	2-22
2.10.2.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Cave Resources.....	2-23
2.10.2.2	Action Alternatives for Cave Resources Management.....	2-23
2.10.3	Cultural and Heritage Resources.....	2-23
2.10.3.1	Sonoran Desert National Monument	2-25
2.10.3.2	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Cultural and Heritage Resources	2-25
2.10.3.3	Action Alternatives for Cultural and Heritage Resources.....	2-26
2.10.3.4	Administrative Actions	2-31
2.10.4	Paleontological Resources	2-33
2.10.4.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Paleontological Resources.....	2-33
2.10.4.2	Action Alternatives for Paleontological Resources	2-33
2.10.5	Soil Resources	2-35
2.10.5.1	Existing Management Decisions (Alternative A - No Action) Soil Resources	2-35
2.10.5.2	Action Alternatives for Soil Resources	2-36
2.10.6	Vegetation Resources.....	2-39
2.10.6.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)	2-40
2.10.6.2	Action Alternatives for Vegetation Resources.....	2-41
2.10.7	Visual Resources	2-48
2.10.7.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Visual Resources.....	2-49
2.10.7.2	Action Alternatives for Visual Resources	2-50
2.10.8	Water Resources.....	2-53
2.10.8.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) Water Resources.....	2-54
2.10.8.2	Action Alternatives for Water Resources.....	2-54
2.10.9	Wild Horse and Burro Management.....	2-57
2.10.9.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)	2-57
2.10.9.2	Action Alternatives for Wild Horses and Burros	2-58
2.10.10	Wilderness Characteristics	2-59
2.10.10.1	Description of Alternatives	2-60

2.10.10.2	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A – No Action for Wilderness Characteristics.....	2-61
2.10.10.3	Action Alternatives for Wilderness Characteristics	2-61
2.10.11	Wildland Fire Management.....	2-64
2.10.11.1	Existing Management Decisions (Alternative A - No Action).....	2-65
2.10.11.2	Action Alternatives for Wildland Fire Management.....	2-65
2.10.12	Wildlife and Special Status Species	2-75
2.10.12.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Wildlife and Special Status Species	2-77
2.10.12.2	Action Alternatives for Wildlife and Special Status Species Management	2-82
2.11	Resource Uses.....	2-98
2.11.1	Lands and Realty	2-98
2.11.1.1	Land Use Authorizations (LUAs).....	2-99
2.11.1.2	Land Tenure.....	2-103
2.11.1.3	Withdrawals, Classifications and Segregations	2-104
2.11.1.4	Existing Management Decisions (Alternative A - No Action) Lands and Realty	2-105
2.11.1.5	Action Alternatives for Lands and Realty	2-109
2.11.2	Livestock Grazing.....	2-117
2.11.2.1	Lower Sonoran Decision Area.....	2-118
2.11.2.2	SDNM Decision Area	2-119
2.11.2.3	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) Livestock Grazing.....	2-121
2.11.2.4	Action Alternatives for Livestock Grazing.....	2-124
2.11.3	Minerals Management	2-132
2.11.3.1	Existing Management Decision, Alternative A (No Action).....	2-133
2.11.3.2	Action Alternatives for Minerals Management	2-134
2.11.4	Recreation Management	2-139
2.11.4.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Recreation Management.....	2-143
2.11.4.2	Action Alternatives for Recreation Management.....	2-149
2.11.5	Travel Management.....	2-182
2.11.5.1	Current Temporary Closure on the SDNM.....	2-183
2.11.5.2	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A - No Action for Travel Management	2-184
2.11.5.3	Action Alternatives for Travel Management.....	2-186
2.12	Special Designations.....	2-199
2.12.1	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)	2-199
2.12.1.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)	2-200
2.12.1.2	Action Alternatives for ACECs.....	2-200
2.12.2	National Byways.....	2-206

2.12.2.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternatives A (No Action) National Byways.....	2-207
2.12.2.2	Action Alternatives for National Byways.....	2-207
2.12.3	National Trails.....	2-209
2.12.3.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)	2-210
2.12.3.2	Action Alternatives for National Trails	2-210
2.12.4	Fred J. Weiler Green Belt Resource Conservation Area.....	2-214
2.12.4.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)	2-215
2.12.4.2	Action Alternatives for Fred J. Weiler Green Belt Resource Conservation Area	2-215
2.13	Tribal Interests, Public Safety, and Social and Economic Conditions.....	2-217
2.13.1	Hazardous Materials and Public Safety	2-217
2.13.1.1	Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety.....	2-218
2.13.1.2	Action Alternatives for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety.....	2-218
2.14	Scientific Research, Education, and Public Outreach.....	2-221
2.14.1	Scientific Research.....	2-221
2.14.2	Interpretation, Environmental Education, and Outreach.....	2-221
2.14.2.1	Resources Education.....	2-222
2.14.2.2	Public Uses and Visitor Information.....	2-223
2.14.2.3	Public Safety and Fire Education.....	2-223
2.15	Implementation, Adaptive Management, and Monitoring.....	2-223
2.15.1	Implementation and Partnerships	2-223
2.15.2	Adaptive Management	2-224
2.15.3	Monitoring and Partnerships.....	2-225
2.16	Requirements for Further Environmental Analysis	2-225
2.17	Interrelationships.....	2-226
2.18	Comparison of Impact Intensities.....	2-227

TABLES

Page

2-1	Wilderness Areas of the Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas.....	2-17
2-2	Program Area Categories and Abbreviations.....	2-18
2-3	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Air Quality	2-20
2-4	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cave Resources.....	2-23
2-5	Proposed Site Use Allocation by Alternative.....	2-26
2-6	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cultural Resources	2-27
2-7	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Paleontological Resources.....	2-34
2-8	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Soil Resources.....	2-37
2-9	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources	2-43

TABLES <i>(continued)</i>		Page
2-10	VRM Classes by Alternative	2-51
2-11	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Visual Resources.....	2-51
2-12	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Water Resources	2-55
2-13	Management Actions for Wild Horses and Burros	2-58
2-14	Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative	2-61
2-15	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wilderness Characteristics.....	2-61
2-16	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management.....	2-66
2-17	Wildlife Habitat Area by Alternative.....	2-83
2-18	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species.....	2-84
2-19	Description of Land Use Authorization Types.....	2-99
2-20	Lands and Realty Allocations for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area.....	2-109
2-21	Lands and Realty Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area.....	2-110
2-22	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty.....	2-111
2-23	Livestock Grazing Allocations for Lower Sonoran Decision Area.....	2-124
2-24	Livestock Grazing Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area.....	2-124
2-25	Livestock Grazing Acres for the SDNM North of Interstate 8 Only	2-125
2-26	Permitted Animal Unit Months for the SDNM	2-126
2-27	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration.....	2-127
2-28	Acres of Public Lands Available for Mineral Activity by Alternative	2-134
2-29	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Minerals Management.....	2-136
2-30	Comparison of Draft and Proposed Recreation Management Areas by Decision Area.....	2-141
2-31	Recreation Allocations by Decision Area	2-150
2-32	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management.....	2-152
2-33	Off-Highway Vehicle Area Designations by Alternative.....	2-186
2-34	Route Designations in the SDNM by Alternative.....	2-187
2-35	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management	2-188
2-36	Model of Potential Maintenance Level Assignments for Each Alternative	2-197
2-37	ACEC Acres Based on Alternative.....	2-201
2-38	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for ACECs	2-201
2-39	Potential Byway Designations by Alternative.....	2-208
2-40	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Byways	2-208
2-41	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Trails.....	2-211
2-42	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Resource Conservation Areas.....	2-216
2-43	Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety.....	2-218
2-44	Comparison of Impact Intensities.....	2-228

MAPS

Note: Maps referenced in this chapter may be found in Volume 4, Map Book.

2-1a	Alternative A Cultural Resource Allocations
2-1b	Alternative B Cultural Resource Allocations
2-1c	Alternative C Cultural Resource Allocations
2-1d	Alternative D Cultural Resource Allocations
2-1e	Alternative E Cultural Resource Allocations
2-2a	Alternative A Visual Resource Management
2-2b	Alternative B Visual Resource Management
2-2c	Alternative C Visual Resource Management
2-2d	Alternative D Visual Resource Management
2-2e	Alternative E Visual Resource Management
2-3c	Alternative C Wilderness Characteristics
2-3d	Alternative D Wilderness Characteristics
2-3e	Alternative E Wilderness Characteristics
2-4a	Alternative A Wildlife and Special Status Species
2-4b	Alternative B Wildlife and Special Status Species
2-4c	Alternative C Wildlife and Special Status Species
2-4d	Alternative D Wildlife and Special Status Species
2-4e	Alternative E Wildlife and Special Status Species
2-5a	Alternative A Renewable Energy Conflict Analysis
2-5b	Alternative B Renewable Energy Conflict Analysis
2-5c	Alternative C Renewable Energy Conflict Analysis
2-5d	Alternative D Renewable Energy Conflict Analysis
2-5e	Alternative E Renewable Energy Conflict Analysis
2-6a	Alternative A Land Use Authorizations
2-6b	Alternative B Land Use Authorizations
2-6c	Alternative C Land Use Authorizations
2-6d	Alternative D Land Use Authorizations
2-6e	Alternative E Land Use Authorizations
2-7a	Alternative A Land Tenure
2-7b	Alternative B Land Tenure
2-7c	Alternative C Land Tenure
2-7d	Alternative D Land Tenure
2-7e	Alternative E Land Tenure
2-8a	Alternative A Livestock Grazing
2-8b	Alternative B Livestock Grazing
2-8c	Alternative C Livestock Grazing
2-8d	Alternative D Livestock Grazing
2-8e	Alternative E Livestock Grazing

MAPS *(continued)*

2-9a	Alternative A Mineral Restrictions: Locatables
2-9b	Alternative B Mineral Restrictions: Locatables
2-9c	Alternative C Mineral Restrictions: Locatables
2-9d	Alternative D Mineral Restrictions: Locatables
2-9e	Alternative E Mineral Restrictions: Locatables
2-10a	Alternative A Mineral Restrictions: Leasables
2-10b	Alternative B Mineral Restrictions: Leasables
2-10c	Alternative C Mineral Restrictions: Leasables
2-10d	Alternative D Mineral Restrictions: Leasables
2-10e	Alternative E Mineral Restrictions: Leasables
2-11a	Alternative A Mineral Restrictions: Mineral Materials
2-11b	Alternative B Mineral Restrictions: Mineral Materials
2-11c	Alternative C Mineral Restrictions: Mineral Materials
2-11d	Alternative D Mineral Restrictions: Mineral Materials
2-11e	Alternative E Mineral Restrictions: Mineral Materials
2-12a	Alternative A Recreation Management
2-12b	Alternative B Recreation Management
2-12c	Alternative C Recreation Management
2-12d	Alternative D Recreation Management
2-12e	Alternative E Recreation Management
2-13a	Alternative A Target Shooting Areas
2-13b	Alternative B Target Shooting Areas
2-13c	Alternative C Target Shooting Areas
2-14a	Alternative A Travel Management
2-14b	Alternative B Travel Management
2-14c	Alternative C Travel Management
2-14d	Alternative D Travel Management
2-14e	Alternative E Travel Management
2-15a	Alternative A SDNM Route Designations
2-15b	Alternative B SDNM Route Designations
2-15c	Alternative C SDNM Route Designations
2-15d	Alternative D SDNM Route Designations
2-15e	Alternative E SDNM Route Designations
2-16a	Alternative A Special Designations
2-16b	Alternative B Special Designations
2-16c	Alternative C Special Designations
2-16d	Alternative D Special Designations
2-16e	Alternative E Special Designations

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 2

ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes and compares alternatives for developing the Lower Sonoran-SDNM PRMP/FEIS. The document consists of five alternatives, a No Action (or current management) Alternative, three action alternatives, and the PRMP. The No Action Alternative means that management of the affected public lands and resources would continue without change from the guidance provided by existing applicable land use plans (LUPs) and, in the case of SDNM, Presidential Proclamation 7397 and its associated Interim Guidance. The action alternatives present various combinations of public land uses and resource management practices that address issues identified during the scoping process. Each alternative varies in perspective and intensity of management and describes a series of decisions and desired outcomes that collectively would direct future management for the Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas. Additionally, each alternative consists of a set of designations, land use allocations, allowable uses, and management actions needed for implementation of that alternative. All alternatives have been assessed for potential environmental impacts, which are summarized at the end of this chapter. A detailed discussion of the potential impacts is presented in **Chapter 4**, Environmental Consequences.

The alternatives represent a reasonable range of management options identified in accordance with NEPA, other applicable laws, intergovernmental and interagency collaboration, and public participation. These inputs were used to derive the management purposes, missions, and goals for the Lower Sonoran-SDNM PRMP/FEIS, described in **Chapter 1**, Purpose and Need for the Resource Management Plan. Consistency with these purposes, missions, and goals was a basic requirement for each alternative.

Once the purposes, missions, and goals were established, the intergovernmental/interagency planning team developed management alternatives that incorporated decisions for a number of resource or resource use categories. These are described in **Table 2-2**, Program Area Categories and Abbreviations, of **Section 2.8**, Alternatives. The above information was presented, reviewed, and discussed at public workshops throughout the Planning Area. Public input from the workshops was carefully considered by the planning team and incorporated into the scope and content of the alternatives provided in this FEIS.

Each alternative portrays a different management focus, as defined by the desired outcomes and actions selected for each alternative. All alternatives meet the BLM's overarching principles of multiple use and sustained yield. All action alternatives provide a high degree of protection for SDNM resources, as required by Presidential Proclamation 7397.

2.2 SELECTION OF THE PROPOSED RMP

The DRMP/DEIS described and analyzed five alternatives, including Alternative A (the No Action Alternative) and Alternatives B, C, D, and E (the Preferred Alternative), each of which represented varying management actions for each resource and resource use for achieving the stated goals and objectives. The BLM has the discretion to select an alternative in its entirety, to combine aspects of the

various alternatives that were presented in the DRMP/DEIS, or to consider management approaches that were presented during the comment period that do not result in significant changes from what the DRMP/DEIS considered. In this PRMP/FEIS, Alternative E has been identified as the PRMP.

The PRMP uses Alternative E from the DRMP/DEIS as a foundation, with adjustments made in response to public comments and coordination with cooperating agencies. Alternative E (PRMP) was chosen because it resolves the major issues while providing for common ground among conflicting opinions and multiple uses of public lands in a sustainable fashion. It provides the best balance of resource protection and use within legal constraints. The PRMP:

- Satisfies statutory requirements (true for all alternatives);
- Reflects what the BLM believes to be the best combination of actions to achieve the stated goals;
- Represents the best solution for the purpose and need as described in **Chapter 1**, Purpose and Need for the Resource Management Plan;
- Provides the best approach to address the key resource and planning issues; and
- Includes input from cooperating agencies, collaborating partners, stakeholders, and the public.

The PRMP does not represent a final BLM decision. The BLM planning process requires a 30-day public protest period and 60-day Governor's consistency review period prior to signing a ROD and Approved RMP. Only upon signing of the ROD/Approved RMP do the actions presented in the EIS become final decisions.

2.3 TYPES OF BLM DECISIONS

These plans include two levels of BLM decision making: planning-level decisions and implementation-level decisions. This document describes other administrative actions the BLM takes when managing public lands. These types of decisions and administrative actions are described below. Implementation of all actions and decisions within the RMP are subject to available funding and staffing.

2.3.1 PLANNING-LEVEL DECISIONS

Planning-level decisions represent the goals and objectives for the Planning Area and the actions needed to achieve them. These decisions guide future land management actions and subsequent site-specific implementation decisions.

2.3.1.1 Goals and Objectives

The BLM's land use plans must identify goals and objectives that direct the BLM actions to meet legal mandates, regulatory responsibilities, national policy, BLM State Director guidance, and other resource or social needs. Goals are broad statements that define desired outcomes. Objectives define specific desired outcomes for a selected resource or use and are considered necessary to achieve the

overarching goal. Examples of objectives include maintaining or restoring palo verde-mixed cacti vegetation communities or directing public recreation use to areas that provide the appropriate resource setting, opportunity, and experience.

2.3.1.2 Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Management actions and allowable uses describe actions the BLM or its partners would take. They guide how allowable uses of the public land would be managed to achieve the desired outcomes.

2.3.1.3 Special Designations

Special designations include those designated by Congress for special protection, such as wilderness areas or national historic or scenic trails. Such designations are not land use plan decisions and are not included in the Lower Sonoran-SDNM PRMP/FEIS. Administrative designations made by the BLM are also considered special designations and can be decided in a land use plan. These include designating ACECs or back country byways.

2.3.1.4 Land Use Allocations

Land use allocations are decisions that describe geographic areas for specific resources or uses, such as where grazing is authorized, specific areas to enhance wildlife habitat, target cultural management objectives, or where OHV areas are available. Allocations have geographic boundaries and are shown on maps provided in this document.

2.3.2 IMPLEMENTATION-LEVEL DECISIONS

Implementation-level decisions are management actions tied to a specific location and are used to implement planning-level decisions. Unlike planning-level decisions, implementation-level decisions are not subject to protest under the planning regulations. Implementation decisions are generally appealable to the Office of Hearings and Appeals under 43 CFR 4.410. These decisions constitute the BLM's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. Most implementation-level decisions are developed following adoption of an RMP; however, a single land use planning/NEPA process may be used to make both planning-level and implementation-level decisions when doing so is timely and has undergone appropriate NEPA analysis. When implementation-level decisions are included in the environmental analysis for an RMP, further NEPA analysis is not required to begin implementation of these decisions.

Implementation-level decisions included in the PRMP/FEIS are for the SDNM Decision Area only and include:

- (1) Route designation in the SDNM for approved motorized and/or non-motorized public use (see **Section 2.11.5**, Travel Management);
- (2) Allotment-specific grazing management practices (e.g., allotment preferences and season of use) and livestock forage amounts in the SDNM that are based on the grazing compatibility analysis findings in **Appendix E**, Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument, as well as constraints and needs related to other resources (see **Section 2.11.2**, Livestock Grazing); and

- (3) Target shooting decisions based on findings from analysis within the SDNM in **Section 2.11.4, Recreation Management**; the analysis findings are in **Appendix G, Sonoran Desert National Monument Recreational Target Shooting Analysis**.

2.3.3 ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Administrative actions are day-to-day activities conducted by the BLM, which are often required by the FLPMA but may or may not require specific evaluation under NEPA and do not require a written decision by a responsible official to be accomplished. Examples of administrative actions include, but are not limited to, mapping, surveying, inventorying, monitoring, partnering, developing education materials, adjusting staffing, patrolling, and conducting scientific research and studies.

2.4 SUMMARY OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The range of management alternatives considered in this PRMP/FEIS is described in detail in under each resource or resource use section. The following section summarizes the general scope and key highlights of each alternative.

2.4.1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY

BLM lands within the Planning Area are currently managed under three separate resource management plans and several amendments. The decisions from these plans have been extracted and are listed by year of approval. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of the current decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

In addition, the interim management guidance required by proclamation for the SDNM are being considered current management actions, and those policy statements are included with the decisions. Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, consists of the current management actions for both Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas.

2.4.2 LOWER SONORAN DECISION AREA ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

Land management must address resources that are unevenly distributed across a landscape. As described in **Section 1.2.2, Decision Areas**, the Lower Sonoran Decision Area public lands are divided into seven relatively large geographic regions, or blocks, dispersed over a large region (see **Map I-2, Common Geographical Reference Areas**). Noteworthy as management factors, the wide distribution and geographic segregation represent a considerable variety of environments, land uses, public interests, and threats to natural and cultural resources.

Some management issues are best addressed through planning-level decisions applied to the entire Decision Area. Other management issues differ from place to place in character, value, and/or social or economic interest, and thus require more place-specific management techniques found in implementation-level decisions. The planning-level or implementation-level decisions must be sensitive to the geographically distinct characteristics of the Decision Area. As a result, the alternatives for the

Lower Sonoran Decision Area include planning-level decisions that would be applicable across the entire area.

2.4.2.1 Alternative A (No Action)

Selecting the No Action Alternative for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area would continue current management without change to land use, public use, or resource protection management, and would not address issues that were unforeseen or nonexistent when the existing management plans were prepared.

Under Alternative A:

- Wildlife waters would continue to be developed and maintained in the current manner.
- No specific special status species or cultural resource provisions or allocations would be followed; however, management actions would be consistent with the long-term protection of priority species and cultural resources as required by law and policy.
- No management actions would be specific to wildlife movement corridors.
- The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt Resource Conservation Area (RCA) would continue to be managed by the BLM, AGFD, and USFWS as specified in cooperative agreements.
- The Coffeepot ACEC would be maintained and would be the only ACEC designation.
- No areas would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics.
- No back country byways would be allocated.
- Four SRMA allocations would continue without management changes.
- The existing route system would be available for use. This alternative would include the least restrictions and also the least management of motorized use and access.
- Recreational use opportunities would be unchanged from current mix and distribution.
- Opportunities for developed and motorized, as well as primitive and non-motorized, recreation would continue.
- Ten one-mile-wide utility corridors would remain as currently designated.
- Grazing allotments would continue to be allocated as perennial, perennial-ephemeral, or ephemeral, as appropriate to allotment-specific characteristics.

2.4.2.2 Alternative B

The management decisions prescribed by Alternative B would identify the greatest extent of public land suitable for the widest potential array of uses and would emphasize opportunities for those uses. It

generally emphasizes motorized and developed recreation. Opportunities to visit remote settings and experience non-motorized, primitive recreation would be reduced from the current condition. As a result, this alternative would require the most intensive use management, as well as “hands-on” resource stabilization and restoration measures, as compared to the other alternatives, in order to ensure desired outcomes would be achieved.

Under Action Alternative B:

- Cultural and heritage tourism and interpretation would be promoted in appropriate locations.
- No special cultural resource management areas (SCRMA) would be allocated.
- The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt RCA allocation would continue to be managed by the BLM, AGFD, and USFWS as specified in cooperative agreements.
- Existing wildlife waters would be managed or redeveloped, and new ones would be built to sustain or enhance wildlife populations.
- No wildlife habitat areas (WHAs) would be allocated, and few special management actions would be applied for wildlife corridors.
- The Coffeepot-Batamote ACEC would be maintained as the only ACEC and expanded to include additional potential wildlife habitat.
- No areas would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics.
- Visual and scenic resources would be managed to facilitate various public uses, including mineral development.
- No back country byways would be allocated.
- The 40-acre parcel near the Ajo Block (Township 12 South, Range 6 West, Section 4) would be allocated as an open area.
- Routes would be designated as open year-round, open seasonally, or closed year-round to motorized vehicle use in all areas where route inventories have been completed. This alternative would include more restrictions to motorized use than Alternative A but would include the most-managed and best-maintained motorized network.
- Ten one-mile-wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated.
- The least amount of land use authorization (LUA) exclusion and avoidance areas for any alternative would be designated.
- Ephemeral grazing applications would continue to be considered, but perennial stocking rates would be reduced by approximately 40 percent.

2.4.2.3 Alternative C

This alternative represents an attempt to balance resource protection with human use and influence by providing opportunities for a variety of uses, while placing an emphasis on resource protection and conservation. It proposes a mix of natural processes and “hands-on” techniques for resource stabilization and restoration, thus reducing the need for intensive use management to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects.

Under Alternative C:

- Cultural and heritage tourism and interpretation would be promoted only when use is compatible with resource protection.
- Two SCRMAAs would be allocated to provide protection and management of cultural resources.
- Existing wildlife waters would be managed or redeveloped, and new ones would be built to sustain or enhance wildlife populations.
- The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt RCA allocation would continue to be managed by the BLM, AGFD, and USFWS as specified in cooperative agreements.
- Four WHAs would be allocated to protect biological resources, and special management prescriptions would be applied to wildlife movement corridors.
- Two ACECs would be designated. The Coffeepot ACEC would be expanded to better align with the mountain range and would be renamed the Coffeepot-Batamote ACEC. The Cuerda de Lena ACEC south of Ajo would be designated for Sonoran pronghorn.
- Wilderness characteristics would be protected on approximately 128,100 acres.
- The scenic and visual resource in high-value areas would be protected, and any facilities developed in these areas would be built to be less noticeable, to the extent possible.
- Agua Caliente Road would be allocated as a back country byway to provide sightseeing and recreational opportunities.
- A modest reduction in motor vehicle access, compared to the current condition, would occur by limiting selected routes in the existing system to seasonal use, and closing other routes to reduce system redundancy or protect resources.
- Nine one-mile-wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated (a portion of the El Paso Natural Gas Corridor from Ajo to the Tohono O’odham Indian Reservation would be excluded).
- Grazing allotments designated as perennial-ephemeral would be reclassified as perennial only, with no supplemental ephemeral grazing applications considered. This alternative does

not apply to ephemeral-only allotments. Season-of-use adjustments on perennial allotments would be considered.

2.4.2.4 Alternative D

This alternative would place the greatest emphasis on resource protection/conservation, with opportunities to visit remote settings and experience non-motorized, primitive recreation. It focuses on natural processes and other unobtrusive methods for resource stabilization and restoration, so the need for both intensive use management and “hands-on” resource measures would be reduced by the greatest extent among all alternatives.

Under Alternative D:

- Cultural and heritage tourism and scientific research would only be allowed when use is compatible with resource protection.
- No SCRMAAs would be allocated; they would be become ACECs.
- Existing wildlife waters would be managed or redeveloped, and new ones would be built to sustain or enhance wildlife populations.
- The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt RCA allocation would continue to be managed by the BLM, AGFD, and USFWS as specified in cooperative agreements.
- There would be one WHA and four ACEC designations, containing more acres than any other alternative.
- ACECs would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry, and opportunities for mineral development would be reduced.
- Agua Caliente Road would be allocated as a back country byway to provide sightseeing and recreational opportunities.
- The largest number of acres managed to protect wilderness characteristics, for a total of 250,000, would be proposed.
- The 40-acre parcel near the Ajo Block (Township 12 South, Range 6 West, Section 4) would be allocated as a Limited to Designated Routes Area.
- Scenic and visual resources across the area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic views.
- Recreational opportunities would focus on primitive and non-motorized recreation.
- Opportunities for developed and motorized vehicle uses would be reduced due to a smaller number of open vehicle routes.

- Seven one-mile-wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated (the fewest of all alternatives).
- All allotments currently open to grazing would become unavailable as permits expire.

2.4.2.5 Alternative E (Proposed RMP)

Alternative E is the BLM's PRMP for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area. It incorporates elements from each of the other alternatives, and offers a unique prescription for managing the Decision Area while, at the same time, providing long-term protection and resource conservation. Alternative E balances human use and influence with resource protection.

Under Alternative E (PRMP):

- Cultural and heritage tourism and scientific research would only be allowed when use is compatible with resource protection.
- No SCRMA's would be allocated; they would become ACECs.
- One Anza NHT Management Area would be allocated.
- Existing wildlife waters would be managed or reconstructed, and new ones would be built to sustain or enhance wildlife populations.
- The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt RCA would continue to be managed by the BLM, AGFD, and USFWS as specified in cooperative agreements.
- There would be one WHA, special management actions for protection of wildlife movement corridors would be applied, and three ACECs would be designated.
- Wilderness characteristics would be protected on approximately 91,200 acres.
- The 40-acre parcel near the Ajo Block (Township 12 South, Range 6 West, Section 4) would be allocated as a Limited to Designated Routes Area.
- Agua Caliente Road would be allocated as a back country byway to provide sightseeing and recreational opportunities.
- Scenic and visual resources would be managed to maintain visual values in some areas, while accommodating appropriate development in higher-use areas.
- A moderate reduction in motor vehicle access would occur as a result of route closures and seasonal limitations.
- Eight one-mile-wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated (a portion of the El Paso Natural Gas Corridor from Ajo to the Tohono O'odham Indian Reservation would be excluded).

- Grazing allotments would be allocated as perennial, perennial-ephemeral, or ephemeral, as appropriate to allotment-specific characteristics. Season-of-use adjustments on perennial allotments would be considered.

2.4.3 SONORAN DESERT NATIONAL MONUMENT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

2.4.3.1 Alternative A (No Action)

Selection of the No Action Alternative for the Monument would continue current management under the existing LUPs, except as changed by Presidential Proclamation 7397, which established the Monument and specified certain management provisions. This continues current public use and resource protection/conservation prescriptions without change. It neither sets desired outcomes for resource management or most uses, nor addresses new issues unforeseen or nonexistent when the current management plans were prepared.

Under Alternative A:

- Livestock grazing permits south of Interstate 8 (I-8) are terminated. Livestock grazing north of I-8 would continue if determined to be compatible with protecting Monument resources.
- Motorized or mechanical vehicle use off road would be prohibited, except for emergency or authorized purposes.
- The Monument is withdrawn from mineral material sales, new mining claims, mineral or geothermal leasing, or other forms of appropriation.
- The Vekol Valley Grasslands ACEC would be maintained, even though provisions of the Proclamation satisfy the ACEC's objectives.
- Three one-mile-wide utility corridors would be maintained.

2.4.3.2 Alternative B

The management decisions in Alternative B generally identify the areas of the Monument that would be most suitable for the widest potential uses, and emphasize opportunities for those uses. Alternative B sets desired outcomes and allocations for resources discussed in the proclamation, including natural, cultural, and visual, while providing appropriate human use/influence and an array of visitor experiences and opportunities. It focuses on "hands-on" techniques for ecosystem restoration, resource management, and scientific research, and likely requires more intensive use management to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects.

Under Alternative B:

- Existing wildlife waters would be managed or redeveloped, and new ones would be built to sustain or enhance wildlife populations.

- No WHAs would be allocated, but management prescriptions would be applied to protect Monument objects.
- Cultural and heritage tourism and interpretation would be promoted in appropriate locations, as long as resources and Monument objects are protected.
- No areas would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics.
- Grazing allotments north of I-8 would be allocated as perennial grazing with an approximate 40-percent reduction in AUMs. Applications for ephemeral grazing would be considered. Monument objects found to be incompatible with livestock grazing would be fenced off to prevent impacts from livestock grazing.
- The route system would be slightly reduced, but motorized opportunities would continue to be available; non-motorized recreation would also be provided.
- Three one-mile-wide multiuse utility corridors would be maintained.

2.4.3.3 Alternative C

The management decisions in this alternative generally represent an attempt to balance resource protection and human use and influence. As in Alternative B, it sets desired outcomes and allocations for the resources discussed in the Monument's proclamation, including natural, cultural, and visual. It proposes a moderate amount of open roads and trails and a mix of recreational opportunities. It proposes a mix of natural processes and "hands-on" techniques for ecosystem restoration, resource management, and scientific research, and would likely reduce the need for intensive use management to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects.

Under Alternative C:

- Existing wildlife waters would be managed or redeveloped, and new ones would be built to sustain or enhance wildlife populations.
- No WHAs would be allocated, but management prescriptions would be applied to protect Monument objects.
- Cultural and heritage tourism and interpretation would be allowed, when such use is compatible with resource protection and Monument objects. A priority would be placed on scientific research.
- The Lower Gila Historic Trail SCRMA would be allocated to protect a number of historic trails.
- Certain areas, primarily in the Sand Tank Mountains, would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics, for a total of 112,200 acres.

- Grazing allotments north of I-8 would be allocated as perennial grazing only, with no ephemeral grazing. Monument objects found to be incompatible with livestock grazing would be fenced off to prevent impacts from livestock grazing.
- A diversity of recreational opportunities would be provided, with increased non-motorized recreation. Certain uses, such as recreational target shooting and wood collecting for campfires, would be limited, compared to current conditions.
- A modest reduction in motor vehicle access, compared to current conditions, would occur by limiting selected routes in the existing system to seasonal use and closing other routes to reduce system redundancy or protect resources.
- Two half-mile-wide multiuse utility corridors where only underground utilities would be allowed would be allocated.
- Highway 238 would be allocated as a scenic byway.

2.4.3.4 Alternative D

Alternative D places the greatest emphasis on minimal human use/influence and maintenance of primitive landscapes. It focuses on natural processes and other unobtrusive methods for ecosystem restoration, resource management, and scientific research, while emphasizing resource protection/conservation. As in the other alternatives, it sets desired outcomes and allocations for Monument resources discussed in the proclamation, including natural, cultural, and visual, while allowing a lower level of human use. The need for both intensive use management and “hands-on” resource stabilization and restoration measures would be reduced by the greatest degree under Alternative D.

Under Alternative D:

- Existing wildlife waters would be managed or redeveloped, and new ones would be built to sustain or enhance wildlife populations.
- Passive restoration would be used, and management would be implemented through limiting human access and development.
- No WHAs would be allocated, but management prescriptions would be applied to protect Monument objects.
- Cultural and heritage tourism and scientific research would be allowed only when such use is compatible with resource protection.
- The largest number of acres (154,800) would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics.
- Allotments currently open to grazing would become unavailable as permits expire.

- Recreational opportunities would focus on primitive and non-motorized recreation. Certain uses, such as recreational shooting, paintball, and wood collection for campfires, would not be allowed.
- All-terrain vehicles, motorcycles, and vehicles weighing less than 1,800 pounds would be prohibited on the Monument. A smaller number of vehicle routes would remain open for public use.
- No multiuse utility corridors would be designated, and new LUAs would not be allowed.
- Highway 238 and I-8 would be allocated as scenic byways.

2.4.3.5 Alternative E (Proposed RMP)

Alternative E is BLM's PRMP for the SDNM Decision Area. This incorporates elements from each of the other alternatives, offering a unique prescription for managing public use of the Monument, while, at the same time, providing long-term protection and conservation of resources. It balances human use and influence with resource protection. The need for both intensive use management and "hands-on" resource stabilization and restoration measures would be reduced by an intermediate degree.

Under Alternative E (PRMP):

- New wildlife waters would be built, or redeveloped, when needed to maintain, or enhance wildlife resources.
- Active or passive restoration could be used when necessary to restore or enhance Monument resources, however, management would be implemented by limiting human access and development whenever possible.
- No WHAs would be allocated, but management prescriptions would be applied to protect Monument objects.
- Cultural and heritage tourism and interpretation, as well as scientific research, would be allowed when use is compatible with resource protection.
- The Lower Gila Historic Trail SCRMA would be allocated to protect a number of historic trails.
- One Anza NHT Management Area would be allocated.
- Certain areas in the Sand Tank Mountains area would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics, for a total of 107,800 acres.
- Grazing allotments north of I-8 would be allocated as perennial, perennial-ephemeral, or ephemeral, as appropriate to allotment-specific characteristics. Monument objects found to be incompatible with livestock grazing would be fenced off to prevent impacts from livestock grazing. Additionally, the portion of Conley Allotment within SDNM boundaries would become unavailable for livestock use. Grazing use across the Monument would be adjusted

as needed in accordance with grazing regulations and in response to the grazing determinations required by the proclamation.

- A diversity of recreational opportunities would be provided, with increased non-motorized recreation. Uses likely to cause resource damage such as recreational target shooting, paintball, and wood collecting for campfires would not be allowed.
- A modest reduction in motor vehicle access similar to Alternative C would occur by limiting selected routes in the existing system to seasonal use and closing other routes to reduce system redundancy or protect resources and Monument objects.
- No multiuse utility corridors would be designated, and new LUAs would not be allowed.
- Highway 238 and I-8 would be allocated as scenic byways.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT FURTHER ANALYZED

This section briefly describes alternatives considered but not incorporated into an alternative for further analysis in this FEIS. The management actions considered were recommended by members of the public either during scoping or in the alternatives development workshops, or by resource specialists. The management actions are described below, along with the rationale for excluding them from further consideration.

2.5.1 PUBLIC SAFETY

There was a recommendation to prohibit the carrying of weapons. By law, US citizens may carry weapons on or through public lands for a number of legitimate purposes including, but not necessarily limited to, hunting and self-protection. Alternatives for managing recreational target shooting activities are being considered in this PRMP for public safety and resource protection purposes, but a prohibition against the possession of firearms is not being pursued.

2.5.2 TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

2.5.2.1 Driving in Washes

A proposal was submitted that driving in washes be allowed in all washes large enough to accommodate a four-wheel-drive vehicle as a long-standing, traditional use. This alternative was not carried forward into an action alternative because allowing vehicular travel in washes not specifically designated as a BLM asset, such as a primitive road, would force drivers to determine whether or not the wash was open for travel. Such ambiguity could lead to situations of unlawful driving and resource damage. The travel route inventory conducted by the BLM since 2000 includes routes in washes.

In addition, authorizing unlimited driving in washes at the driver's discretion would essentially open hundreds of miles of wash system to all-terrain or four-wheel drive vehicles, as this action would include currently traveled washes as well as untraveled washes. This type of travel is inconsistent with Presidential Proclamation 7397, which expressly prohibits, with the exception of emergency or authorized administrative use, all motorized and mechanized vehicle use "off road" in the Monument.

Furthermore, washes throughout the Lower Sonoran Planning Area contribute substantially to sustaining healthy, diverse, and productive ecosystems and cultural landscapes. Due to potentially adverse resource impacts on wildlife habitat, soils, and vegetation, unlimited driving in washes is inconsistent with the resource protection and management goals established for both the Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas. Vehicle travel in certain washes would be considered during the route evaluation process for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area as part of the comprehensive travel management plans.

2.5.3 RECREATION

During public comment, an alternative was suggested to manage the Buckeye Hills West area as a Special Recreation Management Area with an emphasis on OHV recreation. The commenter suggested development of motorcycle trails, a motorcycle park, a youth size ATV and motorcycle area, and facilities to accommodate developed OHV use. The area in question includes land managed by BLM, Arizona Game and Fish Department, and Maricopa County Parks. The objectives for the Buckeye Hills West area are being developed in concert by all three agencies involved (**Appendix R**). Management as a motorcycle and ATV recreation area with a youth all-terrain vehicle and motorcycle park on this parcel would not be consistent with these objectives. Planning for specific recreation facilities to meet area objectives, including those to accommodate motorized forms of recreation, would be conducted as part of an implementation plan and is beyond the scope of this RMP. In addition, there currently is no legal public access to BLM managed lands within the Buckeye Hills West area. Without legal access, the suggested recreation management would not be implementable. For these reasons, BLM found this alternative impractical to analyze further.

2.5.4 LAND TENURE

2.5.4.1 Land Disposal

The recommendation was to identify for disposal the federal lands bordering the Gila River Indian Reservation in the Estrella Mountains. While there are lands that border the Reservation analyzed in detail for disposal among the alternatives, those lands situated in the Sierra Estrella Wilderness and within the Anza NHT boundaries cannot be disposed. They are Congressionally protected and designated under the Wilderness Act of 1964 and National Trails System Act of 1968.

2.5.5 LIVESTOCK GRAZING

For livestock grazing allotments within the Lower Sonoran Decision Area, an alternative was considered regarding the potential conversion of all, or some, perennial and perennial-ephemeral livestock grazing allotments to strictly ephemeral use only. This alternative was not evaluated further because these decisions would be determined on an individual allotment basis based on monitoring findings and through a land health evaluation (LHE) process, which was not conducted for this plan. During the LHE process, the BLM would determine if the allotments meet the criteria described in the Special Ephemeral Rule as described in **Table 2-27**, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration, and could modify the designation based on their findings, and in coordination and cooperation with the permittee and the interested public, as required by NEPA.

For livestock grazing allotments within the SDNM Decision Area, the analysis was intended to satisfy the SDNM proclamation requirement to determine the extent of livestock grazing that would be compatible with protection of the Monument objects. During the LHE process (**Appendix F**, Arizona Land Health Evaluation for the Sonoran Desert National Monument) for the Compatibility Analysis (**Appendix E**, Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument), the BLM did not determine if the allotments meet the criteria described in the Special Ephemeral Rule as described in **Table 2-27**, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration. Therefore, an alternative to convert all allotments to ephemeral was not analyzed at this time. However, in the future, BLM could modify the designation based on their future findings, and in coordination and cooperation with the permittee and interested publics, as required by NEPA.

2.6 EXISTING MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

2.6.1 EXISTING PLANS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Management actions and decisions that apply to all alternatives include those related to the Arizona Land Health Standards and actions and decisions from previous RMPs or amendments that are determined to be valid and are carried forward under the revised plan. However, the public lands within this Planning Area are currently managed under three separate RMPs and several amendments (refer to **Map I-12** for the geographic areas that each of these plans encompass). Therefore, many of the existing decisions only cover portions of the Planning Area, not the entire Planning Area.

Existing management decisions come from the following RMPs or RMP amendments that overlay the Planning Area (in chronological order):

- Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (MFP) (1983)
- Phoenix RMP (1989)
- Lower Gila South RMP (1988)
- Lower Gila South RMP (Goldwater Amendment) (1990)
- Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (1997)
- Statewide Amendment for Fire, Fuels, and Air Quality (2003)
- Cameron Allotment Amendment (2004)
- Amendment to the Lower Gila North MFP and Lower Gila South RMP (2005)

In addition to the LUPs above, several programmatic environmental impact statements (EIS) are also adopted and incorporated into this plan where applicable. These are:

- Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic EIS (2007) and Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report (2007)

- Geothermal Leasing in the Western United States (2008)
- Programmatic EIS, Designation of Energy Corridors on Federal Land in the 11 Western States (2009)

2.7 **MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES**

2.7.1 **WILDERNESS**

The Planning Area includes six wilderness areas designated by the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990. These areas total 249,450 acres: 91,750 acres in the Lower Sonoran Decision Area and 157,700 acres in the SDNM Decision Area. They are identified in **Table 2-1**, Wilderness Areas of the Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas.

**Table 2-1
Wilderness Areas of the Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas**

Wilderness Area	Size (Acres)
Lower Sonoran	
Sierra Estrella	14,400
Signal Mountain	13,350
Woolsey Peak	64,000
Sonoran Desert National Monument	
North Maricopa Mountains	63,200
South Maricopa Mountains	60,100
Table Top	34,400
<i>Total</i>	<i>249,450</i>

BLM management policy (BLM Manual 8560) directs that each BLM wilderness area have a management plan. Management guidance is provided under the Maricopa Complex Wilderness Management Plan (BLM 2005c) (for the North Maricopa Mountains, Sierra Estrella, South Maricopa Mountains, and Table Top Wildernesses) and the Woolsey Peak Wilderness and Signal Mountain Wilderness Management Plan (BLM 2003j). There are no proposals in this RMP that would change any decisions contained in these management plans. The BLM's policy is to allow emergency and/or law enforcement access into wilderness areas under administrative access provisions. See either wilderness area plan noted above for full explanation of the management actions allowed within the wilderness areas.

As stated in **Chapter I**, Purpose and Need for the Resource Management Plan, only Congress has the authority to designate wilderness and wilderness study areas; no new areas will be proposed in this plan. However, lands with wilderness characteristics can be managed by the BLM to protect those characteristics and are discussed throughout the chapters of this document.

2.7.2 **ARIZONA LAND HEALTH STANDARDS**

The Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration were developed, pursuant to 43 CFR 4180, through a collaborative process involving BLM staff and the Arizona BLM

Resource Advisory Council, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior in April 1997. The Standards and Guidelines have been developed to identify the characteristics of healthy ecosystems on public lands and the management actions that promote them.

When approved, the Standards and Guidelines became Arizona BLM policy, guiding the planning for and management of BLM public lands. Arizona Standards and Guidelines, therefore, have been incorporated into this PRMP/FEIS. The Standards for Rangeland Health describe the conditions necessary to encourage proper functioning of ecological processes, and are adopted as Land Health Standards. In managing and implementing all resource programs, the BLM must consider the Land Health Standards.

The Guidelines for Grazing Administration are a series of management practices used to ensure that grazing activities meet the Land Health Standards. These Guidelines are incorporated into the PRMP/FEIS in **Section 2.11.2**, Livestock Grazing, and are detailed in **Appendix B**, Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Policies, and **Appendix L**, Guidelines for Grazing Administration.

2.8 ALTERNATIVES

Detailed alternatives descriptions for the Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas are presented by program area and include:

- A brief introduction about the program area;
- Existing management decisions (Alternative A), split between five of the existing LUPs;
- Alternative allocation tables if the program area has any land use allocations; and
- Action alternative (Alternatives B, C, D, and E) management action tables.

Within the Action Alternative Management Action Tables, abbreviations are used to note which Decision Area and alternative applies to an individual action. Abbreviations are also used for the program areas themselves. Program area abbreviations appear before each decision number. The abbreviations used in this chapter are outlined in **Table 2-2**, Program Area Categories and Abbreviations.

Table 2-2
Program Area Categories and Abbreviations

Planning Decision Areas	
Lower Sonoran	LS
Sonoran Desert National Monument	SDNM
Resource Program Areas	
Air Quality	AQ
Cave Resources	CR
Cultural and Heritage Resources	CH
Paleontological Resources	PL
Soil Resources	SR
Vegetation	VG

**Table 2-2
Program Area Categories and Abbreviations**

Visual Resources	VR
Water Resources	WR
Wild Horse and Burro Management	HB
Wilderness Characteristics	WC
Wildland Fire Management	WF
Wildlife and Special Status Species	WL
Resource Use Program Areas	
Lands and Realty	LR
Livestock Grazing	GR
Minerals Management	MM
Recreation Management	RM
Travel Management	TM
Special Designations	
Special Designations	SD
Social and Economic Concerns	
Hazardous Materials and Public Safety	PS

2.9 STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES AND BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Review of the alternatives must always consider that, despite the goals, objectives, and management actions prescribed, the BLM functions using a set of standard operating procedures (SOPs) and best management practices (BMPs) that guide day-to-day operations and business practices. Every alternative should be reviewed within the context of the way the BLM conducts business. The SOPs and BMPs are the combined product of procedures developed to comply with laws, regulations, policies, and other guidance and are often institutionalized in manuals and handbooks. The SOPs and BMPs are described in detail (although not all inclusive) by program in **Appendix H**, Best Management Practices and Standard Operating Procedures.

2.10 RESOURCES

2.10.1 AIR QUALITY

The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has delegated rulemaking pertaining to air quality and achieving attainment of air quality standards to states, which further delegate authority to counties through state implementation plans. Guidance for management of air resources is published in BLM Manual 7300. Activities on BLM lands contribute a small share of target pollutants in central Arizona. However, within air pollution nonattainment areas in the vicinity of Phoenix, rules made by Maricopa County apply to BLM lands. BLM activities that emit target pollutants in nonattainment areas need to be managed so that they do not contribute to standards violations. The primary target pollutant emitted by activities on BLM lands is particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less (PM₁₀). The goals, objectives, and management actions below are intended to assure that activities on BLM land comply with the appropriate rules.

2.10.1.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) Air Quality

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan – Goldwater Amendment (1990) [Applies to the three relinquished Sentinel Plain, Sand Tank Mountains, and Ajo Airport parcels]:

- Control excessive fugitive dust at BLM-permitted construction sites and recreation activity areas (WS-12).
- Monitor air quality trends (WS-13).

2.10.1.2 Action Alternatives for Air Quality

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Protect, maintain, and improve the quality of air resources associated with authorized uses and activities on public lands.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-3, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Air Quality, describes management actions and allowable uses for air quality.

**Table 2-3
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Air Quality**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Protect, maintain, and improve the quality of air resources associated with authorized uses and activities on public lands.						
<u>Objective 1.1</u> : Maintain existing air quality and air quality-related values (e.g., visibility) by ensuring that authorized uses on public lands comply with and support federal, state, and local laws and regulations for protecting air quality.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	AQ-1.1.1: State and local agencies and adjacent land managers would be consulted to address emissions that affect public lands.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	AQ-1.1.2: Appropriate management techniques and practices would be applied to all authorized surface-disturbing projects and activities as needed to ensure compliance with standards.
<u>Objective 1.2</u> : Apply mitigation measures for uses and activities within and near adjoining communities, wilderness areas, and large particulate-matter (PM ₁₀) (i.e., dust) non-attainment and maintenance areas, especially as they pertain to unpaved roads that traverse public lands.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	AQ-1.2.1: Excessive fugitive-dust generation from unpaved roads, construction sites, recreation activity areas, and other areas would be managed to ensure emissions do not exceed air quality standards, particularly those more rigid requirements in non-attainment areas.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	AQ-1.2.2: Fugitive-dust emissions from unpaved roads would be mitigated through appropriate control methods, including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowering speed limits by creating obstacles such as speed bumps; • Using fugitive-dust control measures such as dust suppressants, gravel, or pavement;

**Table 2-3
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Air Quality**

Decision Area	Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installing cattle guards where unpaved roads meet paved roads; • Reducing vehicle-use intensity or duration, reducing route density, or re-routing travel routes to more stable soils; • Limiting the vehicle type on roads or in areas that are susceptible to excessive dust due to unstable soils; • Closing high-use areas during high-pollution days; • Closing areas that frequently exceed PM₁₀ standards to non-compliant recreation and other projects until mitigation measures are implemented. • Implementing temporary, seasonal, or permanent route closures when other methods are unsuccessful at controlling fugitive dust that exceeds regulatory limits.

Administrative Actions for Both Decision Areas

- Participate in the Interagency Smoke Program and other programs related to air quality.
- Participate and comment on proposed projects identified as requiring Prevention of Significant Deterioration/New Source Review permits for their effects on air quality and affected resources within 100 kilometers of wilderness areas. Request that location-specific pre-application monitoring be conducted to support the permit review process when appropriate.
- Review projects requiring non-major permits within 10 kilometers of wilderness areas to determine their effects on air quality and affected resources, and provide comments to the appropriate regulatory agency.
- Participate in the public workshops and provide comments on the Maricopa County or other proposed air quality rule changes.
- Work with adjoining land managers and users to mitigate air quality effects on public lands.
- Coordinate with county or municipal authorities to encourage control of fugitive dust emissions from unpaved roads that affect attainment of air quality standards.
- Work with federal, state, and local agencies to monitor air quality on public lands, particularly in wilderness and other special areas. Air quality monitoring should include visibility, ozone, acid deposition or other relevant air quality indicators.
- Work with federal, state, and local agencies to gather meteorological data, including installing meteorological stations on the public lands, as needed and appropriate.
- Encourage research of air quality-related issues.

- Address air quality impacts when planning and executing prescribed burns to comply with federal and state air quality standards and adhere to Article 15 of the Arizona Administrative Code and State Implementation Plan provisions.

Administrative Actions Specific to the SDNM Decision Area

- Review projects requiring non-major permits within 10 kilometers of the SDNM to determine their effects on air quality and affected resources and provide comments to the appropriate regulatory agency.
- Work with adjoining land managers and users and county or municipal authorities to mitigate air quality effects on the SDNM. Make control of fugitive dust emissions from unpaved roads, construction sites, or other activity areas within 10 kilometers of SDNM a priority of this effort.
- Coordinate with county or municipal authorities to encourage control of fugitive dust emissions from unpaved roads that affect attainment of air quality standards in the SDNM.
- Increase public awareness and appreciation of air quality resources and visibility through interpretative displays as part of the public outreach program and visitor facilities planning for SDNM.
- Work with federal, state, and local agencies to monitor air quality in the SDNM. Air quality monitoring should include visibility, ozone, acid deposition, or other relevant air quality indicators.
- Promote the study of air quality conditions in the SDNM, including the effects of ozone, acid deposition and other related pollutants on plants and the supporting ecosystems. Cooperate and promote such activity with academic institutions and other interested parties.

2.10.2 CAVE RESOURCES

Although no caves have been identified in the Decision Areas, there may be undocumented caves located in geologically suitable rock units. Any newly discovered caves would be evaluated for scientific, educational, biological, and recreational value.

The Planning Area contains Paleozoic sedimentary deposits and Tertiary volcanic rocks that are known to contain caves elsewhere in Arizona. While Paleozoic limestone occurs in the Sand Tank Mountains, no caves or karst resources are known. The Sentinel Plain area contains two lava tubes. Small rock overhangs and shallow openings are present in some rock units of the lava tubes; however, by definition these do not qualify as caves. The definition of a cave requires that its depth exceed its width.

BLM Manual 8380, Cave and Karst Resources Management, provides guidance and direction for the management of cave and karst resources on BLM-administered lands, including aquifers and their surface water and groundwater-drainage areas.

2.10.2.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Cave Resources

No existing management decisions exist for caves and cave resources.

2.10.2.2 Action Alternatives for Cave Resources Management

Program Goals

- **Goal 1:** Protect and conserve caves and karst resources as they are discovered on the public lands.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-4, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cave Resources, describes management actions and allowable uses for cave resources.

Table 2-4
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cave Resources

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Protect and conserve caves and karst resources as they are discovered on the public lands.						
Objective 1.1: Manage caves and karst resources to maintain or enhance their physical integrity and scientific interest.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CR-1.1.1: Evaluate and inventory caves and karst resources, as they are discovered, to determine if the cave contains significant cultural, scientific, biological, geological, hydrological, educational, or recreational values.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CR-1.1.2: Protect and manage significant caves and karst resources for cultural, scientific, biological, geological, hydrological, educational, and recreational values.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CR-1.1.3: Public access to all caves within this Decision Area would be by permit only unless public entry is signed as open. Federal, state and local government employees operating within the scope of their authorizations would be exempt from permit issuance.

2.10.3 CULTURAL AND HERITAGE RESOURCES

Cultural and heritage resources are the physical and traditional remnants of thousands of years of human occupation and use of the land and its resources. Cultural resource sites date to both prehistoric and historic time periods up to the mid-twentieth century. Cultural resources also include places of traditional importance to Native Americans. The BLM strives to protect the informational, heritage, and interpretive values of archaeological and heritage sites.

Cultural and heritage sites are recognized as fragile and irreplaceable resources with potential public and scientific uses. Allocation to one of five use categories is prescribed in BLM Manual 8100:

- Scientific use,
- Conservation for future use,
- Traditional use,
- Public use, or
- Experimental use.

See **Appendix B, Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Policies**, for more information on site allocations.

Management of sites on a regional or landscape level can be achieved by allocating an area as a SCRMA. This is an area containing cultural resources (archaeological sites, historic sites, or places of traditional cultural importance) that are particularly important for public use, scientific use, traditional use, or other uses as defined in BLM Manual 8110.4. Management prescriptions for these areas should reflect and support the primary values for which the areas are allocated. For example, management prescriptions for a SCRMA allocated primarily for public use should focus on developing and interpreting sites for public visitation, including heritage tourism. Management prescriptions for a special area allocated primarily for scientific use should focus on protecting sites for study, supporting field schools, and other research efforts. Management prescriptions for a special area allocated primarily for traditional use should seek to accommodate the traditional cultural practices of Indian tribes or other cultural groups that ascribe religious or other heritage values to the area.

Management prescriptions for a special area allocated primarily to protect scarce sites of singular importance that should not be subjected to invasive studies or other uses that would threaten their present condition should focus on conserving sites for the future. Management prescriptions for a single SCRMA can focus on more than one type of use, just as a single cultural property can be allocated to more than one of the use categories described in Manual 8110.4. For example, a special area might contain a set of cultural properties that, linked together and interpreted as a group, would make a good auto tour route for heritage tourism. At the same time, the area might contain several cultural properties of unusual historic importance that should be segregated from land or resource uses that might impair their present condition or setting. While both kinds of properties should receive management emphasis, they can be included within a single land use allocation with management prescriptions tailored to support public visitation of the sites along the auto tour route, and protection for the sites that warrant segregation.

The primary purpose of this land use allocation is to differentiate some portions of a Planning Area from others in terms of cultural resource values. The allocation can denote priority for the expenditure of time and funds or the need for special protection to achieve management objectives. However, highlighting a geographic area for its special cultural resource values does not diminish the importance of cultural resources in other areas. Cultural resources on lands not included within special areas still need to be managed for the values they contain and opportunities they afford.

The regulatory framework under which cultural and heritage resources are managed include a list of laws, regulations, and Executive Orders. The most important laws are the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA); Archaeological Resources Protection Act; National Trails System Act;

American Indian Religious Freedom Act; Antiquities Act of 1906; Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990; NEPA; FLPMA; Historic Sites Act of 1935; Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960, as amended by the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974; and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act.

2.10.3.1 Sonoran Desert National Monument

The purpose of the SDNM designation according to Presidential Proclamation 7397 is to protect the objects of the Monument. Some cultural and historic objects were listed individually, and some were inferred. The objects include the natural historic landscape settings of a 23-mile corridor segment of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (Anza NHT) corridor, and the Butterfield Overland Stage Route and Mormon Battalion Trail located within the same 23-mile corridor. The other named objects include rock art, lithic quarries, historic and prehistoric structures, prehistoric routes, objects of historic or scientific interest, significant archaeological and historic sites, large prehistoric villages, permanent habitation sites, protohistoric villages, Vekol Wash, and other prehistoric travel and trade corridors.

The cultural and heritage resources located on the Monument are a far more diverse collection than this list of object names. Less than three percent of the Monument has been inventoried. As the inventory grows, a greater understanding of these resources and their relationship with each other would be discovered and documented. Protection of these resources as Monument objects would ensure their survival into the future.

2.10.3.2 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Cultural and Heritage Resources

The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. The decisions are also displayed in **Map 2-1a, Alternative A Cultural Resource Allocations**. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)

- Allocate cultural resources identified through inventory for scientific uses (CL-01 and CL-02).
- Reduce or eliminate indirect impacts of land uses on cultural resources as identified through study plots (CL-03).
- Conserve a representative sample of site types in the Planning Area for future use (CL-04).
- Provide immediate and long-term in-place preservation and protection of selected cultural resources that are threatened or deteriorating (CL-05).
- Resources that are threatened or deteriorating (CL-05).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (Goldwater Amendment – 1990)*(Applicable to the three relinquished BGR parcels)*

- Provide special protection for significant cultural sites that are being impacted or threatened by the public. For sites being impacted or threatened by the military, a different process would be followed. The BLM would be available to the military at all times as a consultant (CL-3).
- Minimize impacts on cultural resources by avoiding cultural property locations whenever feasible and using previously disturbed areas as the preferred locations for ground-disturbing activities when practical (CL-4).

Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (1997)

- Guideline 3-7: Management practices to achieve desired plant communities would consider protection and conservation of known cultural resources, including historical sites, and prehistoric sites, and plants of significance to Native American peoples (CL-9).

2.10.3.3 Action Alternatives for Cultural and Heritage Resources**Program Goals**

- Goal 1: Identify, preserve, and protect important cultural resources and Monument objects. Ensure they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.
- Goal 2: Reduce threats, reduce or prevent damage, and resolve potential conflicts from naturally occurring or unauthorized human-caused damage or deteriorations.
- Goal 3: Manage assemblages of sites within the Decision Areas as cultural landscapes.

Allocation Summaries

Table 2-5, Proposed Site Use Allocation by Alternative, provides data for site use allocations by Alternative.

Table 2-5
Proposed Site Use Allocation by Alternative

Cultural and Heritage Site Uses	Alternative (BLM acres)				
	A	B	C	D	E
Lower Sonoran					
Painted Rock Petroglyph Site – Public and Scientific Use	0	200	200	200	200
Butterfield West – Public and Scientific Use	0	10	10	0	10
Sundad – Public and Scientific Use	0	73	73	0	73
Butterfield West – Public and Scientific Use	0	0	0	10	0
Sundad – Public and Scientific Use	0	0	0	73	0
Saddle Mountain SCRMA	0	0	48,500	ACEC	ACEC
Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA	0	0	82,500	ACEC	ACEC

**Table 2-5
Proposed Site Use Allocation by Alternative**

Cultural and Heritage Site Uses	Alternative (BLM acres)				
	A	B	C	D	E
SDNM					
Bighorn Station – Public and Scientific Use	0	<5	<5	0	<5
Christmas Camp – Public and Scientific Use	0	<5	<5	0	<5
Happy Camp (Desert Station) – Public and Scientific Use	0	<5	<5	0	<5
Selected segments of Butterfield Overland Stage Route (Butterfield Pass) – Public and Scientific Use	0	3,600	3,600	0	3,600
Bighorn Station – Public and Scientific Use	0	0	0	<5	0
Segments of Butterfield Overland Stage Route – Public and Scientific Use	0	0	0	3,600	0
Christmas Camp – Public and Scientific Use	0	0	0	<5	0
Happy Camp (Desert Station) – Public and Scientific Use	0	0	0	<5	0
Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA	0	0	16,200	0	16,200

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-6, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cultural Resources, describes management actions and allowable uses for cultural resources.

**Table 2-6
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cultural Resources**

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses			
Goal 1: Identify, preserve, and protect important cultural resources and Monument objects. Ensure they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.					
Objective 1.1: Allocate 90 percent of known and evaluated cultural resource sites to one of five use categories: (1) scientific use, (2) conservation for future use, (3) traditional use, (4) public use or (5) experimental use, or classify as “discharged from management,” within one year of recording (use categories and criteria to determine categories are described in Appendix B , Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Policies).					
Site Use Allocations					
LS	B	C	D	E	CH-1.1.1: Painted Rock Petroglyph Site would remain a public or scientific use site for heritage tourism and interpretation purposes. The site would continue to be managed for interpretation and education uses according to the existing project and business plans (Maps 2-1b, c, d, and e .)
LS	B	C	D	E	CH-1.1.2: Retain public lands and acquire available state and private lands and/or easements to assure long-term use, protection, and access to important cultural sites and Monument objects that occupy a particular and definitive role in the cultural landscape or are of particular importance to local Native American tribes. Emphasize lands located within allocated use site categories and SCRMA.

**Table 2-6
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cultural Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C	D	E	CH-I.1.3: All known cultural sites allocated to a use category as identified in Appendix B would be closed to locatable mineral exploration and development, and mineral material disposals (saleables). Public lands would be recommended for withdrawal.
LS		B	C	D	E	CH-I.1.4: Public use sites would remain open to all leasable minerals, but any lease or energy LUA would contain a no surface occupancy stipulation. The typical Public Use Site in the Planning Area would be less than 5 acres.
LS		B	C	D	E	CH-I.1.5: Public use sites would be exclusion areas for utility scale energy development and multiuse corridor LUAs. They would be avoidance areas for minor linear and nonlinear LUAs and mitigated to be consistent with management objectives. The typical Public Use Site in the Planning Area would be less than 5 acres.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	CH-I.1.6: Sundad, Butterfield West (selected segment of the Butterfield Overland Stage Route west of the Painted Rock Site), Anza-Butterfield Interpretive Trail (a high potential use segment of the Juan Bautista de Anza NHT and Butterfield Overland Stage Route within the SDNM), Happy Camp, Christmas Camp and Bighorn Station would be allocated as public or scientific use sites. Management prescriptions for public use sites would follow those set forth in the applicable special designation sections of the RMP when more restrictive. Inventory, recordation, documentation, and preparation of all sites for increased public visitation must be accomplished prior to implementing interpretive developments. Sundad would only be allocated if critical safety issues are addressed. Big Horn Station would only be allocated if stabilization measures are taken, critical safety issues are addressed and legal access is obtained. (Maps 2-1b, c, and e.)
LS	SDNM			D		CH-I.1.7: Sundad, Butterfield, Anza-Butterfield Interpretive, Happy Camp, Christmas Camp and Bighorn Station sites would be allocated as scientific use sites only. Sites would not be used for tourism or interpretive development (Map 2-1d). Management prescriptions for these areas would follow those set forth in the applicable special designation sections of the RMP where more restrictive.
	SDNM			D		CH-I.1.8: The Anza-Butterfield Interpretive Trail high potential use segment would be limited to non-motorized uses.
	SDNM	B	C		E	CH-I.1.9: Camping within 100 feet of centerline along the Anza-Butterfield Interpretive Trail high potential use segment would be limited to designated campsites as determined in activity level planning.
	SDNM			D		CH-I.1.10: No camping (motorized or non-motorized) would be allowed along the Anza-Butterfield Interpretive Trail high potential use segment.

**Table 2-6
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cultural Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
<u>Objective 1.2:</u> Encourage appropriate scientific use of cultural resources.					
LS	SDNM	B	C	E	CH-1.2.1: Provide opportunities for scientific research and inventory at selected sites, including excavation by qualified researchers.
LS	SDNM		D		CH-1.2.2: Opportunities would be provided for scientific research and inventory at selected sites by qualified researchers if designed to have a minor or negligible impact to cultural resources.
<u>Objective 1.3:</u> Allocate cultural and historical features as SCRMA's to protect the features and visual settings and to enhance visitor experience.					
Common To All SCRMA's					
LS	SDNM		C		CH-1.3.1: Selected public lands within Saddle Mountain would be allocated as the Saddle Mountain SCRMA (approximately 48,500 acres), and the Gila River Terraces (bluffs with cultural features along the Gila River) and the Lower Gila Historic Trails Corridor would be allocated as the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA (approximately 82,500 in the Lower Sonoran Decision Area and 16,200 acres in the SDNM). (See Map 2-1c .)
LS	SDNM		C		CH-1.3.2: Motorized vehicle routes would be closed, limited, or mitigated as needed to protect the cultural resources during the route designation process or when conflicts with cultural resources are identified.
LS	SDNM		C		CH-1.3.3: Heritage tourism would be allowed only if compatible with protection strategies.
LS	SDNM		C		CH-1.3.4: Inventory and evaluations on cultural resources in SCRMA's would be increased and emphasized.
LS	SDNM		C		CH-1.3.5: Sites allocated to Public Use may be developed for interpretation and environmental education.
LS			C		CH-1.3.6: The Saddle Mountain and portions of the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA located outside the SDNM would be open to locatable minerals but closed to mineral material disposals (saleables).
LS			C		CH-1.3.7: All LUAs would be avoided, mitigated, and otherwise managed, within the Saddle Mountain and portions of the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA located outside the SDNM to be consistent with management objectives.
The Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA					
LS			C		CH-1.3.8: Portions of the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA located outside the SDNM would remain open to all leasable minerals, but any mineral lease would contain a no surface occupancy stipulation.
LS			C		CH-1.3.9: Treatments of invasive species would be allowed within the SCRMA's if they can be designed to have a minor or negligible impact to cultural resources.
LS			C		CH-1.3.10: Vegetation would be rehabilitated and restored in priority areas consistent with cultural landscape, viewshed, and cultural resource integrity.

**Table 2-6
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Cultural Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 2: Reduce threats, reduce or prevent damage, and resolve potential conflicts from naturally occurring or unauthorized human-caused damage or deterioration.						
Objective 2.1: Impacts by erosion, natural processes, or those due to vandalism visitation, vehicle traffic, or other unauthorized human activity would be reduced.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-2.1.1: Potential conflicts from other resource uses would be minimized, reduced, or unauthorized by complying with Section 106 of the NHPA, and using mitigation or avoidance strategies as prescribed by law, regulation, or the BLM 8100 Manual.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-2.1.2: Sites suffering damage or deterioration resulting from natural or human causes would be restored or stabilized.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-2.1.3: Sites and Monument objects would be protected from degradation due to erosion and other natural processes by using a wide variety of techniques and tools, such as wash bank stabilization, rip rap, and vegetation restoration.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-2.1.4: Sites and Monument objects damaged by vandalism, excessive visitation, vehicle traffic, or other causes would be restored by using signing, fencing, gating, trail re-routing, or other measures.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-2.1.5: Special recreation permit (SRP) holders would be required to provide archaeological site etiquette and resource conservation information to all participants, employees, and volunteers associated with permitted activities.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-2.1.6: The number of visitors at cultural or historic sites would be limited to 25 people at the site at any one time to emphasize resource protection. Some sites may require further limitations to protect the resource. Casual use or group limits for SRPs may be higher on a case-by-case basis if determined to be acceptable in site specific evaluations and the activity/action can be designed to have a minor or negligible impact to cultural resources.
Goal 3: Manage assemblages of sites within the Decision Areas as cultural landscapes.						
Objective 3.1: Distinct cultural landscapes would be described and mapped as defined by human use of the environment to protect the physical integrity, enhance visitor experience, and maintain or enhance visual settings. Cultural landscapes are a new and holistic land use concept that attempts to understand human interaction with each other and their environment through time on a landscape scale.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-3.1.1: The age, function, and interrelationship of sites attributed to historic indigenous populations in different environmental settings would be identified when possible.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	CH-3.1.2: Cumulative impacts to the cultural landscape, as well as impacts to individual sites, would be analyzed as part of the project assessment when projects are proposed.

2.10.3.4 Administrative Actions

State Historic Preservation Office/NHPA

- Continue to regularly communicate with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to share information and obtain technical advice on issues relating to compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA, in accordance with the Arizona State Protocol.
- Focus proactive (Section 110) inventories on areas defined as Special Cultural Resource Management Areas, ACECs, and areas along historic trail routes.

Tribal Consultation and Concerns

- Continue to consult with the Gila River Indian Community, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, and other interested Indian tribes to identify places of traditional importance and associated access needs. Develop measures for management and protection of such places that may be identified by tribes during the life of the approved RMP.
- Identify sacred areas in consultation with Indian tribes and, where practicable, limit land uses to those that do not conflict with ascribed values.
- Honor tribal requests to protect the confidentiality of sensitive information to the extent permitted by law.
- Provide opportunities for participation by Indian tribes in research and interpretation.
- Specific management prescriptions for sites allocated to the Traditional Use category would be developed in consultation with the Indian tribes to which they are culturally important.
- Restrict public information about the locations of sites that are not allocated to public use as allowed by law and regulation.

Research Opportunities

- Complete documentary research and oral histories to gain a better understanding of cultural resources from homesteading, mining, ranching, and other historical period activities.
- Establish collaborative research partnerships with academic institutions, tribes, professional and nonprofit organizations, vocational organizations, and other entities for an orderly process of cultural research, recordation, and education.
- Work with researchers, tribes, interested members of the public, contractors, local communities, and published materials to define specific cultural landscapes. Work with tribal groups and individuals to define temporal, functional, and inter-relationships of sites within certain landscape settings.

- Provide opportunities for training and participation in site documentation, research, protection, and education projects by tribal members, students, and volunteers. Ensure adequate professional oversight of work conducted by tribal members, students, and volunteers.

Interpretation and Education

- Map and document sites before interpretive development for public use, as needed, to preserve archeological data, plan for interpretive data, and provide a baseline condition assessment for monitoring changes resulting from visitor use.
- Complete interpretive plans for public use sites selected for interpretive development.
- Develop interpretive materials and facilities for selected sites. Provide educational opportunities to the public, including resource protection and appreciation, education, and stewardship.
- Continue to participate in Arizona Archaeology Awareness Month events and other educational outreach programs to highlight the values of cultural heritage resources and the need to protect these resources.
- Provide opportunities for tribal and interested public participation in interpretation.

Monitoring

- Continue to work with and support the Arizona Site Steward Program.
- Develop a monitoring scheme to evaluate the condition of cultural resources.
- Implement procedures for systematic monitoring of all sites developed or authorized for public visitation.

Planning

- The BLM would develop Cultural Resource Project Plans for protection or interpretation projects that require precise descriptions of implementation procedures, workforce, scheduling, equipment, and supplies. Project planning would be implemented following guidance in BLM's Manual 8130, Planning for Uses of Cultural Resources.

Special Programs/Cultural Landscapes

- Work with researchers, tribes, concerned members of the public, contractors, local communities, and other stakeholders to make use of previously published materials to define certain cultural landscapes.
- Develop a strategy to identify, assess, and monitor the viewsheds along the historic trail corridor and other important cultural landscapes on the SDNM and within ACECs. Use

Geographical Information System (GIS) technology to create viewshed studies and collect information for the monitoring program.

2.10.4 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Paleontological resources constitute a fragile and nonrenewable scientific record of the history of life on Earth. Once damaged, destroyed, or improperly collected, their scientific and educational value may be lost forever. In addition to their scientific, educational, and recreational values, paleontological resources can be used to understand the relationships between the biological and geological components of ecosystems over long periods of time. The BLM strives to manage paleontological resources for their scientific, educational, and recreational values, and to mitigate adverse impacts on them. On the SDNM, paleontological resources are considered objects of the Monument, implied by the statement “other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the ... National Monuments” (Proclamation 7397).

Historic trends have shown that very few geologic units in the Planning Area contain paleontological material. This is due primarily to the lack of sedimentary formations in this part of Arizona. It should be noted, however, that very little of the Planning Area was inventoried for paleontological remains or the geologic units that tend to carry them.

The Paleontology Program Manual and Handbook, BLM Manual 8270 and H-8270-1, provide guidelines for implementing the Paleontological Resource Management Program.

2.10.4.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Paleontological Resources

SDNM Current Management Guidance (2002)

The collection of any objects, including vegetation, paleontological resources, or rock specimens, should not be permitted, except where intended for legitimate scientific uses for which documentation is provided to the satisfaction of the responsible management official. Scientific, archaeological, and historical investigations that increase our understanding of the Monument’s resources are important, but surface disturbance should be avoided.

2.10.4.2 Action Alternatives for Paleontological Resources

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Protect and manage any paleontological resources, including all vertebrate fossils, traces, and invertebrate or plant fossils of paleontological interest, found on public lands for scientific, educational, or recreational values.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-7, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Paleontological Resources, describes management actions and allowable uses for paleontological resources.

**Table 2-7
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Paleontological Resources**

Decision Area	Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Protect and manage any paleontological resources, including all vertebrate fossils, traces, and invertebrate or plant fossils of paleontological interest, found on public lands for scientific, educational, or recreational values.						
Objective 1.1: Manage paleontological resources to maintain or enhance their physical integrity, educational values, and scientific interest while avoiding all surface-disturbing activities to the extent possible that would damage paleontological resources.						
LS		B	C	D	E	PL-1.1.1: Collection of all vertebrate fossils and invertebrate and plant fossils of paleontological interest would be prohibited without a permit from the BLM authorized officer in accordance with 16 USC 470aaa et seq. Casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources is prohibited unless it is determined by the authorized officer that the resources cannot be protected on site.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PL-1.1.2: Collection of paleontological resources for personal use would be prohibited except where intended for legitimate scientific uses and for which written authorization is obtained from the BLM authorized officer.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PL-1.1.3: Standard discovery stipulations would be included in any permit approval that is likely to affect significant paleontological resources. Stipulations would require the user or operator to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suspend operations immediately upon discovery of paleontological resources that would disturb them, • Contact the authorized officer as soon as reasonably possible, • Bear the cost of required mitigation.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PL-1.1.4: Upon notification of discovery by a permit user or operator, the BLM would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the discovery and inform the user/operator within 5 days, • Allow resumption of use/operations only after completion of mitigation.

Administrative Actions

- Geologic units would be assigned and entered into the Potential Fossil Yield Classification System (per Instruction Memorandum No. 2008-009) using geological maps and professional consideration. A separate class ranking would be assigned to each recognized geologic formation or member present at the surface in accordance with the guidelines provided in the IM.
- All assigned units entered into the Potential Fossil Yield Classification System would be integrated onto a GIS-based geologic map.

2.10.5 SOIL RESOURCES

Soil resources are fundamental to all other resources and resource uses. Guidance for management of soil resources is published in BLM Manual 7100. Primary authority for management includes the Taylor Grazing Act, the Public Rangelands Improvement Act, and FLPMA, which address use of federal rangelands, including assessment, conservation, and improvement of soil resources. The Clean Water Act indirectly affects soil management by controlling the release of nonpoint-source pollution such as sedimentation caused by erosion. The BLM's Phoenix District Office uses surveys developed by the US Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), as well as on-site assessments, when possible, to determine soil types and characteristics when assessing management actions.

Soil conditions are monitored and assessed through land health assessments. Impacts on soils are analyzed during the development of EISs or EAs for projects and use authorizations. The soil program works to reduce impacts on soil and associated vegetation resources through allocation of uses such as transportation and grazing, and through mitigation of project impacts. The soil program also works with other programs to implement restoration projects.

2.10.5.1 Existing Management Decisions (Alternative A - No Action) Soil Resources

The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Install gully plugs, waterbars, and other erosion structures to prevent excessive erosion on existing roads in Vekol Valley ACEC (WS-18).
- During construction of all rangeland developments, surface disturbance would be minimized. After construction, disturbed surfaces would be restored to a natural condition to the extent practicable (WS-19).
- Repair and maintain the existing watershed dike system and associated watershed fence (WS-21).

Phoenix Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Maintain and improve soil cover and productivity through erosion-prevention measures and land treatments (WS-03).
- Salinity control measures would be incorporated into erosion-prevention strategies and rehabilitation treatments (WS-04).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan - Goldwater Amendment (1990)*(Applies to the three relinquished BGR parcels)*

- Restrict the operation of motorized vehicles and heavy equipment to established roadways and previously impacted areas except when the use relates to a specific permitted project (WS-8).
- Assess, as part of site appraisals for NEPA, the vulnerability of soils to disruption and subsequent wind and water erosion (WS-9).
- Use the following techniques to minimize soil disturbance and conserve soil resources on previously unimpacted sites:
 - Gain access to the site, where possible, by using existing roads and trails.
 - Use equipment, where possible, that creates the least amount of soil disturbance.
 - Return disturbed areas to as close to pre-disturbed conditions as possible.
 - Minimize activities where it is known that soils are unstable and subject to wind erosion.

Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (1997)

- Guideline 1-1: Management activities would maintain or promote ground cover that provides for infiltration, permeability, soil moisture storage, and soil stability appropriate for the ecological sites within management units. The ground cover should maintain soil organisms, plants, and animals to support the hydrologic and nutrient cycles and energy flow. Ground cover and signs of erosion are surrogate measures for hydrologic and nutrient cycles and energy flow.
- Guideline 1-2: When grazing practices alone are not likely to restore areas of low infiltration or permeability, land management treatments may be designed and implemented to attain improvement.

2.10.5.2 Action Alternatives for Soil Resources**Program Goals**

- Goal 1: Ensure watersheds are functioning appropriately and are consistent with Land Health Standards. Characteristics of a properly functioning watershed include channels that are stable and in balance with the landscape; erosion and sediment deposition appropriate for the ecological site; infiltration of surface water in soils sufficient to support desired future conditions (DFCs) and minimize erosion from runoff; and flood frequencies, durations, and magnitudes appropriate for the landscape.
- Goal 2: Maintain or improve sensitive soils to avoid accelerated erosion rates.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-8, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Soil Resources, describes management actions and allowable uses for soil resources.

**Table 2-8
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Soil Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1 (Watershed): Ensure watersheds are functioning appropriately and are consistent with Land Health Standards. Characteristics of a properly functioning watershed include channels that are stable and in balance with the landscape; erosion and sediment deposition appropriate for the ecological site; infiltration of surface water in soils sufficient to support desired future conditions (DFCs) and minimize erosion from runoff; and flood frequencies, durations, and magnitudes appropriate for the landscape.						
Objective 1.1: Maintain or restore upland, channel, and riparian components of watersheds that help stabilize or improve watershed conditions. Major indicators of watershed health include maintaining total cover (vegetation and litter) consistent with desired future conditions, riparian areas in proper function condition, and erosion and sedimentation rates appropriate to the ecological site.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-1.1.1: Priorities for restoration would be established for disturbed areas. Priorities would be based on the potential for soil erosion and loss, damage to cultural or ecologically sensitive sites, and effects on water quality and quantity.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-1.1.2: Degraded sites would be stabilized and restored to slow or stop accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation and limit erosion to the natural rate for the ecological site.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-1.1.3: Benefits and risks of retaining the Vekol Valley spreader dike system would be evaluated along with benefits and risks of retaining or implementing vehicle closures in areas with eroded or otherwise degraded roads and trails.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-1.1.4: Soil erosion at cultural and ecologically sensitive sites would be evaluated. Soil erosion or degradation at these sites would be mitigated.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-1.1.5: Any management-caused soil erosion or degradation of the protected objects of the SDNM would be mitigated and restored to the extent possible.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-1.1.6: New or redeveloped facilities not related to water management would be constructed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside riparian areas and the 100-year floodplain of washes or water ways. Water catchment facilities for wildlife waters could be developed or redeveloped in riparian areas or in the 100-year floodplain or if needed to meet wildlife objectives and no other options are viable. • In a manner that avoids changing natural water flow or watershed dynamics, and consistent with other resource and public safety goals. • Existing facilities could be relocated or modified if they are significantly affecting watershed or floodplain function. Where

**Table 2-8
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Soil Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						water management facilities are necessary, the BLM would pursue options that minimize changes to natural water flow and watershed dynamics. Any activities in the 100-year floodplain would be planned for compliance with any county or federal floodplain regulations.
Goal 2: Maintain or improve sensitive soils to avoid accelerated erosion rates.						
Objective 2.1: Disturbance of sensitive soil surfaces, including those classified as highly susceptible to wind and water erosion and those with protective desert pavement or well-developed cryptogamic crust, would be avoided. If disturbance occurs, damage would be mitigated.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-2.1.1: Developments and ground-disturbing activities would be located away from areas of significant desert pavement, cryptogamic crust, and other sensitive or fragile soils that are vulnerable to disruption or have high wind or water erosion potential unless project goals cannot be met in another location. Where facilities or projects cannot be relocated, mitigation measures would be taken, including application of ground cover, to minimize erosion.
LS		B	C	D	E	SL-2.1.2: The density of roads and trails would be reduced during route designation within areas known to have sensitive soils. Closed roads would be rehabilitated. Roads left open would be treated to mitigate wind and water erosion.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-2.1.3: Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads, primitive roads, and trails. Specific designations would occur within this plan for the SDNM. LSFO routes would be designated within 5 years of RMP completion. Vehicle travel in LSFO would be restricted to inventoried routes only for the interim.
LS		B	C	D	E	SL-2.1.4: Vehicle parking and camping would be limited to 100 feet from the road centerline or designated sites in areas determined to have sensitive soils. Designated sites in such locations would be inventoried, mapped, and signed. If monitoring results show effects that exceed limits of acceptable change, motorized vehicles would not be allowed to pull off a designated route 100 feet either side of centerline.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-2.1.5: Vehicle parking and camping would be limited to reasonable use of the shoulder or adjacent area (see TM-6.1.1 in Table 2-37). Designated sites in such locations would be inventoried, mapped, and signed. If monitoring results show effects that exceed limits of acceptable change, motorized vehicles would not be allowed to pull off a designated route.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	SL-2.1.6: Surface-disturbing activities – including vehicle camping, parking, and recreation facilities – would be prohibited on undisturbed desert pavement or well-developed cryptogamic crusts.

Administrative Actions

- Update existing soils database on public lands that were formerly part of the BGR.
- Implement watershed improvement projects to increase ground cover to reduce erosion, sediment yield, and salinity contributions.

2.10.6 VEGETATION RESOURCES

Management of vegetation resources on public lands requires the management of a variety of resources, including watersheds, vegetative communities, wildlife habitat, livestock forage, priority plant species, and noxious weeds. The BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) requires that land use plans identify DFCs for vegetative resources, provide provisions for wildlife habitats and livestock forage, identify areas of ecological importance, and protect priority plant species and habitats. The list of priority plant species may be found at the end of **Appendix J**, Wildlife and Plant Priority Species.

The basis for managing vegetative communities and invasive or noxious weeds on public lands can be found in the federal and state laws, regulations, and policy guidance (**Appendix B**, Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Policies):

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976
- Arizona Native Plant Law of 1993
- Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (BLM 1997a)
- Clean Water Act of 1977
- EO 11990 Protection of Wetlands
- EO 11988 Floodplain Management
- Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations Part 4100
- The Sikes Act of 1974, as amended (16 USC 670 et seq.)
- BLM Manual 6500 – Wildlife, Fish and Plant Resources
- BLM Manual 6840 – Special Status Species
- BLM MS 1740 Renewable Resource Improvements and Treatments
- BLM Manual 9011 Chemical Pest Control
- BLM Manual 4180 – Rangeland Health Standards
- EO 13112 Invasive Species Control

- Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974
- Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 USC App. 1)
- Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978
- Taylor Grazing Act of 1934
- Vegetation Treatments using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Final EIS (September 2007)

2.10.6.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)

The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Continue to issue woodcutting permits for the Lower Gila Resource Area on a case-by-case basis.
- Developed spring storage and adjacent riparian habitat **would** be fenced to exclude livestock.

Phoenix Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Maintain and improve habitat and viable wildlife populations (VM-01).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan - Goldwater Amendment (1990)

- Give priority to protecting vegetation from disturbances during land-based activities (VM-1).
- Prohibit woodcutting and wood collection for commercial or domestic use on BGR lands. (VM-7; also included in **Section 2.11.4**, Recreation Management)
- No vegetation material is to be removed, with the exception of specific cases deemed appropriate and properly permitted (VM-8).
- Permit campfires on BGR lands using dead and down wood. Wood cannot be collected in ACECs and other areas specifically closed to wood collection by this RMP amendment or subsequent activity planning (RR-17; also included in **Section 2.11.4**, Recreation Management).

Vegetation Treatments using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Final EIS (September 2007)

- Implement an integrated vegetation-treatment program for BLM-administered public lands. The vegetation management priorities are as follows:
 - Priority 1 – Take actions to prevent or minimize the need for vegetation control when and where feasible considering the management objectives for the site.
 - Priority 2 – Use effective nonchemical methods of vegetation control when and where feasible.
 - Priority 3 – Use herbicides after considering the effectiveness of all potential methods or in combination with other methods of control.
- Follow the Herbicide Treatment Standard Operating Procedures from Appendix B of Vegetation Treatments using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Final EIS (September 2007).

Arizona Land Health Standards (1997)

The Arizona Land Health Standards were derived from the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (1997) (**Appendix L**, Guidelines for Grazing Administration). All BLM activities and management practices should allow for achievement of the Arizona Land Health Standards. These standards describe conditions needed for healthy sustainable public lands and must be maintained by all users of the public land. In accordance with BLM policy, activities on public land must be evaluated against indicators developed for each standard.

SDNM Current Management Guidance (2002)

- Unauthorized removal of living or dead native plant material is prohibited by the SDNM Proclamation. (Not numbered)
- Native plants as the first priority for all restoration projects. Non-invasive, nonnative plants may be used in limited, emergency situations where they may be necessary to protect the resources or when taking no action would further degrade the resources. This use would be allowed if it complies with the vegetation objectives and other management goals and objectives. In these situations, short-lived species (i.e., nurse-crop species) would be preferentially used and would be combined with native species to facilitate the establishment of native species. (Not numbered)

2.10.6.2 Action Alternatives for Vegetation Resources

Within the Sonoran Desert National Monument, all of the vegetative communities are considered Monument objects as defined in Presidential Proclamation 7397. (Plant communities are described in some form for Objects 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Presidential Proclamation.) Management and protection of vegetative resources in the Monument would also be provided under guidance from other

resource management programs. The following vegetation communities and special status plants are specific biological objects (vegetative) that were identified in the Proclamation:

- Saguaro cactus forests (within palo verde-mixed cacti vegetation community)
- Woodlands (Sonoran mid-elevation desert scrub)
- Palo verde-mixed cacti vegetation community
- Acuña pineapple cactus
- Creosote bush-bursage vegetation community
- Desert washes (xeroriparian)

Program Goals

- **Goal 1:** The natural diversity and abundance of native vegetation would occur as expected for landform and ecological site, and within the SDNM protect the vegetative objects of the Monument.
- **Goal 2:** Populations of endangered, threatened, and special status plants would be stable and/or increasing and suitable habitat is available for future establishment and maintenance of the populations.
- **Goal 3:** Noxious and undesirable plant species would not occur on the landscape or, if they occur, they would make up a sufficiently small percentage of the vegetative community that they do not affect ecological processes.
- **Goal 4:** Protect native plants from over-collecting and other uses.
- **Goal 5:** Native plants would occur at a natural abundance and distribution.
- **Goal 6:** The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt would be a productive and functioning riparian system supporting healthy, diverse, and abundant populations of wildlife and riparian-dependent plant species with an emphasis on migratory game birds. See also **Table 2-41**, Management Actions for Resource Conservation Area Action Alternatives.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-9, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources, describes management actions and allowable uses for vegetation resources.

**Table 2-9
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources**

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1 (Ecosystems): The natural diversity and abundance of native vegetation occurs as expected for landform and ecological site, and within the SDNM would protect the vegetative objects of the Monument.		
<u>Objective 1.1:</u> Maintain or restore vegetative communities to achieve desired future conditions (DFCs) as identified below:		
DFCs common to all vegetative communities:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetative communities would provide appropriate cover levels, as described in NRCS Ecological Site Descriptions, to protect soils from wind and water erosion. This would ensure properly functioning watersheds and ecological processes in order to sustain healthy biotic populations and communities (biological objects within the SDNM Planning Area). • Each vegetation community would be maintained within its natural range of variation in plant composition, structure, and cover at the landscape level. Site potentials (soil, climate, topography) establish the natural limits on what can be produced in terms of vegetation and related resource values like forage, wildlife habitat, and watershed characteristics. 		
DFCs by specific vegetative community:		
<p>The DFCs described below are general descriptions of the expected plant community makeup. Site potentials (based on ecological sites) and the development of specific desired plant community objectives for each vegetation type should be determined through the use of the NRCS ecological site descriptions, rangeland health reference sheets, or information collected from reference or comparison areas or a combination of the above. The ecological site descriptions that correspond to each vegetation community can be found at http://esis.sc.egov.usda.gov.</p>		
<p>The vegetative communities listed below that occur within the SDNM are identified as biological objects of the Monument. Within the SDNM, specific desired plant community objectives and site potentials were developed for each ecological site and corresponding vegetation type (biological object) through the land health evaluation process. These site potentials were determined through the use of a combination of the information collected from the BGR and Area A (comparison areas), the NRCS's ecological site descriptions, and the rangeland health reference sheets for the ecological sites. Achievement of these desired plant community objectives would ensure that the biological objects of the Monument are being protected.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creosote Bush–Bursage: (597,700 acres LS; 179,600 acres SDNM) The potential of this community is a shrub dominated site with desert scrub species, cacti, and annual forbs and grasses. • Palo Verde-Mixed Cacti: (312,000 acres LS; 303,300 acres SDNM) This vegetative community should consist of more diverse vegetative composition and structure than that of the creosote bush- bursage community. It includes vegetation varying from small shrubs to large trees (such as ironwood, palo verde, and mesquite) interspersed with a variety of cacti, such as mammalaria (<i>Mammalaria spp.</i>), prickly pear (<i>Opuntia spp.</i>), cholla (<i>Opuntia spp.</i>), barrel cactus (<i>Ferocactus wislizenii</i>), hedgehog (<i>Echinocereus spp.</i>), and saguaro (<i>Carnegiea gigantea</i>). Where potential exists, saguaro cactus forests would support appropriate densities of saguaro, with all age classes represented to ensure recruitment. • Riparian: (8,800 acres LS; 0 acres SDNM) Riparian habitats should contain a diversity of native riparian obligate trees (such as cottonwood [<i>Populus spp.</i>] and willow [<i>Salix spp.</i>]) of various age and size classes and herbaceous plants adapted to hydric soils to restore ecological conditions and function. • Apacherian-Chihuahuan Upland Scrub: (3,400 acres LS; 400 acres SDNM) The potential for this 		

**Table 2-9
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources**

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses
<p>community is a shrubland dominated community consisting of large desert scrub/trees, including mesquites, acacias or junipers, and cacti. Perennial grass cover is typically low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub (Woodlands): (1,800 acres LS; 2,000 acres SDNM) This vegetative community should consist of a diverse vegetative composition and structure, similar to that of the palo verde-mixed cacti community, but with an increase of perennial grasses, forbs, and large shrub species (jojoba, crucifixion thorn, etc.) due to the increased precipitation. • Mogollon Chaparral: (1,400 acres LS; 100 acres SDNM) This vegetative community should consist of woody species such as shrub live oak, mountain mahogany, desert ceanothus, and cliffrose interspersed with an understory of perennial grasses along with small shrub and forb species. • Desert Grassland: (0 acres LS; 1,054 acres SDNM) Manage this plant community as a tobosa (<i>Pleuraphis mutica</i>)-dominated grassland while limiting the encroachment of mesquites and other shrubs. • Desert Washes (xeroriparian): (1,658 miles in the LS; 970 miles in the SDNM*) This community should have a multi-layered vegetative structure, as provided by perennial vegetation. • Diverse vegetative composition and structure would include such species as foothills palo verde (<i>Cercidium microphyllum</i>), blue palo verde (<i>Cercidium floridum</i>), desert willow (<i>Chilopsis linearis</i>), ironwood (<i>Oleña tesota</i>), mesquite (<i>Prosopis spp.</i>), smoke tree (<i>Psorothamnus spinosus</i>), and catclaw acacia (<i>Acacia greggii</i>) of various sizes and growth forms appropriate to the ecological site. • Ensure sufficient bank and floodplain vegetation (including along braided channel floodplains) provides for hydrologic function of the site. 		

*Based on USGS 1:100K scale topographic quadrangles

LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-1.1.1: Activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and impacts minimized, mitigated, or avoided to achieve land-health standards and vegetation community DFCs, and ensure protection of the vegetative objects of the Monument.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-1.1.2: Vegetation treatments could be conducted in order to make progress toward achieving land health standards. Treatments would include, but would not be limited to, thinning, burning, seeding, transplanting, watering, seasonal closures, and seasonal use restrictions.

Goal 2 (Special Status Plants): Populations of endangered, threatened, and special status plants would be stable or increasing and suitable habitat is available for future establishment and maintenance of the populations.

Objective 2.1: Identify and protect occupied and potential habitats for maintenance, restoration, or reestablishment of Acuña pineapple cactus and other endangered, threatened, or special status plants. Maintain the diversity and properly functioning ecological processes of natural plant communities that support rare or special status plant species.

LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-2.1.1: Authorized surface-disturbing activities within occupied acuña cactus habitat areas would be minimized, mitigated, or avoided. Currently, the only known areas of location are within the Coffeepot-Batamote and the very southern portion of the SDNM.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-2.1.2: Authorized surface-disturbing activities within habitat areas of any endangered, threatened, or special status plants would be minimized, mitigated, or avoided to ensure stable populations.

**Table 2-9
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-2.1.3: Implement activities to reduce hazardous fuels or improve riparian habitats (prescribed burning or vegetation treatments) within occupied or found-to-be-occupied habitat for southwestern willow flycatchers only during the non-breeding season (October 1 to March 31).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-2.1.4: Vegetation treatment projects adjacent to occupied or found-to-be-occupied habitat would only be conducted when willow flycatchers are not present (October 1 – March 31).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-2.1.5: Any prescribed fire or vegetation treatment project in occupied or suitable marsh habitat would only occur between September 1 and March 15 to avoid the Yuma clapper rail breeding and molting seasons.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-2.1.6: Mechanical removal of overstory habitat (Tamarisk) could occur as early as August 15, after the breeding season for Yuma clapper rails.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-2.1.7: Herbicide application could occur in Yuma clapper rail habitat. Herbicide drift would be minimized by using appropriate drift-inhibiting agents and may include dyes or other tracking agents.

Goal 3 (Noxious Weeds): Noxious and undesirable plant species would not occur on the landscape or, if they occur, they would make up a sufficiently small percent of the vegetative community that they do not affect ecological processes.

Objective 3.1: Control invasive species using an integrated weed-management approach, including prevention, restoration, mechanical, chemical, biological control methods, and prescribed fire, where appropriate.

LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-3.1.1: Proposed projects would use practices that minimize the introduction and spread of invasive species.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-3.1.2: Priority would be assigned to the control of invasive species that have a substantial and apparent impact on native plant communities and wildlife. When infestations are identified, they would be evaluated for their potential threat and scheduled for removal accordingly.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-3.1.3: Monitoring for invasive species would focus on likely vectors of invasion such as linear features (roads, canals, railroads, utility corridors, etc.), disturbed areas (construction or development areas), and areas where water is available or may pond (water-control structures, etc.).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-3.1.4: Certified weed-free feed would be required for all equestrian and stock animal uses authorized under special recreation permits. The general public would be encouraged to provide weed-free feed for their equestrian and stock animals.

Goal 4 (Collection and Allowable Uses): Protect native plants from over-collecting and other uses.

Objective 4.1: Manage native desert vegetation for commercial and non-commercial uses in accordance with the Arizona Native Plant Law and BLM regulations.

LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.1: Collection of living or dead native plant material for commercial uses could be permitted on a case-by-case basis as long as it meets resource objectives.
----	--	---	---	---	---	--

**Table 2-9
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.2: Collection of reasonable amounts of renewable native plant byproducts, including flowers, leaves, fruit, seeds, nuts, cones, and berries, and dead and downed native vegetation for non-commercial, personal use would be allowed when conducted in accordance with the Arizona Native Plant Law.
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.3: Collection of living or dead native vegetation and byproducts that are federally listed as threatened and endangered species would not be permitted without a valid and current permit issued by the USFWS.
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.4: Collection of living or dead native vegetation and byproducts that are highly safeguarded native plants identified in the Arizona Native Plant Law could be permitted on a case-by-case basis to achieve resource recovery objectives.
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.5: Collection of saguaro cacti skeletons for personal use or campfire burning would be prohibited in the Planning Area.
LS				D		VM-4.1.6: Collection of all firewood would be prohibited within ¼ mile of developed recreation sites, and the collection of wood for on-site campfires is also addressed in Section 2.11.4 .
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.7: Woodcutting would not be allowed for commercial or personal use, or campfire burning. It may be authorized on a case-by-case basis as needed to meet management objectives, such as hazardous fuels reduction or native plant propagation.
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.8: The collection of dead, down, and detached wood for personal use and campfire burning while camping on public lands would be allowed unless otherwise prohibited.
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.9: Removal of all other vegetation material not specifically provided for would be prohibited without written authorization. Examples of authorizations include vegetation removal for Native American traditional uses, scientific research, educational uses, salvage, or meeting management objectives. Authorizations must be in accordance with the Arizona Native Plant Law.
LS		B	C	D	E	VM-4.1.10: Removal of native vegetation for personal use or commercial landscaping may be allowed during authorized salvage operations where vegetation is destined to be destroyed, with written authorization from the BLM and a permit from the Arizona Department of Agriculture in accordance with the Arizona Native Plant Law. Priority would be given to utilizing salvage plants for restoration activities on public lands.
Objective 4.2: Protect SDNM vegetation by managing collection and uses consistent with the Monument proclamation.						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-4.2.1: Collecting or removing living or dead native vegetation, including plant byproducts and woodcutting for commercial and personal uses, would be prohibited within the SDNM without written authorization. Examples of authorizations include vegetation removal for Native

**Table 2-9
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						American traditional uses, scientific research, educational uses, salvage, or meeting management objectives. Authorizations must be in accordance with the Arizona Native Plant Law.
Goal 5 (Rehabilitation): Native plants occur within the natural range of abundance and distribution consistent with the ecological sites on which they occur.						
Objective 5.1: Rehabilitate native plant communities after land-disturbing activities, where appropriate. Rehabilitation would be designed to achieve vegetative conditions (cover, composition, etc.) necessary to stabilize the site.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>VM-5.1.1: Rehabilitation practices would be used to stabilize and rehabilitate sites impacted from new surface-disturbing activities. Long-term restoration would occur through natural processes. In most cases, lands previously disturbed by historical uses would be allowed to recover through natural processes. Sites that may be appropriate for rehabilitation practices include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recently disturbed sites that may respond quickly to rehabilitation practices, including damage caused by wildfire, immigrant traffic, or other illegal activities; • Severely damaged, rapidly deteriorating, or rapidly expanding sites; • Placing adjacent resources at risk; • Prone to invasion by nonnative species; • Heavily disturbed, such as mining sites; • Capable of improving habitat for threatened and endangered species; • Management priorities that require accelerated restoration to meet selected management objectives.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>VM-5.1.2: Native plants would be used as the first priority for all rehabilitation projects. Non-invasive, nonnative plants may be used in limited urgent situations where it may be necessary to protect the resources or when taking no action would further degrade the resources. In these situations, short-lived species (i.e., weed-free nurse crop species) would be preferentially used and would be combined with native species to facilitate the establishment of native species.</p>
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>VM-5.1.3: Rehabilitation and reclamation plans that describe the site restoration goals, considering the starting condition of the site, and restoration methods would be required for all surface-disturbing activities commensurate with the amount of surface disturbance.</p>

**Table 2-9
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Vegetation Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VM-5.1.4: Preliminary success criteria for a site would be considered achieved when soil conditions are stabilized and approximately 50 percent or more of the plant composition and cover are present based on appropriate Ecological Site Descriptions. Trees and shrubs would be considered established when they have survived (without assistance such as watering) for two consecutive years. Livestock would not be turned out on rehabilitated sites until it was determined by an interdisciplinary team that the re-established forage could sustain livestock grazing.

Administrative Actions

- Seed from regionally native or sterile alien (nonnative) species of grasses and herbaceous vegetation would be used in areas where reseeding is necessary following ground disturbance to stabilize soils and prevent erosion by both wind and water.
- Monitoring for invasive species would be prioritized to determine if weeds not immediately being treated are becoming a greater threat to the resources of concern.

2.10.7 VISUAL RESOURCES

Outstanding scenic landscapes administered by the BLM provide a place to escape and enjoy the beauty of nature. They also are used for a multitude of other activities, including recreation, mining, grazing, and road development. Many of these activities have the potential to change the visual quality of the landscape and impact scenic values. Visual resource management (VRM) is a system for minimizing the visual impacts of surface-disturbing activities and maintaining scenic values for the future.

Federal laws requiring the protection of visual resources include the following stipulations:

- Public lands would be managed in a manner which protects the quality of the scenic (visual) values of these lands (43 USC 1701, Section 102(a)(8)).
- Aesthetically pleasing surroundings would be assured for all Americans (43 USC 4321, Section 101(b)).

The BLM Visual Resource Program manages landscapes based on visual indicators defined in the Visual Resource Inventory Handbook H-8410-1. The handbook is used for guidance in activities related to management of visual resources.

According to the Visual Resource Inventory Handbook H-8410-1, the objectives of VRM management classes are:

- **Class I:** The objective of this class is to preserve the existing character of the landscape. This class provides for natural ecological changes; however, it does not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention.
- **Class II:** The objective of this class is to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen but should not attract attention from the casual observer.
- **Class III:** The objective of this class is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer.
- **Class IV:** The objective of this class is to provide for management activities that require major modification of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention.

The construction of campgrounds, energy and mineral development, vegetation treatments, and ROWs all would be evaluated for design to ensure consistency with the VRM classes. All permitted actions on public lands are evaluated to minimize impacts on visual contrast with the landscape, including impacts on the night sky. VRM classes acknowledge existing visual contrasts, and more restrictive requirements would not be retroactively applied to existing projects.

2.10.7.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Visual Resources

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)

- Recognize areas proposed as Class II visual resource management areas as being an area where a contrast may be seen but should not attract attention. Manage visual resources using existing utility corridors (see the Lands and Realty for further detail on decisions regarding existing utility corridors) (RR-01).
- Recognize areas proposed as Class III visual resource management areas as those in which contrasts may be evident and begin to attract attention. Manage visual resources using existing utility corridors (RR-02).
- Recognize areas proposed as Class IV visual resource management areas as those in which a contrast may attract attention and be a dominant feature in the landscape. Manage visual resources by using existing utility corridors (RR-03).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan - Goldwater Amendment (1990)

(Applies to the three relinquished Sentinel Plain, Sand Tank Mountains, and Ajo Airport parcels)

- Protect mountain vistas from visual intrusion by developing, during site- or project-specific activity planning, visual resource management prescriptions needed to maintain appropriate visual resource management objectives (Not Numbered).
- Protect the visual resource quality on lands adjacent to the highways (Interstate 8 and State Route 85) by 1) establishing portions of these roads as scenic byways in cooperation with the Arizona Department of Transportation, US Air Force, and US Marine Corps; and 2) using the visual resource management process during activity planning to maintain appropriate visual resource management objectives established for these byways.

Lower Gila Resource Management Amendment (2005)

- Management of recreation opportunities and developments would be evaluated using two inventory and management tools called the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum and Visual Resource Management (RR-1).
- Existing visual resource inventory classes of the RMP would be adopted as management classes (RR-3).
- All MFP visual resource management classes would be brought forward (RR-4).
- Visual resource management classes would be reviewed and refined during future interdisciplinary planning (RR-5).
- All unclassified lands of the MFP and RMP Planning Areas are established as Visual Resource Management Class I and II areas, subject to review and refinement during future interdisciplinary planning (RR-8).

2.10.7.2 Action Alternatives for Visual Resources**Program Goals**

- Goal 1: Manage public lands that would maintain scenic quality, natural landscapes, undisturbed views, and other high-quality visual resources.
- Goal 2: Maintain night sky condition.
- Goal 3: The natural splendor for which the SDNM was designated shall be maintained.

Land Use Allocations Summary

The proposed VRM classes by alternative are presented in **Table 2-10**, VRM Classes by Alternative.

**Table 2-10
VRM Classes by Alternative**

VRM Class	Alternative (BLM Acres)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
The following VRM classes would be allocated for each alternative to support management objectives for the various resources such as designated wilderness, areas with wilderness characteristics, NHT segments, ACECs, WHAs, and back country recreation settings.					
Lower Sonoran					
Class I	91,800	91,800	91,800	91,800	91,800
Class II	116,300	64,800	387,800	622,400	65,500
Class III	279,600	551,000	385,600	192,000	554,800
Class IV	442,500	222,600	65,000	24,000	218,100
SDNM					
Class I	158,700	158,700	158,700	457,900	158,700
Class II	91,600	219,000	267,300	28,500	246,500
Class III	116,400	108,700	60,400	None	81,200
Class IV	119,700	0	0	0	0

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-11, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Visual Resources, describes management actions and allowable uses for visual resources.

**Table 2-11
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Visual Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Manage public lands that would maintain scenic quality, natural landscapes, undisturbed views, and other high-quality visual resources.							
Objective 1.1: Visual resources would be managed according to the class objectives set in the Visual Resource Inventory Handbook H-8410-1 and BLM Guidelines for a Quality Built Environment.							
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VR-1.1.1: Designated wilderness areas would be allocated as VRM class I.	
LS		B	C	D	E	VR-1.1.2: All other public lands within the Lower Sonoran would be allocated to the VRM classes as depicted in Maps 2-2a, b, c, d, and e .	
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VR-1.1.3: All surface-disturbing projects or activities, regardless of size or potential impact, would incorporate visual design considerations consistent with the Visual Resource Contrast Rating Manual H-8431-1 to meet VRM class objectives for the area. Even activities in VRM Class IV would consider designs that help reduce visual contrast between a proposed project and landscape settings (color, texture, line, and form). Measures to mitigate potential visual impacts could include the use of natural materials, screening, painting, project design, location sighting, or restoration.	

**Table 2-11
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Visual Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VR-1.1.4: Restoration projects would ensure that visual impacts are minimized in the short term (5 years) and that VRM objectives in the project area are met in the long term (life of the project) when such projects are a) considered essential for public safety, achieving DFCs, or reducing hazardous fuels buildups, and b) expected to be visually prominent.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VR-1.1.5: The viewshed of the Juan Bautista de Anza NHT, Painted Rock, Agua Caliente, and Ajo Scenic Loop roads, Highway 238, and Interstate 8 would be managed in a manner that exceeds or maintains the VRM objectives. VRM and scenic management prescriptions would be applied for their preservation and enhancement. The viewshed of the Anza NHT would be managed to maintain the historic landscape setting.
Goal 2: Maintain current night sky condition.						
<u>Objective 2.1:</u> Manage activities and projects on public lands that would contribute light or air pollution to maintain or improve dark, clear skies for stargazing and nighttime military training.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VR-2.1.1: Permanent outdoor lighting would not be allowed in VRM Class I areas.
LS	SDNM	B				VR-2.1.2: The use of dark-sky-friendly technology would be emphasized when placing facilities on public lands. Measures may include, but would not be limited to: directing all light downward, using shielded lights, using only the minimum illumination necessary, using lamp types such as sodium lamps (less prone to atmospheric scattering), using circuit timers, using motion sensors, or using flight proximity detectors.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	VR-2.1.3: Development on public lands would be required to use dark-sky-friendly technologies in VRM Classes I through IV and in the Sentinel Plain area to provide opportunities for stargazers and amateur astronomers and to maintain conditions favorable to nighttime military operations. Measures may include, but would not be limited to directing all light downward, using shielded lights, using only the minimum illumination necessary, using lamp types such as sodium lamps (less prone to atmospheric scattering), using circuit timers, using motion sensors, or using flight proximity detectors.
Goal 3: The natural splendor for which the SDNM was designated shall be maintained.						
<u>Objective 3.1:</u> Visual resources of the SDNM would be managed to preserve or to retain the existing character of the landscape. The visual character of management activities would be managed according to the objectives described above and in VRM Handbook H-8410-1.						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	VR-3.1.1: Public lands within the Monument would be allocated to the VRM classes as depicted in Maps 2-2a, b, c, d, and e to ensure visual landscapes as described in the Monument proclamation are protected.

Administrative Actions

- All surface-disturbing projects or activities, regardless of size or potential impact, would incorporate visual design considerations consistent with the Visual Resource Contrast Rating Manual H-8431-I to meet VRM class objectives for the area.
- Participate in regional planning initiatives and comment on proposals for development on adjacent non-federal lands to encourage future development to be compatible with VRM designations and protection of dark night skies on public lands.
- Develop user facilities (trailheads, non-motorized trails, campgrounds, roads, utilities, interpretive areas) to take advantage of views of scenic and historic landscapes in such a way that visual quality is protected.

2.10.8 WATER RESOURCES

Surface water resources in the Planning Area are limited to the perennial flow of the Gila River and treated effluent discharges into the Gila basin. Surface flow often ends near Highway 85, although flow may continue as far as Painted Rock Reservoir during periods of high precipitation. This section of the river has impaired water quality. An Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) plan for improving water quality is scheduled to be completed soon. The BLM would be the designated management agency carrying out this plan, and the agency would participate along with other landowners and managers with land that drains into this segment of the Gila River. Currently, the agency's primary management actions on the river consist of fuels and habitat management associated with tamarisk-dominated riparian areas.

Water use in the Planning Area must fulfill two primary responsibilities:

- Comply with laws and regulations that protect the nation's and the state's water resources; and
- Take all legal and resource-development steps necessary to provide a supply of water of sufficient quality and quantity to meet BLM management needs.

Groundwater is the sole source of drinking water for every community in the Planning Area outside metropolitan Phoenix. Arizona state law limits the use of groundwater within the Phoenix Active Management Area (AMA), which includes the Lower Sonoran Decision Area north of the Gila River and west of Apache Junction. According to the state's 1980 Groundwater Management Act, groundwater use by the BLM and other pumpers in the AMA must not interfere with existing wells, and users must meet requirements for proving an assured supply. Groundwater pumping outside of the AMA by the BLM or its permittees and lessees is limited to "reasonable" amounts for a given use.

Guidance for management of water resources is published in BLM Manual 7200 and DOI Department Manuals (Series 31-Environmental Quality Programs, Series 34-Public Lands, and Series 37-Water and Land Resources) along with a framework set by the following federal laws and regulations:

Federal Land Policy and Management Act: Authorizes the BLM to inventory and monitor the presence and condition of water resources on public land.

Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended: Requires that all water sources meet quality standards developed by the states with authority delegated by the EPA; charges the BLM (and other land-management agencies) with developing and implementing best management practices for the control of non-point source pollution; and requires a number of other actions in coordination with other agencies, such as participating in permitting to protect wetlands and stream channels.

Fundamentals of Rangeland Health (1995): These require the BLM to apply for water rights in the name of the United States, where allowed by state law. These regulations, particularly those associated with grazing, also require public lands to meet or make progress toward land health standards, including meeting state water quality standards.

2.10.8.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) Water Resources

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Phoenix Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Maintain and enhance stream flows through activity plans in special management areas (WS-01).
- Ensure that all waters on public land meet or exceed federal and state water quality standards (WS-02).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan - Goldwater Amendment (1990)

(Applies to the three relinquished BGR parcels)

- Keep groundwater development and exploration to a minimum in ACECs, other management areas, and other environmentally sensitive areas (WS-1).
- Limit all field activities relating to groundwater exploration and development to designated roadways and previously disturbed areas (WS-2).

2.10.8.2 Action Alternatives for Water Resources

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Assure physical and legal availability of water in sufficient quantity and quality to meet the management needs of the Lower Sonoran and Sonoran Desert National Monument Decision Areas.

- **Goal 2:** All surface water in the Planning Area would meet appropriate state water quality standards or would have state-approved plans for water quality improvement.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-12, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Water Resources, describes management actions and allowable uses for water resources.

**Table 2-12
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Water Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Assure physical and legal availability of water in sufficient quantity and quality to meet the management needs of the Lower Sonoran and Sonoran Desert National Monument Decision Areas.						
Objective 1.1: New water source developments would not adversely affect existing sources and uses. This would be determined prior to any new development activity, including issuance of landowner's permission to drill required by the Arizona Department of Water Resources.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WR-1.1.1: All proposed new water uses and developments would be assessed to determine whether they would adversely affect springs, streams, tinajas, or seeps; decrease water availability at existing wells; or conflict with other resource management goals.
LS		B	C	D	E	WR-1.1.2: The only proposed water developments allowed would be those that are consistent with management objectives.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WR-1.1.3: The only proposed water developments allowed would be those that are consistent with the proclamation.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	WR-1.1.4: Groundwater exploration and development would be restricted and damage mitigated in areas with ecological or cultural resources that are sensitive to disturbance.
Objective 1.2: The BLM would take necessary steps to acquire all water rights allowed by law to properly manage the Lower Sonoran Planning Area, including the SDNM, and to protect the natural resources of the Planning Area and the objects of the SDNM. Inventory work and at least one-half of water-rights filings would be completed within 5 years of issuing this plan.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WR-1.2.1: Water would be inventoried and appropriate applications and claims filed for state water rights for all water sources and beneficial uses on public land in accordance with state law to ensure water availability to meet management needs and protect ecological functions.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WR-1.2.2: Inventory all water sources, including groundwater sources, within the three wilderness areas of the SDNM for quantification and assertion of federal reserved water rights, and provide notice of these rights to Arizona Department of Water Resources.
Goal 2: All surface water in the Planning Area would meet appropriate state water quality standards or would have state-approved plans for water quality improvement.						
Objective 2.1: Impaired water quality in stretches of the Gila River that run through the Planning Area would be improved or corrected within 5 years; the BLM would commit to the state schedule for water quality improvement.						

**Table 2-12
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Water Resources**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C	D	E	WR-2.1.1: The BLM would implement best management practices for grazing, mining, energy development, and other activities that have been specifically established to protect streams from non-point source pollution.
LS		B	C	D	E	WR-2.1.2: The BLM would be an active participant as the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality begins work on the Total Maximum Daily Load for the Gila River between the Salt River and Painted Rock Reservoir.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WR-2.1.3: No new water development that would divert water out of SDNM would be allowed.

Administrative Actions

- Identify, evaluate, and assign priorities for restoring disturbed areas considering the potential for soil erosion and loss, damage to cultural or ecologically sensitive sites, and effects on water quality and quantity.
- Evaluate proposals for groundwater withdrawals on BLM-administered lands within an AMA in coordination with the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) and incorporate any restrictions or guidelines for the AMA.
- Work with county, state, and federal agencies to monitor surface and groundwater quantity and quality on public lands. Correct problems as they are identified.
- Coordinate with the AGFD to be sure all wells within the BGR are registered with ADWR. Inventory all water sources on BGR and enter them into the BLM water data management system. Coordinate water rights filings for water sources with the US Air Force and AGFD (applicable to the three relinquished BGR parcels).

Administrative Actions in the SDNM Decision Area

- Work with county, state, and federal agencies and other partners to evaluate the quantity of groundwater available and predict the effect of future potential water withdrawals on the ability to provide adequate water availability for natural resource and multiple use goals within SDNM.
- Begin a dialogue with appropriate State of Arizona policy, legal, and water resources staff on the development of a cooperative agreement on the protection of water resources on SDNM.

2.10.9 WILD HORSE AND BURRO MANAGEMENT

In 1971, Congress passed the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act (WFRHBA, Public Law 92-195). It states, “It is the policy of Congress that wild free-roaming horses and burros shall be protected from capture, branding, harassment, or death; and to accomplish this they are to be considered in the area where presently found, as an integral part of the natural system of the public lands.”

After the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act, the BLM was required to survey public lands and delineate where wild horses and burros found habitat and forage, and designate these areas as herd areas. These herd areas established boundaries of where wild horses and burros were located at the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act. Later, herd management areas (HMAs) were established within those herd areas to manage healthy, self-sustaining populations of wild horses and/or burros, in accordance with BLM land use plans (i.e., RMPs) and other decisions. Only one herd area, the Painted Rock Herd Area, is located in the Lower Sonoran Decision Area. No other herd areas and no HMAs have been allocated within either Decision Area. The Herd Area is shown on **Map 3-10**, Livestock Grazing Allotments and Wild Horse and Burro Herd Area.

The Painted Rock Herd Area has been administered as a herd area with a target population of zero wild horses and burros. This decision has been based on conflicts in the area with private landowners, wildlife, and a lack of year-round forage and water to support the wild horses and burros within the herd area. A zero population requires removing all wild horses and burros from the herd area.

All previous planning documents, including the Lower Gila South RMP, referred only to wild burros in the area. However, in 1999, it was determined that horses were also present in the area in 1971 and subject to the protection of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act. Protests and litigation of an RMP amendment in the late 1990s resulted in a settlement agreement regarding the Painted Rock Herd Area. The BLM was instructed to conduct an analysis of the manageability of the Painted Rock herds and make a decision in the new RMP based on that analysis. The Painted Rock Burro Herd Manageability Analysis can be found in **Appendix M** of this PRMP/FEIS, and the goals and objectives found below are based on that analysis.

In 1992, the BLM Lower Gila South Field Office determined, through a review of the 1974 census and personal interviews, that burros were not making use of the BGR at the time of passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act. Therefore, any burros roaming the BGR are not wild burros, but strays or feral animals from the Tohono O’odham Reservation. Thus, the burros located on the BGR are not protected under the provisions of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act. Likewise, none of the lands relinquished by the US Air Force can be designated as a herd area, as defined by the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act. Any burros (or other livestock) found on the BGR are considered in trespass and subject to 43 CFR 4150.

2.10.9.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)

The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (Goldwater Amendment) (1990)

(Applies to the three relinquished BGR parcels)

- Inventory the burro population to determine herd size and ownership (HB-1).
- Prepare a burro capture-and-removal plan in coordination with the US Air Force, Tohono O’odham tribe, and other affected parties (HB-2).
- Adopt captured burros through the adoption program or impound and sell, whichever is appropriate according to the determination of their ownership (HB-3).

Approved Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan and Decision (2005)

- This amendment deferred to subsequent resource management planning all decisions relating to the management of wild horses and burros that were proposed in the Final Amendment and Environmental Assessment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan.
- Prepare a burro capture plan in consultation with appropriate government agencies and interest groups. All burros would be removed from the Painted Rock Reservoir area. Details for the burro capture program would be outlined in a herd management plan (HMP) (HB-06).

2.10.9.2 Action Alternatives for Wild Horses and Burros

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Manage the Painted Rock Herd Area in accordance with the Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-13, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wild Horses and Burros, describes management actions and allowable uses for wild horses and burros.

**Table 2-13
Management Actions for Wild Horses and Burros**

Decision Area	Alternative					Management Actions
Goal 1: Manage the Painted Rock Herd Area in accordance with the Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act.						
Objective 1.1: Manage the Painted Rock Herd Area as a Herd Area with a target population of zero wild horses and burros.						
LS	B	C	D	E	HB-1.1.1: In accordance with the manageability analysis (Appendix M , Painted Rock Herd Manageability Analysis), the Painted Rock Herd Area would not be managed as an HMA. Neither reproducing nor non-	

**Table 2-13
Management Actions for Wild Horses and Burros**

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions
		reproducing herds of wild horses or burros would be permissible. Burros and horses would be removed from the herd area as funding is available, with the target of reaching a population of zero. Wild horses and burros straying off the herd area onto private lands would be treated as nuisance animals and removed, in accordance with 43 CFR 4720.2.

2.10.10 WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

In order for an area to contain wilderness characteristics, it must exhibit sufficient size, naturalness, and outstanding opportunities for solitude and/or outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. Managing the wilderness resource is part of the BLM's multiple use mission. Consistent with FLPMA and other applicable authorities, the BLM would consider the wilderness characteristics of public lands when undertaking land use planning. Considering wilderness characteristics in the land use planning process may result in different outcomes across the Planning Area over the life of the plan, including:

- Emphasizing other multiple uses as a priority over protecting wilderness characteristics;
- Emphasizing other multiple uses while applying management restrictions, such as conditions of use or mitigation measures, to reduce impacts to some or all of the wilderness characteristics; and
- Emphasizing the protection of some or all of the wilderness characteristics as a priority over other land uses.

Guidance used to inventory wilderness characteristics and consider wilderness characteristics in the Lower Sonoran-SDNM Draft RMP comes from BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) and WO IM 2011-154:

Identify decisions to protect or preserve wilderness characteristics (naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation). Include goals and objectives to protect the resource and management actions necessary to achieve these goals and objectives. For authorized activities, include conditions of use that would avoid or minimize impacts to wilderness characteristics.

Inventory is a process of gathering, identifying, and documenting information about the public lands and is not a decision to be proposed in the RMP. The existing inventory for wilderness characteristics is extensive, focused on wilderness characteristics, well documented, and includes years of public participation. A summary of wilderness characteristics inventory findings is presented in **Section 3.2.11, Wilderness Characteristics**, of **Chapter 3, Affected Environment**.

The inventory, public scoping, public comment on the DRMP/DEIS, and agency participation contributed to development of a broad range of alternatives for lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics.

The range of alternatives extends from no areas allocated to protect wilderness characteristics under Alternatives A and B, to Alternative D that proposes to allocate 404,800 acres as lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Alternative D includes all lands determined to possess wilderness characteristics. The remaining two alternatives propose portions of the Planning Area to be managed to protect wilderness characteristics: Alternative C would allocate 240,300 acres, and Alternative E (Proposed RMP) would allocate 199,000 acres.

The Alternative D presented in the DRMP/DEIS was based on a citizen inventory proposal. The Alternative D presented in the PRMP/FEIS discloses BLM's field-based wilderness inventory findings. All lands considered for wilderness characteristics management under Alternatives C, D, and E have received field inventory and a determination of the presence of wilderness characteristics by the BLM.

As indicated in the DRMP/DEIS and based on the BLM's knowledge of the Planning Area, it was determined that not all of the lands included in the citizens' proposal in Alternative D contained wilderness characteristics as those characteristics are defined. The Gila Bend Mountains (Red Rock Canyon), Oatman Mountain, Cuerda de Lena, Why, and Pozo Redondo areas were determined not to possess the mandatory wilderness characteristics.

Wilderness characteristic areas not addressed in the DRMP/DEIS were brought forward during the public comment period on the DRMP/DEIS. These areas were inventoried by BLM at the close of the public comment period. Some of these areas were determined to possess wilderness characteristics while other areas did not. A summary of these findings is presented in **Section 3.2.11**, Wilderness Characteristics.

The land use plan identifies a variety of measures to protect wilderness characteristics that would be carried forward as land use plan decisions for the life of the RMP. Examples include establishing VRM class objectives to guide analysis, placement, or decisions (approval/disapproval) of features like roads, trails, or facilities; identifying conditions of use for permitted uses; or designating lands as open, closed, or limited to OHV use.

2.10.10.1 Description of Alternatives

The Lower Sonoran-SDNM Planning Area has approximately 42,640 acres that were within three released WSAs. Proposals for lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics are presented under Alternatives C, D, and E that include lands within these former WSAs.

Alternative C contains lands with wilderness characteristics inventoried by the BLM with 240,300 acres to be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics include Batamote Mountains East/West, Black Mountain, Face Mountain, Palo Verde Hills, Saddle Mountain, Javelina Mountain and Blue Plateau (Sand Tank Mountains East/West), Saucedo Mountains, South Maricopa Mountains Addition, White Hills, and Yellow Medicine Butte.

Alternative D contains all lands with wilderness characteristics inventoried by the BLM. All 404,800 acres of these lands would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics under Alternative D.

Alternative E contains lands with wilderness characteristics inventoried by the BLM with 199,000 acres to be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Lands managed to protect wilderness

characteristics include Batamote Mountains East/West, Cortez Peak, Saddle Mountain, Javelina Mountain and Blue Plateau (Sand Tank Mountains East/West), Sauceda Mountains, Yellow Medicine Butte, and White Hills.

2.10.10.2 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A – No Action for Wilderness Characteristics

There are no existing management decisions for wilderness characteristics.

2.10.10.3 Action Alternatives for Wilderness Characteristics

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Areas to be managed to protect wilderness characteristics should retain a high degree of naturalness where the imprint of humans on lands and resources is substantially unnoticeable. Furthermore, outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive or unconfined types of recreation should be maintained or enhanced.

Allocations Summary

Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative, lists acreages managed to protect wilderness characteristics under each alternative.

Table 2-14
Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative

Decision Area	Alternative (BLM Acres Rounded to Nearest Hundred)				
	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E
Lower Sonoran	0	0	128,100	250,000	91,200
Sonoran Desert National Monument	0	0	112,200	154,800	107,800
Total	0	0	240,300	404,800	199,000

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-15, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wilderness Characteristics, describes management actions and allowable uses for wilderness characteristics.

Table 2-15
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wilderness Characteristics

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses
		<i>Goal 1: Areas to be managed to protect wilderness characteristics should retain a high degree of naturalness where the imprint of humans on lands and resources is substantially unnoticeable. Furthermore, outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive or unconfined types of recreation should be maintained or enhanced.</i>
		<i>Objective 1.1: Manage lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics to maintain a high degree of naturalness and offer outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive, unconfined recreation by reducing impacts to these values while considering manageability and competing resource demands.</i>

Table 2-15
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wilderness Characteristics

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses	
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.1: Public lands would be designated as lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics as shown in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative . (See Maps 2-3c, d, and e)
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.2: Private or state in-holdings, including subsurface, would be acquired when available from willing owners.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.3: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be managed as exclusion areas for placement of new utility-scale renewable energy developments.
LS	SDNM		C		E	WC-1.1.4: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be managed as avoidance areas for minor and nonlinear LUAs with the exception for law enforcement, public safety or administrative purposes as approved by the authorized officer.
LS	SDNM			D		WC-1.1.5: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be managed as exclusion areas for minor and nonlinear LUAs with the exception for law enforcement, public safety, or administrative purposes as approved by the authorized officer.
LS	SDNM		C		E	WC-1.1.6: Any potential new minor and nonlinear LUAs, and maintenance of existing facilities, would be evaluated and allowed under the following circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When compatible with maintaining or enhancing wilderness characteristics or when needed to protect, manage, or improve natural or heritage resource conditions; • When meeting law enforcement, agency, or public safety needs; • When reconstruction, replacement, or major maintenance of existing facilities, or development of new projects, is consistent with this plan's objectives, VRM classes, and desired recreation, social, and managerial settings; • When the project site can be restored to its previous condition after the project is completed.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.7: Existing facilities and projects no longer active would be removed if practicable.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.8: Sites and locales with human-caused disturbances would be rehabilitated if such actions maintain or enhance wilderness characteristics and natural/heritage resources, are practicable, meet management prescriptions and SOPs, and are addressed in a restoration plan.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.9: Measurement standards would be developed and adopted for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trail conditions, • Facility conditions, • Visitor-to-visitor encounters, • Vegetation changes, • Vegetation and wildlife desired resource conditions (DRCs), and

**Table 2-15
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wilderness Characteristics**

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other approved activities 	
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.10: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be closed to leasable minerals exploration and development.
LS			C	D	E	WC-1.1.11: Mineral materials sales and free-use authorizations would be prohibited.
LS			C		E	<p>WC-1.1.12: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be designated and managed as limited OHV use areas. Motorized vehicle use would be limited to primitive routes described in the wilderness inventory findings and generally subject to the four prescriptions below. When this planning is completed, motorized travel and non-motorized vehicles (e.g., bicycles, hang gliders, other devices for conveyance, and stock drawn carts/wagons) would generally be restricted to designated roads, primitive roads, and trails.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major arterial vehicle travel routes through wilderness character allocation areas would remain open for motorized travel. Vehicle routes to range and wildlife developments would remain open to public use under most circumstances. Vehicle spur roads and vehicle routes in washes would be closed to motorized travel and vehicle use.
LS				D		WC-1.1.13: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be designated closed OHV areas. Motorized, non-motorized, and mechanized vehicles (with the exception of game carriers) would be prohibited. Until travel management plans are completed, vehicle travel would be restricted to existing routes acknowledged by the BLM's current OHV route inventory.
	SDNM		C		E	WC-1.1.14: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be designated limited OHV use areas. All inventoried primitive vehicle routes within the wilderness characteristics boundary would be closed.
	SDNM			D		WC-1.1.15: Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be designated closed OHV areas. Motorized, non-motorized, and mechanized vehicles (with the exception of game carriers) would be prohibited. All primitive vehicle routes within such lands would be closed, including primitive routes to range and wildlife developments, primitive route spurs, and routes in washes.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.16: Public or commercial collection of plant and mineral materials would be prohibited.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	WC-1.1.17: Wheeled game carriers would be allowed.
LS	SDNM		C		E	WC-1.1.18: Closed vehicle routes could be converted, where appropriate, for use as equestrian and/or hiking trails.
LS	SDNM		C		E	WC-1.1.19: New equestrian and/or hiking trails would be established when consistent with this plan's objectives; desired recreation, social, and managerial settings; and VRM classes.

**Table 2-15
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wilderness Characteristics**

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM		C	E	WC-1.1.20: Special recreation permits, commercial recreation and vending operations, guided hunts, and concession leases would be allowed when they are landscape- and wilderness-character resource-dependent activities consistent with this plan's objectives; desired recreation, social, and managerial settings; and VRM classes.
LS	SDNM			D	WC-1.1.21: Closed vehicle routes would not be converted for use as equestrian and/or hiking trails.
LS	SDNM			D	WC-1.1.22: Development of new equestrian and/or hiking trails would be prohibited.
LS	SDNM			D	WC-1.1.23: Special recreation permits, including commercial, organized group, and competitive activities, vending operations, and concession leases, would be prohibited.

Administrative Actions

- Projects would employ the least-impacting methods for development that can be reasonably applied;
- Use design methods that cause the facility to blend into the landscape, including consideration of site selection and use of a low profile;
- Design facilities that would require minimal maintenance;
- Use best management practices to minimize surface and vegetation disturbance during construction;
- Decrease the visual effect of existing facilities during reconstruction, replacement, or major maintenance;
- Establish baseline standards to protect proper levels of recreational and landscape disturbance to protect wilderness characteristics.

2.10.11 WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

Staff at the BLM's Lower Sonoran Field Office coordinates with other agencies to manage fire in accordance with the nationwide BLM fire policy and the National Fire Plan. This integrates fire and fuels management with other land and resource management activities to benefit natural resources and implement multiple use on BLM-administered lands within Arizona that fall within the Planning Area.

The Lower Colorado River subdivision of the Sonoran Desert is the predominant vegetation community within the Planning Area. This vegetation community is neither fire adapted nor fire dependent. Historically, fire has never played a large role in the development and maintenance of the ecosystem

throughout the Planning Area. However, the invasion of nonnative species has created areas that are now prone to high- intensity fires with high rates of spread.

The Planning Area also contains wildland-urban interface (WUI) areas. These are places where manmade structures and infrastructure are intermingled with wildlands. Unplanned ignitions in the WUI could have adverse effects on the ecosystem and society unless some form of mitigation takes place. Wildfire management includes areas where mitigation and suppression are required to prevent direct threats to life or property. Mitigation may include mechanical, manual, biological, chemical, or prescribed fire to maintain non-hazardous levels of fuels, reduce the hazardous effects of unplanned wildland fires, and meet resource objectives.

When applying fuels treatment methods, BLM policies, procedures, and plans are to be followed in all cases. The mechanical, manual, chemical, biological, and fire-treatment methods that may be used are described in this document. There are several treatment methods and standard operating procedures that would be used in a vegetation treatment program. BLM policies and guidance for public land treatments would be followed in implementing all treatment methods.

2.10.11.1 Existing Management Decisions (Alternative A - No Action)

The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Arizona Statewide Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire, Fuels, and Air Quality Management (2004)

- Manage fire and fuels according to the current policies and requirements and to meet desired future conditions for other resource values.
- All public lands within the Planning Area are assigned to one of the following allocations for Fire Management based on ecological conditions and ecological risk, and determined by contrasting current with historical conditions and ecological risks associated with those changes. Allocation 1 lands are ecologically adapted to fire, and Allocation 2 lands are not ecologically adapted to fire. Almost all of the lands located within the Lower Sonoran Field Office Planning Area fall into the Allocation 2 classification.

2.10.11.2 Action Alternatives for Wildland Fire Management

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Ensure firefighter and public safety is the highest priority in every fire or fuels management activity.
- Goal 2: Wildland fuels are managed to protect WUI areas and meet resource management objectives.

- **Goal 3:** Limit the extent of wildfires and the impact of fire suppression efforts on wildlife, plant communities, and natural and cultural features.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-16, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management, describes management actions and allowable uses for wildland fire management.

**Table 2-16
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management**

Decision Area		Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Ensure firefighter and public safety is the highest priority in every fire or fuels management activity.							
Objective 1.1: Set priorities among protecting residences, community infrastructure, and other manmade property and improvements.							
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-1.1.1: Management Response to unplanned ignitions would be full suppression for all lands within the LSFO Planning Area.	
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-1.1.2: Implement a hazardous fuels reduction program that creates conditions conducive for safe and effective firefighting.	
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-1.1.3: With community partners, implement the Pinal and Pima County Community Wildfire Protection Plans.	
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-1.1.4: With community partners, provide input into the development of the Pima and Gila County Community Wildfire Protection Plans.	
Goal 2: Wildland fuels are managed to protect WUI areas and to meet resource management goals.							
Objective 2.1: Fuels within WUI areas are proactively managed to improve the protection of life and property.							
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-2.1.1: Hazardous fuels around communities at risk and utility infrastructure (e.g., roads, power lines, and communication sites) within the WUI are reduced using mechanical, chemical, biological, and prescribed fire treatments, where applicable.	
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-2.1.2: Identify, prioritize, and implement WUI fuels treatments in the Planning Area. Fuels treatments to reduce wildland fire risk would focus on the WUI areas identified in the Planning Area Community Wildfire Protection Plans and those that are developed collaboratively with Planning Area partners.	
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-2.1.3: In consultation with cultural resource specialists, develop fuels treatments to protect cultural resources that are susceptible to damage from wildfire.	
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-2.1.4: Analyze and implement where needed, hazardous fuels reduction in and around recreation sites to improve public and firefighter safety.	
Goal 3: Limit the extent of wildfires and the impact of fire suppression efforts on wildlife, plant communities, and natural and cultural features.							
Objective 3.1: Reduce the frequency of human-caused wildland fires and minimize the total number of acres burned within the Planning Area.							
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.1.1: Management Response to unplanned ignitions would be full suppression for all lands within the Planning Area.	

Table 2-16
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.1.2: Identify, prioritize, and implement non-WUI fuels treatments within the Planning Area. Prioritization would be given to fuels treatments that maintain areas in Fire Regime Condition Class I or have the ability to improve areas characterized as Fire Regime Condition Class II and III.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.1.3: Implement fuels treatments, suppression activities, and prevention activities that target reducing the size and number of human-caused wildland fires.
Objective 3.2: For all fire management activities (wildfire suppression, prescribed fire, and mechanical, chemical, and biological vegetation treatments), a focus would be to maintain or improve habitat for federally threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate (federally protected) species.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.1: Identify and implement post-fire stabilization and rehabilitation actions in burned areas to restore a functional landscape to meet the resource management objectives.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.2: Use prescribed fire, chemical, mechanical, manual, and biological treatments in areas of the Planning Area that fall in Fire Regimes 2 and 4 to reduce shrub and tree components.
LS		B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.3: Hazardous fuel reduction projects would be integrated with riparian restoration projects to reduce the frequency and the extent of fires along the Gila River as well as improve the quality and quantity of native riparian vegetation communities.
LS		B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.4: Utilize fuels management treatments including prescribed fire to manage decadent marsh vegetation and improve habitat for Yuma Clapper Rail and other species that depend upon cattail and bulrush marsh for foraging and nesting habitat.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.5: Protect known locations of habitat occupied by federally listed species. Minimum impact suppression tactics (MIST) would be followed in all areas with known federally protected species or habitat.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.6: Construction of permanent roads, primitive roads, or trails would not be permitted during fire-suppression activities in habitat occupied by federally protected species. Construction of temporary roads, primitive roads, or trails is approved only if necessary for safety or the protection of property or resources, including federally protected species habitat. Temporary road construction should be coordinated with the USFWS, through the resource advisor.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.7: Crew camps, equipment staging areas, and aircraft landing and fueling areas should be located outside of listed species habitats, preferably in locations that have previously been disturbed. If camps must be located in listed species habitat, the resource advisor would be consulted to ensure habitat damage and other effects to listed species are minimized and documented. The resource advisor should also consider the potential for indirect effects to listed species or their habitat from the siting of camps and staging areas (e.g., if an area is within the water flow pattern, there may be

Table 2-16
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						indirect effects to aquatic habitat or species located off-site).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.8: Use of motorized vehicles during prescribed burns or other fuels treatment activities in suitable or occupied listed species habitat would be restricted, to the extent feasible, to existing roads, trails, washes, and temporary fuel breaks or site-access routes. If off-road travel is deemed necessary, any cross-country travel paths would be surveyed prior to use and would be closed and rehabilitated after the prescribed burn or fuels treatment project is completed.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.9: Sediment traps or other erosion control methods would be used to reduce or eliminate an influx of ash and sediment into aquatic systems.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.10: Use of motorized vehicles during rehabilitation or restoration activities in suitable or occupied listed species habitat would be restricted, to the extent feasible, to existing roads, trails, or washes, and to temporary access roads or fuel breaks created to enable the fire suppression, prescribed burn, or fuels treatment activities to occur. If off-road travel is deemed necessary, any cross-country travel paths would be surveyed prior to use and would be closed and rehabilitated after rehabilitation or restoration activities are completed.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.11: All temporary roads, vehicle tracks, skid trails, and OHV trails resulting from fire suppression and the proposed fire management activities would be rehabilitated (water bars, etc.), and would be closed or made impassible for future use.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.12: During wildfire suppression, apply MIST within riparian areas. Fire-suppression actions in riparian areas should be prioritized to minimize damage to stands of native vegetation from wildfire or suppression operations. To the extent possible, retain large, downed woody materials and snags that are not a hazard to firefighters.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.13: In riparian areas, use natural barriers or openings in riparian vegetation where possible as the easiest, safest method to manage a riparian wildfire. Where possible and practical, use wet fuelbreaks in sandy overflow channels rather than constructing fire lines by hand or with heavy equipment.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.14: Construction or development of a crossing for motorized vehicles across a perennial stream would not be permitted, unless an established road already exists or where dry, intermittent sections occur.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.15: Avoid the use of fire retardants or chemical foams in riparian habitats or within 300 feet of aquatic habitats, particularly sites occupied by federally protected species. Apply operational guidelines as stated in the Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations (as updated), "Environmental Guidelines for Delivery of Retardant or Foam Near Waterways."

Table 2-16
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.16: When using water from sources supporting federally protected species, care must be taken to ensure adverse impacts on these species are minimized or prevented. Unused water from fire abatement activities would not be dumped in sites occupied by federally protected aquatic species to avoid introducing nonnative species, diseases, or parasites.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.17: If water is drafted from a stock tank or other body of water for fire suppression, it would not be refilled with water from another tank, lakes, or other water sources that may support nonnative fishes, bullfrogs, crayfish, or salamanders.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.18: Use of containment systems for portable pumps to avoid fuel spills in riparian or aquatic systems would be required.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.19: All conservation measures for wildland fire suppression also apply to fuels treatment activities (prescribed fire; mechanical, chemical, and biological treatments) in riparian, wetland, and aquatic habitats.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.20: Fire management treatments within or adjacent to riparian and aquatic habitats would be designed to provide long-term benefits to aquatic and riparian resources by reducing threats associated with dewatering and surface disturbance, or by improving the condition of the watershed and enhancing watershed function.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.21: For priority fire/fuels management areas (e.g., WUI) with federally protected species or designated critical habitat downstream, BLM biologists and other resource specialists, as appropriate, in coordination with USFWS and AGFD, would determine: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of acres and the number of projects or phases of projects to occur within one watershed per year. 2. An appropriately-sized buffer adjacent to perennial streams in order to minimize soil and ash from entering the stream. 3. Where livestock grazing occurs in areas that have been burned, specialists would determine when grazing can be resumed. Such deferments from grazing would only occur when necessary to protect streams from increased ash or sediment flow into streams.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.22: To the extent possible, maintain habitat features necessary to support breeding populations of the pygmy-owl within their historic range and review ongoing fire management activities for effects on essential habitat features needed by cactus ferruginous pygmy-owls. Modify activities, where necessary, to sustain the overall suitability of the habitat for the owls. Priority would be given to activities in or near occupied or recently (within the last 10 years) occupied habitat.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.23: Implement the conservation measures for Fire Management Activities in Riparian and Aquatic Habitats.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.24: Except where fires are active in occupied Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat, minimize unnecessary low-level helicopter flights during

Table 2-16
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						the breeding season (April 1 – September 30). Approach bucket dip sites at a 90-degree direction to rivers to minimize flight time over the river corridor and occupied riparian habitats. Locate landing sites for helicopters at least one-quarter mile from occupied sites to avoid impacts on Southwestern willow flycatchers and their habitat.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.25: Minimize use of chainsaws or bulldozers to construct fire lines through occupied or found to be occupied listed species habitat except where necessary to reduce the overall acreage of occupied habitat or other important habitat areas that would otherwise be burned.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.26: Avoid developing access roads that would result in fragmentation or a reduction in habitat quality for listed species. Close and rehabilitate all roads that were necessary for project implementation (see RR-5).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.27: Prescribed burning would only be allowed within one-half mile of occupied or found-to-be-occupied habitat when weather conditions allow smoke to disperse away from the habitat when Southwestern willow flycatchers may be present (breeding season of April 1 – September 30).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.28: The following reasonable and prudent measures, terms, and conditions are necessary and appropriate to minimize take of Southwestern willow flycatchers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize the effects of harassment, harm, and mortality to Southwestern willow flycatchers. In cooperation with USFWS and using guidance from the Southwestern willow flycatcher recovery plan, the BLM shall incorporate the elements recommended for fire risk evaluation and planning into its fire management plans for all current flycatcher breeding sites on or adjacent to BLM-administered lands. If additional sites become occupied, the BLM shall include them in the yearly fire management plans in cooperation with USFWS, prior to the next wildfire season.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.29: During fire management activities in habitat occupied by federally protected plant species, no staging of equipment or personnel would be permitted within 100 meters of identified individuals or populations, nor would off-road vehicles be allowed within the 100-meter buffer area, unless necessary for firefighter or public safety or the protection of property, improvements, or other resources (see FS-7). Primary threats to many of these plant species are trampling or crushing from personnel and vehicles.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.30: No prescribed burning would be implemented within 100 meters of identified locations or unsurveyed suitable habitat for federally protected and sensitive plant populations unless specifically designed to maintain or improve the existing population.

**Table 2-16
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildland Fire Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.31: Prior to implementing any fuels treatment activities (prescribed fire, vegetation treatments), pre-project surveys would be conducted for paniculate agaves and saguaros that may be directly affected by fuels management activities.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.32: Protect long-nosed bat forage plants—saguaros and high concentrations of agaves—from wildfire and fire-suppression activities, and from modification by fuels treatment activities (prescribed fire, vegetation treatments), to the greatest extent possible. Agave concentrations are contiguous stands or concentrations of more than 20 plants per acre. Avoid driving over plants, piling slash on top of plants, and burning on or near plants. Staging areas for fire crews or helicopters would be located in disturbed sites, if possible.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.2.33: No seeding/planting of nonnative plants would occur in any wildfire rehabilitation site or fuels treatment site with paniculate agaves or saguaros.

Objective 3.3: For all fire management activities efforts would be made to reduce the impacts on natural and cultural resources.

LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.3.1: Conduct all fire management activities within the SDNM, ACECs, and along the Anza NHT in a manner that would avoid or minimize degradation of these areas and values that have been identified in the respective legislative designations for these areas.
LS		B	C	D	E	WF-3.3.2: As part of an integrated vegetation resources management strategy, create fuel breaks and complete hazardous fuels reduction activities within the Fred J. Weiler Green Belt to protect and restore mesquite bosques and native riparian woodlands.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WF-3.3.3: Ensure fire management activities in wilderness areas are compatible with the applicable wilderness plan.

Administrative Actions

- Resource advisors from the BLM would be designated to coordinate natural resource concerns, including federally protected species. They would also serve as a field contact representative responsible for coordination with the USFWS. Duties would include identifying protective measures endorsed by the field office manager, and delivering these measures to the incident commander; surveying prospective campsites, aircraft landing, and fueling sites; and performing other duties necessary to ensure adverse effects on federally protected species and their habitats are minimized. On-the-ground monitors would be designated and used when fire-suppression activities occur within identified occupied or suitable habitat for federally protected species.
- All personnel on the fire (firefighters and support personnel) would be briefed and educated by resource advisors or designated supervisors about listed species and the importance of

minimizing impacts on individuals and their habitats. All personnel would be informed of the conservation measures designed to minimize or eliminate take of the species present. This information is best identified in the incident objectives.

- The effectiveness of fire-suppression activities and conservation measures for federally protected species should be evaluated after a fire when practical, and the results shared with the USFWS and AGFD. Revise future fire-suppression plans and tactical applications as needed and as practical.
- Biologists would be involved in the development of prescribed burn plans and vegetation treatment plans to minimize effects on federally protected species and their habitats within, adjacent to, and downstream of proposed project sites. Biologists would consider the protection of seasonal and spatial needs of federally protected species (e.g., avoiding or protecting important use areas or structures and maintaining adequate patches of key habitat components) during project planning and implementation.
- Pre-project surveys and clearances (biological evaluations/assessments) for federally protected species would be required for each project site before implementation. All applicable conservation measures would be applied to areas with unsurveyed suitable habitat for federally protected species, until a survey has been conducted by qualified personnel to clear the area for the treatment activity.
- As part of the mandatory fire briefing held prior to prescribed burning, all personnel (firefighters and support personnel) would be briefed and educated by resource advisors or designated supervisors about listed species and the importance of minimizing impacts on individuals and their habitats. All personnel would be informed of the conservation measures designed to minimize or eliminate take of the species present.
- When rehabilitating important areas for federally listed species that have been damaged by fire or other fuels treatments, the biologist would give careful consideration to minimizing short-term and long-term impacts. Someone who is familiar with fire impacts and the needs of the affected species would contribute to rehabilitation plan development. Appropriate timing of rehabilitation and spatial needs of federally listed species would be addressed in rehabilitation plans.
- Burned area emergency rehabilitation activities and long-term restoration activities should be monitored, and the results provided to the USFWS and AGFD. Section 7 consultation for burned area emergency rehabilitation activities would be conducted independently, if necessary.
- Develop public education plans that discourage or restrict fires and fire-prone recreation uses during high-fire-risk periods. Develop brochures, signs, and other interpretive materials to educate recreationists about the ecological role of fires, and the potential dangers of accidental fires.
- Fire suppression and rehabilitation in riparian corridors would be coordinated with the resource advisor or qualified biologist approved by the BLM.

- Site-specific implementation plans that include project areas with federally protected aquatic or riparian-obligate species would specify fire management objectives and wildland fire-suppression guidance, taking into account the special concerns related to these species.
- Develop and implement restoration plans for affected riparian or aquatic areas, including long-term monitoring, to document changes in conditions in the riparian zone and watershed that maintain flood regimes and reduce fire susceptibility. Monitor stream water quality and riparian ecosystem health to determine effects of wildfire and fire management activities.. Coordinate efforts and results with the USFWS and AGFD.
- Develop mitigation plans in coordination with the USFWS for fuels treatment projects (prescribed fire; vegetation treatments) that may adversely affect cactus ferruginous pygmy-owls or their habitat. Mitigation plans for prescribed fire shall limit to the extent practicable the possibility that fire would spread to riparian habitats. Mitigation plans would be approved by the USFWS.
- The following reasonable and prudent measures, terms, and conditions are necessary and appropriate to minimize take of Yuma clapper rail:
 - Minimize disturbance to Yuma clapper rails during prescribed fire activities.
 - To allow for a better estimate of the number of birds in the affected area, the BLM or their designated representative shall conduct surveys of the site to be prescribed burned during the breeding season prior to the burn. Since prescribed fires would be conducted during September to March, the surveys shall be done the preceding March to May.
- Instruct all crew bosses fire personnel (wildfire suppression, wildland fire use, prescribed fire, and vegetation treatments) in the identification of agave and columnar cacti and the importance of their protection.
- Known locations and potential habitat for plant populations would be mapped to facilitate planning for wildland fire use, prescribed fires, and vegetation treatments, and to ensure protection of these populations during fire suppression.
- The BLM would coordinate with USFWS to delineate buffer areas around plant populations prior to prescribed fire and vegetation treatment activities. The BLM would coordinate with USFWS during any emergency response and wildland fire use activities to ensure protection of plant populations from fire and fire-suppression activities.
- A mitigation plan would be developed by the BLM in coordination with the USFWS for prescribed fires or fuels management projects (mechanical, chemical, biological treatments) within 0.5 mile of bat roosts or in areas that support paniculate agaves or saguaros. The mitigation plan would ensure that effects on bat roosts and forage plants are minimized and would include monitoring of effects on forage plants. The plan would be approved by the USFWS.

- BLM personnel should examine concentrations of agaves (including shindagger [*A. schottii*]) within each proposed fuels treatment area, and blackline or otherwise protect from treatments any significant concentrations of agaves that appear to be amidst fuel loads that could result in mortality greater than 20 percent (greater than 50 percent for *A. schottii*). BLM personnel should use their best judgment, based on biological and fire expertise, to determine which significant agave stands are prone to mortality greater than 20 percent (greater than 50 percent for *A. schottii*) (see conservation measures FT-1 and FT-3).
- The BLM should continue to support and cooperate in the investigations of agave relationships to livestock grazing, and of the effects of prescribed fire on paniculate agaves.
- Coordinate invasive-species management, monitoring, control, and education efforts with the appropriate federal, state, county, municipal, and tribal agencies and other partners. Efforts would be coordinated through the Borderlands Cooperative Weed Management Area and other similar groups.
- Conduct floristic surveys and monitoring for populations of sensitive, candidate threatened, endangered, rare, or unique species (applicable to the three relinquished BGR parcels).
- Update the existing botanical resources database and vegetation map (applicable to the three relinquished BGR parcels).
- Adhere to the intent of the Arizona Native Plant Law, ESA, and all other applicable laws and regulations to protect vegetative resources.
- Focus invasive species monitoring efforts on likely vectors of invasion, such as linear features (roads, canals, railroads, utility corridors, etc.), disturbed areas (construction or development areas), and areas where water is available or may pond (water control structures, etc.).
- Control of noxious weeds required by law would not be subject to a benefit-cost analysis; however, the most economical and efficient method would be analyzed along with the safety of the proposed kind of treatment.
- Rehabilitation procedures would follow the Phoenix District Reclamation Plan.
- (Environmental Assessments) Conduct an environmental analysis at the time of the pretreatment survey. An interdisciplinary team would review any analysis needed on individual projects or group of projects.
- (Cost-Benefit Analysis) Subject land treatments proposed for livestock forage improvement to a cost-benefit analysis to ensure total benefits gained would equal or exceed the cost of the treatments.
- Develop effective interagency and community interactions and cooperation to meet wildland-fire and fuel-management strategies and landscape-scale resource condition objectives across administrative boundaries.

- Include wildfire hazard mitigation strategies in the Fire Management Plan for the Planning Area by identifying appropriate areas for prescribed fire and mechanical, manual, biological, or chemical treatments to reduce hazardous fuels to minimize the adverse effects of uncharacteristic wildland fires and meet resource objectives. The plan would also identify areas for exclusion from fire (through fire suppression), chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments.
- Protect human life (both firefighters' and the public) and communities, property, and the natural resources on which they depend. Firefighter and public safety are the highest priority in all fire management activities.
- Improve public awareness of the role of fire in ecosystem restoration, wildfire risk and mitigation strategies, and wildfire safe community, preparedness, and response planning.

2.10.12 WILDLIFE AND SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

The BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) requires the BLM to designate priority species and habitats, in addition to special status species, for fish or wildlife species recognized as significant for at least one factor such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age. Because priority wildlife species includes special status species, as well as the majority of other wildlife species in the Planning Area, this section also covers special status species in order to display in a single section all actions and desired outcomes for wildlife species.

The primary categories of priority species are listed below. For the complete list of priority wildlife species see **Appendix J**, Wildlife and Special Status Species.

- Special status species, including species listed as threatened or endangered, or those proposed for listing under the ESA, and candidate and BLM sensitive species (BLM Manual 6840);
- Bats;
- Migratory birds, including birds of conservation concern;
- Raptors;
- Game species;
- Species for which there is a signed conservation agreement or strategy.

The BLM focuses most of its wildlife management efforts on priority species habitat. The general assumption is that if the habitat requirements for priority species are met, the habitat for most other wildlife species also is met. The BLM manages priority species in accordance with a variety of laws, regulations, policies, plans, manuals, and agreements. Priority species include fish and wildlife species requiring protective measures and management guidelines to encourage their perpetuation. Moreover, priority wildlife species include state endangered, threatened, sensitive, and candidate species; animal aggregations considered vulnerable; and those species of recreational, commercial, or tribal importance

that are vulnerable. The major sources of guidance the BLM uses to manage priority species are the Endangered Species Act of 1973; Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918; Executive Order 13186 (2001); Bald and Golden Eagle Act of 1940; FLPMA of 1976; BLM Manual 174, Introduction, Transplant, Augmentation and Reestablishment of Fish, Wildlife and Plants; BLM Manual 6840 Special Status Species Management (2008); Desert Tortoise Rangewide Plan (1990); and various Instructional Memoranda. See **Section 3.2.13** of **Chapter 3**, Affected Environment, and **Appendix B**, Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Policies, for a comprehensive list and descriptions.

Priority habitats are defined as fish and wildlife habitats requiring protective measures or management guidelines to support habitat availability. Priority habitats are limited in range and size; provide necessary components for threatened, endangered, and special status species; connect two or more priority habitat areas; or are especially sensitive to disturbance and degradation. Priority habitats are large areas that encompass WHAs and wildlife movement corridors. Connection between these habitat patches is important to provide wildlife the ability to move along elevation gradients and between habitat areas. As climate conditions change, wildlife must be able to adapt by expanding or contracting according to the needs of their lifecycles. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain corridors of undisturbed vegetation that connect to other undisturbed habitat areas. Human population growth that results in the development of subdivisions, highways, and other infrastructure creates barriers to wildlife movement. In order to provide for wildlife movement, the BLM, in coordination with AGFD, developed movement corridors where surface-disturbing activities must mitigate damage to habitat and maintain connectivity to other undisturbed areas. In this plan, WHAs are proposed in the various alternatives, and numerous wildlife movement corridors are identified in all action alternatives for the Lower Sonoran Field Office Decision Area.

Arizona's wildlife is one of its most precious resources. To protect wildlife and wildlife habitat, we have proposed allocations of WHAs with an emphasis on habitat management for priority species. This designation contains management prescriptions that are designed to enhance and protect wildlife habitats within the WHA. Also incorporated are wildlife movement corridors. These corridors are not an allocation; however, they would be managed to enhance opportunities for wildlife to traverse from one area to another with relative ease and security. Therefore, there is overlap in the designation of the WHAs and a number of the corridors. These overlaps facilitate management actions in both areas to encourage habitat availability for wildlife species, passageways for wildlife species, and their continued persistence. WHAs and wildlife corridors are defined as follows:

Wildlife Habitat Area: A WHA is an area that offers feeding, roosting, breeding, nesting, and refuge areas for a variety of wildlife species native to an area. The WHAs proposed in the Planning Area are large areas with a multitude of different habitats and uses within their boundaries. Public lands comprise the vast majority of each WHA, but they also may contain state and private land. The proposed WHA includes recommendations to protect and enhance their areas for all wildlife species and would target priority species for management purposes while facilitating multiple uses. The proposed WHA considers both the quality and quantity of habitat when determining whether they would support local populations of wildlife.

Wildlife Movement Corridors: A wildlife movement corridor (WMC) is a continuous natural pathway that allows native wildlife species to move between habitats in relative security over short or great distances. The goal of identifying wildlife movement corridors is to maintain a belt of native vegetation

between various habitats that is as nearly contiguous as possible while facilitating multiple uses. Corridors work best when they are composed of land that is sparsely developed and unfragmented. The land through which wildlife must pass when traveling between these habitats may, at times, consist of lands in private, state, and public ownership. Corridors can and do encompass public roads, rights-of-way, trails, farmlands, OHV areas, and urban areas. Corridors with appropriate management actions facilitate movements of wildlife and aid in maintaining genetic diversity. Genetic diversity plays a very important role in the survival and adaptability of a species. Corridors also facilitate the ability for wildlife to expand and contract based on habitat availability and population cycles, allowing wildlife to travel from sub-par habitat types during drought, for example, to more suitable and sustainable habitat types. Adaptive management and best management practices would be used in WHAs and corridors to allow for multiple uses while preserving passage areas for wildlife. Numerous areas have been identified as movement corridors for wildlife and vary in size and shape depending on alternatives.

These areas contain characteristics necessary for wildlife to traverse their natural range securely and with relative ease. These corridors encompass topography ranging from mountainous terrain to desert flats and washes. While wildlife do not notice or use lines on a map, BLM as habitat managers must in some fashion delineate areas for management prescriptions. Therefore, the areas delineated include prescriptions for habitat management, and protections are provided to assist wildlife in their quest to survive.

2.10.12.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Wildlife and Special Status Species

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Please note that the majority of the decisions regarding the management of wildlife and desert tortoise were standard operating procedures or administrative actions and may be found in **Appendix B**, Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Policies or at the end of this section.

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)

- Provide wildlife safe access to year-round water at 150 livestock waters on public lands by 1987 and cooperate with allottees to develop similar considerations on private lands (WL-1.1).
- Develop small and upland game waters in 11 areas by FY-87 (WL-1.2).
- Avoid subdividing bighorn sheep lambing areas with fencing and monitor livestock use of these key areas. Negotiate with range users to alleviate competition where documented. This will be done by change in season of use or by instituting a grazing system to rest lambing areas during critical lambing season (January through May) (WL-2.4).
- Decrease cattle densities in bighorn habitat to relieve competition between bighorn sheep and livestock for space, water, and browse. Graze domestic sheep as far from bighorn

habitat as possible to decrease bighorn disease vectors. Management will begin by 1990. Implementation of this recommendation will be met through range management in the following allotments: Aguila (intensive), Ohaco, and Calhoun (non-intensive). Implementation of this recommendation will be met through habitat management plans for the remaining allotments or as a result of planning for Lower Gila South (Crowder Cattle Company-portion lying within Lower Gila North; K-Lazy-B-portions lying within Lower Gila North; Carter-Herrera; Muse portion lying within Lower Gila North; Clem-portion lying within Lower Gila North; and Orosco). Domestic sheep will graze as far from bighorn habitat as practicable (WL-2.8).

- Cooperate with Arizona Game and Fish to acquire water rights to maintain or enhance spring habitats and riparian habitats in the planning unit. Specific sites will be determined in the Habitat Management Plan to achieve the goals stated in the plan (WL-4.4).
- Within distribution of desert and Arizona night lizards (10,000 acres) and Sonoran Mountain king-snake (1,200 acres), utilize 43 CFR 3809 (Surface Management Regulations) to minimize habitat disturbance during new road construction. Specify closing new roads as a provision in new mining plans of operation, when and where necessary, to prevent recreation disturbance to night lizard and king-snake habitat (WL-5.2).

Phoenix Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Maintain and improve habitat and viable wildlife populations (VM-01).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1989)

- As a general practice, new roads will not be bladed for use in fence construction. Vehicles will travel overland or fences will be built by hand (Not numbered).
- Before installing facilities, the BLM will conduct a site evaluation for state-protected animals and will develop mitigation to protect these species and their habitats. Such mitigation might include project relocation, redesign, or abandonment (Not numbered).
- The BLM will continue to place wildlife escape ramps in water troughs and construct or maintain new wildlife waters in coordination with state and other federal agencies (Not numbered).
- Fences proposed in big game habitat will be designed to reduce adverse impacts on big game movement. Specifications in BLM Manual 1737 and in local BLM directives will be used. The BLM will consult with the AGFD on the design and location of new fences (Not numbered).
- Where existing fences in big game habitat do not meet BLM specifications, they will be modified, according to BLM Manual 1737, when they are scheduled for replacement or major maintenance (Not numbered).
- New livestock waters to be located within two miles of crucial tortoise habitat and/or crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat will be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to determine

potential impacts. Significant impacts will be mitigated with appropriate stipulations on site selection (Not numbered).

- All livestock waters will provide safe, usable water for wildlife. As funding and opportunities permit, existing facilities will be modified to make them safe for wildlife use.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan - Goldwater Amendment (1990)

(Applies to the three relinquished Sentinel Plain, Sand Tank Mountains, and Ajo Airport parcels)

- Support continued Sonoran pronghorn monitoring and recovery efforts, including specific recovery efforts stipulated in the RMP (Not numbered).
- Eliminate all trespass grazing by livestock, goats, and burros and construct fences where trespass is a problem (Not numbered).

Vegetation Treatment of Public Lands in Thirteen Western States Final EIS (1991)

- Projects that may affect areas of threatened or endangered species of plants or animals will be postponed or site design modified to protect the presence of these species. Section 7 consultation (as required by the ESA) with the appropriate office of the USFWS will be initiated (Not numbered).

Lower Gila Resource Management Plan Amendment (2005)

Objectives:

- Objective 1: Not relevant.
- Objective 2: Complete and maintain a continuing inventory and monitoring program for tortoise populations and habitats to assist in making management decisions, including habitat categorization, on public lands. The BLM's desert tortoise inventory and monitoring handbook will contain the standards for inventory and monitoring in Arizona.
- Objective 3: Develop and maintain a monitoring program specifically for land use activities that adversely affect tortoise habitats for use in analyzing and responding to the cumulative impacts of land use decisions on tortoise habitats.
- Objective 4: Comply fully with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, as it relates to tortoise population and habitat management on public lands.
- Objective 5: Coordinate and cooperate with other federal and state agencies and other publics concerning tortoise populations and habitat management.
- Objective 6: Conduct research and studies sufficient to develop and document the knowledge and techniques needed to ensure the viability of tortoise populations and habitats in perpetuity.

- Objective 7: Manage the public lands on a continuing basis to protect the scientific, ecological, and environmental quality of tortoise habitats consistent with the goals and objectives of the Rangewide Plan. This implies management, within BLM's capability, of an adequate number of healthy and vigorous tortoise populations of sufficient size and resilience to withstand the most severe environmental disturbances, and with appropriate sex and age ratios and recruitment rates to maintain viable populations in perpetuity.
- Objective 8: When the need is identified through the BLM planning system, acquire and/or consolidate, under BLM administration, management units with high tortoise habitat values. When public land tortoise habitat values will be affected by the issuance of a lease, permit, right-of-way, or other land use authorization, mitigate to minimize loss of those values.
- Objective 9: Ensure that OHV use in desert tortoise habitats is consistent with the category goals, objectives, and management actions of the Rangewide Plan and the Strategy.
- Objective 10: Ensure that livestock use is consistent with the category goals, objectives, and management actions of the Rangewide Plan and the Strategy. This may include limiting, precluding, or deferring livestock use as documented in activity plans or other site-specific plans.
- Objective 11: Manage wild horses and burros in a manner consistent with the category goals, objectives, and management actions of the Rangewide Plan and the Strategy. This may include limiting or precluding wild horse and/or burro use.
- Objective 12: Manage other wildlife on the public lands consistent with the goals, objectives, and management actions of the Rangewide Plan and the Strategy.
- Objective 13: Cooperate as necessary with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service-Animal Damage Control to control predators that are taking desert tortoises. This will be considered only where predation is interfering with attaining the goals and objectives of the Rangewide Plan or the Strategy.
- Objective 14: Manage the BLM's energy and minerals program in a manner consistent with the goals and objectives of the Rangewide Plan and the Strategy.

Management Decisions/Administrative Actions

- Phoenix Field Office personnel would participate, when asked and when appropriate, in public events such as fairs and open houses with information and displays showing the management of public lands including desert tortoise habitat (WL-1).
- The Phoenix Field Office would develop a public brochure on desert tortoise (WL-2).
- Records of environmental assessments that contain stipulations pertaining to the desert tortoise would be maintained for the express purpose of tracking compliance and effectiveness of the stipulations (WF-5).

- An annual summary of the environmental assessments of actions in desert tortoise habitats would be provided to the Arizona State Office (WF-6).
- The Phoenix Field Office would comply with Section 2 of the Endangered Species Act and BLM policy for managing habitat of candidate species to ensure that the Sonoran desert tortoise does not become threatened or endangered through BLM actions (WL-7).
- The Phoenix Field Office would continue to work with, share information, and support to the extent possible the interests and work of other agencies and public entities concerning tortoise populations and habitat management (WL-8).
- The Phoenix Field Office would forward tortoise-related research proposals received to the Desert Tortoise Management Oversight Group (WL-9).
- Specific and quantifiable desert tortoise management objectives for categorized habitat would be included at the interdisciplinary planning level (WL-10).
- Environmental decision documents for all actions occurring in desert tortoise habitat would address and include mitigation measures sufficient to offset, to the extent possible, any loss of tortoise habitat quantity or quality in Category I, II, and III habitats (WL-11).
- New land uses would be granted in Category I, II, and III tortoise habitats only if no reasonable alternative exists. If no alternative exists, mitigation, including compensation, would be evaluated to meet the no net loss goal (WL-12).
- Competitive OHV race courses are prohibited in Category I desert tortoise habitat (WL-13).
- Competitive OHV race courses would not be located in Category II desert tortoise habitat unless no reasonable alternative site exists. If no reasonable alternative site exists, impacts would be fully mitigated (WL-14).
- Competitive OHV race courses would be evaluated in Category III desert tortoise habitat and impacts would be mitigated (WL-15).
- Categorized desert tortoise habitat would be reviewed in relation to ongoing livestock use on public lands in the MFP and RMP planning areas; forage needs of desert tortoise and ecological site potential would be considered in determining and prioritizing the resolution of conflicts (WL-16).
- In Category I and II desert tortoise habitat, only those range improvements for livestock that do not conflict with desert tortoise habitat or populations would be allowed (WL-17).
- New wildlife improvements would be allowed in category I and II desert tortoise habitats only if there is no conflict with desert tortoise habitat populations or habitat (WL-18).
- Information on predation of desert tortoises would be collected as opportunities arise (WL-19).

- BLM actions in desert tortoise habitats would be evaluated to assure that they do not encourage the proliferation or range expansion of predator populations (WL-20).
- The Phoenix Field Office would use the BLM's discretionary authorities relating to leasable and saleable minerals to meet the desert tortoise habitat category goals and objectives (WL-21).
- Boulder sale permits would be restricted to areas that would result in no net loss of tortoise habitat (WL-22).
- The Arizona Game and Fish Department, in cooperation with the Phoenix Field Office, may use re-establishment and augmentation to assist desert bighorn sheep populations in reaching their natural potential (WL-23).
- Re-establishment and augmentation of desert bighorn sheep populations would be done in areas where conflicts with other uses and resources do not occur, or where conflicts can be resolved (WL-24).
- Final decisions on re-establishment and augmentation proposals would be considered on a case-by-case basis within the appropriate level of National Environmental Policy Act documentation that addresses conflicts and meets the requirement for public participation (WL-25).

2.10.12.2 Action Alternatives for Wildlife and Special Status Species Management

Program Goals

The following goals have been developed to manage habitat for all wildlife with an emphasis on priority wildlife species habitats. These goals are intended to provide diverse and healthy habitat for the continued and future occupancy of species that are or were native to the area. Adapted management, best management practices, and mitigation would be instituted where applicable. The associated objectives may be found in the management decisions section. The goals cover both Decision Areas unless otherwise indicated.

- Goal 1: (Wildlife Habitat Area Management): Manage to encourage habitat availability and diversity for wildlife resources so habitats are maintained and/or improving within WHAs, where priority species would receive focus when analyzing activities and projects.
- Goal 2: (Lesser Long Nosed Bat): Maintain, protect, and make accessible to lesser long-nosed bats, roosts and contiguous foraging habitat.
- Goal 3: (Sonoran Pronghorn): Protect and enhance Sonoran pronghorn habitat and manage to support suitable habitat so it is available for future occupancy based on recovery goals.
- Goal 4: (Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and Yellow-billed Cuckoo): Manage habitats for the Southwestern willow flycatcher and yellow-billed cuckoo so they are maintained and/or improving.

- **Goal 5:** (Yuma Clapper Rail): Manage habitat for the Yuma clapper rail so it is maintained and/or improving.
- **Goal 6:** (Sonoran Desert Tortoise): Manage tortoise habitat so habitats provide sufficient forage and shelter for a viable population.
- **Goal 7:** (Cactus Ferruginous Pygmy Owls): Maintain or restore habitats to support cactus ferruginous pygmy owls.
- **Goal 8:** (General Bats): Manage to encourage the natural abundance and diversity of bat habitats so they are stable or increasing.
- **Goal 9:** (Migratory Birds): Manage migratory bird habitats so they are maintained and/or improving to meet the needs of migratory birds in general.
- **Goal 10:** (Raptor Habitats): Manage raptor habitats so they are maintained and/or improving to meet the needs of raptors in general.
- **Goal 11:** (Bighorn Sheep/Big Game): Manage bighorn sheep and other big game habitats so they are maintained and/or improving.
- **Goal 12:** (Wildlife Movement Corridors): Manage wildlife movement corridors so they contain ample habitat to assist wildlife in moving from one area to another in a relatively safe manner.
- **Goal 13:** (Priority Species Management Guidance): Manage wildlife habitats so they are maintained and/or improved.
- **Goal 14:** (Wildlife Waters): Provide wildlife with safe, usable, year-round access to water.
- **Goal 15:** (Nonnative Invasive Animal Species Guidance): Manage to reduce or eliminate undesirable nonnative animal species so they do not occur in the Decision Areas or so their presence does not adversely affect ecological processes.

Allocations Summary

The WHAs proposed for allocation are presented in **Table 2-17**, Wildlife Habitat Area by Alternative, and the management actions and allowable uses are presented in **Table 2-18**, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species.

Table 2-17
Wildlife Habitat Area by Alternative

Wildlife Habitat Area	Alternative (BLM Acres)				
	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E
Lower Sonoran					
Batamote Mountains	0	0	62,900	0	0
Cuerda de Lena	0	0	58,500	0	0

Table 2-17
Wildlife Habitat Area by Alternative

Wildlife Habitat Area	Alternative (BLM Acres)				
	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E
Gila Bend Mountains	0	0	255,700	255,700	255,700
Saddle Mountain	0	0	48,800	0	0
SDNM					
Wildlife Habitat Areas	0	0	0	0	0

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-18, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species, describes management actions and allowable uses for management of wildlife and special status species.

Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses			
Goal 1 (Wildlife Habitat Area Management): Manage to encourage habitat availability and diversity for wildlife resources so habitats are maintained and/or improving within WHAs, where priority species would receive focus when analyzing activities and projects.					
Objective 1.1: Manage to encourage habitat availability and diversity for wildlife resources so habitats are maintained and/or improving within WHAs, where priority species would receive focus when analyzing activities and projects.					
Common to all WHAs for Alternatives C thru E					
Note: Only the Gila Bend Mountains WHA is proposed in Alternatives D and E; refer to the ACEC section, Section 2.12.1 , for actions affecting the other WHAs in D and E.					
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.1: WHAs would be designated as described by alternative as presented in Table 2-17 .
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.2: All public lands would be retained, and private and state lands would be acquired as available and as funds allow, on a willing seller, willing buyer basis to maintain habitat connectivity.
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.3: Maintenance of utility corridors, including vegetation clearing, would be restricted to the existing authorized LUA corridor only.
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.4: Motorized vehicle use would be prohibited in washes that are occupied or are found to be occupied and in cactus ferruginous pygmy-owls habitat from February 1 to August 31 to protect pygmy-owls during the breeding, nesting, and dispersal season. All other areas would be limited to existing or designated routes.
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.5: Routes that conflict with resource protection and management could be closed, limited by seasonal restrictions, or mitigated to prevent habitat degradation and fragmentation.
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.6: Through travel management planning, route densities would be reduced and the designation of upland routes would be emphasized. Necessary use of access routes in washes would be allowed; however,

Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
					these access routes may contain seasonal closures.
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.7: All new roads or highways crossing public land would be designed to facilitate movement of wildlife and would be mitigated to minimize disturbance.
LS		C	D	E	WL-1.1.8: Priority habitat areas would be maintained during road improvements (e.g., altering, upgrading, paving, and widening) and improvements must meet desert tortoise protection standards. Mitigation may include at-grade wildlife crossings, wildlife under- or overpasses, wildlife-appropriate fencing, speed limits, and other appropriate actions.
LS		C		E	WL-1.1.9: WHAs would be avoidance areas for utility-scale renewable energy development. Uses would be concentrated in less sensitive resource areas or in areas already disturbed. If no other options exist, activities must be mitigated and managed to ensure consistency with management objectives, with an emphasis to maintain wildlife habitat and movement connectivity within WHAs.
LS		C		E	WL-1.1.10: WHAs would be open for locatables, leasables, and mineral materials. Activities must be mitigated and managed to ensure consistency with management objectives, with an emphasis to maintain wildlife habitat and movement connectivity within WHAs. Valid existing rights would be respected. Existing mineral material free use permits used as community pits would be allowed to continue and be reissued upon expiration.
LS		C			WL-1.1.11: The construction of routes would be allowed if consistent with natural resource objectives and if they do not conflict with wildlife management objectives. Closed roads could be converted for use as non-motorized trails if consistent with natural resource objectives.
Specific to Cuerda de Lena WHA					
Note: In Alternatives D and E, the area would be managed under the proposed Cuerda de Lena ACEC. Also see actions under the Sonoran pronghorn habitat section.					
LS		C			WL-1.1.12: The WHA would be closed to the public for general recreational use during pronghorn fawning between March 15 and July 15 or as determined annually by the Sonoran pronghorn recovery team. Minor non-linear LUAs would also be prohibited unless deemed necessary by the authorized officer. Federal, state, and local government employees and BLM permit holders operating within the scope of their authorizations would be exempt from the closure.
Specific to Gila Bend Mountains WHA					
LS			D		WL-1.1.13: The WHA would be an exclusion area for utility-scale renewable energy development and exploration.
LS			D		WL-1.1.14: The WHA would be closed to all locatable and leasable minerals exploration and development (including geothermal and sodium), and mineral material disposals. Public lands in the WHA would be recommended for withdrawal to all forms of mineral entry.

**Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species**

Decision Area	Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Specific to Saddle Mountain WHA						
Note: In Alternatives D and E, the area is managed under the proposed Saddle Mountain ACEC.						
LS		C				WL-1.1.15: Facilities, including those for recreational purposes, and construction of new roads would be prohibited within one-half mile of known bat roosts and cliffs or other unique habitat features used by nesting raptors.
Goal 2 (Lesser Long Nosed Bat): Maintain, protect, and make accessible to lesser long-nosed bats, roosts and contiguous foraging habitat.						
Objective 2.1: Protect known roosting habitat for lesser long-nosed bat on public land and maintain contiguous foraging habitat at its current range and distribution.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-2.1.1: Mitigation could occur for facility development, including those for recreation purposes, within 4 miles of known lesser long-nosed bat roosts as long as the action does not impact roost sites. In the event that mitigation is not sufficient, the development would be relocated at least 4 miles from roost sites.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-2.1.2: Activities with the potential to impact lesser long-nosed bats or their habitats would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and impacts would be mitigated or avoided.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-2.1.3: Medium to high density columnar cactus habitat (≥ 30 saguaro/acre) within 40 miles of known roost sites would be maintained and/or restored.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-2.1.4: Protect long-nosed bat forage plants-saguars and high concentrations of agaves-from modification by treatment activities (prescribed fire, vegetation treatments), to the greatest extent possible. Saguars and high concentrations of agaves would be excluded from treatments. Agave concentrations are contiguous stands or concentrations of more than 20 plants per acre.
Goal 3 (Sonoran Pronghorn): Protect and enhance Sonoran pronghorn habitat and manage suitable habitat so it is available for future occupancy based on recovery goals.						
Objective 3.1: Manage for no net loss in currently occupied Sonoran pronghorn habitats. Protect the creosote-bursage, desert washes (xeroriparian), and palo verde mixed cacti communities which provide nutritious forage species that encourages fawn recruitment, provides thermal cover, enables predator avoidance, and provides for growth and survival to the extent practicable. Protect areas that provide for chain-fruit cholla production.						
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-3.1.2: The pronghorn habitat area south of Ajo (see Maps 2-4a-e) would be closed to the public for general recreational use during pronghorn fawning between March 15 and July 15 or as determined annually by the Sonoran pronghorn recovery team. Minor non-linear LUAs would also be prohibited unless deemed necessary by the authorized officer. Federal, state and local government employees and BLM permit holders operating within the scope of their authorizations would be exempt from the closure.

Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-3.1.3: Portions of the Lower Sonoran would be identified as potential reintroduction sites for an experimental/nonessential population of Sonoran pronghorn. (See Map 3-15 , Sonoran Pronghorn Classification Areas).
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-3.1.4: Sonoran pronghorn experimental/nonessential populations would be managed to achieve recovery goals. Mitigation could be required for activities that may impede movements or otherwise disturb the species or habitat.
Objective 3.2: Manage to maintain or improve habitat for future populations of experimental/ nonessential Sonoran pronghorn within the SDNM.						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-3.2.1: Sonoran pronghorn habitat within the SDNM would be managed to achieve recovery goals.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-3.2.2: The Monument would be identified as a potential reintroduction site for an experimental/nonessential population of Sonoran pronghorn.
Goal 4 (Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and Yellow-billed Cuckoo): Manage habitats for the Southwestern willow flycatcher and yellow-billed cuckoo so they are maintained and/or improving.						
Objective 4.1: Protect, maintain, and restore southwestern willow flycatcher and yellow-billed cuckoo habitats and prevent actions that could harm individuals of the two listed species.						
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-4.1.1: Southwestern willow flycatcher and yellow-billed cuckoo habitats in the Fred J. Weiler Green Belt would be maintained and/or restored in coordination with USFWS and AGFD.
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-4.1.2: Recreation activities would only be allowed outside of ½ mile of occupied or found to be occupied habitat when birds may be present (breeding season of April 1 – September 30).
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-4.1.3: Vegetation treatment projects adjacent to occupied or found to be occupied habitat would only be conducted when willow flycatchers are not present (October 1 – March 31).
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-4.1.4: Avoid surface-disturbing activities that would result in fragmentation or a reduction in habitat quality for both species.
Goal 5 (Yuma Clapper Rail): Manage habitat for the Yuma clapper rail so it is maintained and/or improving.						
Objective 5.1: Maintain and protect riparian and wetland areas with potential or occupied Yuma clapper rail habitats.						
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-5.1.1: Yuma clapper rail habitat would be maintained and/or restored by developing or engineering projects that would encourage native emergent vegetation.
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-5.1.2: Vegetation treatment projects in occupied, or found to be occupied, marsh habitat would only occur between September 1 and March 15 to avoid the Yuma clapper rail breeding and molting seasons.
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-5.1.3: Mechanical removal of overstory habitat (<i>Tamarisk</i>) would only occur after the breeding season for Yuma clapper rails (September 1 to

**Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses								
						March 15).								
Goal 6 (Sonoran Desert Tortoise): Manage tortoise habitat so it provides sufficient forage and shelter for a viable population.														
Objective 6.1: Achieve the following objectives in desert tortoise habitat, as identified by habitat category:														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category I - Maintain stable, viable populations and protect existing tortoise habitat values and increase populations where possible. • Category II - Maintain stable, viable populations and halt further declines in tortoise habitat values. • Category III - Limit tortoise habitat and population declines to the extent possible through mitigation. • Retain natural shelter sites (boulders or caliche caves or similar features used by tortoises for sheltering) in Category I and II desert tortoise habitats, and • Maintain or restore a diverse mixture of forage species and adequate cover of vegetation for desert tortoise habitat as recommended by the 1988 Rangewide Plan (BLM 1988b). 														
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>WL-6.1.1: Public lands currently allocated for management as Category I, II, and III Sonoran Desert tortoise habitat, as described in Table 2-18a, Sonoran Desert Tortoise Habitat by Category, would be managed according to the objectives listed above.</p>								
						<p align="center">Table 2-18a: Sonoran Desert Tortoise Habitat by Category</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Category</th> <th colspan="2">Sonoran Desert Tortoise Habitat (BLM Acres)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Lower Sonoran</th> <th>SDNM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I</td> <td align="center">24,800</td> <td align="center">166,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II</td> <td align="center">355,700</td> <td align="center">124,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III</td> <td align="center">65,300</td> <td align="center">3,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Sonoran Desert Tortoise Habitat (BLM Acres)		Lower Sonoran	SDNM	I	24,800	166,000
Category	Sonoran Desert Tortoise Habitat (BLM Acres)													
	Lower Sonoran	SDNM												
I	24,800	166,000												
II	355,700	124,700												
III	65,300	3,500												
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>WL-6.1.2: Habitat-management categories and boundaries may be revised as new population information becomes available. The criteria that would be used in revising categories and boundaries are those in the 1988 Rangewide Plan (BLM 1988b).</p>								
						<p>The criteria for Category I tortoise habitat areas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat areas are essential to the maintenance of large, viable populations; • Conflicts are resolvable; • Populations are medium- to high-density or low-density contiguous with medium- or high-density; • Populations are increasing, stable, or decreasing. <p>The criteria for Category II tortoise habitat areas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat areas may be essential to maintenance of viable populations; • Most conflicts are resolvable; • Populations are medium- to high-density or low-density 								

Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						<p>contiguous with medium- or high-density;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Populations are stable or decreasing. <p>The criteria for Category III tortoise habitat areas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat areas are not essential to maintenance of viable populations; • Most conflicts are not resolvable; • Populations are low- to medium-density and not contiguous with medium- or high-density; <p>Populations are stable or decreasing.</p>
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>WL-6.1.3: No net loss would occur in the quality or quantity of Category I and II desert tortoise habitat. Mitigation for impacts would be permissible to achieve no net loss in quantity or quality of desert tortoise habitat in accordance with the Desert Tortoise Rangewide Plan and other applicable policy guidance.</p>
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>WL-6.1.4: In Category I and II tortoise habitats, all motorized competitive speed races would be prohibited from March 31 through October 15. All other use requests during this time would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and could be denied or adjusted to avoid conflict with tortoise activity and habitat. Mitigation for conflicts would be permissible to achieve no net loss in quantity or quality of desert tortoise habitat. Development and uses must be compatible with wildlife objectives.</p>
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>WL-6.1.5: Category I and II habitats would be avoidance areas for utility-scale renewable energy development and major linear land use authorizations. Uses would be concentrated in less sensitive resource areas or in areas already disturbed. If no other options exist, activities must be mitigated in accordance with the Desert Tortoise Rangewide Plan and other applicable policy guidance.</p>
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>WL-6.1.6: Minor linear and all nonlinear LUAs would be allowed on a case-by-case basis. Mitigation for conflicts would be permissible to achieve no net loss in quantity or quality of desert tortoise habitat. Development and uses must be compatible with wildlife objectives.</p>
LS			C			<p>WL-6.1.7: Category I, II, and III tortoise habitats would be open to all minerals activities on a case-by-case basis. Mitigation for conflicts would be permissible to achieve no net loss in quantity or quality of desert tortoise habitat. Uses must be mitigated in accordance with applicable policies and guidance, and managed to ensure consistency with management objectives, with an emphasis to maintain habitat. Uses would be concentrated in less sensitive resource areas or in areas already developed or disturbed. Stipulations would be applied to prevent habitat fragmentation, to the extent practicable, when the area is located between Category I and II habitat.</p>

**Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 7 (Cactus Ferruginous Pygmy Owls): Maintain or restore habitats to support cactus ferruginous pygmy owls.						
Objective 7.1: Protect cactus ferruginous pygmy-owls from disturbance during the breeding and nesting seasons. Maintain or improve a complex, multi-layered vegetative structure provided by perennial plants within the range of the cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl. Structure should consist of approximately 30 percent each of grasses and forbs, shrubs, and trees as dictated by site conditions. Maintain current or improve interconnected habitat patches of sufficient quality (diversity, density, and structure) and quantity (≥ 3 acres) to support cactus ferruginous pygmy-owls. Maintain sufficient vegetation between patches to allow for dispersal.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-7.1.1: Activities would be managed to protect, maintain, or improve occupied, or found to be occupied, cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl habitat.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	WL-7.1.2: Surface-disturbing activities authorized or permitted by the BLM would be avoided within ½ mile of a known active cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl nest site from February 1 through July 31. All actions would be mitigated and managed to ensure consistency with management objectives, with an emphasis to maintain available habitat. Development planned to occur within 100 meters/330 feet of any known or found to be occupied CFPO nest site would be evaluated on a site-specific basis, but significant modification of habitat within these areas should be avoided year round. Uses would be concentrated in less sensitive resource areas or in areas already disturbed.
LS	SDNM			D		WL-7.1.3: Surface-disturbing activities authorized or permitted by the BLM would be excluded within ½ mile of known active cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl nest site from February 1 through September 15.
LS	SDNM		C		E	WL-7.1.4: Use of motorized vehicles on routes within washes in the SDNM and Ajo Block that are occupied or found to be occupied by cactus ferruginous pygmy-owls would be prohibited from April 15 to August 31 to protect pygmy-owls during their nesting seasons. Exceptions to the prohibitions would be authorized only for personnel engaged in constructing, maintaining, or repairing facilities; conducting research or surveys; for authorized law-enforcement or fire-suppression emergencies.
LS	SDNM			D		WL-7.1.5: Motorized use within occupied, or found to be occupied, cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl habitat would be prohibited from February 1 to September 15 to protect pygmy-owls during their breeding, nesting, and dispersal seasons. Exceptions to the prohibitions would be authorized only for personnel engaged in constructing, maintaining, or repairing facilities; conducting research or surveys; for authorized law-enforcement or fire-suppression emergencies.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-7.1.6: Treatment of riparian habitat, Sonoran desert/desert scrub, or mesquite-invaded grasslands under 4,000 feet in elevation that may support nesting cactus ferruginous pygmy-owls would only occur during the non-nesting season of August 1 to January 31, unless pre-project surveys indicate the area does not support pygmy-owls or mitigation plans

Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						approved by the USFWS have alleviated negative consequences.
Goal 8 (General Bats): Manage to encourage the natural abundance and diversity of bat habitats so they are stable or increasing.						
Objective 8.1: Protect bat roosts associated with natural caves and abandoned mine features that are necessary to provide roosting locations for existing bat populations and opportunities for expansion.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-8.1.1: In cooperation with AGFD, important bat roosts would be protected where practicable and mitigation measures would be used to resolve potential resource conflicts.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-8.1.2: New water developments would be configured to allow for safe use by bats.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-8.1.3: Hazardous mine features occupied by bats would be remediated in coordination with the AGFD by installing bat gates or, if other roosts are readily available, by backfilling.
Goal 9 (Migratory Birds): Manage migratory bird habitats so they are maintained and/or improving to meet the needs of migratory birds in general.						
Objective 9.1: Avoid take of migratory birds (adults, nests, eggs, and chicks) to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Executive Order 13186, and the BLM-USFWS Memorandum of Understanding.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-9.1.1: Applications for activities on public lands would evaluate the effects of the BLM's actions on migratory birds during the NEPA process, if any, and identify where take reasonably attributable to agency actions may have a measurable negative effect on migratory bird populations, focusing first on species of concern, priority habitats, and key risk factors. In such situations, the BLM would implement approaches lessening such take.
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-9.1.2: Burrowing owl artificial habitats would be developed to facilitate introduction/transplant of owls in suitable locations.
Goal 10 (Raptor Habitats): Manage raptor habitats so they are maintained and/or improving to meet the needs of raptors in general.						
Objective 10.1: Manage activities that could reduce raptor nest production.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-10.1.1: Authorized developments, uses, and activities within ¼ mile of known occupied raptor nests would be avoided, relocated, or seasonally limited.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-10.1.2: Authorized developments, uses, and activities within ½ mile of communal raptor nesting areas would be avoided.
LS		B	C	D	E	WL-10.1.3: All authorized activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis within active eagle nest territories to comply with Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.
Goal 11 (Bighorn Sheep/Big Game): Manage bighorn sheep, and other big game, habitats so they are maintained and/or improving.						
Objective 11.1: Provide water for bighorn sheep and protect them from communicable diseases.						

**Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-11.1.1: Additional waters may be installed in high elevations of bighorn sheep habitat to improve habitat suitability.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-11.1.2: Domestic sheep and goat use would be prohibited on all allotments within nine miles of bighorn sheep habitat.
Goal 12 (Wildlife Movement Corridors): Manage wildlife movement corridors so they contain ample habitat to assist wildlife in moving from one area to another in a relatively safe manner.						
Objective 12.1: Manage wildlife movement corridors in a manner that would assist wildlife in safe passage from one area to another.						
Specific to Wildlife Movement Corridors (WMCs)						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-12.1.1: All new roads and primitive roads where average speeds may be greater than 45 miles per hour, or highways crossing public land, would be designed to facilitate movement of wildlife to reduce mortality of wildlife from vehicle collisions.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-12.1.2: Maintenance or expansion of existing roads would incorporate measures to maintain or restore wildlife habitat connectivity and would incorporate, where appropriate, wildlife underpasses or overpasses.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-12.1.3: Existing and/or designated roads and/or trails would be subject to seasonal closures if conflicts with wildlife cannot be mitigated.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-12.1.4: New surface disturbance within 100 meters of the edge of large washes located in the desert washes vegetative community (those depicted on USGS 1:24,000 maps) would be mitigated as needed to protect the integrity of washes as corridors.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-12.1.5: Density of roads, primitive roads, and motorized trails would be limited to 3 miles of road per section or less within the wildlife movement corridors in accordance with the Habitat Guidelines for Mule Deer (Mule Deer Working Group 2006).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-12.1.6: Treatments of invasive plant species would be allowed.
LS		B	C			WL-12.1.7: WMCs would be open to all locatable and leasable minerals exploration and development (including geothermal and sodium) and mineral material disposals with the exception of seasonal restrictions in Sonoran pronghorn habitat for leasables and mineral material disposals (See 1.1.13). All activities would be managed through existing regulations. Mitigation, terms and conditions would be applied as necessary to retain or improve habitat.
LS			C		E	WL-12.1.8: Surface-disturbing activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Activities would be concentrated in less sensitive resource areas or in areas already disturbed. If no other options are available, actions must be mitigated and managed to ensure consistency with management objectives, with an emphasis to maintain wildlife habitat continuity and movement connectivity. If impacts to wildlife cannot be mitigated, the action would be denied.

**Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS				D		WL-12.1.9: WMCs would be exclusion areas for utility-scale renewable energy development and exploration.
LS				D		WL-12.1.10: WMCs would be closed to leasable minerals exploration and development (including geothermal and sodium), and mineral material disposals. Public lands located within the corridors would be recommended for withdrawal.
LS					E	WL-12.1.11: WMCs would be open to all locatable minerals. Exploration and development would be managed through existing regulations. Mitigation, terms and conditions would be applied as necessary to retain or improve habitat.
LS					E	WL-12.1.12: WMCs would be open to all non-renewable leasable minerals actions, including geothermal and sodium, but would be mitigated to allow available habitat no less than 200 meters wide as a corridor to facilitate wildlife movement.
LS					E	WL-12.1.13: WMCs would be open to mineral material sales on a case-by-case basis. Preference would be to place the surface disturbance outside of the WMC but if an area within the WMC is unavoidable, mitigation to improve or enhance the habitat would occur. Development and uses must be compatible with wildlife objectives and not detrimental to wildlife or its habitat. If impacts cannot be mitigated, the action would be denied.

Goal 13 (Priority Species Management Guidance): Manage wildlife habitats so they are maintained and/or improved.

Objective 13.1: Manage habitats for wildlife species so they are maintained and/or improving to meet the needs of wildlife in general.

LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-13.1.1: Reintroductions, transplants, and supplemental stockings of native wildlife populations (as defined in BLM Manual 1745 or subsequent guidance) could occur in their current or historic range with collaboration between the AGFD and FWS.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-13.1.2: The release of rehabilitated or displaced wildlife on public lands would be allowed, which could involve constructing artificial habitats where appropriate, for species that are compatible with other resource-management and use objectives.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-13.1.3: Acquisitions of non-federal lands and disposals of federal land that have, or potentially have, priority species or habitats would include the potential to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the conservation and management of threatened, endangered or special status species habitat, riparian habitat, desert tortoise habitat, key big game habitat; • Improve the overall manageability of wildlife habitat; • Improve habitat connectivity in and around the WHA and wildlife

**Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						<p>movement corridors.</p> <p>The BLM would not transfer (dispose of) from federal ownership the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated or proposed critical habitat for a listed or proposed threatened, endangered or special status species; • Lands supporting listed or proposed threatened or endangered species if such transfer would be inconsistent with recovery needs and objectives or conservation measures or would likely affect the recovery of the listed or proposed species, and lands supporting federal candidate species if such action would contribute to the need to list the species as threatened or endangered. <p>Retain Category I and II tortoise habitat unless it is in the general public interest to dispose of them, and losses in habitat quality and quantity can be mitigated.</p> <p>Exceptions to the above could occur if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recipient of the lands agrees to protect the species or critical habitat under the ESA, such as disposal to a non-federal governmental agency or private organization; • If conservation of the habitat would still be achieved and ensured; or • In a land exchange if a net gain in the value of species habitat or protection is achieved.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL 13.1.4: Treatments of invasive species would be allowed to benefit visual resources or wildlife habitat unless otherwise restricted.
	SDNM		C		E	WL-13.1.5: Designated roads, primitive roads, and/or trails within washes would be closed from April 15-August 31 during the travel management route designation process to address the forage, shelter, breeding, and thermal cover protection provided by washes as a component of wildlife habitat. In Alternative B, this management action would apply to routes 8008H, 8013, 8016B, 8017, 8018, 8019, and 8026B. In Alternative E, this management action would apply to routes 8013, 8018 and 8019.
Goal 14 (Wildlife Waters): Provide wildlife with safe, usable, year-round access to water.						
Objective 14.1: Increase, improve or maintain the density and distribution of wildlife waters on public lands throughout the Planning Area to sustain and enhance wildlife populations across their range.						
LS	SDNM	B			E	WL-14.1.1: Maintain and re-develop existing and develop additional wildlife waters in cooperation with AGFD. Increase the density and/or restore the distribution of wildlife waters throughout the Planning Area to sustain and enhance native wildlife populations across their range. All existing wildlife waters would be maintained or improved as needed to maintain the

Table 2-18
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Wildlife and Special Status Species

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						presence of perennial water for native wildlife. New wildlife waters would be built when needed to maintain, restore, or enhance native wildlife population numbers or distributions.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	WL-14.1.2: In the event that range water developments are no longer needed for livestock use, the BLM, in consultation with the AGFD, would determine if the water development would be beneficial to meet wildlife distribution goals or other objectives. If it is deemed that the water development is not useful for such purposes, the water source would be removed.
Goal 15 (Non-Native Invasive Animal Species Guidance): Manage to reduce or eliminate undesirable non-native animal species so they do not occur in the Decision Areas or that their presence does not adversely affect ecological processes.						
Objective 15.1: Limit the distribution and abundance of invasive animal species to current levels. Reduce the impact of invasive species on native ecosystems from current levels.						
LS	SDNM	B			E	WL-15.1.1: Non-native, invasive animal species would not be allowed except for biological controls for which peer-reviewed scientific literature states that the introduced species would have no detrimental effects to any native wildlife or plant species in the Planning Area.

Administrative Actions

- Work in partnership with AGFD to manage wildlife and wildlife habitat to achieve AGFD's wildlife population goals. Cooperatively develop HMPs to meet Sikes Act requirements and address site-specific habitat management objectives consistent with other natural resource objectives. Wildlife management activities administered by AGFD include, but are not limited to, surveys, telemetry, transplants, water management, vegetation restoration and enhancement, invasive species control, research, law enforcement activities, setting and administering hunting permits, and other wildlife or habitat management projects as identified in the Master MOU between the Arizona Game and Fish Commission and the BLM.
- Work in partnership with AGFD to manage wildlife and wildlife habitat to achieve AGFD's wildlife population goals and other activities as identified in the Master MOU between AGFD and the BLM.
- Work with other land owners within wildlife movement corridors to maintain or improve vegetative connectivity and prevent actions that would obstruct the movement of wildlife through the areas. Fences may be removed when no longer needed or other options meet the need and as funding and opportunities allow.
- Emphasize maintaining and restoring ecological connectivity through land acquisition, partnerships with local landowners, and vegetation resources. If opportunities for wildlife

movement cannot be adequately maintained, then mitigation to maintain isolated wildlife populations would be adopted.

- Eliminate unauthorized grazing by cattle, sheep, goats, burros, and other non-native animals and construct wildlife-passable fences where unauthorized use is a problem. Fences may be removed when no longer needed or other options meet the need and as funding and opportunities allow.
- Livestock waters would provide safe, usable water for wildlife, where possible. As funding and opportunities permit, existing facilities would be modified for safe wildlife use. The above-ground height of livestock troughs and tanks would not exceed 20 inches. The BLM would install wildlife escape ladders in each facility and provide ramps for small bird and mammal access as funding permits. Storage tanks would be configured to reduce evaporation and prevent wildlife from drowning.
- The BLM would contact the appropriate USFWS biologist as soon as practical once a wildfire starts and a determination is made that a federally protected species or its habitat could be affected by the fire or by fire-suppression activities.
- The USFWS would work with the BLM during the emergency response to apply the appropriate conservation measures.
- If conservation measures cannot be applied during the suppression activities, the BLM would consult with the responding agency after the fact on any suppression actions that may have affected the federally protected species or its habitat.
- If conservation measures are adhered to, the BLM would report on the actions taken and the effects to the species and its habitat following the fire, but no further consultation on that incident would be required.

Threatened and Endangered Species

- The BLM would initiate formal Section 7 consultation with USFWS on all actions that may affect federal listed threatened and endangered species or critical habitat as required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended.
- The ESA of 1973, as amended, provides for the protection of threatened and endangered and proposed threatened and endangered species of plants and animals. Specifications of the ESA pertain to both the Lower Sonoran and SDNM Decision Areas. BLM Manual 6840 prescribes conservation measures for threatened and endangered species, including conservation measures for fire management activities and species-specific conservation measures. To a large extent, these measures have been built in to the RMP alternatives evaluated in this FEIS.
- Monitor existing populations and inventory for additional populations of threatened and endangered species as funding permits.

Wildlife Species

- Maintain and develop a proactive public education program on the desert tortoise and its habitat requirements, including participation in public events with tortoise habitat information.
- Continue to work with and support other agencies and public entities in desert tortoise conservation.
- Coordinate invasive animal species control and education efforts with AGFD.
- Follow management prescriptions for livestock grazing allotments in the Woolsey Peak and Signal Mountain wilderness areas as provided in the wilderness management plans or, if different, as described in Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration evaluations.
- Design fences to reduce adverse impacts on wildlife movement. Specifications in BLM Manual 1741 and in local BLM directives would be used. The BLM would consult with AGFD on the design and location of new fences. Where existing fences in wildlife habitat do not meet BLM specifications, they would be modified according to BLM Manual 1741 when they are scheduled for replacement or major maintenance as funding permits. Special consideration would be given to placement, type, and installation of fences in Category I and II desert tortoise habitat to facilitate desert tortoise movement, dispersal, and protection. Before installing facilities, the BLM would conduct a site evaluation for special status and state-protected animals and would develop mitigation to protect these species and their habitats. Such mitigation might include project relocation, redesign, and abandonment.
- Inventory for federally listed, proposed, and candidate species. Implement monitoring programs on known populations of listed, proposed, and candidate species and other special status species (as defined in BLM Manual 6840) to document population levels and status. Where monitoring finds threats to these populations, actions would be taken to protect the species and their habitats.
- Standardize desert tortoise management throughout its habitat. Management would be consistent with the following documents:
 - Desert Tortoise Habitat Management on Public Lands: A Range wide Plan (BLM 1988b).
 - Strategy for Desert Tortoise Habitat Management on Public Lands in Arizona, Instruction Memorandum No. AZ-91-16 (BLM 1990a).
 - Strategy for Desert Tortoise Habitat Management on Public Lands in Arizona: New Guidance on Compensation for the Desert Tortoise, Instruction Memorandum No. AZ-92-46 (BLM 1992).

- Instructional Memorandum No. 94-018 Ephemeral Grazing Policy in Desert Tortoise Habitat Supplemental Guidance for Desert Tortoise Compensation, Instruction Memorandum No. AZ-99-008 (BLM 1999).
 - Desert Tortoise Mitigation Policy, Instruction Memorandum No. AZ-2009-010 (BLM 2009)
- Establish additional desert tortoise study plot(s) or other monitoring methods, as necessary. Read plots at 5-year intervals, or as necessary, and as funding permits.

2.11 RESOURCE USES

2.11.1 LANDS AND REALTY

The lands and realty program for the Planning Area consists of three distinct parts: (1) land use authorizations (LUAs), which includes ROWs for utility-scale renewable energy development proposals; (2) land tenure (disposal and acquisition of lands); and (3) withdrawals, classifications, and segregations. The lands and realty program processes applications related to solar, wind, and biomass energy; while geothermal proposals are managed by the minerals program and are discussed in **Section 2.11.3, Minerals Management**.

The lands and realty program administers uses on public lands within a framework of numerous laws and mandates, which are discussed below:

- The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended enables the BLM to accomplish a variety of lands actions, including but not limited to sales, withdrawals, acquisitions, exchanges, leases, permits, easements, and ROWs.
- Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act (102 Stat. 1087) established uniform rules for the resolution of appraisal disputes in the exchange process.
- Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (MLA) (30 USC 185), as amended authorizes the BLM to process ROWs for pipelines for the transportation of oil, natural gas, synthetic liquid or gaseous fuels, or any refined product produced.
- Recreation and Public Purposes Act of June 14, 1926 (R&PP) (43 USC 869 et seq.), as amended authorizes the sale and/or lease of public lands for recreational and public service needs for parks and other related community buildings.
- Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 USC 2215) provides for the conveyance of public lands to public agencies for use as airports and airways.
- Various Federal Highway Acts codified in 23 USC, Sections 17 and 317 established to build, improve, and maintain the federal interstate highway system.

- Federal Land Transaction and Facilitation Act (114 Stat. 613; 43 USC 2301 et seq.) of July 25, 2000 allows retention by the BLM of receipts received from the sale of or interests in land if a LUP was completed prior to July 25, 2000.
- Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 USC 15801) encourages energy efficiency and conservation, promotes alternative and renewable energy sources, and encourages the expansion of nuclear energy.

2.11.1.1 Land Use Authorizations (LUAs)

This segment of the lands and realty program focuses on requests for rights-of-way (ROWs), permits, leases, and easements, which are all referred to as “land use authorizations (LUAs)” throughout this document. As a general rule, proponents need an LUA (grant, permit, or lease) whenever a surface-disturbing activity takes place on public land. Some examples of land uses which require a LUA grant include: electric transmission lines, communication sites, roads, highways, trails, telephone/fiber optic lines, canals, flumes, pipelines, reservoirs, and utility-scale renewable energy developments. Proponents do not need a LUA for so-called “casual uses.” Examples of casual uses include driving vehicles over existing roads, sampling, surveying, or collecting data to prepare an application for a ROW, and performing certain activities that do not cause any appreciable disturbance or damage to the public land, resources, or improvements.

The objective of the LSFO is to meet the public land use demands on public lands, while also minimizing unnecessary impacts to resources. The LSFO would meet this objective by organizing the LUA types the Planning Area is accustomed to processing (or anticipates to receive in the next twenty years) into defined LUA category types (which are dictated by the size and intensity of the surface disturbance of the proposed LUA). Management allocations from other resource specific program areas (such as priority wildlife, special designations, and cultural resources) set restrictions on certain LUA types or state whether or not they are avoided or excluded. These allocations have been consolidated and renamed by the Lands and Realty program, so that the public, future utility proponents, and current LUA holders can easily comprehend what LUA type is allowed or prohibited within a certain location of the Planning Area.

These LUA types and the Lands and Realty designation in which the LUA type is managed (allowed or excluded in a certain area), have been defined in **Table 2-19**, Description of Land Use Authorization Types.

Table 2-19
Description of Land Use Authorization Types

LUA Type	Description	Lands and Realty Designations Managing the LUA Type
Utility-scale Renewable Energy Development LUAs	Utility-scale renewable energy development ROWs where the proponent has signed a purchase power agreement with a utility company to sell power. These facilities typically produce more than 100 megawatts of power and may include linear utility features	Utility-scale Renewable Energy Development Exclusion Areas: this type of LUA would be excluded in prohibited areas under all action alternatives (refer to Map 2-5b, 2-5c, 2-5d, and 2-5e). Utility-scale Renewable Energy Development

Table 2-19
Description of Land Use Authorization Types

LUA Type	Description	Lands and Realty Designations Managing the LUA Type
	such as access roads, transmission lines, and/or pipelines.	Avoidance Areas: this type of LUA would be avoided in high and moderate sensitivity conflicts areas under all action alternatives (refer to Map 2-5b, 2-5c, 2-5d and 2-5e)
Major Linear LUAs	<p>Linear LUAs that require a ROW width of more than 20 feet. These types of utilities include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transmission lines that are greater than 115 kV, • Pipelines (water or gas) greater than 10 inches in diameter, and • Primary paved roads (as defined by the Planning and Conducting Route Inventories Technical Reference Guide 9113-1 [2006]). 	<p>Utility Corridors: this type of LUA (excluding roads) would be routed through these corridors under the no action alternative (refer to Map 2-6a).</p> <p>Multiuse Utility Corridors: this type of LUA would only be authorized within these corridors under all action alternatives (refer to Map 2-6b, 2-6c, 2-6d and 2-6e)</p>
Minor Linear LUAs	<p>Linear LUA lines that require a ROW width of no more than 20 feet. These types of utilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transmission lines that are 115 kilovolts or smaller, • Pipelines (water or gas) smaller than 10 inches in diameter, • Roads other than primary paved roads as defined by the Planning and Conducting Route Inventories Technical Reference Guide 9113-1 [2006]), and • Fiber optic or telephone lines. 	<p>LUA Exclusion Areas: this type of authorization would be excluded in these areas under all action alternatives (refer to Map 2-6b, 2-6c, 2-6d, and 2-6e)</p> <p>LUA Avoidance Areas: this type of authorization would be excluded in these areas under all action alternatives (refer to Map 2-6b, 2-6c, 2-6d and 2-6e)</p>
Nonlinear LUAs	<p>LUAs that are not linear in fashion and typically do not exceed five acres of surface disturbance. These LUAs do not produce or store more than 100 megawatts of power. These types of LUAs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil, natural gas, or water wells, • Cathodic protection utilities, • Communication facilities, • Meteorological devices (such as rain gauges), • Apiaries, • Wildlife waters, • Geophysical exploration facilities, and • Storage facilities. 	<p>LUA Exclusion Areas: this type of authorization would be excluded in these areas under all action alternatives (refer to Map 2-6b, 2-6c, 2-6d and 2-6e)</p> <p>LUA Avoidance Areas: this type of authorization would be excluded in these areas under all action alternatives.</p> <p>Communication Sites: communication facilities would be encouraged to be authorized in this site under all action alternatives (refer to Maps 2-6b, c, d, and e)</p>

Utility-Scale Renewable Energy Development

Proposals for the development of utility-scale renewable energy facilities on BLM administered public lands fall under the authority of FLPMA as a land use authorization for a ROW, which are subject to environmental analysis under NEPA. The high demand for utility-scale renewable energy development (primarily solar development in the Western US) has led to three parallel processes within the agency to respond to this rapid demand: an agency wide programmatic process, an Arizona BLM process, and the process being analyzed in detail for this planning effort at the field office level. Regardless of when each of these processes become final decisions, this resource management plan would be amended to meet the decisions set forth by both the agency wide and state level decisions.

The management actions set forth in this Plan were crafted from methods which were adopted from the Western Governors' Association and local utility companies' planning efforts through the Western Renewable Energy Zones initiative. For the Plan, 2010 BLM GIS data was used to categorize public lands into four sensitivity categories (prohibited, high sensitivity, moderate sensitivity, and low known sensitivity areas). These four categories indicate the level of conflict that utility-scale renewable energy development proposals would encounter on public lands, in regards to existing resources and management goals and objectives.

This conflict analysis categorization method (which is described in detail in **Appendix N**, Analysis for Renewable Energy Sensitivity) was used to identify locations within the Lower Sonoran Decision Area where utility-scale renewable energy development would encounter some level of conflict, based on known resources and the allocations set forth in this plan. Management actions were then guided by this analysis to decipher which areas of the Planning area would be excluded or avoided to utility-scale renewable energy development. **Maps 2-5a, b, c, d, and e** display the lands that fall under each of these sensitivity categories. Under all of the action alternatives, public lands that fall under the "prohibited" category would be areas where utility-scale renewable energy development proposals would be excluded and proposals that fall under the "high and moderate sensitivity" categories would be areas where these types of developments would be avoided. Applications within the Decision Area would still need site-specific environmental analysis no matter where they are proposed in the Decision Area. The polygons depicted on **Maps 2-5a through 2-5e** do not imply a preauthorization for utility-scale renewable energy development, but are simply an RMP level depiction of where conflicts exists. Other conflicts may be revealed as site-specific analysis is conducted.

According to Appendix B of the Wind Energy Development Final Programmatic EIS (June 2005), there is little known potential for wind energy development on public lands in the Planning Area; therefore, no management actions were developed to manage such developments. Proposals for wind energy development would be entertained in low sensitivity areas of Planning Area and must comply with the best management practices that are identified in the Programmatic EIS ROD for Wind Energy Development.

Utility Corridors and Multiuse Utility Corridors

In order to minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of individual and isolated LUAs, utility corridors and multiuse utility corridors would be designated. Major linear LUA holders reserve to the BLM the right to grant additional major linear LUAs from other holders for compatible uses adjacent and at times within existing LUAs and designated utility corridors. Under existing

management, there are ten designated utility corridors (now referred to as multiuse utility corridors in all four of the action alternatives, in an effort to stress that utilities, including transportation networks, are permitted in these corridors). Under current management, major linear transportation facilities are not required to be placed within the existing utility corridors. Multiuse utility corridor designations vary by each action alternative and are displayed on **Maps 2-6b, c, d, and e**, while the ten existing utility corridors are displayed on **Map 2-6a**.

Portions of the San Diego Gas and Electric, El Paso Natural Gas, and Tucson Electric Power multiuse utility corridors (which exist throughout all alternatives and can be identified on **Maps 2-6a through 2-6e**) would comply with the adopted interagency operating procedures and standards for Section 368 energy corridors, set by the Approved Resource Management Plan/ROD for Designation of Energy Corridors on BLM Administered Lands in 11 Western States. Sections 368 (of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) corridors are allocated for oil, gas, and hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and distribution facilities (energy corridors).

Land Use Authorization (LUA) Avoidance and Exclusion Areas

LUA Avoidance Areas are areas with sensitive resource values where minor linear LUAs and nonlinear LUAs (such as ROWs, permits, leases, and easements) would be strongly discouraged and therefore “avoided”. Authorizations to be considered within avoidance areas must be compatible with the purpose for which the area was designated and not be otherwise feasible on lands outside the avoidance area. Authorizations approved within these areas would be required to meet additional mitigation measures set forth by individual program areas that manage the “avoided” designated allocation. For example, WHAs call for the avoidance of LUAs. If LUAs are authorized within the WHA (or LUA Avoidance Area), the LUA would be required to meet the mitigation measures (or management actions) prescribed for that WHA in this Plan.

LUA Exclusion Areas are areas with sensitive resource values where minor linear LUAs and nonlinear LUAs (such as ROWs, permits, leases, and easements) would not be authorized. These areas have been determined to be unsuitable for a LUA because of (1) unique, highly valued, complex, or legally protected resources; (2) potentially significant environmental impacts resulting from conflicts with current land uses; or (3) areas posing substantial hazard to construction and/or operation of a linear facility (e.g., electric transmission line, pipeline, telephone line, fiber optic line). In these areas, LUAs would be granted only in cases where there is a legal requirement to provide such access or an immediate public safety concern.

LUA Avoidance and Exclusion Areas vary by alternative depending on the allocations established by other resources and program areas, BLM policy, or congressional/secretarial/presidential orders. These areas can be found on **Maps 2-6a through 2-6e**.

Communication Sites

Communications sites are generally limited to designated areas with existing facilities on mountain peaks. Communications sites (a nonlinear LUA type) on public lands accommodate the wireless systems referred to in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as well as many other uses, including, but not limited to, AM/FM broadcast facilities, commercial mobile radios, private mobile radios, and microwaves on designated communications sites. There is currently one designated communication site in the Planning

Area at Oatman Mountain (refer to **Map 2-6a**), in which all proposed communication facilities would be encouraged to be placed. Throughout all of the alternatives, communication facilities would be placed outside of LUA Exclusion Areas on a case-by-case basis.

2.1.1.1.2 Land Tenure

Land tenure focuses on disposing and acquiring lands or interests in lands. The land tenure segment of the lands and realty program specifies that BLM would (1) retain all public lands or interests in land that enhance multiple-use management, (2) acquire lands or interests in land that complement important resource values and further management objectives, and (3) dispose of lands or interests in lands that are difficult or uneconomical to manage or are no longer needed for federal purposes.

Land Acquisition

The Secretary of the Interior is delegated with the authority from FLPMA to acquire non-federal lands or interests in lands. Lands acquired by the LSFO must accomplish at least one of the following:

- Facilitate access to public lands and resources,
- Maintain or enhance public uses and values,
- Facilitate implementation of this RMP/EIS,
- Provide for a more manageable land ownership pattern,
- Include significant natural or cultural resource values,
- Eliminate split-estate by acquiring either the surface or subsurface rights, if acquisition of rights would be in the public interest,
- Assist in the consolidation of large tracks of BLM administered lands, and/or
- Facilitate proper management within congressionally designated NLCS management units.

Lands Suitable for Disposal

Disposal actions usually take place in response to a request from the public, or from an application that could result in a title transfer wherein the lands leave the public domain. Federal lands can be disposed of through sale, exchange, or Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) patent. Sales and exchanges are used for disposal in order to assure an optimum final land ownership pattern and provide better overall land management. The types of sales include direct, competitive, and modified-competitive. Lands identified as being suitable for disposal are displayed on **Maps 2-7a through 2-7e** in green. Lands that are shaded in blue on **Maps 2-7b through 2-7e** are currently leased under the R&PP Act and could potentially be patented to these lease holders.

Public lands selected for disposal typically are those lands that meet the following criteria:

- Isolated and fragmented from larger tracks of BLM-administered lands,

- Adjacent to urbanizing private and state lands, which could be subject to future development,
- Currently leased under the R&PP Act and are eligible to be patented, and/or
- Present an economic and management challenge to retain under public ownership.

The BLM would not transfer from federal ownership the following:

- Designated or proposed critical habitat for a listed or proposed threatened, endangered or special status species; and/or
- Lands supporting listed or proposed threatened, endangered, or candidate species if such transfer would be inconsistent with recovery needs, objectives, and conservation measures or would likely affect the recovery of the species.

Exceptions to the above could occur if the recipient of the lands agrees to protect the species or critical habitat under the ESA, such as disposal to a non-federal governmental agency or private organization if conservation purposes for the species would still be achieved and ensured.

Disposal of lands would be made on a case-by-case basis and would be accomplished by the most appropriate disposal authority and after proper NEPA analysis. Should the authorizing official wish to dispose of lands not designated for disposal in this RMP, an RMP amendment would have to be made and the lands would need to meet the disposal criteria of the applicable laws and regulations.

No management actions related to land withdrawals, classifications are presented in this plan; therefore, each proposal would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

2.1.1.3 Withdrawals, Classifications and Segregations

Withdrawn lands where another public agency manages the surface estate are displayed on **Maps 2-6a through 2-6e**. Withdrawn lands from congressional designations (such as wilderness areas) and proposed withdrawn lands from program area allocations (such as ACECs and public use and conservation for future use sites) where the BLM still manages the surface are also displayed on these maps.

The BLM is delegated the authority to process withdrawal actions for the BLM and other federal agencies. Most of the existing plans for the subject Planning Area do not specifically address withdrawals, however, the following items are generally considered consistent:

- Review existing withdrawals on a case-by-case basis. Determine whether the use is consistent with the intent of the withdrawal and whether the withdrawal should be continued, modified, revoked or terminated.
- If it is determined by a withdrawal review that a withdrawal should be revoked or terminated or a withdrawal expires, the land does not automatically open to operation of the laws(s) to which the land was closed. An opening order would be published to notify the public when and to what extent the land would be opened. An opening order may be

incorporated in a public land order or termination order that revokes or terminates a withdrawal or may be published in the Federal Register as a separate document.

- Land on which a withdrawal has expired or has been revoked or terminated would be managed in a consistent manner with adjacent or comparable public lands within the Planning Area.
- New withdrawals may be completed when existing laws or regulations cannot adequately protect or preserve the integrity of resources of rarity, significance, fragility, or irreplaceability, or when valuable capital improvements are involved. They must be shown to be at risk by current land management practices. New withdrawals may also be completed when land is needed by another federal agency. Proposed withdrawals would be the minimum acreage consistent with the demonstrated need.

Classification of lands is the process of determining whether the lands are more valuable or suitable for transfer or use under federal ownership for management purposes. The classification process is currently used for potential disposals under the R&PP. The segregation of lands is an action such as a withdrawal or allowed application (R&PP) that suspends the operation to entry under all or portions of the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws. Similar to withdrawals, classifications and segregations are not specifically addressed in all the applicable current land use plans, but are generally considered consistent with the following actions:

- Review existing and subsequent segregations on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the segregation is appropriate and should be continued, modified or terminated. A notice of termination and opening order would be published to notify the public when and to what extent the land would be opened. Land on which a classification or segregation has been terminated would be managed in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the Planning Area.

No management actions related to land withdrawals, classifications are presented in this Plan; therefore, each proposal would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

2.11.1.4 Existing Management Decisions (Alternative A - No Action) Lands and Realty

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)

- Establish the following seven *multiple-use utility corridors along existing rights-of-way in Lower Gila North. In these corridors, all utility uses (including transportation, pipelines, and electrical transmission lines) will be allowed when the uses are compatible (LR-07).
- Palo Verde-Devers*: 2 miles (restricted between Burnt Mountain and Big Horn Mountains)

- El Paso Natural Gas Company*: 2 miles (1 mile at Bill Williams River crossing) [*Only the two corridors located within the Lower Sonoran Planning Area and are listed above.]
- Continue to allow small-utility distribution systems to be developed on an “as needed” basis throughout the Lower Gila North Planning Area. These small distribution systems will include all uses such as electrical lines, gas and water pipelines, and roads. These distribution systems will be authorized when consistent with environmental and land use considerations (LR-08).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Designate 10 corridors within the Lower Gila South Planning Area (each one mile wide) (LR-13).

Phoenix Resource Management Plan (1989)

- All major utilities in the Phoenix RMP Planning Area would be routed through designated corridors (LR-02).
- All the corridors in the Phoenix RMP Planning Area [except for the Black Canyon corridor] would be 1 mile in width (LR-03).
- Retain 6,880 acres in the San Tan Mountains, outside the Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs), as a Cooperative Recreation Management Area with state or local agencies (LR-20).
- Acquire 480 acres of state land in the San Tan Mountains Cooperative Recreation Management Area (LR-21).
- Designate 391,803 (remainder thereof) acres of federal surface outside the seven RCAs as suitable for disposal through state indemnity selection, R&PP patent, or state or private exchange (LR-29). This now refers to two RCAs (which are now within the Bradshaw Harquahala RMP Area) based on the redesignation of BLM Field Office management boundaries. Therefore, all public lands from the Phoenix RMP Planning Area that are now within the Lower Sonoran Planning Area have been identified as suitable for disposal.
- Designate 45,000 (remainder thereof) acres of federal surface outside the seven RCAs as suitable for disposal through state indemnity selection, state or private exchange or sale (LR-30). This now refers to two RCAs (which are within the Bradshaw Harquahala RMP Area) based on redesignation of BLM Field Office management boundaries. Therefore, all public lands from the Phoenix RMP Planning Area that are now within the Lower Sonoran Planning Area have been identified as suitable for disposal.
- Identify for disposal all subsurface mineral estate underlying federal surface designated for disposal outside the seven RCAs, Cooperative Recreation Management Areas and R&PP lands (LR-31). This now refers to two RCAs (which are within the Bradshaw Harquahala RMP Area) based on the redesignation of BLM Field Office management boundaries.

Therefore, all public lands from the Phoenix RMP Planning Area that are now within the Lower Sonoran Planning Area have been identified as suitable for disposal.

- Transfer 1,140 acres in the Goldfield Area to the City of Apache Junction for park development under R&PP leases (LR-32).
- On land retained or acquired, communication facility development would be limited to designated sites (LR-52).
- Land identified for disposal would generally be left open for communication site development on a case-by-case basis (LR-53).
- Communication site applications will continue to be considered on land identified for disposal until such time as disposal takes place (LR-54).
- Land use authorizations (right-of-way, leases, permits, easements) will continue to be issued on a case-by-case basis (LR-55).
- Rights-of-way will be issued to promote the maximum utilization of existing right-of-way routes, including joint use whenever possible (LR-56).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (Goldwater Amendment) (1990)

- Restrict construction of overhead transmission lines to paralleling the existing Gila Bend to Ajo 69-kilovolt transmission line. Underground facilities must be constructed on the west side of the Tucson Cornelia and Gila Bend railroad. All rights-of-way are subject to US Air Force concurrence (LR-3). Applies only to the relinquished Ajo Airport parcel.
- Communicate promptly to the public and other agencies, as necessary, new designations for land use, resource protection, safety and security (LR-6). Applicable to the three relinquished BGR parcels.
- Prohibit new ROWs and other land use authorizations except those installed in the established Interstate 8 utility corridors; encourage the installation of below ground utility services within the corridor south of Interstate 8 unless overhead facilities are required due to technical and/or operational circumstances (Not Numbered).

Lower Gila Resource Management Plan Amendment (2005)

- Approximately 33,459 acres of public lands within the Planning Area are identified for disposal (LR-1; identified on **Map 2-7a**).
- Public lands in the Gila Bend Management Area adjacent to the White Tanks County Regional Park, described as T.2 N., R. 3 W., sections 4,5,8,9,14,15,17 through 22, 26 through 29, and 33 through 35; T. 2 N., R. 4 W., section 1; and T. 3 N., R. 4 W., sections 1, 11 through 14, 24, 25, and 36 will be retained in federal ownership and will only be available for disposal to local or state governmental entities for recreation/park purposes (LR-2).

- The BLM will continue to dispose of federal subsurface estate under non-federal surface estate on a case-by-case basis (LR-3).
- Exchanges to re-position lands within all the management areas may occur if it has been determined that it would be in the public interest (LR-4).
- Lands identified for disposal may be retained if significant resource values are found during evaluation. The policy is not to dispose of lands occupied by proposed or listed threatened or endangered species. If other public uses outweigh the value of a parcel as federally owned threatened or endangered species habitat, disposal could be considered on a case-by-case basis. If a listed or proposed threatened or endangered species would be affected by a land disposal action, consultation or conferencing with the USFWS will be required. Exchange for other parcels of habitat will be encouraged. Compensation for loss of habitat value would be required where such a policy exists. Other mitigation may also be required. These determinations would be made during preparation of the site-specific environmental assessments required for every disposal action. Environmental documentation must be in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act prior to the approval of any lands action (LR-5).
- Approximately 3,043,900 acres not listed in Appendix 3 or identified for specific purposes in this amendment will be retained in public ownership unless needed for recreation or public purposes. Such disposal proposals on lands not identified for disposal will be considered on a case-by-case basis (LR-6).
- All non-federal lands with high resource values within the boundaries of the management areas may be considered for acquisition. Acquisitions will occur primarily through the land exchange process in accordance with 43 CFR 2200 and the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act. Acquisition by donation and purchase using Land and Water Conservation Funds will also be considered when willing parties or available funds exist. All acquisitions will be negotiated with willing landowners only and must be in the public interest. There are approximately 288,800 acres of non-federal land within the four management areas (LR-7).
- The BLM will continue to acquire non-federal subsurface estate under federal surface estate on a case-by-case basis (LR-8).

Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Designation of Energy Corridors on BLM Administered Lands in 11 Western States (2009)

- Section 368 directs the Secretary of the Interior (the Secretary) to designate energy transport corridors under existing authorities, such as those provided by Section 503 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 USC 1763) (FLPMA). By signing this ROD, the Sale and Lease Management Agreement amends the affected BLM land use plans under the authority of FLPMA and in accordance with BLM planning regulations (43 CFR Part 1600). The approved plan amendments are consistent with the requirements of Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The decision also adopts interagency operating procedures to meet the Section 368 requirement to improve the ROW application process and to meet NEPA requirements to provide practicable means to avoid

or minimize environmental harm which may result from future ROW grants within the designated 3 corridors. The approved BLM plan amendments are presented in Appendix A of this ROD and the interagency operating procedures are presented in Appendix B of this ROD. This decision reallocates the El Paso Natural Gas, San Diego Gas and Electric, and Tucson Electric Powers Utility Corridors (identified on **Maps 2-6a through 2-6e** in this Plan) as a Section 368 energy transport corridor.

2.1.1.1.5 Action Alternatives for Lands and Realty

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Manage lands and realty actions to effectively support public needs and resource management objectives.
- Goal 2: Manage land tenure to meet natural resource management objectives, community needs, and to promote agency efficiency.

Allocations Summary

Table 2-20, Lands and Realty Allocations for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area, and **Table 2-21**, Lands and Realty Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area, list lands and realty allocations for both Decision Areas.

Table 2-20
Lands and Realty Allocations for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area

	Alternative				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Land Use Authorizations: Utility-scale Renewable Energy Avoidance and Exclusion Areas (acres)					
Acres avoided (moderate and high sensitivity conflict areas)	N/A	727,600	617,500	405,100	499,900
Acres excluded (prohibited areas)	105,000	160,100	293,800	519,400	394,200
Land Use Authorizations: Utility Corridors (Width/Length miles)					
El Paso Natural Gas	1.0/49.2	1.0/49.2	1.0/34.8	1.0/34.8	1.0/34.8
Palo Verde to Devers	1.0/8.8	1.0/8.8	1.0/8.8	N/A	1.0/8.8
Sand Diego Gas and Electric	1.0/22.3	1.0/22.3	1.0/21.5	1.0/21.5	1.0/21.5
Palo Verde-Kyrene	1.0/8.1	1.0/8.1	1.0/7.6	1.0/7.6	1.0/7.6
Liberty-Gila Bend	1.0/9.2	1.0/9.2	1.0/9.2	1.0/9.2	1.0/9.2
Gila Bend-Ajo	1.0/0.5	1.0/0.5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Santa Rosa-Gila Bend	1.0/0.1	1.0/0.1	1.0/0.1	N/A	N/A
Interstate 8	1.0/22.9	1.0/22.9	1.0/24.4	1.0/20.5	1.0/20.5
Tucson Electric Power	1.0/34.4	1.0/34.4	1.0/15.6	1.0/15.6	1.0/15.6
Interstate 10	1.0/1.0	1.0/1.0	1.0/1.0	1.0/1.0	1.0/1.0
Total Corridor Acres	134,328	134,328	95,203	72,153	82,301

Table 2-20
Lands and Realty Allocations for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area

	Alternative				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Multiuse utility corridor widths and lengths are measured as they cross BLM administered lands only. Multiuse utility corridors are simply referred to as utility corridors within Alternative A and would not include transportation facilities.					
*Indicates that the multiuse utility corridor would only permit underground facilities in a certain portion of the corridor					
Land Use Authorizations: Avoidance and Exclusion Areas (acres)					
LUA Avoidance Area	N/A	609,000	449,500	260,500	344,800
LUA Exclusion Area	105,100	143,700	271,900	593,600	295,100
Land Use Authorizations: Communication Sites					
The Oatman Communication Site is allocated in all alternatives					
Land Tenure (acres)					
Disposal	18,900	29,500	36,300	34,800	36,800
R&PP Leased	N/A	3,400	3,400	3,400	2,800
Acquisition	Private and state lands would be acquired as available and funds allow, on a willing seller, willing buyer basis.				
Retention	899,400	888,600	890,600	907,400	896,300

Table 2-21
Lands and Realty Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area

	Alternative				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Land Use Authorizations: Utility-scale Renewable Energy Avoidance and Exclusion Areas (acres)					
The SDNM is excluded from any potential utility-scale renewable energy development within all alternatives.					
Land Use Authorizations: Utility Corridors (Width/Length miles)					
Santa Rosa-Gila Bend	1.0/18.1	1.0/18.1	0.5*/17.9*	N/A	N/A
Interstate 8	1.0/21.1	1**/21.1	0.5*/21.1*	N/A	N/A
Tucson Electric Power	1.0/7.4	1.0/7.4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Corridor Acres	32,900	32,900	14,900	N/A	N/A

Multiuse utility corridor widths and lengths are measured as they cross BLM administered lands only. Multiuse utility corridors are simply referred to as utility corridors within Alternative A and would not include transportation facilities.

*Indicates that the multiuse utility corridor would only permit underground facilities

Indicates that a portion of the multiuse utility corridor narrows to a ½ mile wide (south of the Interstate 8 highway centerline) as it passes along the length of the South Maricopa Mountains Wilderness (refer to **Map 2-6b)

Table 2-21
Lands and Realty Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area

	Alternative				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Land Use Authorizations: Avoidance and Exclusion Areas (acres)					
LUA Avoidance Area	N/A	293,600	181,400	N/A	N/A
LUA Exclusion Area	164,900	192,800	305,000	486,400	486,400
Land Use Authorizations: Communication Sites					
No communication sites are designated in the SDNM					
Land Tenure (acres)					
Disposal	No lands are designated as being suitable for disposal within the Monument. Exchanges for lands within the Monument for other private lands within the Monument's boundaries would be permitted if they further improve the management of Monument objects and present no net loss to existing objects that would be impacted by the exchange.				
R&PP Leased	No lands are presently leased under the R&PP Act within the SDNM, therefore no acres were identified.				
Acquisition	Private and state lands would be acquired as available and funds allow, on a willing seller, willing buyer basis.				
Retention	All 486,400 acres of public land would be retained.				

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-22, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty, describes the management actions and allowable uses for lands and realty.

Table 2-22
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses				
Goal 1: Manage lands and realty actions to effectively support public needs and resource management objectives.						
Objective 1.1 (Utility-scale Renewable Energy Development LUAs): Authorize utility-scale renewable energy development LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14 , Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) in locations that are found to be suitable due to limited conflicts with other management objectives.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	LR-1.1.1: Utility-scale renewable energy development LUAs would be excluded on lands that fall under the "prohibited" area (refer to Map 2-5b through 2-5e and Appendix N , Analysis for Renewable Energy Sensitivity.
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-1.1.2: Utility-scale renewable energy development LUAs would be avoided on lands that fall under the "high and moderate sensitivity" conflict areas (refer to Map 2-5b through Map 2-5e and Appendix N , Analysis for Renewable Energy Sensitivity.

Table 2-22
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses			
<p>Objective 1.2 (Major Linear LUAs): Authorize major linear LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) in locations that utilize designated multiuse utility corridors effectively.</p>					
LS	B				<p>LR-1.2.1: Ten 1-mile wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated, in which all compatible major linear utility LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) would be allowed unless otherwise specified by the authorizing official. The corridors are listed below; also see Map 2-6b for location descriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Paso Natural Gas (section from Ajo, AZ to the Tohono O’odham Nation would allow only underground facilities). • Palo Verde-Devers • San Diego Gas and Electric • Palo Verde-Kyrene • Liberty-Gila Bend • Gila Bend-Ajo • Gila Bend-Santa Rosa • Interstate 8 • Tucson Electric Power • Interstate 10
LS	C				<p>LR-1.2.2: Nine 1-mile wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated, in which all compatible major linear utility LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) would be allowed unless otherwise specified by the authorizing official. The corridors are listed below; also see Map 2-6c:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Paso Natural Gas (<i>section from Ajo, AZ to the Tohono O’odham Nation would be removed</i>). • Palo Verde-Devers • San Diego Gas and Electric • Palo Verde-Kyrene • Liberty-Gila Bend • <i>Gila Bend-Ajo would be removed</i> • <i>Gila Bend-Santa Rosa (underground facilities only)</i> • Interstate 8 • Tucson Electric Power (<i>section from Ajo, AZ to Tohono O’odham Nation would be removed</i>) • Interstate 10
LS			D		<p>LR-1.2.3: Seven 1-mile wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated, in which all compatible major linear utility LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) would be allowed unless otherwise specified by the authorizing official. The corridors are listed below; also see Map 2-6d:</p>

Table 2-22
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty

Decision Area	Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Paso Natural Gas (section from Ajo, AZ to the Tohono O’odham Nation would be removed). • Palo Verde-Devers would be removed • San Diego Gas and Electric • Palo Verde-Kyrene • Liberty-Gila Bend • Gila Bend-Ajo would be removed • Gila Bend-Santa Rosa would be removed • Interstate 8 • Tucson Electric Power (section from Ajo, AZ to Tohono O’odham Nation would be removed) • Interstate 10
LS				E	<p>LR-1.2.4: Eight 1-mile wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated, in which all compatible major linear utility LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) would be allowed unless otherwise specified by the authorizing official. The corridors are listed below; also see Map 2-6e:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Paso Natural Gas (section from Ajo, AZ to the Tohono O’odham Nation would be removed). • Palo Verde-Devers • San Diego Gas and Electric • Palo Verde-Kyrene • Liberty-Gila Bend • Gila Bend-Ajo would be removed • Gila Bend-Santa Rosa would be removed • Interstate 8 • Tucson Electric Power (section from Ajo, AZ to Tohono O’odham Nation would be removed) • Interstate 10
LS	B	C		E	<p>LR-1.2.5: Major linear LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) may be authorized on case-by-case basis outside designated multiuse utility corridors if they are due and necessary in connecting a generating facility to the closest designated multiuse utility corridor.</p>
LS	B	C	D	E	<p>LR-1.2.6: Portions of the El Paso Natural Gas, San Diego Gas and Electric, and Tucson Electric Powers Multiuse Utility Corridors (as shown in Maps 2-6a through 2-6e) would adhere to the decisions and interagency operating procedures set forth in the Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments / Record of Decision (ROD) for Designation of Energy Corridors on BLM Administered Lands in 11 Western States (2009).</p>
SDNM	B				<p>LR-1.2.8: Three 1-mile wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated in which all compatible major linear LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14,</p>

**Table 2-22
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						<p>Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) would be allowed unless otherwise specified by the authorizing official. The corridors are listed below; also see Map 2-6b for location descriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gila Bend to Santa Rosa • Interstate 8 • Tucson Electric Power
	SDNM		C			<p>LR-1.2.8: Two ½-mile wide multiuse utility corridors would be designated in which all compatible major linear LUAs (as defined in Table 2-14, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative) would be allowed unless otherwise specified by the authorizing official. The corridors are listed below; also see Map 2-6c:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gila Bend to Santa Rosa (<i>underground facilities only</i>) • Interstate 8 • Tucson Electric Power would be removed.
	SDNM			D	E	<p>LR-1.2.9: No existing or future multiuse utility corridors would be designated within the Monument (see Map 2-6d and 2-6e).</p>

Objective 1.3 (Minor Linear and Nonlinear LUAs): Authorize minor linear and nonlinear LUAs (as defined in **Table 2-14**, Acres of Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative in locations that minimize resource impacts, are compatible with multiple use objectives, and do not compromise the existing rights of current holders.

LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>LR-1.3.1: Proposed minor linear and nonlinear LUAs would be prohibited in areas designated as LUA Exclusion Areas, unless they allow for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to private property in holdings when there is no other reasonable access alternative across non-federal land, • Authorized emergency, public safety and administrative uses, and • Authorized emergency, public safety and administrative uses, and • Uses that would further enhance the goals and objectives of the allocation, as permitted by the authorizing official. <p>Exclusion areas for minor linear and nonlinear LUAs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SDNM (Alternatives D and E only), • Designated wilderness areas (all alternatives), • The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (all alternatives), • The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt (PLO 1015 lands) (all alternatives), • Sentinel Plain (military land relinquished to the BLM with restrictions related to public safety)(all action alternatives), • Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics (in Alternative D only) • ACECs (Alternative D and E only), • VRM Class I lands (all action alternatives) and • High-potential segments of the Butterfield Overland Stage Route
----	------	---	---	---	---	---

**Table 2-22
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						(Alternative D only).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	<p>LR-1.3.2: Proposed minor linear and nonlinear LUAs would be strongly discouraged in areas designated as LUA Avoidance Areas, unless they allow for / or are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorized emergency, public safety, and administrative uses. • Uses that are compatible with the purpose for which the allocation was designated by meeting the restrictions set forth by the underlining program area allocation, an • Are not feasible on lands outside the avoidance area. <p>LUA Avoidance Areas for minor and nonlinear LUAs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDNM (Alternatives B and C only), • ACECs (Alternatives B and C only), • Anza NHT Management Areas • Developed campgrounds and recreation sites • BLM threatened and endangered species habitats, including Sonoran desert tortoise habitats (all action alternatives), • Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics (in Alternatives C and E only), • VRM Class II lands (all action alternatives), • SCRMAAs (Alternative D only), • Fred J. Weiler Green Belt (non-PLO 1015 lands) (all action alternatives), • Cultural sites allocated to a use category (such as public and conservation use sites)(all action alternatives), • High-potential segments of the Butterfield Overland Stage Route (Alternatives B, C, and E only), and • Back country recreation settings (Alternative D only).
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-1.3.3: Proposed minor linear and nonlinear LUAs would continue to be authorized on an “as needed” case-by-case basis in areas outside of LUA Avoidance and Exclusion areas.
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-1.3.4: Oatman Mountain would be designated as a communication site (see Map 2-6a through 2-6e).
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-1.3.5: Communication facilities would be encouraged to be authorized within the designated Oatman Mountain Communication Site.
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-1.3.6: Apiary special-use permits (a nonlinear LUA) would not be authorized within ¼ mile of a developed recreation facility or water sources such as livestock waters and springs.

Goal 2: Manage land tenure to meet natural resource management objectives, community needs, and to promote agency efficiency.

Objective 2.1: Determine interests in lands for consolidation, retention, disposal, and acquisition. Evaluate land tenure actions in accordance with the criteria established in the Arizona Land Tenure Adjustment Strategy (**Appendix O**, Arizona Land Tenure Strategy)

**Table 2-22
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B				LR-2.1.1: Approximately 29,500 acres would be suitable for disposal via any disposal method, including patent through the R&PP Act on a case-by-case basis (as shown on Map 2-7b).
LS			C			LR-2.1.2: Approximately 36,300 acres (including San Tan Mountain Regional Park) would be suitable for disposal via any disposal method, including patent through the R&PP Act on a case-by-case basis (as shown on Map 2-7c).
LS				D		LR-2.1.3: Approximately 34,800 acres (including San Tan Regional Park) would be suitable for disposal via any disposal method, including patent through the R&PP Act on a case-by-case basis (as shown on Map 2-7d).
LS					E	LS-2.1.4: Approximately 36,800 acres (including San Tan Regional Park) would be suitable for disposal via any disposal method, including patent through the R&PP Act on a case-by-case basis (as shown on Map 2-7e).
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.5: Land interests disposed of through the R&PP Act would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. (Current R&PP leased lands are identified on Map 2-7b through 2-7e).
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.6: Disposal of 1,140 acres of R&PP leased lands near the City of Apache Junction to the City of Apache Junction would continue via any disposal method on a case-by-case basis.
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.7: Non-federal interests for acquisition would be targeted on a case-by-case basis, with an emphasis on acquiring lands that adjoin or are near existing public lands that would increase the continuity of public lands, facilitate proper management, or protect an existing use.
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.8: Acquisition by donation and purchase would be considered when willing parties or available funds exist.
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.9: All acquisitions would be negotiated with willing landowners only and would have to be in the public interest.
LS		B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.10: Public lands bordering the Gila River Indian Reservation, which are identified as being suitable for disposal (as shown on Maps 2-7b through 2-7e), would only be available for disposal to local, state, federal, or tribal governmental entities.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.11: The BLM would continue to eliminate split estate situations by acquiring non-federal subsurface estates that lies beneath federal lands when there is a willing seller.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.12: The BLM would continue to eliminate split estate situations by disposing of federal subsurface estates when there are no known mineral values
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.13: The BLM would not dispose of any subsurface mineral estates that lie under BLM managed surface estate.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.14: The BLM would seek land owners who are willing to sell private land interests within the Monument and proceed with acquiring these

**Table 2-22
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lands and Realty**

Decision Area	Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						inholdings (surface and subsurface) as funding opportunities arise
SDNM	B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.15: The BLM would seek landowners who are willing to sell partial private land interests (i.e., “easements”) within the Monument in cases where the BLM cannot acquire fee-simple ownership in land interests, and proceed with securing the easements as funding opportunities arise.	
SDNM	B	C	D	E	LR-2.1.16: No lands are designated as being suitable for disposal within the Monument. Exchanges for lands within the Monument for other private lands within the Monument’s boundaries would be permitted if they further improve the management of Monument objects and present no net loss to existing objects that would be impacted by the exchange.	

Administrative Actions

- Continue to coordinate with the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), Pinal County, Pima County, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), and the Federal Highway Administration for transportation activities that may affect public lands.
- Cooperate with the Western Utility Group and other industry groups to facilitate the exchange of information and coordinate planning efforts between federal agencies and utility providers through the western US.
- Whenever possible, promote energy transfer efficiency and support alternative energy sources such as the use of photovoltaic cells (solar energy) and wind power.
- Promptly communicate new designations for land use, resource protection, safety, and security to the public and other agencies, as necessary.
- Utility-scale renewable energy land use authorizations within designated multiuse utility corridors shall not conflict with existing and potential future linear facilities.

Specific to the SDNM Decision Area

- Activities to maintain existing facilities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and if SDNM resources can be protected, approved.

2.11.2 LIVESTOCK GRAZING

The livestock grazing program in the Planning Area is managed under Title 43 of the CFR 4100, to carry out the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended and supplemented, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978. Grazing permits or

leases are valid for up to 10 years and authorize grazing within grazing districts on public land and other land administered by the BLM under Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act, and outside of grazing districts under Section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act.

The BLM evaluates allotments when leases or permits are scheduled for renewal consistent with 43 CFR 4100 (subpart 4180) and the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration, IM-AZ-98-013. Terms and conditions are specified in grazing permits or leases, which require lessees to meet management objectives, provide for proper range management, and assist in the orderly administration of the public rangelands. These terms and conditions are contained in 43 CFR 4100 (subpart 4130).

In Arizona, BLM rangelands and grazing allotments are classified as perennial, ephemeral, or perennial-ephemeral. These classifications correspond to the following types of designated rangelands:

- Perennial rangeland: consistently produces perennial forage to support a year-round livestock operation;
- Ephemeral rangeland: does not consistently produce enough forage to sustain a year-round livestock operation but may periodically produce large amounts of annual forage to accommodate livestock grazing; and
- Perennial-ephemeral rangeland: produces perennial forage each year and periodically provides additional ephemeral vegetation. In a year of abundant moisture and favorable climatic conditions, annual forbs and grasses add materially to the total grazing capacity.

During the resource management planning process, land use plan decisions identify lands available or not available for livestock grazing. In contrast implementation decisions identify areas available for grazing, and then establish allotment-specific grazing management practices and livestock forage amounts, based on monitoring and assessment information. Grazing management practices and levels of livestock grazing use must achieve the desired outcomes outlined in the land use plan, including rangeland health standards (or comprehensive Land Health Standards), or must result in significant progress toward fulfilling rangeland health standards. They must also conform to the guidelines required under 43 CFR 4180.2(b).

2.11.2.1 Lower Sonoran Decision Area

For the LSFO Decision Area, the proposed land use allocations for livestock grazing availability are as follows:

- Alternative A (No Action): Grazing allotments would continue to be allocated as perennial, perennial-ephemeral, or ephemeral, as appropriate to allotment-specific characteristics. Season of use adjustments on perennial allotments would be considered (see **Map 2-8a**).
- Alternative B: Ephemeral grazing applications would continue to be considered, but perennial stocking rates would be reduced (see **Map 2-8b**).

- Alternative C: Grazing allotments designated as perennial-ephemeral would be reclassified as perennial only, with no supplemental ephemeral grazing applications considered. This alternative does not apply to ephemeral-only allotments. Season of use adjustments on perennial allotments would be considered (see **Map 2-8c**).
- Alternative D: All allotments currently open to livestock grazing would become unavailable as permits expire (see **Map 2-8d**).
- Alternative E (Proposed RMP): Grazing allotments would be allocated as perennial, perennial-ephemeral, or ephemeral, as appropriate to allotment-specific characteristics. Season of use adjustments on perennial allotments would be considered. Alternative E incorporates elements from each of the other alternatives (see **Map 2-8e**).

Once the RMP is adopted for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area, the BLM would evaluate allotments when leases or permits are scheduled for renewal consistent with 43 CFR 4100 (subpart 4180) and the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration, IM-AZ-98-013. These decisions would be implemented as directed pursuant to 43 CFR 4100.

2.11.2.2 SDNM Decision Area

Within the SDNM Decision Area, the Proclamation for the Sonoran Desert National Monument requires the BLM to determine the compatibility of grazing “with the paramount purpose of protecting objects identified in this proclamation.” A grazing Compatibility Analysis which represents the BLM’s analysis of livestock grazing on 252,500 acres of public lands currently available for livestock grazing within the SDNM north of I-8, is available in **Appendix E**, Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument. The compatibility analysis is used to determine whether livestock grazing is compatible with the paramount purpose of the Monument, which is to protect the objects identified in the proclamation. Process steps for the compatibility analysis include:

- Identify the objects of the Monument.
- Conduct a literature review. The literature review helps identify potential effects of livestock grazing in the Sonoran Desert.
- Prepare a land health evaluation (LHE). The LHE documents if standards are achieved or not achieved, including causal factors for non-achievement.
- Analyze the effects of grazing on the biological and cultural Monument objects.
- Develop a grazing Compatibility Analysis.
- Develop a full range of Alternatives presented in this Resource Management Plan.

The grazing Compatibility Analysis and Land Health Evaluation (**Appendix E**, Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument and **Appendix F**, Arizona Land Health Evaluation for the Sonoran Desert National Monument, respectively) analyzed the effects of livestock grazing on the SDNM only.

The results of the Compatibility Analysis indicate that, in some locations, current conditions on the SDNM's six allotments are not achieving all of the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health. Where standards are not being achieved and grazing has been determined to be a contributing factor, the BLM has determined that current grazing practices are not compatible with protection of the objects of the Monument. Current livestock grazing practices were determined to be a contributing factor of non-achievement of Standards in areas where forage utilization exceeded 41 percent (or "moderate" to "severe" utilization). In areas that showed negligible to light utilization (0–40 percent), yet did not achieve Land Health Standards, other causal factors (such as fire, drought, historic livestock use patterns, OHV use, or combinations thereof) were considered to be the contributing factor(s). The proposed Compatibility Analysis indicates that livestock grazing is a contributing factor for non-achievement of Standard 3 on 8,498 acres of the 252,500 (3.4 percent) acres north of I-8.

The LHE and Compatibility Analysis recommended adjustments to season of use levels to primarily fall-winter-spring with reduced levels during the summer months as follows: 65 percent of the permitted use would occur from October 1 to April 30, and 35 percent of permitted use would occur from May 1 to September 30. This would reduce potential competition with special status wildlife species and other wildlife species during the critical summer months. Moderate ephemeral grazing does not appear to influence achievement of Land Health Standards, and thus should be considered to continue where applicable, in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule and the Arizona Guidelines for Grazing Administration.

These management recommendations and the Compatibility Analysis Determination helped in the development of alternatives for the RMP. Through this RMP/EIS process, a full range of alternatives and management actions would be considered that would allow for continued protection of the objects of the Monument and grazing management design features that would ensure continued compatibility.

For the SDNM Decision Area, the planning- and implementation-level decisions reflect the findings of the compatibility analysis. Based on the results of the compatibility analysis, a limited amount of livestock grazing has been determined to be compatible with protection of the biological and cultural objects of the Monument on most of the lands north of Interstate 8. **Table 2-24**, Livestock Grazing Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area, and **Table 2-25**, Livestock Grazing Acres for the SDNM North of Interstate 8 Only, present the planning-level use allocations and acreages for the SDNM; **Table 2-26**, Permitted Animal Unit Months (AUMs) for the SDNM, presents the implementation-level AUM decisions for the allotments in the SDNM for each alternative. The 8,498 acres determined to be incompatible with livestock grazing would be unavailable for grazing under all alternatives, except the No Action Alternative. This is to ensure that non-compatible areas are protected, per the Monument proclamation.

Summarized below are the SDNM livestock grazing alternatives:

- **Alternative A (No Action Alternative):** Livestock grazing permits south of I-8 are terminated. Livestock grazing north of I-8 would continue to be allocated as perennial, perennial-ephemeral, or ephemeral, as appropriate to allotment-specific characteristics, if determined to be compatible with protecting Monument resources. Season of use adjustments on perennial allotments would be considered.

- Alternative B: Stocking rates on grazing allotments north of I-8 would be allocated as perennial grazing and would be reduced by approximately 40 percent. Ephemeral grazing applications would continue to be considered. The approximately 8,500 acres determined to be incompatible with livestock grazing would be made unavailable for grazing by fencing off these specific areas.
- Alternative C: Grazing allotments in the SDNM north of I-8 would be allocated as perennial only with no ephemeral grazing applications considered (this would not apply to the Arnold Allotment). Approximately 8,500 acres determined to be incompatible with livestock grazing, plus an additional 36,300 acres that connect and/or surround those 8,500 acres, would be made unavailable for grazing. Grazing management of these areas would be accomplished by using a combination of fencing and natural topographic barriers to make grazing enclosures, rather than directly fencing off the incompatible areas. As part of the historic Anza NHT, approximately 10 acres around North Tank would be directly fenced. Season of use adjustments on perennial allotments would be considered.
- Alternative D: All allotments currently open to livestock grazing in the SDNM would become unavailable as permits expire.
- Alternative E (Proposed RMP): Livestock grazing north of I-8 would continue to be allocated as perennial, perennial/ephemeral, or ephemeral, as appropriate to allotment-specific characteristics. Grazing allocations would be adjusted as needed, in accordance with grazing regulations and in response to the grazing determinations required by the Proclamation. The SDNM portion of the Conley Allotment (which is the allotment with the largest departure from Standard 3 and has the most acreage found to be incompatible with grazing) would be unavailable for grazing. This alternative includes the fenced enclosures of Alternative C.

2.11.2.3 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) Livestock Grazing

The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)

- Construct 21 reservoirs, 32 wells, and develop nine springs in areas of low forage production. (RM-1.5) Applies only to those present in the Saddle Mountain area.
- Allocate forage on all (33) allotments based on preference. Initiate monitoring studies that include actual use, utilization, trend in condition, and climate, using the Bureau's Selective Management Policy (Appendix 34 of the Decision Source) to set priorities. These studies will be used to adjust stocking rates, either upward or downward to meet multiple-resource management objectives (GR-13). Only a few allotments in the northwestern part of the Phoenix South Planning Area are addressed in the Decision Source.

Eastern Arizona Grazing Environmental Impact Statement and Rangeland Program Summary (1985)

- Land that is presently unleased for livestock use would remain unleased, with vegetation reserved for wildlife and non-consumptive use (GR-07). Applies only to those allotments in the eastern Lower Sonoran Planning Area covered by the Decision Source.
- Grazing management systems including rest rotation, deferred rotation, deferred, seasonal, short-duration or others which are various combinations of these would be implemented where needs are identified through monitoring (maintain and improve categorized allotments). On custodial allotments, grazing systems or season of use would be coordinated with the private landowners, State Land Department, or Soil Conservation Service (GR-11). Applies only to those allotments in the eastern Lower Sonoran Planning Area covered by the Decision Source.
- Fences would be needed to support grazing or land treatments and would be built to allow wildlife movement. Any fences that currently restrict wildlife movement would be modified to facilitate movement (GR-12). Applies only to those allotments in the eastern Lower Sonoran Planning Area covered by the Decision Source.
- Stocking additional animals would be allowed in the good ephemeral years where additional but unquantified animal-unit months (AUMs) of forage are available (GR-14). Applies only to those allotments in the eastern Phoenix South Planning Area covered by the Decision Source.
- Long-term target AUM figures (from increased vegetation production through revision of grazing systems already implemented, additional grazing systems and various land treatments) would be distributed on the basis of 40 percent to livestock and 60 percent to nonconsumptive uses (GR-18). Applies only to those allotments in the eastern Phoenix South Planning Area covered by the Decision Source.
- Grazing is authorized at the levels presented in the Range Program Summary (GR-19). Applies only to those allotments in the eastern Phoenix South Planning Area covered by the Decision Source.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Institute grazing-management practices that would ensure perpetuation of botanical diversity within the Coffee Pot Botanical ACEC (GR-02).
- Livestock facilities will not be developed in Table Top area where that development would serve to increase livestock use within the area proposed for designation (GR-03).
- Improvement and maintenance of the rangeland will be accomplished through the construction of new rangeland developments (see Table I in Decision Source) and through livestock adjustments if needed (GR-05). The majority of allotments in the Lower Sonoran Planning Area are covered by this Decision Source.

- Livestock facilities will not be developed where that development would serve to increase livestock use within the Coffee Pot Botanical ACEC being proposed for designation (GR-07).

Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (1997)

- Guideline 3-4: Intensity, season and frequency of use, and distribution of grazing use should provide for growth and reproduction of those plant species needed to reach desired plant-community objectives (GR-43).
- Guideline 3-5: Grazing on designated ephemeral (annual and perennial) rangeland may be authorized if the following conditions are met (GR-44):
 - Ephemeral vegetation is present in draws, washes, and under shrubs and has grown to useable levels at the time grazing begins;
 - Sufficient surface and subsurface soil moisture exists for continued plant growth;
 - Serviceable waters are capable of providing for proper grazing distribution;
 - Sufficient annual vegetation will remain on site to satisfy other resource concerns, (i.e., watershed, wildlife, wild horse and burro); and
 - Monitoring is conducted during grazing to determine if objectives are being met.

SDNM Current Management Guidance (2002)

- Laws, regulations, and policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering grazing leases on all lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply with regard to the lands in the Sonoran Desert National Monument;
- The grazing permits south of Interstate 8, in the SDNM, shall not be renewed at the end of their current term;
- Grazing in the SDNM north of Interstate 8 shall be allowed to continue only to the extent that the BLM determines that grazing is compatible with the paramount purpose of protecting the objects identified in the Proclamation (biological, scientific, and historic resources).

Cameron Allotment Amendment to the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (2004)

- The above amendment approved decisions to protect the endangered Sonoran Pronghorn which affected grazing management for four allotments in the Ajo area, including the closure of the Cameron allotment in its entirety. See **Section 2.10.12**, Wildlife and Special Status Species for specific decisions.

2.11.2.4 Action Alternatives for Livestock Grazing

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Manage livestock grazing in the Lower Sonoran Decision Area to provide for multiple uses while maintaining healthy ecosystems.
- Goal 2: Manage livestock grazing in the SDNM Decision Area to provide for multiple uses while maintaining healthy ecosystems and protecting the Monument's biological and cultural resources.

Allocations Summary

Table 2-23, Livestock Grazing Allocations for Lower Sonoran Decision Area, and **Table 2-24**, Livestock Grazing Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area, describe planning-level livestock grazing acres and AUM allocations in both Decision Areas.

Table 2-23
Livestock Grazing Allocations for Lower Sonoran Decision Area

Allocation	Alternatives				
	A (No Action)	B (Reduced Perennial)	C (Perennial Only/ No Ephemeral)	D (Closed)	E (Proposed RMP)
Available Acres	830,200	830,200	830,200	0	830,200
Unavailable Acres ¹	100,000	100,000	100,000	930,200	100,000
Total Acres	930,200	930,200	930,200	930,200	930,200
Total Proposed (AUMs ²)	17,541	10,431 ³	17,541	0	17,541

¹ Unavailable acres include approximately 58,700 acres of grazing allotments that have been closed (e.g. Cameron Allotment, Fred J. Weiler Green Belt, Sentinel Plain, other Ajo parcels, land leases, etc.) and approximately 41,200 acres that are otherwise unallocated or unavailable for grazing within the Lower Sonoran Decision Area.

² Animal Unit Month (AUM) means the amount of forage necessary for the sustenance of one cow or its equivalent for a period of 1 month.

³ Ephemeral AUMs are permitted on a case-by-case basis pursuant to the Special Ephemeral Rule. These AUMs are not included in the proposed perennial AUMs listed.

Table 2-24
Livestock Grazing Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area

Allocation	Alternatives				
	A (No Action)	B (Reduced Perennial)	C (Perennial Only/No Ephemeral)	D (Closed)	E (Proposed RMP)
Total Acres within SDNM	486,400	486,400	486,400	486,400	486,400
Unavailable Acres from Proclamation	155,900	155,900	155,900	155,900	155,900

Table 2-24
Livestock Grazing Allocations for the SDNM Decision Area

Allocation	Alternatives				
	A (No Action)	B (Reduced Perennial)	C (Perennial Only/No Ephemeral)	D (Closed)	E (Proposed RMP)
Unavailable Acres from Area A ¹	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000
Unavailable Acres ² from RMP Decisions	N/A	8,500 ³	44,800 ⁴	252,500	95,290 ⁵
<i>Total Unavailable Acres</i>	<i>233,900</i>	<i>242,400</i>	<i>278,700</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>329,190</i>
<i>Total Available Acres</i>	<i>252,500</i>	<i>244,000</i>	<i>207,700</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>157,210</i>
Total Proposed (AUMs ⁶)	8,703	5,321 ⁷	7,092	0	3,114

¹ Relinquished lands in Barry M. Goldwater Range south of I-8.

² In accordance with the Monument Proclamation the allotments or portions of allotments south of I-8, within SDNM, were made unavailable to livestock grazing when the permits expired.

³ Acreage includes approximately 8,500 acres [Bighorn 2,970 acres; Conley 5,520 acres; and Lower Vekol 10 acres (all rounded to nearest 10 acres)] or 3.4% of the area north of I-8 determined to be unavailable for livestock grazing through the compatibility analysis and would be fenced off (see **Map 2-8b**).

⁴ Acreage includes the 8,500 acres found to be incompatible with Monument objects, plus 36,300 acres [Bighorn 14,000 acres; Conley 21,700 acres; and Lower Vekol 600 acres (all rounded to nearest 100 acres)] connected or surrounding acres, using a combination of fencing and topographic barriers and wilderness boundaries, for a total of 44,800 acres of unavailable acres under Alternative C (see **Map 2-8c**).

⁵ Acreage includes all unavailable acreage identified in Alternative C above (44,800 acres) plus the remaining acres in the Conley Allotment (50,490 acres) from recommendations in the grazing Compatibility Analysis (**Appendix E**, Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument). All unavailable acres would remain unallocated for livestock grazing, and its forage and other vegetation would be reserved for wildlife habitat.

⁶ AUMs shown are prorated and reduced by 7,884 from the total permitted use due to the allotment closures south of I-8. In Alternatives B and E, AUMs were further prorated using current data compared to forage allocations suggested in the Lower Gila South RMP Resource Protection Alternative (see **Section F.6** in **Appendix F** for more details).

⁷ Ephemeral AUMs are permitted on a case-by-case basis pursuant to the Special Ephemeral Rule.

Table 2-25, Livestock Grazing Acres for the SDNM North of Interstate 8 Only, and **Table 2-26**, Permitted Animal Unit Months for the SDNM, describe implementation-level livestock grazing acres and AUM allocations by allotment in the SDNM Decision Area.

Table 2-25
Livestock Grazing Acres for the SDNM North of Interstate 8 Only

Allotments	Alternatives (BLM Acres) ¹									
	A (No Action)		B (Reduced Perennial)		C (Perennial Only/ No Ephemeral)		D (Closed)		E (Proposed RMP)	
	Avail.	Un-avail.	Avail.	Un-avail. ²	Avail.	Un-avail. ³	Avail.	Un-avail.	Avail.	Un-avail. ³
Arnold	1,609	0	1,609	0	1,609	0	0	1,609	1,609	0
Beloat	33,600	0	33,600	0	33,600	0	0	33,600	33,600	0
Big Horn	92,204	0	89,230	2,974	75,230	16,974	0	92,204	75,230	16,974
Conley	77,708	0	72,191	5,517	50,491	27,217	0	77,708	0	77,708

Table 2-25
Livestock Grazing Acres for the SDNM North of Interstate 8 Only

Allotments	Alternatives (BLM Acres) ¹									
	A (No Action)		B (Reduced Perennial)		C (Perennial Only/ No Ephemeral)		D (Closed)		E (Proposed RMP)	
	Avail.	Un-avail.	Avail.	Un-avail. ²	Avail.	Un-avail. ³	Avail.	Un-avail.	Avail.	Un-avail. ³
Hazen	31,926	0	31,926	0	31,926	0	0	31,926	31,926	0
Lower Vekol	15,409	0	15,402	7	14,802	607	0	15,409	14,802	607
<i>Total</i>	<i>252,456</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>243,958</i>	<i>8,498</i>	<i>207,658</i>	<i>44,798</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>252,456</i>	<i>157,167</i>	<i>95,289</i>

¹ These numbers reflect the numbers from the Land Health Evaluations and are estimated. The acreage totals shown in **Table 2-24**, Livestock Grazing Allocations for the SDNM, were rounded up for the land use plan-level decisions.

² Alternative B unavailable numbers come from the acres determined to be incompatible with Monument objects from the Compatibility Analysis in **Appendix E**, Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument.

³ Alternatives C and E unavailable numbers come from the acres determined to be incompatible with Monument objects from the Compatibility Analysis in **Appendix E**, Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument, and the acreage determined to become unavailable due to the projected boundary closures of the area based on fencing and topographic boundaries.

Table 2-26
Permitted Animal Unit Months for the SDNM

Allotments	Alternatives				
	A (No Action)	B (Reduced Perennial)	C (Perennial Only/ No Ephemeral)	D (Closed)	E (Proposed RMP) (% Reduction from Alternative A)
Arnold	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Beloat	776	541	936	0	552 (29%)
Big Horn ¹	2,812	2,031	2,278	0	1,633 (42%)
Conley ²	3,403	1,572	2,212	0	0 (100%)
Hazen	886	531	873	0	400 (55%)
Lower Vekol	826	646	793	0	529 (36%)
Total AUMs ³	8,703	5,321	7,092	0	3,114 (64%)

¹ The AUMs for the Big Horn allotment in Alternative A reflect the reduction in permitted use due to the closure of the portion of the allotment south of Interstate-8.

² Acres within the SDNM portion of the Conley allotment are proposed to be made unavailable for the following reasons:

- It has the largest departure from achieving Land Health Standard 3 of all other SDNM allotments,
- It has the most acreage found incompatible with the Monument proclamation, and
- Future management options for the remaining available portion would be limited due to the amount and location of pasture fencing that would be required to be placed around the non-achieving acres.

³ AUMs shown are prorated and reduced by 7,884 from the total permitted use due to the allotment closures south of I-8. In Alternatives B and E, AUMs were further prorated using current data compared to forage allocations suggested in the Lower Gila South RMP Resource Protection Alternative.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

**Table 2-27
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration**

Decision Area		Alternatives			Management Actions and Allowable Uses	
Goal 1: Manage livestock grazing to provide forage for multiple uses while maintaining healthy ecosystems.						
Objective 1.1: Livestock grazing use and associated practices would be managed in a manner consistent with other multiple use needs and other desired resource condition objectives to ensure that the health of rangeland resources and ecosystems are maintained or improved. Management would achieve, or make significant progress toward achieving, Land Health Standards and produce a wide range of public values such as wildlife habitat, livestock forage, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds.						
LS		B	C		E	GR-1.1.1: Public lands would be allocated and available for livestock grazing as shown in Table 2-23 and Maps 2-8b, c and e .
LS				D		GR-1.1.2: All public land acres currently available to grazing would become unavailable when current permits expire.
LS		B				GR-1.1.3: All perennial-ephemeral and perennial allotments available to grazing would receive a reduction in permitted use as reflected in Table 2-23 . Total proposed AUMs in the Lower Sonoran would be reduced by approximately 41 percent.
LS			C			GR-1.1.4: All perennial-ephemeral and ephemeral allotments that are available to grazing would be reclassified as perennial only. Ephemeral authorizations would not be permitted on these allotments
LS				D		GR-1.1.5: No AUMs would be permitted for allotments currently available to grazing when permits expire.
LS					E	GR-1.1.6: All allotments that are currently available to grazing would remain open to grazing under their current classifications and permitted AUMs as reflected in Table 2-23 (see Appendix P , Grazing Allotment Information).
General Management Actions						
LS		B	C		E	GR-1.1.7: The portions of the Santa Rosa Allotment south of I-8 and outside Monument boundaries would remain available for livestock grazing if fencing is built to exclude SDNM from the allotment.
LS		B	C		E	GR-1.1.8: The portion of the Big Horn allotment south of I-8 and outside of the SDNM would remain available for livestock grazing if fencing is built to exclude SDNM from the allotment.
LS		B	C		E	GR-1.1.9: The portion of the Table Top allotment south of Interstate 8 and outside of SDNM, would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
LS		B			E	GR-1.1.10: The portion of the Table Top allotment north of I-8, outside SDNM, would be classified as Perennial-ephemeral. The authorized permitted use would be 148 AUMs.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	GR-1.1.11: All existing water developments would be evaluated, and modified as necessary, to provide the maximum benefit and minimum impact to priority wildlife and special status species.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	GR-1.1.12: Grazing management on allotments categorized as “Maintain” and “Improve” may include rest rotation, deferred rotation, deferred, seasonal, short duration or other management practices to be implemented

Table 2-27
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration

Decision Area		Alternatives			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
					where needs are identified through monitoring. On “Custodial” allotments, grazing systems or season of use would be coordinated with the permittee, Arizona State Land Department, and/or Natural Resources Conservation Service.
LS	SDNM	B	C	E	GR-1.1.13: If grazing availability or classification differs for the Big Horn, Conley, Lower Vekol, Hazen, Belloat, and Arnold allotments outside SDNM versus inside the Monument boundaries, fencing or other control mechanisms would be installed to allow for management of Monument lands separately from the rest of the allotment before grazing could continue.
LS	SDNM	B		E	GR-1.1.14: Allotments may be classified as ephemeral in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule published December 7, 1968 through Rangeland Health Assessments during the permit renewal process. The BLM has established criteria and SOPs (see Appendix H, Best Management Practices and Standard Operating Procedures) based upon the Special Rule through which allotments can be classified and managed as ephemeral. These criteria include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rangelands are within the hot desert biome; • Average annual precipitation is less than eight inches; • Rangelands produce less than 25 pounds per acre of desirable perennial forage; • The vegetative community is composed of less than five-percent desirable forage species; • The rangelands are generally below 3,500 feet in elevation; • Annual production is highly unpredictable and forage availability is of a short duration; • Usable forage production depends on abundant moisture and other favorable climatic conditions; and • Rangelands lack potential to improve existing ecological status and produce a dependable supply of forage through intensive rangeland management practices.
LS	SDNM	B	C	E	GR-1.1.15: The Arizona Guidelines for Grazing Administration, as approved in the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (1997), would apply where appropriate to all livestock grazing activities (Appendix L).
LS	SDNM	B	C	E	GR-1.1.16: Land not allocated for livestock use would remain unallocated for this use and its forage and other vegetation would be reserved for wildlife and non-consumptive uses.
LS	SDNM	B	C	E	GR-1.1.17: If an evaluation of land health standards identifies an allotment where land health standards cannot be achieved under any level or management of livestock use and where current grazing use has been identified as the causal factor, then decisions identifying those areas as available for livestock grazing would be revisited.

**Table 2-27
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration**

Decision Area		Alternatives			Management Actions and Allowable Uses	
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	GR-1.1.18: Should a livestock grazing permit be relinquished, the allotment and associated resources, and public uses would be evaluated to determine the appropriate allocation of available forage.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	GR-1.1.19: One-time travel off of designated routes may be approved with written authorization from the authorized officer to access sick or injured livestock.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	GR-1.1.20: Construction of new livestock waters in Category I and Category II desert tortoise habitat and in bighorn sheep habitat would be addressed on a case-by-case basis.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	GR-1.1.21: Range improvement permits and cooperative range improvement agreements shall specify the standards, design, construction and maintenance criteria for the range improvements and other additional conditions and stipulations or modifications deemed necessary. The extent, location and timing of such actions would be based on allotment-specific management objectives adopted through the evaluation process, interdisciplinary development and analysis of proposed actions, and funding.

Goal 2: Manage livestock grazing to provide for multiple uses while maintaining healthy ecosystems and protecting the Monument's biological and cultural resources.

Objective 2.1: Public lands in SDNM north of I-8 available to livestock use would be managed to achieve or make significant progress toward achieving Land Health Standards to ensure that the health of the biological resources are maintained or improved. Livestock grazing use and associated practices would be managed in a manner consistent with other multiple use needs and other desired resource condition objectives to ensure that the health of rangeland resources and ecosystems are maintained or improved.

	SDNM	B	C	D	E	GR-2.1.1: Pursuant to the Monument Proclamation, the grazing permits for the allotments south of I-8, within SDNM, were not renewed upon expiration. The public lands South of I-8, within SDNM, would remain unavailable for livestock use and the grazing preferences, attached to the base properties, for permitted use on the allotments would be cancelled. Forage previously allocated for livestock grazing (7,255 AUMs) would be available for other resource uses such as wildlife habitat, watershed values, recreation, etc.
	SDNM	B				GR-2.1.2: Domestic goats or sheep would not be permitted within nine miles of suitable bighorn sheep habitat or within allotments that contain suitable bighorn sheep habitat.
	SDNM		C	D	E	GR-2.1.3: Domestic goats or sheep would not be permitted.

Implementation-Level Decisions for the SDNM

Proposed Changes to Available Acres by Allotment within the SDNM

	SDNM	B				GR-2.1.4: 8,500 acres found to be incompatible with protecting the objects of the Monument due to current livestock use as specified in the Proposed Compatibility Analysis would become unavailable to livestock grazing use within allotments north of I-8. Allotment-specific unavailable acres (rounded to nearest 10 acres):
--	------	---	--	--	--	--

Table 2-27
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration

Decision Area	Alternatives				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,970 acres within the Big Horn allotment • 5,520 acres within the Conley allotment, and • 10 acres within the Lower Vekol allotment. See Map 2-8b and Appendix E , Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument.
	SDNM		C		GR-2.1.5: 44,800 acres would become unavailable to livestock grazing use within allotments north of I-8 through a combination of fencing, natural barriers, and wilderness boundaries. These acres include the 8,500 acres determined to be incompatible with the objects of the Monument due to current livestock use, plus 36,300 connected or surrounding acres. Allotment-specific unavailable acres (rounded to nearest 10 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16,970 acres within the Big Horn allotment, • 27,220 acres within the Conley allotment, and • 610 acres within the Lower Vekol allotment. (Total of 8,500 incompatible acres and 36,300 pasture fencing acres) See Map 2-8c and Appendix E , Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument
	SDNM		D		GR-2.1.6: All public land acres currently available to grazing in the SDNM would become unavailable as current permits expire.
	SDNM		E		GR-2.1.7: 95,290 acres would become unavailable to livestock grazing use within allotments north of I-8 through a combination of fencing and natural barriers. These acres include the 8,500 acres determined to be incompatible with the objects of the Monument due to current livestock use, the acres made unavailable in Alternative C, and an additional 86,790 connected or surrounding acres. Allotment-specific unavailable acres(rounded to nearest 10 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16,970 acres within the Big Horn allotment • 77,710 acres within the Conley allotment, and • 610 acres within the Lower Vekol allotment. (Total of 8,500 incompatible acres, 36,300 pasture fencing acres and remaining 50,490 acres in Conley allotment) See Map 2-8e and Appendix E , Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the Sonoran Desert National Monument
Proposed Changes to AUMs by Allotment within the SDNM					
	SDNM	B		E	GR-2.1.8: All perennial-ephemeral and perennial allotments that are available to grazing within the SDNM would receive a reduction in permitted use, as described in Table 2-26 . Actions result in approximate 39% AUM reduction in Alternative B and 64% AUM reduction in alternative E due to closure of Conley allotment. Rationale for this includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of desirable forage species are perennial browse species and winter/spring annuals; • Reduces competition with special status wildlife species considered

**Table 2-27
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Grazing Administration**

Decision Area		Alternatives			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
					to be Monument objects (Sonoran desert tortoise, Desert bighorn sheep, etc.); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported by inventory and monitoring data; and Supported by the Arizona Land Health Evaluation for the SDNM and the Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the SDNM, Arizona, April 2011 (Appendices E and F).
	SDNM		C		GR-2.1.9: Perennial-ephemeral allotments that are available to grazing would be reclassified as perennial only and AUMs would be adjusted due to acreage reductions (Map 2-8c). Ephemeral authorizations would not be permitted on any allotment classified as perennial. (See Table 3-16 in Chapter 3 for actual ephemeral use from 1998 to 2007.)
	SDNM			D	GR-2.1.10: No AUMs would be permitted for allotments currently available to grazing when permits expire.
	SDNM			E	GR-2.1.11: The period and level of use (approx. 65 percent of permitted use) would be adjusted to primarily fall-winter season (Oct. 1 – April 30) and reduced use levels (approx. 35 percent of permitted use) during the summer season (May 1 – Sept. 30). The rationale for this includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bimodal precipitation pattern provides more consistent and widespread rainfall during winter season, when the majority of the forage is produced; Majority of desirable forage species are perennial browse species and winter/spring annuals; Provides for rest period for key browse species; Reduces competition with wildlife during critical hot summer months; Reflects general pattern of current grazing management practices; Supported by inventory and monitoring data; and Supported by the Arizona Land Health Evaluation for the SDNM and the Proposed Compatibility Analysis: Livestock Grazing on the SDNM, Arizona, April 2011 (Appendices E and F).

Administrative Actions

- Existing range developments in areas not allocated for livestock use may be removed if not necessary for management of other resources.
- Develop a monitoring plan for allotments as needed to determine and track ecological condition and trend.

Administrative Actions in the SDNM Decision Area

Livestock management changes may be made based on assessment, inventory, or monitoring data. Except under Alternative D, develop and implement a monitoring plan on the SDNM to determine and track ecological condition and trend. The plan would include:

- Monitoring previously established study sites in allotments that would continue to be grazed, and establishing new key areas as needed. Data would be used to support grazing management decisions.
- Monitoring previously-established study sites in the allotments not to be grazed and establishing new sites as needed. Location of sites should be established based on resource management goals. Data would be used for comparison to grazed areas and historical data to track resource responses to management changes.
- Establish frequency and intensity of monitoring effort.
- BLM would develop a monitoring program based upon the land health evaluation methodology to determine any effects on Monument objects, not limited to livestock use.

2.11.3 MINERALS MANAGEMENT

The BLM supports mineral exploration and development on public lands in keeping with its multiple-use mandate. Unless otherwise restricted, all federal mineral estates administered within the Planning Area would be available for orderly and efficient development of mineral resources. Exploration and development would be conducted in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies, and in conformance with the approved resource-management plan. Restrictions and stipulations would be applied on a case-by-case basis.

Identified mineral resources are classified according to the BLM's system as described in Manual 3031 (BLM 1985a) and Manual 3060 (DOI BLM undated). Mineral and mining laws and policy are implemented through the BLM's minerals management regulations which are contained in the 3000 series of volume 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations. A mineral resource potential report was prepared for the Planning Area (URS Corporation 2004). Mineral resources are categorized as follows:

- Locatable Minerals: metallic minerals including, but not exclusively, gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, and uranium, as well as some non-metallic minerals such as alunite, asbestos, barite, gypsum, and mica, and also unique and uncommon varieties of stone and other construction materials (43 CFR 3800 and 43 CFR 3715).
- Leasable Minerals: mostly, but not exclusively, energy minerals, including fluid minerals such as oil and gas and geothermal resources, and some solid minerals such as coal, sodium, and potash (43 CFR 3100, 43 CFR 3200, 43 CFR 3400, and 43 CFR 3500).
- Mineral Material Disposals (saleables): common varieties of construction materials such as sand, gravel, cinders, decorative rock, and building stone (43 CFR 3600).

2.11.3.1 Existing Management Decision, Alternative A (No Action)

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)

- Restrict any actions or withdrawal in the Planning Area that would “segregate” leasable minerals unless there is strong evidence that the area is not conducive to mineralization. Leave the Planning Area open to mineral leasing. (MM-03) Applicable to the northwestern Lower Sonoran Planning Area near Saddle Mountain.
- Leave Planning Area open to mineral location and development. (MM-05) Applicable to the northwestern Lower Sonoran Planning Area near Saddle Mountain.
- Leave Planning Area open to mineral leasing. (MM-06) Applicable to the northwestern Lower Sonoran Planning Area near Saddle Mountain.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Mitigate mining practices that adversely impact unique botanical and animal habitat in Vekol Valley ACEC. (MM-15) Decision still applicable to area although not being carried forward as an ACEC.
- Demand for saleable minerals will be met by sales or free-use permits on a case-by-case basis. (MM-16)

Phoenix Resource Management Plan (1989)

- All land in the RMP/EIS area would remain open to leasing. Should exploration and/or development of leasable resources be pursued, special stipulations will be incorporated into the lease agreement after the results of site-specific environmental assessments for each action are known. (MM-02) Applies to the eastern Lower Sonoran Planning Area, including the Apache Junction and Globe/Miami areas.
- Mining activity within the Planning Area would continue to be administered on a case-by-case basis. (MM-09) Applies to the eastern Lower Sonoran Planning Area, including the Apache Junction and Globe/Miami areas.
- Sales of mineral materials to the public would continue to be administered on a case-by-case basis. (MM-10) Applies to the eastern Lower Sonoran Planning Area, including the Apache Junction and Globe/Miami areas.
- Free-use permits would continue to be issued to the state and local communities as the need arises. (MM-11) Applies to the eastern Lower Sonoran Planning Area, including the Apache Junction and Globe/Miami areas.

SDNM Current Management Guidance

- All federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the Monument are appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, leasing, or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing. Unless otherwise specified in legislation or proclamation, all valid existing rights will be recognized in accordance with policy. Mining claims that predate the Monument designation have valid rights if those rights continue to be supported by a discovery. (Not numbered)

Lower Gila Resource Management Plan Amendment (2005)

- All lands in the Planning Area are considered open for oil and gas leasing unless specifically ruled closed. Approximately 375,000 acres of federal minerals in wilderness are closed to oil and gas leasing. The approximately 1.6 million acres of federal minerals remaining in the Planning Area are open to oil and gas leasing. Conditions of approval and special stipulations will be developed and incorporated as part of any operational permit after site-specific environmental analyses are completed and documented per the National Environmental Policy Act. Stipulations will mitigate impacts to special status species, cultural areas, and other resources affected by leasing-related activities. (MM-1)

2.11.3.2 Action Alternatives for Minerals Management**Program Goals**

- Goal 1: Provide opportunities for exploration and development of energy and mineral resources.

Allocations Summary

Table 2-28, Acres of Public Lands Available for Mineral Activity by Alternative enumerates the acreages available for minerals activities for each category (locatables, leasables, mineral material [saleables]) under each alternative. Lands with BLM federal reserved mineral estate and non-federal surface (state, local government, and private lands) are shown only for Alternative A but remain the same under all alternatives. The BLM has limited authority to manage non-BLM surface and there are no proposals for the withdrawal of BLM managed mineral estate under non-federal surface.

Table 2-28
Acres of Public Lands Available for Mineral Activity by Alternative

	Alternative (BLM acres (percent))				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Acres of BLM-administered Surface Lands/Subsurface Mineral Estate					
Existing Closed*	625,000 (47%)				
Existing Open	713,300 (53%)				

Table 2-28
Acres of Public Lands Available for Mineral Activity by Alternative

	Alternative (BLM acres (percent))				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,338,300 (100%)</i>				
* The Existing Closed total includes the SDNM (461,000 ac.), Lower Sonoran wilderness areas (89,200 ac.), Sentinel Plain, Fred J. Weiler Green Belt, and Painted Rock Dam area (64,300 ac. combined), and R&PP leases (10,500 ac).					
Locatable Minerals					
Additional acreage recommended for withdrawal under Action Alternatives	--	2,350 (<1%)	2,300 (<1%)	393,900 (29%)	2,300 (<1%)
<i>Total Closed</i>	<i>625,000 (47%)</i>	<i>627,350 (47%)</i>	<i>627,300 (47%)</i>	<i>1,018,900 (76%)</i>	<i>627,300 (47%)</i>
Total Available (Open) with Standard Mitigation Measures Applied	713,300 (53%)	710,950 (53%)	711,000 (53%)	319,400 (24%)	711,000 (53%)
Leasable Minerals					
Additional acreage closed under Action Alternatives	--	2,300 (<1%)	2,300 (<1%)	584,900 (44%)	2,300 (<1%)
<i>Total Closed</i>	<i>625,000 (47%)</i>	<i>627,300 (47%)</i>	<i>627,300 (47%)</i>	<i>1,209,900 (90%)</i>	<i>627,300 (47%)</i>
Open with No Surface Occupancy	--	20,900 (2%)	25,600 (2%)	0 (0%)	23,800 (2%)
Open with Mitigation	287,100	280,700 (21%)	396,800 (30%)	88,500 (7%)	263,700 (20%)
Open with Standard Stipulations	--	409,400 (31%)	288,600 (22%)	39,900 (3%)	423,500 (32%)
<i>Total Open</i>	<i>713,300 (53%)</i>	<i>711,000 (53%)</i>	<i>711,000 (53%)</i>	<i>128,400 (10%)</i>	<i>711,000 (53%)</i>
Mineral Material Disposals (Saleables)					
Additional acreage closed under Action Alternatives	--	24,700 (2%)	193,300 (14%)	556,000 (42%)	155,800 (12%)
<i>Total Closed</i>	<i>625,000 (47%)</i>	<i>649,700 (49%)</i>	<i>818,300 (61%)</i>	<i>1,181,000 (88%)</i>	<i>780,800 (58%)</i>
Open with Mitigation	--	280,500 (21%)	238,600 (18%)	95,700 (7%)	169,900 (13%)
Open with Standard Stipulations	--	408,100 (30%)	281,400 (21%)	61,600 (5%)	387,600 (29%)
<i>Total Available</i>	<i>713,300</i>	<i>688,600</i>	<i>520,000</i>	<i>157,300</i>	<i>557,500</i>

Table 2-28
Acres of Public Lands Available for Mineral Activity by Alternative

	Alternative (BLM acres (percent))				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
	(53%)	(51%)	(39%)	(12%)	(42%)
Acres of Non-BLM Surface Land/BLM-administered Subsurface** (Split Estate)					
Closed (Total)	71,000 (34%)				
Open (Total)	139,000 (66%)				
<i>Total</i>	<i>210,000 (100%)</i>				

** The definition for Non-BLM Surface lands means lands not owned or administered by BLM, such as lands owned or administered by other federal agencies, the State of Arizona, local municipalities, and private parties.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-29, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Minerals Management, describes management and allowable uses for minerals management.

Table 2-29
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Minerals Management

Decision Area	Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Provide opportunities for exploration and development of energy and mineral resources						
Objective 1.1: Utilize mineral potential determinations (high, medium, and low) during the evaluation of all proposed actions for all resources. Reduce or mitigate hindrances to mineral development, particularly in areas of moderate to high potential. Mitigate impacts to other resource values.						
All Minerals						
LS	B	C	D	E		MM-1.1.1: Minerals activities would be managed to provide maximum protection for other resources while attempting to allow sufficient mineral development to occur to meet public demand.
LS	B	C	D	E		MM-1.1.2: Should lands now closed to mineral activity be opened, these lands, including the mineral estate, would be managed to be consistent with the decisions made in this plan.
LS	B	C	D	E		MM-1.1.3: On split-estate lands where the BLM manages the federal mineral estate but the surface is not in federal ownership, the BLM would manage the minerals in accordance with existing laws and regulations while providing the surface owner input into the management process.
LS	B	C	D	E		MM-1.1.4: Within ACECs, WHAs, SCRMA, SRMAs, ERMA, and lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics, minerals-related actions would be approved in a manner and with mitigation that maintains the resource values for which the special designation or allocation was made while not denying valid existing rights for locatable minerals. Leasable or saleable minerals actions would be severely restricted or prohibited

**Table 2-29
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Minerals Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						depending on the management allocation.
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>MM-1.1.5: The following areas would remain closed to all forms of mining, including locatable mineral entry, under the mining laws, mineral leasing, and mineral material disposals for the life of the plan (Maps 2-9a-e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated wilderness areas, • Fred J. Weiler Green Belt RCA (PLO 1015 lands), • Painted Rock Dam power site withdrawal area, • Sentinel Plain withdrawal area, • San Tan Mountains SRMA (Alternative B), • Bureau of Reclamation withdrawn lands, and • Lands leased under the R&PP Act, including San Tan Mountains Regional Park (Alternatives A, C, D and E).
Locatable Minerals						
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>MM-1.1.7: All BLM-administered lands would be open to locatable mineral entry under the mining laws except the following areas, which would be recommended for withdrawal for all alternatives unless otherwise noted (Maps 2-9b-e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail and Management Area, • Select high potential route segments of the Butterfield Trail, • Painted Rock Campground and Petroglyph Site, • Quartz Peak trailhead, • Sundad and Butterfield West proposed Public Use Sites (not more than 5 acres each) (Alternatives B, C and E), • Gunsight Wash Campground (Alternatives B, C and E), • Ajo 40-acre open use OHV area (Alternative B), and • ACECs: Cuerda de Lena, Coffeepot, Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails, and Saddle Mountain (Alternative D only).
LS		B	C	D	E	MM-1.1.8: Notices and plans of operations would be processed according to the 43 CFR 3802 and 3809 regulations.
LS		B	C	D	E	MM-1.1.9: The use and occupancy of public lands would be managed to that which is reasonably incident to prospecting, mining or processing operations under the mining laws (43 CFR 3715).
Leasable Minerals (Fluid energy minerals, including geothermal resources and sodium)						
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>MM-1.1.10: All BLM-administered lands not withdrawn or segregated from minerals actions would be open for mineral leasing in accordance with resource management objectives except the following areas, which would be closed for all alternatives unless otherwise noted (Maps 2-10a-e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lands with existing segregations or withdrawals (see MM-1.1.5), • Painted Rock Campground, • Gunsight Wash Campground SRMA (Alternatives B, C and E),

Table 2-29
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Minerals Management

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail and Management Area (Alternative D only), Gila Bend wildlife habitat area (Alternative D only), Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only), and All ACECs: Cuerda de Lena, Coffeepot, Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails, and Saddle Mountain (Alternative D only).
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>MM-1.1.1.1: The following BLM-administered lands would be open for mineral leasing but with a No Surface Occupancy stipulation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail and Management Area (Alternatives B, C and E), Select high-potential route segments of the Butterfield Trail, Sundad and Butterfield West proposed Public Use Sites (not more than 5 acres each) (Alternatives B, C and E), Selected parcels in the Lower Gila Terrace and Historic Trails SCRMA (Alternative C only), 40-acre Ajo open use area (Alternative B only), and Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails ACEC (Alternative E only).
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>MM-1.1.1.2: Leases would be issued for fluid energy minerals with appropriate stipulations. Site-specific actions would be addressed such as geophysical exploration, approval or disapproval of applications for permit to drill, well siting, tank-battery placement, and pipeline routing would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and include appropriate restrictions or conditions of approval.</p>
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>MM-1.1.1.3: Mineral-use authorizations for non-energy leasables would be issued for prospecting permits, exploration licenses, preference-right leases, competitive leases, lease modifications, and use permits subject to appropriate restrictions and stipulations to protect other resources.</p>
Mineral Material Disposals (Saleables)						
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>MM-1.1.1.4: All BLM-administered lands not recommended for withdrawal or segregated from minerals actions would be open to discretionary mineral materials disposal via sales or free-use permits on a case-by-case basis in accordance with resource management objectives. Those lands unavailable for mineral materials disposal for all alternatives unless otherwise noted are as follows (for specific acreages for each alternative see Table 2-28; see also Maps 2-11a-e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lands with existing segregations or withdrawals (see MM-1.1.6), Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail and Management Area, Select high-potential route segments of the Butterfield Trail, Painted Rock Campground and Petroglyph Site,

Table 2-29
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Minerals Management

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quartz Peak trailhead, • Sundad and Butterfield West proposed Public Use Sites (not more than 5 acres each) (Alternatives B, C, and E), • Gunsight Wash Campground (Alternatives B, C, and E), • Ajo 40-acre open use OHV area (Alternative B), • Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics, • Portions of the Gila River Terraces and Lower Gila Historic Trails SCRMA and ACEC, • Cuerda de Lena, Saddle Mountain, and Coffeepot ACECs (Alternatives D and E), • Desert tortoise Categories I, II, and III habitats (Alternative D) and • Desert tortoise Categories I and II habitats (Alternatives B, C, and E [if no-net-loss stipulation is not met]), • Within ¼ mile of known active cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl nest site from February 1 through August 31 (Alternatives B, C, and E) • Within ¼-mile of known active cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl nest sites from February 1 through September 15 (Alternative D).
LS		B	C	D	E	MM-1.1.15: Common-use areas and community pits would be established. Exploration for, and disposal of, mineral materials would also be allowed through exploration permits, free-use permits, and competitive and noncompetitive sales subject to appropriate restrictions and stipulations to protect other resources.

Administrative Actions

Specific to the SDNM Decision Area

- Recognize the superior right to explore for and mine mineral resources on those split estate lands where the BLM manages the surface and the subsurface estate is owned by the state of Arizona or private entities. Develop a MOU with the state to establish procedures to protect SDNM resources from the effects of exploration and mining on SDNM to the greatest extent possible.

2.11.4 RECREATION MANAGEMENT

In the DRMP, in accordance with Instruction Memorandum No. 2006-060, the “benefits-based-management” approach was used to establish proposed management goals, objectives, and prescribed actions. This approach transitioned recreation land use planning from a traditional activity-based management approach to one that emphasized managing for specific individual, social, and economic

benefits beginning with the identification of market-based strategies and niches. However, in August of 2011, shortly before the printing of the DRMP, Instruction Memorandum No. 2011-004 was issued. In this new guidance, BLM revised the policy for recreation land use planning, shifting from the benefits-based-management back to more outcomes-focused management. Detailed instructions outlining how to fully implement the new guidance for land use planning is still being drafted; however, the IM did establish a three-tier system for allocating lands managed for recreation, replacing the two-tier system. The major change now incorporates three classifications to allocate lands managed for recreation. These are Special Management Recreation Areas (SRMA), Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMA), and Undesignated Lands (UL).

SRMAs are administrative units where the existing or proposed recreation opportunities and recreation setting characteristics are recognized for their unique value and importance, and/or distinctiveness, especially as compared to other areas used for recreation. In contrast to the former benefits-based-management policy, within an SRMA, recreation management is recognized as the predominant planning focus where specific recreation opportunities and recreation setting characteristics are managed and protected on a long-term basis.

In contrast, ERMAs are administrative units that require specific management consideration in order to address recreation use, demand, or recreation and visitor services program investments. They are managed to support and sustain the principal recreation activities and the associated qualities and conditions of the ERMA. Management of ERMA areas is commensurate with the management of other resources and resource uses.

BLM-administered lands that are not designated as Resource Management Areas (RMAs), Undesignated Lands, are managed to meet basic recreation and visitor services and resource stewardship needs. Recreation is not emphasized; however, recreation activities may occur. The recreation and visitor services are managed to allow recreation uses that are not in conflict with the primary uses of these lands.

To effectively manage for differing expected outcomes within an RMA, SRMAs and ERMAs may be subdivided into separate Recreation Management Zones (RMZs). The RMZs provide for management emphasis tailored to expected recreation opportunities and outcomes over two or more specific geographic areas within an individual RMA.

Based on comments received during the DRMP public comment review, the recreation allocations and decisions were reviewed and revised to reflect changes in planning approach between the old and new policies. **Table 2-30**, Comparison of Draft and Proposed Recreation Management Areas by Decision Area, reflects the changes made to the SRMA and ERMA allocations based on the new guidance. The action alternatives attempt to address the new approach and alternatives for management of recreation that were brought forward through public scoping, internal management analysis, and public comments received on the DRMP.

Table 2-30
Comparison of Draft and Proposed Recreation Management Areas by Decision Area

Recreation Management Area/Zone	Alternative				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Lower Sonoran SRMAs					
Ajo SRMA	SRMA (both)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)
Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA (formerly Buckeye Hills East RMZ)	N/A	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)
Gila Trails SRMA (Lower Sonoran portion)	SRMA (both)	Within Portions of Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA (PRMP) Within Portions of Lower Gila Historic Trails SRMA (DRMP)			
Gunsight Wash SRMA (formerly an RMZ)	N/A	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)
Painted Rock SRMA (formerly an RMZ within Lower Gila Historic Trails SRMA)	N/A	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	SRMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)
Painted Rock Mountains SRMA¹	N/A	None (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	None (both)	None (both)	None (both)
Saddle Mountain SRMA (formerly an SRMA)	SRMA (both)	SRMA (both)	SRMA (both)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)
Sentinel Plain (formerly an ERMA)	SRMA (both)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)
San Tan Mountains (formerly an ERMA)	N/A	SRMA (both)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)
Lower Sonoran ERMAs					
Ajo ERMA (formerly an SRMA)	SRMA (both)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)
Ajo Desert Zone	N/A	RMZ (both)	RMZ (both)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	RMZ (both)

Table 2-30
Comparison of Draft and Proposed Recreation Management Areas by Decision Area

Recreation Management Area/Zone	Alternative				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Ajo Gateway Zone	N/A	RMZ (both)	RMZ (both)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	RMZ (both)
Arlington Trails ERMA <i>(formerly an SRMA)</i>	N/A	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	In Gila Bend Mtns ERMA (PRMP)/ In Gila Bend Mtns SRMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)
Buckeye Hills West ERMA <i>(formerly an RMZ within Buckeye Hills SRMA)</i>	N/A	ERMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) RMZ (DRMP)
Gila Bend Mountains ERMA <i>(formerly an SRMA)</i>	N/A	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)
Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA <i>(formerly Gila Trails SRMA in Alt. A and an SRMA in Alts. B-E)</i>	N/A	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)
SDNM SRMAs					
Gila Trails SRMA <i>(SDNM portion)</i>	SRMA (both)	Portions of Juan Bautista de Anza NHT RMZ (both)			
SDNM ERMAs					
Sonoran Desert ERMA <i>(formerly SRMA)</i>	N/A	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	UL (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)	ERMA (PRMP) SRMA (DRMP)
Desert Back Country RMZ	N/A	RMZ (both)	RMZ (both)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	RMZ (both)
Juan Bautista de Anza NHT RMZ	N/A	RMZ (both)	RMZ (both)	UL (PRMP) ERMA (DRMP)	RMZ (both)

* UL = Undesignated Lands

† The Painted Rock Mountains SRMA was deleted in the PRMP for all alternatives. Wilderness inventory findings concluded that the area did not support motorized-focused uses for which the SRMA was originally proposed.

Note: There is no Gila River RMZ in the PRMP; it is now incorporated within Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA.

2.11.4.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Recreation Management

The following list is a comprehensive compilation of land use planning decisions (and their identifying planning decision number) currently in effect that constitutes the existing management situation for the Decision Areas. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives. They are restated as new action alternatives where applicable. Decisions specific to travel management would be found in **Section 2.11.5**, Travel Management.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (Goldwater Amendment) (1990)

(Applicable to public lands in the Sand Tank Mountains, "Area A" within the SDNM, lands south of Interstate 8 referred to as the Sentinel Plain, and selected parcels near the Ajo airport.)

- Establish the Sentinel Plain Lava Flow SRMA and prepare a recreation area management plan. Implement management prescriptions to maintain recreation, geologic, and educational features associated with the Sentinel Plain Lava Flow (SM-1).
- In the Sentinel Plain Lava Flow SRMA, prohibit new rights-of-way (ROWs) and other land use authorizations (LUAs) except those installed in the established I-8 utility corridor; encourage the installation of below ground utility services within the corridor south of I-8 unless overhead facilities are required due to technical and/or operational circumstances (SM-4).
- In the Sentinel Plain Lava Flow SRMA, minimize visual impacts on the area's geologic formations (from ROWs construction in the I-8 utility corridor) by application of visual resource management guidelines (SM-5).
- Issue a special recreation use permit for specific recreation uses on the public lands of the BGR when required by the BLM's special recreation permit policy. Permits would be issued only with the concurrence of the US Air Force when such activity does not impair or damage natural or cultural resources or interfere with military operations (RR-6).
- Establish ERMA and implement appropriate management actions to facilitate compatible recreation use of each ERMA. (RR-10).
- Survey sites for primitive or undeveloped campgrounds in the ERMA (RR-13).
- Allow camping on all lands open to the public in accordance with standard operating procedures for camping on public lands, permit self-contained or vehicle-based camping within 50 feet of designated or established roads (RR-16).
- Allow campfires using dead and down wood (RR-17).

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)*(Applicable to public lands in the Saddle Mountain area)*

- No new land will be acquired in this area (former Saddle Mountain Wilderness Study Area). If Saddle Mountain is rejected as a wilderness area, no new roads will be allowed, but it will be designated as a recreation and rock-hound area. (LGN-MFP-3-R-4.1)

Lower Gila Resource Management Amendment (2005)*(Applicable to a portion of lands in the LSFO and all lands within the SDNM Planning Areas)*

- Management of recreation opportunities and developments will be evaluated using two inventory and management tools called the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS). And Visual Resource Management (RR-1).
- Recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) classifications will be reviewed, refined, and adopted during interdisciplinary planning (RR-2).
- Four SRMAs are established (Ajo, Gila Trail, Saddle Mountain, and Vulture Mountains) and one is revised (Sentinel Plain) (RR-19) (see **Map 2-12a**).
- The Gila Trail SRMA, to include lands surrounding the Gila Trail, the Butterfield Overland Stage Route, the Anza National Historic Trail (NHT), the Southern Overland Trail, the Mormon Battalion Trail, the Oatman Massacre Site, the Painted Rock Mountains, and associated cultural and recreational features, is established (RR-26).
 - Facilities and maintenance to protect resource values and improve visitor safety and recreational opportunities are authorized in areas classified as rural, roaded-natural, or semi-primitive motorized (RR-27).
 - Single-use and multiple-use trails to meet the demand for hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking opportunities will be developed (RR-28).
 - Surface-disturbing activities within one-quarter mile of historic and prehistoric trail segments will be mitigated (RR-29).
 - All OHV routes will be inventoried and designated (RR-30).
 - Signing, regulations, and brochures will be provided as needed (RR-31).
- The Saddle Mountain SRMA, to include the public lands containing Saddle Mountain and the Palo Verde Hills, is established to emphasize provision of geologic, cultural, and wildlife interpretive sites; protection of the area's scenic landscapes and vistas; and promotion of recreational opportunities (RR-32).
 - Facilities and maintenance to protect resource values and improve visitor safety and recreational opportunities are authorized for the northern and northeastern portions of the area (RR-33).

- Single-use and multiple-use trails to meet the demand for hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking opportunities will be developed (RR-34).
- Signing, regulations, and brochures will be provided as needed (RR-35).
- The southern and western portions of the area will be maintained as remote and mostly undeveloped (RR-36).
- The Ajo SRMA, to include the entire Ajo Management Area, is established (RR-37).
 - Facilities and maintenance to protect resource values and improve visitor safety and recreational opportunities are authorized (RR-38).
 - Single-use and multiple-use trails to meet the demand for hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking opportunities will be developed (RR-39).
 - Signing, regulations, and brochures will be provided as needed (RR-40).
- The Sentinel Plain Lava Flow SRMA is restricted to entry by permit only. Existing boundaries may be adjusted through interdisciplinary planning to respond to changing land uses (RR-41).
 - Existing prescriptions authorized by the Goldwater Amendment (BLM, 1990) will be brought forward without change (RR-42).
 - Facilities and maintenance to protect resource values and improve recreational opportunities and visitor safety are authorized (RR-43).
 - Single-use and multiple-use trails to meet the demand for hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking opportunities will be evaluated (RR-44).
 - Signing, regulations, and brochures will be provided as needed (RR-45).
- Project level planning for the ERMA will be conducted on a case-by-case basis (RR-46).
 - Primitive facilities are authorized where needed for resource protection, visitor safety, improvement of the recreation experience, or increasing recreational opportunities (RR-47).
 - Camping locations, camping stay limits, OHV and special recreation vehicle use, and utilization of the existing natural resources will be established (RR-48).
 - Long- and short-term camping areas, commercial or competitive OHV and special recreation vehicle use areas, scenic turnouts, cultural interpretive sites, hiking, equestrian or mountain bike trails, road and portal signage, and road maintenance will be evaluated (RR-49).

- A “designated routes only” OHV and special vehicle classification will be established on a site-specific basis when needed for resource protection or to maintain consistency with ROS classifications (RR-50).
- The existing 14-day camping stay limit and all associated policy will be maintained throughout the Planning Area unless otherwise designated by the authorized officer or through project planning. Areas may be closed for resource protection, rehabilitation, or to reduce conflicts with other uses (RR-51).
- Camping facilities and length-of-stay limits may be established as prescribed below for dispersed camping, long-term visitor areas, extended camping areas, and short-term camping areas (RR-52).
- Self-contained or vehicle-based camping will be permitted within 50 feet of the centerline of designated or existing routes. Cross-country travel to campsites is not permitted (RR-54).
- Trailhead facilities will be closed to overnight camping upon written approval of the field manager (RR-55).
- Long-term visitor areas (LTVAs) will be defined on the ground with fences or signs. Each LTVA will include designated roads, designated campsites, and amenities to support long-term camping occupancy (RR-56).
- The following resource factors will be considered for implementation and development of LTVAs (RR-57):
 - Permitted only in rural or roaded-natural ROS classes.
 - Location on rocky or resilient soils.
 - Well-maintained ingress and egress routes.
 - Location within 30 miles of local community.
 - Location outside of Category I or II desert tortoise habitat.
 - Mitigation if located in Category III desert tortoise habitat.
 - Location with no cultural resource conflicts.
 - Location outside of burro HMAs.
 - Location of developments in a manner that “is not likely to adversely affect” threatened or endangered species and their habitats.
 - Location outside of riparian areas.

- Location outside of areas of critical environmental concern and wild and scenic river areas
- The following operating rules will be considered for LTVA development and use (RR-58):
 - Long-term camping will be restricted to the term of the permit.
 - Long-term camping will be restricted to designated sites.
 - Services may be provided by contract or local vendor, but the costs of services (firewood, sanitation, trash, water, etc.) will be the responsibility of each occupant.
 - Users will be required to comply with all other LTVA regulations.
 - LTVA users must comply with all local, state and federal laws.
 - LTVA supplementary rules may be enacted as needed.
- The following operating rules will be considered for extended camping area development and use (RR-63):
 - Camping restricted to designated sites.
 - Services may be provided by contract or local vendor, but the costs of services (firewood, sanitation, trash, water, etc.) will be the responsibility of each occupant.
 - Extended camping area visitors must comply with all local, state, and federal laws.
 - Extended camping area supplementary rules may be enacted as needed.
- Other regulations and conditions for extended camping area use will be identified as required during interdisciplinary project planning. If, during the planning process, the interdisciplinary project planning team determines that modifications need to be made to the guidelines listed above those modifications may be made without the need for a planning amendment. Other regulations and conditions identified during ongoing operation of extended camping areas will require public notification (RR-64).
- Short-term camping areas will be designated only where such use promotes resource protection and where all conflicts can be mitigated. Short-term camping areas will be defined on the ground with fences or signs (RR-65).
- Interdisciplinary planning will evaluate short-term camping areas where historic use patterns equate to this type of use, and potential new areas are identified that would be suitable for short-term camping (RR-66).
- The following resource factors will be considered for implementation and development of short-term camping areas (RR-67):

- Primitive ingress and egress routes.
- Location on rocky or resilient soils.
- Mitigation if located in category I, II or III desert tortoise habitat.
- Location with no cultural resource conflicts.
- Location outside of burro HMAs.
- Location of developments in a manner that “is not likely to adversely affect” threatened or endangered species and their habitats.
- Location outside of wildernesses.
- Location outside of areas of critical environmental concern and wild and scenic river areas.
- The following operating rules will be considered for short-term camping area development and use (RR-68):
 - Camping will be restricted to the terms and conditions of that campground.
 - Camping will be restricted to designated sites.
 - Services may be provided by contract or local vendor, but the costs of services (firewood, sanitation, trash, water, etc.) will be the responsibility of each occupant.
 - Camping area users must comply with all local, state and federal laws.
 - Specific supplementary rules may be enacted as needed.
- Other regulations and conditions for short-term camping area use will be identified as required during interdisciplinary project planning. If, during the planning process, the interdisciplinary project planning team determines that modifications need to be made to the guidelines listed above those modifications may be made without the need for a planning amendment. Other regulations and conditions identified during ongoing operation of short-term camping areas will require public notification (RR-69).
- Interdisciplinary planning will evaluate and authorize development of special use areas within the management areas (RR-70).

Federal Register Notice for Painted Rock Campground Closure and Stay-Limit Change

- Federal Register “Closure of Public Lands to Camping and Off-Road Vehicle Use; Modification of Maximum Camping Stay Limit; and Exemption from Visitor Use Fees for Native Americans”; January 28, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 18) Page 4461. This Federal Register notice closed certain public lands in the Painted Rock Mountains in Maricopa

County to camping and off-road vehicle use except designated/signed open roads; established a maximum camping stay of seven (7) months per party at designated sites within the limits of Petroglyph Campground; and waived visitor use fees upon request at Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and Campground for Native Americans visiting the site for the purpose of engaging in activities of traditional cultural importance.

Sonoran Desert National Monument

Current management guidance for the Sonoran Desert National Monument is the same as for current management guidance for the Lower Sonoran Decision Area (presented above), except as modified by Presidential Proclamation 7397 as identified below.

- In order to protect the public during operations at the adjacent BGR and to continue management practices that have resulted in an exceptionally well preserved natural resource, the current procedures for public access to the portion of the Monument depicted as Area A shall remain in full force and effect except to the extent that the US Air Force agrees to different procedures which the BLM determines are compatible with the protection of the objects identified in this proclamation.
- Unauthorized persons cannot appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this Monument.

2.11.4.2 Action Alternatives for Recreation Management

Program Goals

- To provide a diverse array of recreation settings, opportunities and experiences; manage recreation activities and settings consistent with other resource goals; enhance recreation quality and reduce conflicts amongst various users, the following goals were developed:

Lower Sonoran Decision Area

- Goal 1: Provide quality recreation opportunities and experiences derived from public land resource values which are responsive to visitor demand and where these values are recognized as the primary resource management consideration above all others.
- Goal 2: Establish Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) where the recreation setting characteristics are unique in value, importance, and/or distinctiveness providing quality recreation opportunities and experiences derived from public land resource values. These are recognized as the primary resource management consideration above all others and are responsive to visitor demand and resolve use/user conflicts where necessary.
- Goal 3: Establish Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs) and associated zones where specific management considerations are necessary to address recreation use, demand, or recreation program investments commensurate with the management of other resources and resource uses while sustaining the principal recreation activities and associated qualities and conditions of the area.

Sonoran Desert National Monument Decision Area

- **Goal 4:** Recreation opportunities and experiences are derived from the objects and resource values for which the SDNM was established.

Allocations Summary

Tables 2-30 (above) and **2-31**, Recreation Allocations by Decision Area (below), describe recreation allocations for each decision area by type and acreage, respectively.

Table 2-31
Recreation Allocations by Decision Area

Recreation Management Area / Zone	Alternative (BLM acres)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Lower Sonoran SRMAs					
Ajo SRMA	175,200	0 (ERMA)	0 (ERMA)	0 (ERMA)	0 (ERMA)
Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA	0 (UL)	25,800	25,800	25,800	25,800
Gila Trails SRMA (<i>Lower Sonoran portion</i>)	137,100	Portions of Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA and ULs			
Gunsight Wash SRMA	0 (UL)	2,500	2,500	0 (UL)	2,500
Painted Rock SRMA	0 (UL)	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600
Saddle Mountain SRMA	46,300	47,500	47,500	0 (UL)	0 (ERMA)
Sentinel Plain SRMA	20,800	0 (UL)	0 (UL)	0 (UL)	0 (UL)
San Tan Mountains SRMA	0 (UL)	6,800	0 (UL)	0 (UL)	0 (UL)
<i>Subtotal SRMA Acres</i>	<i>379,400</i>	<i>92,200</i>	<i>85,400</i>	<i>35,400</i>	<i>37,900 (4%)</i>
Lower Sonoran ERMAs					
Ajo ERMA	n/a	177,700	177,700	0 (UL)	177,700
<i>Ajo Desert Zone</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>150,400</i>	<i>157,300</i>	<i>0 (UL)</i>	<i>149,800</i>
<i>Ajo Gateway Zone</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>27,300</i>	<i>20,400</i>	<i>0 (UL)</i>	<i>27,900</i>
Arlington Trails ERMA	n/a	60,600	Gila Bend Mtns ERMA	0 (UL)	60,600
Buckeye Hills West ERMA	n/a	22,100	22,100	22,100	22,100

**Table 2-31
Recreation Allocations by Decision Area**

Recreation Management Area / Zone	Alternative (BLM acres)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Gila Bend Mountains ERMA	n/a	253,700	314,800	0 (UL)	259,700
Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA*	n/a	42,600	42,600	0 (UL)	42,600
Saddle Mountain ERMA	n/a	0 (SRMA)	0 (SRMA)	0 (UL)	47,500
<i>Subtotal ERMA Acres</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>556,700</i>	<i>557,200</i>	<i>22,100</i>	<i>610,200 (66%)</i>
Undesignated Lands	550,800	281,300	287,600	872,700	282,100 (30%)
<i>Total Acres</i>	<i>930,200</i>	<i>930,200</i>	<i>930,200</i>	<i>930,200</i>	<i>930,200 (100%)</i>
SDNM SRMAs					
Gila Trails SRMA (SDNM portion)	143,900	Portions of Juan Bautista de Anza NHT RMZ			
SDNM ERMAs					
Sonoran Desert ERMA	n/a	486,400	486,400	0	486,400 (100%)
Desert Back Country RMZ	n/a	433,600	433,600	0	433,600
Juan Bautista de Anza NHT RMZ	n/a	52,800	52,800	0	52,800
Undesignated Lands	342,500	0	0	486,400	0
<i>Total Acres</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400 (100%)</i>

UL = Undesignated Lands

Note: There's no longer a Gila River RMZ; it's now incorporated within Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA. The Painted Rock Mountains SRMA was deleted from all alternatives in the PRMP.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

How to read this table: Most of the management action changes reflected in **Table 2-32**, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management, did not change the on-the-ground recreation management as they were presented in the DRMP. They have been refined for clarification purposes in response to the new policy guidance, or comments received, to aid the reader in understanding BLM's intended management and direction for the area. In addition, some actions that were originally reflected in other sections of the plan have been more appropriately added to the recreation section and are noted in italics with action. Objectives have been refined based on information presented in the **Appendix R** worksheets. **Only those actions that are bordered in thick black lines denote changes in management decisions between the printed DRMP and the PRMP that affect proposed on-the-ground management.**

Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management

Decision Area	Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Provide quality recreation opportunities and experiences derived from public land resource values which are responsive to visitor demand and where these values are recognized as the primary resource management consideration above all others.					
Objective 1.1 (Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA): To provide local residents motorized and non-motorized recreation trail opportunities in the natural open spaces accommodating a range of skill levels for various distances located within an hour's drive of their local communities. Through the life of the plan, at least 85% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreational experience.					
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA (Alternatives B, C, D and E)					
LS		B			RM-1.1.1: The Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA would be designated (25,800 acres) with an emphasis on motorized recreation opportunities, predominately motorcycle trail riding, adjacent to the communities of Buckeye, Avondale, and Goodyear (see Map 2-12b). The physical, social, and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Community Interface.
LS			C		RM-1.1.2: The Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA would be designated (25,800 acres) for a balanced mix of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities adjacent to the communities of Buckeye, Avondale, and Goodyear (see Map 2-12c). Single-track trails would be maintained with developed loop opportunities where appropriate. The physical, social, and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Front Country.
LS				D	RM-1.1.3: The Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA would be designated (25,800 acres) with an emphasis on non-motorized single-track trail recreation opportunities adjacent to the communities of Buckeye, Avondale, and Goodyear (see Map 2-12d). The physical, social, and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Front Country.

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS					E	RM-1.1.4: The Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA would be designated (25,800 acres) for a balanced mix of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities adjacent to the communities of Buckeye, Avondale, and Goodyear (see Map 2-12e). Single-track trails would be maintained with developed loop opportunities where appropriate. The physical, social, and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Community Interface.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.1.5: If needed to meet management objectives, the SRMA, or specific sites within it, would potentially be designated as a Special Management Area (SMA). An Individual Special Recreation Permit (ISRP) program may be established to allow for special management and resource protection if needed to meet the objectives for the area. Fee sites would be established in accordance with Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA). A business plan would be prepared and approved before implementation, and fees would be established as needed for operational management of the site. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.1.6: Partners may be obtained through a Cooperative Management Agreement. Through this agreement, partners could be authorized to share in the operational management of the area and in the collection and management of fees in accordance with FLREA. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.1.7: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of roads maintained at levels 1 to 3. Access roads could be maintained at level 5. The area would provide single track trail opportunities for motorcycle and equestrian trail riders.
LS		B				RM-1.1.8: Up to six staging, parking and/or training areas may be developed with standard and expanded amenity facilities such as gravel surfacing or other soil hardening for dust control, picnic tables, and fire rings (up to 30 acres). Up to two large staging areas could be developed not to exceed 10 acres each.
LS			C		E	RM-1.1.9: Up to six staging, parking and/or training areas may be developed with standard and expanded amenity facilities such as gravel surfacing, or other soil hardening for dust control, picnic tables, and fire rings (up to 30 acres). One large staging area could be developed not to exceed 10 acres.
LS				D		RM-1.1.10: Up to four staging/parking areas may be developed with standard amenity facilities such as gravel surface, picnic tables, and fire rings (up to 20 acres).

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.1.11: Primitive roads and/or trails, especially connector and loop routes, would be developed for a diversity of users. Existing single-track trails would be used as appropriate to provide for those user experiences.
LS				D		RM-1.1.12: Up to 50 percent of the primitive roads (approximately 63 miles) would be converted to non-motorized trails. Trails could be developed to provide connector and loop opportunities for non-motorized users.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.1.13: In the Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA, competitive motorized and non-motorized speed events, including motorcycle enduros or equestrian endurance rides, would be considered on a case-by-case basis and the recreation and resource objectives of the area must be retained. <i>[New; changed because all speed events were prohibited in DRMP]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.1.14: Vehicle-based camping would be limited to existing or designated sites, or as determined by subsequent activity-level planning.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.1.15: The area would be managed mostly for the following VRM Classes (see Maps 2-3b, c, d, and e): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives B and E: Mostly VRM Class IV, and • Alternatives C and D: Mostly for VRM Class III. <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>

Objective 1.2: (Gunsight Wash SRMA): Provide structured, managed camping where there is a high demand from long-distance winter visitors seeking a remote, primitive winter camping experience and access to adjacent BLM-administered lands. Through the life of the plan, at least 90% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their camping experience.

**Management Actions and Allowable Uses Gunsight Wash SRMA
(Alternatives B, C and E)**

LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.1: The Gunsight Wash SRMA would be designated (T14S, R5W, Sections 2-4 and 9-11; 2,500 acres) to provide visitors RV and primitive camping, social gathering, and hiking experiences with sightseeing/touring, photography, and wildlife viewing on the adjacent BLM-administered and other federal lands (see Maps 2-12b, c and e). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed as 100% Front Country.
LS		B				RM-1.2.2: The camping stay limit in the Gunsight Wash SRMA would be 14 days except during October 1 – April 30 when the stay limit would be increased to 120 days. <i>[Additional text removed; too difficult to enforce]</i>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS			C			RM-1.2.3: The camping stay limit in the Gunsight Wash SRMA would be 14 days except during October 1 – April 30 when the stay limit would be increased to 60 days. <i>[Additional text removed; too difficult to enforce]</i>
LS					E	RM-1.2.4: The camping stay in the Gunsight Wash SRMA would be limited to no more than a period of 14 days within any period of 28 consecutive days. All other rules and restrictions pertaining to this standard camping rule would apply. <i>[Changed from 60 days in DRMP to 14 days in PRMP]</i>
LS		B			E	RM-1.2.5: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of roads suitable for two-wheel-drive access for RVs with at least 80 percent maintained at levels 3 to 5 to provide access for dispersed camping and motorized sightseeing and hiking opportunities.
LS			C			RM-1.2.6: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of roads suitable for two-wheel-drive access for RVs with at least 40 percent maintained at levels 3 to 5 to provide access for dispersed camping and motorized sightseeing and hiking opportunities.
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.7: The Gunsight Wash SRMA would be closed to locatable minerals exploration and development, leasable minerals, seismic exploration, and mineral material disposals. Public lands would be recommended for withdrawal to all mineral location and entry.
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.8: The Gunsight Wash SRMA, or specific sites within it, would potentially be designated as a Special Management Area (SMA). An Individual Special Recreation Permit (ISRP) program may be established to allow for special management and resource protection if needed to meet the objectives for the area. Fee sites would be established in accordance with FLREA. A business plan would be prepared and approved before implementation, and fees would be established as needed for operational management of the site.
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.9: Controlled access, such as a center turning lane on Highway 85, would be secured with ADOT.
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.10: Standard and expanded amenity infrastructure would be provided at the campground such as restrooms, ramadas, picnic tables, individual campsites with fire pits and improved road systems.
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.11: The SRMA would be managed for VRM Class III (See Maps 2-3b, c and e). <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.12: The SRMA would be an exclusion area for utility-scale

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						renewable energy developments and major linear LUAs. [DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section and Appendix N]
LS		B	C		E	RM-1.2.13: The SRMA would be an avoidance area for minor linear and all non-linear LUAs. [DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section]
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.14: In the Gunsight Wash SRMA, competitive motorized speed events would be prohibited. [DRMP: only in General Recreation section]
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.15: Firewood collection would be prohibited within ¼ mile of the signed campground. Saguaro skeletons and wood pallets would be prohibited. [Revised; original action in General Recreation section didn't provide protection around the site]
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.16: The developed area, as signed, would remain closed to target shooting in accordance with state and federal regulations. [New: clarification]
LS				D		RM-1.2.17: The existing area used for camping (approximately 1,000 acres) would not be designated as a Recreation Management Area and not developed as a campground. It would remain available for dispersed primitive camping. The camping stay limit would remain 14 days in a 28-day period in accordance with the standard camping guidelines in place and addressed in the general camping section. Restrictions identified in RM-1.1.14 through 16 would apply. [New; clarification]

Objective 1.3 (Painted Rock SRMA): To provide structured, managed camping where there is a high demand from national and international winter visitors seeking a remote, primitive winter camping experience near an adjacent petroglyph site day use area, and access to adjacent public lands which provide cultural and historic attractions of regional, national, and international interest. Through the life of the plan, at least 90% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their camping experience.

**Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Painted Rock SRMA
(Alternatives B, C, D and E)**

LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.3.1: The Painted Rock SRMA would be designated (T4S, R7W, Sections 30-32; T4S, R8W, Sections 13, 24, 25; T5S, R7W, Sections 5-8, 17, 20; and T5S, R8W, Sections 1-3, 10-12; approximately 9,800 acres). The approximate 300-acre Petroglyph Site and Campground (T5S, R8W, Sections 1 and 2) would be retained as day use and campground fee sites for winter visitor camping. Visitors would experience RV and primitive camping, social gathering, petroglyph and historical trail viewing, interpretive exhibit viewing, picnicking, hiking, and motorized exploring adjacent to natural landscapes. The adjacent 9,500 acres would continue to provide the camping closure buffer around the campground with limited off-highway vehicle access offering visitors a more back
----	--	---	---	---	---	--

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						country experience for wildlife viewing and hunting. (Refer to Maps 2-12b through e). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Front Country for the entire SRMA.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.2: The Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and Campground would be retained as campground and day use fee sites in accordance with FLREA and the approved business plan. Fees would be adjusted or established as needed to meet business plan objectives.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.3: At the designated campground, the camping-stay limit would be 14 days except October 1 to April 30, when the stay limit would be increased to 90 days.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.4: Public lands adjacent to the developed campground and day use area, as defined in RM-1.2.1, would remain closed to camping and motorized off-highway vehicle use except designated/signed open roads, primitive roads, and trails. The following persons, operating within the scope of their official duties, are exempt from the provisions of this closure: Employees of the BLM, Arizona Game and Fish Department, and local and federal law enforcement and fire protection personnel. Access by additional parties may be allowed but must be approved in advance in writing by the BLM authorized officer. <i>[DRMP: shown as OHV closure on maps; carried forward from existing Federal Register Notice "Closure of Public Lands to Camping and Off-Road Vehicle Use." dated January 28, 1999]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.5: Pursuant to the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, and Executive Orders 13007 and 13084, visitor use fees at Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and Campground would be waived upon request for Native Americans visiting the site for the purpose of engaging in activities of traditional cultural importance. <i>[Carried forward from existing Federal Register Notice "Closure of Public Lands to Camping and Off-Road Vehicle Use." dated January 28, 1999]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.6: When designated, the travel system would consist of roads suitable for two-wheel-drive RVs and passenger cars with at least 90% maintained at levels 3 to 5. Roads away from the immediate vicinity of the site would be maintained at levels 1-3 for more back country driving experiences.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.7: The Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and Campground (approximately 300 acres) would remain closed to all locatable minerals exploration and development, leasable minerals, seismic exploration, and mineral material disposals. Public lands would be recommended for withdrawal to all mineral location and entry.

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.8: Select public lands adjacent to the Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and Campground (approximately 6,100 acres) would remain open to all non-renewable leasable minerals actions (including geothermal and sodium), but any lease would contain a No Surface Occupancy stipulation. These acres would also be closed to mineral material disposals. <i>[DRMP: revised to correct acreage to match maps]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.9: The remaining public lands in the SRMA not identified above (approximately 3,400 acres) would be open to all mineral activities. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.10: The petroglyph site and campground area would be managed for VRM Class IV (See Maps 2-3a through e). <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.11: The petroglyph site and campground area (300 acres) would be exclusion areas for utility-scale renewable energy developments and major linear LUAs. The remaining public lands in the SRMA would be available unless otherwise excluded. <i>[DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section and Appendix N]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.12: The petroglyph site and campground would be avoidance areas for minor linear and all non-linear LUAs (300 acres). The remaining public lands in the SRMA would be available unless otherwise excluded. <i>[DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.13: In the Painted Rock SRMA, competitive motorized speed events would be prohibited. <i>[DRMP: only in General Recreation section]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.14: Firewood collection would be prohibited within ¼ mile of the signed campground and day use area. Saguaro skeletons and wood pallets would be prohibited. <i>[Revised; original action in General Recreation section didn't provide protection around the site]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-1.2.15: The developed area, as signed, would remain closed to target shooting in accordance with state and federal regulations. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
<p>Objective 1.4 (Saddle Mountain SRMA): To provide recreation and educational opportunities and experiences to local residents and regional visitors seeking a primarily non-motorized trail experience with limited motorized access to explore, discover, and view the outstanding scenic landscapes, unique geologic features, and cultural and wildlife resources of the area, and contribute to the quality of life and economy of the local community of Tonopah. Through the life of the plan, at least 85% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreational experience.</p>						

Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management

Decision Area		Alternative		Management Actions and Allowable Uses	
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Saddle Mountain SRMA					
(Alternatives B and C)					
LS		B	C	E	RM-1.4.1: The Saddle Mountain SRMA would be designated (47,500 acres) with an emphasis on non-motorized recreation experiences (see Maps 2-12b, c and e). [No longer SRMA in Alternative E]
LS		B			RM-1.4.2: The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 6% Community Interface, 83% Front Country, 11% Back Country and < 1% passage.
LS			C		RM-1.4.3: The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 54% Front Country, 45% Back Country and 1% Passage.
LS		B			RM-1.4.4: When designated during travel management planning, the travel system would consist primarily of primitive roads maintained at levels 1 to 3, with up to 10 percent of the route network maintained at level 5 (approximately 5 miles) to provide two-wheel-drive passenger car access to public use cultural sites, day-use, and camping facilities.
LS			C		RM-1.4.5: When designated during travel management planning, the travel system would emphasize primitive access to non-motorized trail opportunities. Roads would predominately be maintained at level 1 with up to 10 percent maintained at level 3 (approximately 9 miles).
LS		B			RM-1.4.6: Primitive roads and primitive trails would be developed to provide sustainable opportunities for motorized and non-motorized trail opportunities.
LS			C		RM-1.4.7: Non-motorized trails would be developed, or converted from motorized roads, to meet demand for hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking. Primitive roads would only be developed if needed to redirect motorized use from the Saddle Mountain.
LS			C		RM-1.4.8: The area would be closed to mineral material disposals and exploration. [DRMP: only in Minerals section and on maps]
LS		B	C		RM-1.4.9: The area would be managed for the following VRM classes (see Maps 2-3b and c): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative B: Mostly for VRM Class III with some Class II in summit area and IV in corridors and north areas; and Alternative C: Mostly for VRM Class II with some Class III along corridors and the north end of the SRMA. [DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]
LS		B	C		RM-1.4.10: In the Saddle Mountain SMRA, SRPs would not be authorized for motorized competitive speed events. Competitive

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						non-motorized speed events such as endurance rides would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis and the resource and recreation objectives of the area must be retained. <i>[New: all speed events were prohibited in DRMP; changed to allow for potential non-motorized speed events]</i>
LS		B	C			RM-1.4.11: Motorized technical and specialized uses, such as rock-crawling and rock-hopping, would be prohibited.
LS		B	C			RM-1.4.12: Vehicle-based camping would be limited to existing or designated sites or as determined by subsequent activity-level planning.
LS		B	C			RM-1.4.13: Facilities may be developed as needed for visitor use or public safety as needed. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B	C			RM-1.4.14: Visitor and management infrastructure would generally be modest in scope and scale, but may include fully developed facilities with paved access, water, and sewer. <i>[New; clarification]</i>

Objective 1.5 (San Tan Mountains SRMA): To continue providing a developed, non-motorized park setting for residents in eastern Maricopa and western Pinal counties, located southeast of metropolitan Phoenix, seeking recreational and educational benefits and opportunities in pristine Lower Sonoran Desert containing quality natural and cultural resources. Activities include hiking, horseback riding, mountain biking, picnicking, and organized events. The park is one of 12 in the Maricopa County Parks System and is an integral part of the local communities' and counties' economy. Through the life of the plan, at least 90% would indicate that they are very satisfied with their recreational experience in the area.

**Management Actions and Allowable Uses for San Tan Mountains SRMA
(Alternative B)**

LS		B				RM-1.5.1: The San Tan Mountains SRMA would be designated (6,800 acres) as a cooperative management recreation area in partnership with Maricopa and Pinal Counties for non-motorized recreational opportunities (see Map 2-12b). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 69% Front Country and 31% Back Country.
LS		B				RM-1.5.2: The area would be established as a Special Management Area (SMA) and an Individual Special Recreation Permit (ISRP) program may be established to allow for special management and protection of the SMA cooperation with Maricopa and Pinal Counties, and other stakeholders as necessary. Through a Cooperative Management Agreement, partners may be authorized to share in the operational management of the area and in the collection and management of fees.
LS			C	D	E	RM-1.5.3: The San Tan Mountains area would be managed as a recreational park under a Recreation and Public Purposes Act Lease (see Maps 2-12c through 2-12e). <i>[Revised for clarification;</i>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
					<i>moved from General Recreation section]</i>
LS		B			RM-1.5.4: Fees may be established as needed to meet activity or business plan objectives in accordance with the FLREA.
LS		B			RM-1.5.5: Primitive roads and primitive trails would be developed to provide sustainable opportunities for motorized and non-motorized trail opportunities. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B			RM-1.5.6: The park would remain a day use area and closed to overnight camping; hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking are acceptable uses. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B			RM-1.5.7: In the San Tan Mountains SRMA, competitive motorized speed events would be prohibited. <i>[DRMP: only in General Recreation section]</i>
LS		B			RM-1.5.8: Visitor and management infrastructure may be developed as needed to protect the cultural and natural resources in the area. <i>[New; clarification]</i>

Goal 2: Provide recreation opportunities and experiences derived from public land resource values which are responsive to visitor demand and where recreation use and program investments are commensurate with the management of other resources and resource uses while sustaining the principal recreation activities and associated qualities and conditions of the area. Manage recreation resources in cooperation with local communities in areas with recreation-dependent economies.

Objective 2.1 (Ajo ERMA): To provide local and seasonal residents of Ajo close-to-home recreational destination opportunities on BLM-administered lands in the Lower Sonoran Desert. The Ajo ERMA (also known as the Ajo Block) is surrounded by the US Air Force Barry M. Goldwater Range, Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Area, the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, and the Tohono O'odham Nation. A sense of freedom is provided the residents in comparison to the other land use agencies that require permits or formal requests. The area contributes to the residents' quality of life, the local economy, and management support of the surrounding sensitive natural and cultural resources. The ERMA is divided into two recreation management zones with discreet management focus and uses. Through the life of the plan, at least 85% of sampled visitors indicate they were satisfied with their recreational experience in the area.

**Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Ajo ERMA
(Alternatives B, C and E)**

LS		B	C	E	RM-2.1.1: The Ajo ERMA would be designated (177,700 acres) for local recreation opportunities that highlight the surrounding BLM-administered lands (see Maps 2-12 b, c and e).
----	--	---	---	---	---

Objective 2.1.1 (Ajo Gateway RMZ): Provide local and seasonal residents of Ajo open natural spaces to enjoy recreational activities predominately for motorized activities, as well as non-motorized opportunities, on BLM-administered lands bordering the Ajo community. Activities include motocross bike riding, mountain biking, and hiking in a system of primitive roads and trails just outside of town.

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses	
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Ajo Gateway RMZ (Alternatives B, C and E)						
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.1.1.1: The Ajo Gateway RMZ would be designated (27,100, 20,300, and 27,100 acres, respectively) for local recreation opportunities that highlight the surrounding BLM-administered lands (see Maps 2-12 b, c and e). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Community Interface.
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.1.1.2: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of roads suitable for two wheel drive maintained at levels 1 to 3, with up to 5 percent (6 to 9 miles) of the route network maintained at level 5 to provide access for dispersed camping and motorized sightseeing and hiking opportunities.
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.1.1.3: Visitor and management infrastructure would generally be moderate in scope and scale, but may include developed facilities which would include a system of primitive roads and trails that meet the desired recreation setting.
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.1.1.4: The Ajo Scenic Loop road would be designated during travel management planning to interpret and educate local and seasonal visitors on adjacent public lands.
LS		B			E	RM-2.1.1.5: A 40-acre open area to accommodate motorized opportunities, such as unrestricted motocross bike riding, would be established with the provision that local partners would be sought to monitor and provide on-site management and educate users in environmental stewardship. <i>[Open use area deleted from Alternative E]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.1.1.6: The area would be managed mostly for VRM Class IV (see Maps 2-3b, c and e). <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.1.1.7: In the Ajo Gateway RMZ, competitive motorized and non-motorized speed events, including motorcycle enduros and equestrian endurance rides, would be considered on a case-by-case basis and the recreation and resource objectives of the area must be retained. <i>[New: changed to allow for consideration; all speed events were prohibited in DRMP]</i>
<p>Objective 2.1.2 (Ajo Desert RMZ): To provide local and regional visitors undeveloped, primitive, and self-directed recreational experiences that allow for motorized as well as non-motorized recreational opportunities. Activities include driving for pleasure, hunting, mountain biking, hiking, camping, exploring, photography, and equestrian use.</p>						

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area	Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Ajo Desert RMZ (Alternatives B, C and E)					
LS	B				RM-2.1.2.1: The Ajo Desert RMZ would be designated (150,400 acres) for self-directed recreation opportunities in the foothills and mountains within the Ajo Block (see Map 2-12b). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 15% Front Country, 81% Back Country and 4% Passage.
LS		C			RM-2.1.2.2: The Ajo Desert RMZ would be designated (157,300 acres) for self-directed recreation opportunities in the foothills and mountains within the Ajo Block (see Map 2-12c). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 16% Front Country, 81% Back Country and 3% Passage.
LS				E	RM-2.1.2.3: The Ajo Desert RMZ would be designated (149,800 acres) for self-directed recreation opportunities in the foothills and mountains within the Ajo Block (see Map 2-12e). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 15% Front Country, 82% Back Country and 3% Passage.
LS	B	C		E	RM-2.1.2.4: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of roads maintained at levels 1 to 3. Major access roads and pullouts could be maintained at level 5.
LS	B	C		E	RM-2.1.2.5: A maximum camping stay would be established of seven days per party. Persons may occupy any one site or multiple sites within a 25 mile radius on public lands not closed or otherwise restricted to camping for a total period of not more than seven (7) days within a 28 day period. When the seven (7) day limit has been reached, the party must move 25 miles from site of last occupation, or off of public land. The authorized officer may give written permission for extension of the seven (7) day limit.
LS	B	C		E	RM-2.1.2.6: Visitor and management infrastructure would generally be low, but developed facilities could be established such as trailheads when linked to primitive trail systems that meet the desired recreation setting. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS	B	C		E	RM-2.1.2.7: The area would be managed for VRM Classes II and III (see Maps 2-3b, c and e). <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
LS	B	C		E	RM-2.1.2.8: In the Ajo Desert RMZ, competitive motorized speed events would be prohibited. Competitive non-motorized speed events, such as equestrian endurance rides would be considered on a case-by-case basis and the recreation and resource objectives of the area must be retained. <i>[New: All speed events were prohibited in DRMP; changed to allow for potential non-motorized speed events]</i>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area	Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
<p>Objective 2.2 (Arlington Trails ERMA): To manage BLM-administered lands in the area west of Arlington and north of the Gila Bend Mountains for local and regional visitors seeking a dispersed or family-oriented motorized recreation experience, including off-highway vehicle driving for various vehicle types and skill levels, camping, exploring, and sightseeing in a remote Sonoran Desert landscape. Through the life of the plan, at least 80% would indicate that they are very satisfied with their recreational experience in the area.</p>					
<p align="center">Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Arlington Trails ERMA (Alternatives B and E)</p>					
LS	B			E	RM-2.2.1: The Arlington Trails ERMA would be designated (60,600 acres) for family-oriented motorized recreational opportunities on BLM-administered lands (see Maps 2-12b and e). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100 percent Front Country.
LS		C			RM-2.2.2: In Alternative C, the area would not be designated as a Recreation Management Area (see Map 2-12c). It would be incorporated into the Gila Bend Mountains ERMA and managed under the objectives described for that ERMA which is predominately dispersed, undeveloped recreation in a backcountry landscape (see Objective 3.4).
LS	B			E	RM-2.2.3: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of roads maintained at levels 1 to 3 to allow for back country, primitive driving experiences with approximately 10% maintained at level 3 (approximately 19 miles) and up to 30% maintained at level 5 (approximately 60 miles) to allow for two-wheel drive access.
LS	B			E	RM-2.2.4: Up to 25 miles of new primitive roads and/or primitive trails may be constructed as needed to connect loop routes to provide a variety of motorized opportunities for family riding experiences and user groups. Existing roads could be re-aligned to improve resource management or public safety.
LS	B			E	RM-2.2.5: Up to two staging, parking, and/or training areas may be developed with standard and expanded amenity facilities such as gravel surfacing or other soil hardening for dust control, picnic tables, and fire rings not to exceed 10 acres each.
LS	B			E	RM-2.2.6: Vehicle-based camping would be limited to existing or designated sites, or as determined by subsequent activity-level planning. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS	B			E	RM-2.2.7: The area would be managed mostly for VRM Class IV (see Maps 2-3b and e). <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
LS	B			E	RM-2.2.8: In the Arlington Trails ERMA, competitive motorized and non-motorized speed events, including motorcycle enduros or equestrian endurance rides, would be considered on a case-by-case

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						basis and the recreation and resource objectives of the area must be retained. <i>[New; changed to allow for consideration; all speed events prohibited in DRMP]</i>
LS		B			E	RM-2.2.9: If needed to meet management objectives, the ERMA, or specific sites within it, would potentially be designated as a Special Management Area (SMA). An Individual Special Recreation Permit (ISRP) program may be established to allow for special management and resource protection if needed to meet the objectives for the area. Fee sites would be established in accordance with Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA). A business plan would be prepared and approved before implementation, and fees would be established as needed for operational management of the site. <i>[New; previously omitted]</i>
<p>Objective 2.3 (Buckeye Hills West ERMA): To provide dispersed recreational opportunities adjacent to the Maricopa County Buckeye Recreation Area Regional Park and the Robbins Butte State Wildlife Area. The ERMA would be managed in partnership with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and Maricopa County for motorized and non-motorized activities including off-highway vehicle touring, hiking, sightseeing, wildlife viewing, photography and hunting. Through the life of the plan, at least 80% would indicate that they are very satisfied with their recreational experience in the area.</p>						
<p>Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Buckeye Hills West ERMA (Alternatives B, C, D and E)</p>						
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.3.1: The Buckeye Hills West ERMA would be designated (25,800 acres) in partnership with Maricopa County and Arizona Game and Fish Department (see Maps 2-12b, c and e). The ERMA would be managed for motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities on BLM-administered lands adjacent to the Maricopa County Buckeye Hills Recreation Area Regional Park and the nearby Robbins Butte State Wildlife Area.
LS		B			E	RM-2.3.2: The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Front Country.
LS			C			RM-2.3.3: The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 40% Front Country, 59% Back Country and 1% Passage.
LS					D	RM-2.3.4: The Buckeye Hills West ERMA would be designated (25,800 acres) in cooperation with Maricopa County and Arizona Game and Fish Department for motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities on BLM-administered lands. The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 98% Back Country and 2% Passage.

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.3.5: If needed to meet management objectives the SRMA, or specific sites within it, would potentially be designated as a Special Management Area (SMA). An Individual Special Recreation Permit (ISRP) program may be established to allow for special management and resource protection if needed to meet the objectives for the area. Fee sites would be established in accordance with Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA). A business plan would be prepared and approved before implementation, and fees would be established as needed for operational management of the site. <i>[Revised for clarification]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.3.6: Partners may be obtained through a Cooperative Management Agreement, including Maricopa County and the Arizona Game and Fish Department. Through this agreement, partners could be authorized to share in the operational management of the area and in the collection and management of fees in accordance with FLREA. <i>[Revised for clarification]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.3.7: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of roads maintained at levels 1 to 3. Any access roads would be maintained at level 5.
LS			C		E	RM-2.3.8: Overnight camping would be prohibited unless specifically authorized.
LS				D		RM-2.3.9: An SMA and ISRP program would not be established and the BLM would remain the lead agency in managing the area in cooperation with Maricopa County and the Arizona Game and Fish Department. The area would remain primitive and undeveloped and used mostly for off-highway vehicle driving and hunting. <i>[Revised for clarification]</i>
LS				D		RM-2.3.10: When designated, the travel system would predominately consist of primitive roads maintained at level 1.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.2.11: The area would be managed mostly for the following VRM Classes (see Maps 2-3b, c and e): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives B and E: Mostly Class III. • Alternatives C and D: Mostly Class II. <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.3.12: Primitive roads or primitive trails may be developed to provide connector and loop routes for a diversity of users and provide trail connections to nearby county and state parks.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.3.13: In the Buckeye Hills West ERMA, competitive motorized and non-motorized speed events would be prohibited. <i>[DRMP: in General Recreation section]</i>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area	Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
<p>Objective 2.4 (Gila Bend Mountains ERMA): To provide local and regional visitors dispersed, self-directed recreation opportunities and experiences in a remote and undeveloped Sonoran Desert landscape which includes two wilderness areas. Activities include off-road vehicle driving, camping, hiking, hunting, and sightseeing. Through the life of the plan, at least 85% would indicate that they are very satisfied with their recreational experience in the area.</p>				
<p align="center">Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Gila Bend Mountains ERMA (Alternatives B, C and E)</p>				
LS	B			<p>RM-2.4.1: The Gila Bend Mountains ERMA would be designated (253,800 and 259,800 acres respectively) for visitors from western Maricopa County primarily seeking dispersed, undeveloped recreation experiences in a remote backcountry setting (see Maps 2-12b and e). To better manage dispersed recreation opportunities the BLM may provide major investments in visitor services however investments in visitor facilities would be moderate to minor. The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 15% Front Country, 83% Back Country and 2% Passage.</p>
LS		C		<p>RM-2.4.2: The Gila Bend Mountains ERMA would be designated (314,800 acres) for visitors from western Maricopa County primarily seeking dispersed, undeveloped recreation experiences in a remote backcountry setting (see Map 2-12c). To better manage dispersed recreation opportunities the BLM may provide major investments in visitor services however investments in visitor facilities would be minor. The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 15% Front Country, 83% Back Country and 2% Passage. (The acreage is higher in this alternative due to the incorporation of the Arlington Trails ERMA.)</p>
LS	B	C		<p>RM-2.4.3: When designated, 90% of the motor vehicle travel system would consist of primitive roads and trails maintained at level 1 to provide a rugged primitive motorized experience, with up to 3% maintained at levels 3-5 (approximately 11-16 miles) to allow for two-wheel drive access.</p>
LS	B	C		<p>RM-2.4.4: Standard camping amenities, interpretive displays, and improved access would be constructed at the Sundad public use site to facilitate visitation.</p>
LS	B	C		<p>RM-2.4.5: Areas of disturbance greater than 2 acres would be rehabilitated back to natural condition and group limits may be established to prevent further resource degradation.</p>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C		E	<p>RM-2.4.6: The area would be managed mostly for the following VRM Classes (see Maps 2-3b, c and e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I in Wilderness areas; • Alternative B: Mostly Class III outside of wilderness except the multi-use utility corridor is Class IV; • Alternative C: Mostly Class II outside of wilderness except the multi-use utility corridor is Class III; and • Alternative E: Class II in lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics, Class III in remaining areas other than the multi-use utility corridor which is Class IV. <p><i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i></p>
LS		B	C		E	<p>RM-2.4.7: In the Gila Bend Mountains ERMA, competitive motorized speed events, including motorcycle enduros, would be prohibited. Competitive non-motorized speed events such as endurance rides would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis and the resource and recreation objectives of the area must be retained.</p> <p><i>[New: all speed events were prohibited in the DRMP; changed to allow for potential non-motorized speed events]</i></p>

Objective 2.5 (Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA): To provide recreation and educational opportunities and experiences to local, regional, and national visitors who seek to discover, tour, and learn about the Juan Bautista de Anza NHT, the historic Butterfield Overland Stage Route, and Mormon Battalion trails that intersect the NHT corridor, in addition to the area's rich cultural and natural history and resources. Through the life of the plan, at least 85% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreational experience.

**Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA
(Alternatives B, C and E)**

LS		B	C		E	<p>RM-2.5.1: The Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA would be designated (42,600 acres) with an emphasis on balanced recreation experiences (see Maps 2-12b, c and e). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 100% Front Country.</p>
LS		B	C		E	<p>RM-2.5.2: When designated, the motorized vehicle travel system would consist primarily of primitive roads maintained at levels 1 to 3, with up to 10 percent of the route network maintained at level 5 to provide two-wheel-drive passenger car access to public use cultural sites, day-use, and camping facilities.</p>
LS		B	C		E	<p>RM-2.5.3: Visitor and management infrastructure would respond to demand for facilities and access to the Juan Bautista de Anza NHT, Butterfield Overland Stage Route and other high-intensity trail segments and cultural properties.</p>
LS		B	C		E	<p>RM-2.5.4: Facilities may be developed as needed for visitor use or public safety at public use sites such as Butterfield West, or other</p>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						areas as identified. Infrastructure would be modest in scope and scale but could include expanded amenities as needed. <i>[Combined actions and reworded for clarity]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.5.5: Allowable land use authorizations and minerals activities would be determined by the applicable allocation decisions established for the Anza NHT and Management Area, and Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails ACEC prescriptions. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.5.6: In the Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA, competitive motorized speed events would be prohibited. Competitive non-motorized speed events such as endurance rides would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis and the resource and recreation objectives of the area must be retained. <i>[New; all speed events were prohibited in DRMP; changed to allow for potential non-motorized speed events]</i>
LS		B	C		E	RM-2.5.7: Vehicle-based camping would be limited to existing or designated sites, or as determined by subsequent activity-level planning. <i>[New; clarification]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.5.8: The area would be managed mostly for the following VRM Classes (see Maps 2-3b, c, d and e): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives B and E: Mostly VRM Class III; and • Alternatives C and D: Mostly for VRM Class II. <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
<p>Objective 2.6 (Saddle Mountain ERMA): To balance the recreation visitor demands with the other resources in the area for which the area is designated as an ACEC, including cultural, wildlife, and scenic qualities. Local residents and regional visitors seek a primarily non-motorized trail experience with limited motorized access to explore, discover, and view the outstanding scenic landscapes, unique geologic features, and cultural and wildlife resources of the area. Through the life of the plan, at least 85% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreational experience.</p>						

**Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Saddle Mountain ERMA
(Alternative E)**

LS					E	RM-2.6.1: The Saddle Mountain ERMA would be designated (47,500 acres) with an emphasis on primarily non-motorized recreation experiences in balance with other resource values and uses (see Map 2-12e). The physical, social and administrative recreation settings would be managed for 5% Community Interface, 77% Front Country, 17% Back Country and 1% Passage Zone.
LS					E	RM-2.6.2: When designated, the travel system would emphasize primitive access to non-motorized trail opportunities. Roads would predominately be maintained at level 1 with up to 10 percent maintained at level 3 (approximately 9 miles).

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS					E	RM-2.6.3: Non-motorized trails would be developed, or converted from motorized roads, to meet demand for hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking. Primitive roads would only be developed if needed to redirect motorized use from the Saddle Mountain.
LS					E	RM-2.6.4: The area would be closed to mineral material disposals and exploration. <i>[DRMP: only in Minerals section and on maps]</i>
LS					E	RM-2.6.5: The area would be managed for VRM Classes II, III, and IV. VRM II would be in the lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics; VRM III in the higher elevations; and VRM IV in the foothills along corridors and the north end of the SRMA. <i>[DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]</i>
LS					E	RM-2.6.6: In the Saddle Mountain ERMA, SRPs would not be authorized for motorized competitive speed events. Competitive non-motorized speed events such as endurance rides would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis and the resource and recreation objectives of the area must be retained. <i>[New; all speed events were prohibited in DRMP; changed to allow for potential non-motorized speed events]</i>
LS					E	RM-2.6.7: Motorized technical and specialized uses, such as rock-crawling and rock-hopping, would be prohibited.
LS					E	RM-2.6.8: Vehicle-based camping would be limited to existing or designated sites or as determined by subsequent activity-level planning.
LS					E	RM-2.6.9: Facilities may be developed as needed for visitor use or public safety as needed. Infrastructure would be modest in scope and scale but could include expanded amenities as needed. <i>[New; clarification]</i>

Objective 2.7 (Common-To-All RMAs): Through the life of the plan, 90% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreation experience.

Common-To-All Management Actions and Allowable Uses for RMAs

[New section for clarification purposes]

LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.7.1: All RMAs would be avoidance areas for all land use authorizations unless otherwise limited (such in developed campgrounds). If no other option is available, recreation objectives and experiences would be priority when evaluating proposals. Potential impacts would be mitigated to ensure targeted recreation outcomes are retained as described in the Appendix R, Special and Extensive Recreation Management Area Worksheets . <i>[DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.7.2: All RMAs would be open to all minerals activities unless otherwise limited (such in developed campgrounds). Recreation

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						objectives and experiences would be priority when evaluating proposals. Potential impacts would be mitigated to ensure targeted recreation outcomes are retained, as described in Appendix R , Special and Extensive Recreation Management Area Worksheets. <i>[DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.7.3: Utility-scale renewable energy development would be prohibited in all Back Country recreation settings within RMAs. <i>[DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section and Appendix N]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.7.4: SRMAs would be high sensitivity conflict areas (avoidance areas) for utility-scale renewable energy developments in all recreation settings other than Back Country. Projects would only be considered and evaluated if no other option exists and potential impacts could be mitigated to ensure recreation outcomes are retained. <i>[DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section and Appendix N]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.7.5: ERMAs would be moderate sensitivity conflict areas (avoidance areas) for utility-scale renewable energy developments in all recreation settings other than Back Country. Projects may be considered and evaluated if potential impacts could be mitigated to ensure recreation outcomes are retained. <i>[DRMP: only in Lands and Realty section and Appendix N]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.7.6: SRPs, including vending, would be authorized on a case-by-case basis in accordance with 43 CFR 2930 guidance presented in the SRP section and Appendix H , Standard Operating Procedures.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-2.7.7: As sites are developed, other restrictions would become effective as set forth in other areas of this plan for developed recreation sites (e.g., firewood, firearm restrictions).
Goal 3: Manage public lands to allow for basic recreation uses and resource stewardship needs. Visitor health and safety would be addressed as needed; use and user conflicts would be kept to a minimum; special recreation permits would be processed in compliance with the primary resource uses of the areas; and recreation impacts to cultural and natural resources would be mitigated as needed.						
Objective 3.1 (General Recreation): Through the life of the plan, 85% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreation experience.						
LS				D		RM-3.1.1: The Ajo, Arlington, Gila Bend Mountains, Gunsight Wash, Lower Gila Historic Trails and Saddle Mountain areas would be classified as Undesignated Lands and managed for general recreation stewardship needs (see Map 2-12d). Recreation opportunities and amenities would not be proactively managed and developed except in the case of conflict with other resource uses (for example a campground would not be developed at Gunsight Wash unless a biological opinion indicated continued dispersed camping was harming a priority wildlife species). <i>[Revised to comply</i>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						<i>with new policy; ERMAs under old policy – management remains for general stewardship under this alternative]</i>
General Recreation Management Actions and Allowable Uses						
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.2: The Sentinel Plain area would be designated and managed as a Special Management Area. Access to the area would require the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range entry and public safety permit (for the BLM, these are managed as Individual Special Recreation Permits).
LS				D		RM-3.1.3: Public lands within the Cuerda de Lena ACEC near Ajo would be closed to public access, for all recreation uses including camping and SRPs, during March 15 – July 15 or as determined by the Sonoran Pronghorn Recovery Team.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.4: All future developed recreation sites not identified in this plan would also be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Public lands would be recommended for withdrawal to all mineral location and entry. Lands would be open to mineral leasing with No Surface Occupancy stipulations. (Campgrounds excluded, the average developed recreation site in the Planning Area would be less than 10 acres.) <i>[Moved from Minerals section]</i>
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.5: All proposed management actions would conform to the settings described for each recreation allocation. <i>[New for clarification]</i>
Camping, Parking, Facilities and Other						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.6: Camping on all lands open to the public would be allowed in accordance with 43 CFR 8365 unless otherwise closed.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.7: Except where otherwise specified (e.g. Painted Rock Campground SRMA and Ajo Desert ERMA), camping would continue to be limited to no more than a period of 14 days within any period of 28 consecutive days and, after the 14th day of occupation, the camper would be required to move outside of at least a 25-mile radius of the previous location until the 29th day since initial occupation.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.8: Self-contained or vehicle-based camping would be permitted within 100 feet of the centerline of designated or existing routes. Cross-country travel to campsites would not be permitted.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.9: Vehicle-based camping and parking along roads and primitive roads would be strongly encouraged through visitor information, education, and signing to assist visitors in selecting and using existing camp and parking sites that show clear evidence of

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						prior use. Existing and suitable sites is indicated or evidenced by the following: vehicle access to the site, lack of vegetation, bare mineral soils, and other dispersed campsite amenities such as fire rings. Existing vehicle parking and camping sites must be large enough to accommodate the group size without increasing the disturbed area. <i>[New for clarification]</i>
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.10: Camping facilities and length-of-stay limits would be developed and adjusted to sustain the prescribed settings and attain the desired objectives of the RMA(s) or undesignated lands for dispersed camping or managed camping areas. <i>[New for clarification]</i>
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.11: Long term visitor areas would not be designated.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.12: Collection of saguaro cacti skeletons for personal use or campfire burning would be prohibited. The burning of wood pallets in developed recreation sites is also prohibited to prevent the accumulation of nails and staples at campsites. <i>[New]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.13: The collection of dead, down, and detached wood for personal or campfire use while camping on public lands would be allowed. Collection of wood may be restricted in the future if needed as determined through monitoring. <i>[Revised to allow for adaptive management]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.14: Collection of firewood would be prohibited within 1/4 mile of developed recreation sites. <i>[Revised; original action in General Recreation section didn't provide protection around the site]</i>
Recreational Target Shooting						
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.15: Discharge of firearms would be allowed on BLM public lands except as specifically restricted in this land use plan or prohibited by federal and state law. This activity may be restricted or prohibited in specific areas where public safety and resource conflicts exist. For the safety of visitors and to avoid undue degradation of natural resources, visitors are encouraged to follow best management practices as outlined in Appendix H , Best Management Practices & Standard Operating Procedures.
Special Recreation Permits (SRPs)						
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.16: At the discretion of the authorized officer, special recreation permits (SRPs) would be authorized on a case-by-case basis as outlined in 43 CFR 2930; in subsequent policies and guidance (See Appendix H , Best Management Practices & Standard Operating Procedures); and in the decisions below.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.17: Organized groups over 75 people conducting non-commercial and non-competitive recreational activities and events

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						would require a permit unless otherwise specified in RMAs or designated sites where carrying capacities are established in subsequent implementation-level plans (such as in wilderness plans), or when special management and monitoring are determined to be needed. <i>[New]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.18: Certified weed-free feed would be required for all equestrian and stock animal uses authorized under SRPs.
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.19: Unless otherwise restricted in RMAs, competitive motorized and non-motorized speed events would be authorized on a case-by-case basis unless specifically prohibited. Routes would be evaluated for sustainability for speed racing activities, both motorized and non-motorized, during travel management planning. <i>[Revised to allow for flexibility in some areas; all speed events were prohibited in DRMP]</i>
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.20: Competitive motorized speed racing would be prohibited in Passage recreation settings (within Back Country settings). <i>[New; to protect Back Country experience]</i>
Paintball Activities						
LS		B	C		E	RM-3.1.21: Paintball activities would not be allowed in wilderness areas, ACECs and SRMAs. Paintball activities would be allowed beyond 0.25 miles of any established facility or site, campground, residence, trailhead, road, staging area, special designation and other areas as posted. Paintball activities would be restricted in accordance with any applicable local and state law.
LS				D		RM-3.1.22: Paintball activities would be prohibited.
Geocaching Activities						
LS		B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.23: An SRP would not be required if the geocaching activity is non-commercial, complies with land use decisions and designations, does not award cash prizes, is not publicly advertised, poses minimal risk for damage to public land or related water resource values, and generally requires no monitoring.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-3.1.24: The placement of geocaches is prohibited in archaeological and raptor nesting sites. Virtual caches may be allowed within archaeological sites with prior written authorization from the authorized officer.
LS	SDNM			D		RM-3.1.25: Geocache activities would be prohibited.

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area	Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 4 (Sonoran Desert National Monument): Recreation opportunities and experiences in the Sonoran Desert National Monument (SDNM) are derived from the objects and resource values for which the Monument was established.						
Objective 4.1 (SDNM ERMA): Provide modest facilities, educational opportunities, and visitor information to the extent that 90% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreation experience.						
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for SDNM ERMA (Alternatives B, C and E)						
	SDNM	B	C		E	RM-4.1.1: The Sonoran Desert National Monument ERMA would be designated (486,400 acres) to provide for recreation opportunities and outcomes that derive from the objects for which the National Monument was designated.
Objective 4.1.1 (Juan Bautista de Anza NHT RMZ): To provide recreation and educational opportunities directed at visitors seeking to discover, tour, and learn about the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, Arizona history, and natural history of the Sonoran Desert.						
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Juan Bautista de Anza NHT RMZ (Alternatives B, C and E)						
	SDNM	B	C		E	RM-4.1.1.1: The Juan Bautista de Anza NHT (Anza) RMZ would be designated within the SDNM ERMA (approximately 52,800 acres).
	SDNM	B				RM-4.1.1.2: The physical, social and administrative settings for the Anza RMZ would be managed for 72% Front Country, 28% Back Country and <1% Passage.
	SDNM		C			RM-4.1.1.3: physical, social and administrative settings for the Anza RMZ would be managed for 31% Front Country, 68% Back Country and <1% Passage.
	SDNM				E	RM-4.1.1.4: physical, social and administrative settings for the Anza RMZ would be managed for 45% Front Country, 55% Back Country and <1% Passage.
	SDNM	B	C		E	RM-4.1.1.5: The motor vehicle travel system would consist primarily of primitive roads maintained at levels 1-3 with up to 20% maintained at level 5 to provide two-wheel-drive passenger car access to public use cultural sites, day use areas and camping facilities.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.1.1.6: The zone would be managed mostly for the following VRM Classes (see Maps 2-3b and e): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative B: Mostly Class III with some Class II near Butterfield Pass; • Alternative C: Mostly Class II with small amount of Class III in high use recreation areas; • Alternative D: Nearly all Class I with small amount of Class II in high use recreation areas; and • Alternative E: Mostly Class II with small portions of Class

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						III near high use recreation areas. [DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]
Objective 4.1.2 (Desert Back Country RMZ): To provide recreation opportunities for visitors seeking a remote, undeveloped, back country experience with resource-dependent activities such as hunting, camping, hiking, sightseeing, and four-wheel touring.						
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Desert Back Country RMZ (Alternatives B, C and E)						
	SDNM	B	C		E	RM-4.1.2.1: The Desert Back Country RMZ would be designated (433,600 acres; see Maps 2-12b, c and e).
	SDNM	B				RM-4.1.2.2: The physical, social and administrative settings for the Desert Back Country RMZ would be managed for 16% Front Country, 84% Back Country and <1% Passage.
	SDNM		C			RM-4.1.2.3: The physical, social and administrative settings for the Desert Back Country RMZ would be managed for 9% Front Country, 91% Back Country and <1% Passage.
	SDNM				E	RM-4.1.2.4: The physical, social and administrative settings for the Desert Back Country RMZ would be managed for 12% Front Country, 88% Back Country and <1% Passage.
	SDNM	B	C		E	RM-4.1.2.5: The motor vehicle travel system would consist primarily of primitive roads maintained at levels 1-3 with up to 5% maintained at level 5 to provide two-wheel-drive passenger car access to public use cultural sites, day use areas and camping facilities.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.1.2.6: The zone would be managed mostly for the following VRM Classes (see Maps 2-3b and e): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All wilderness areas within zone are managed for VRM Class I for all alternatives; Alternative B: Mostly Class II with some Class III in northern section by North Maricopa Wilderness; Alternative C: Mostly Class II with small amount of Class III along I-8 and Vekol road; Alternative D: Nearly all Class I with small amount of Class II along Vekol road; and Alternative E: Mostly Class II with small portions of Class III near I-8 and Vekol road. [DRMP: VRM classes only shown on maps]
Objective 4.2 (SDNM General Recreation): Manage for recreation opportunities that derive from the vast, undeveloped, and remote character of the SDNM landscape, providing for the minimum of visitor assistance necessary to ensure visitor health and safety to the extent that 90% of sampled visitors report satisfaction with their recreation experience.						
	SDNM			D		RM-4.2.1: The SDNM would not be designated as a recreation

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						management area and would be classified as Undesignated Lands (see Map 2-12d). The recreation resource would be managed in response to conflicts with other uses of the SDNM. Physical, social, and administrative settings would not be established, and the designated motor vehicle travel system would consist entirely of primitive roads maintained at levels 1 to 3. Maintenance would not be provided for two-wheel-drive passenger car access. <i>[New to comply with new policy; SDNM originally an SRMA in Alternative D although minor change in emphasis to on-the-ground management]</i>
General Recreation Management Actions and Allowable Uses Specific to SDNM						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.2: The Sand Tanks Mountains area of the SDNM commonly known as "Area A" would be designated as a Special Management Area. Access to the area would continue to require the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range entry and public safety permit (for the BLM, these are managed as Individual Special Recreation Permits). (Area A is within the Desert Back Country RMZ in Alternatives B, C and E) <i>[Revised to correct language; has not previously been designated as a SMA]</i>
Camping, Parking, Facilities and Other						
	SDNM	B				RM-4.2.3: In the ERMA, dispersed overnight vehicle-based camping (including RVs) would be allowed. Cross country travel to access campsites would be prohibited. Existing vehicle and RV-based low-resource-impact campsites would be inventoried, suitable sites marked, their location made known, and their use by visitors encouraged. <i>[New]</i>
	SDNM		C		E	RM-4.2.4: In the Anza RMZ, vehicle-based camping (including RVs) would be allowed at designated sites only. A maximum of 100 sites could be designated over the life of the plan, subject to site-specific analysis and monitoring. Cross country travel to access campsites would be prohibited. Specific sites identified as open and/or available for camping would be periodically reviewed and modified based on public demand and resource protection needs within the SDNM. <i>[New]</i>
	SDNM		C		E	RM-4.2.5: In the Desert Back Country RMZ, dispersed vehicle-based camping (including RVs) would be allowed on existing or suitable sites as defined in RM-3.1.9. Cross country travel to access campsites would be prohibited. Over the life of the plan, designated sites would be established as the need arises to ensure the protection of Monument objects and other sensitive resources. <i>[New]</i>

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
	SDNM			D		RM-4.2.6: In the Monument, vehicle-based camping (including RVs) would be allowed at designated campsites only. A maximum of 100 campsites could be designated over the life of the plan, subject to site-specific analysis and monitoring. The designated sites would be periodically reviewed and modified based on public demand and resource protection needs within the SDNM. <i>[New]</i>
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.7: Motorized and mechanized use would be limited to areas within designated roads, primitive roads, and trails with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping, or parking unless otherwise posted. <i>[New to state existing state policy]</i>
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.8: Collection of native vegetation as firewood would be prohibited in Front Country and Passage settings. Visitors would be encouraged to bring firewood for campfires from sources outside the Monument. The burning of pallets, crates, and similar materials would be prohibited to prevent the accumulation of nails and staples at campsites.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.9: Visitor and management infrastructure would be constructed and maintained to accommodate visitation in balance with protection of Monument objects; would be modest in scope and scale; and would be designed to blend with the dominant features of the landscape.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.10: Visitor and management infrastructure would be placed on non-Monument lands, where possible.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.11: Activities, vehicles, and group sizes would be limited to designated sites and lengths of stay; types and speeds; and numbers as deemed necessary to protect Monument objects.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.12: The designated motorized travel system would consist primarily of existing vehicle routes; however, construction of short segments of new vehicle routes to provide experience opportunities consistent with the outcome objective(s) of management zones would be allowed.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.13: Standards for the management of recreation impacts to objects of the SDNM would be established and monitored by the limits of acceptable change (LAC) method.
Recreational Target Shooting <i>[Changed; Identified as Implementation Decisions in the DRMP]</i>						
	SDNM	B				RM-4.2.14: Recreational target shooting would be prohibited on approximately 389,989 acres, or 80.2 percent, of the SDNM determined to be unsuitable for this activity due to a prevalence of Monument objects. Recreational target shooting would continue on

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						approximately 96,411 acres, or 19.8 percent, of the SDNM where Monument objects are not prevalent. Hunting would be allowed in accordance with applicable federal, state and local laws. (See Appendix G , Recreational Target Shooting Analysis and Map 2-13b .)
	SDNM		C			RM-4.2.15: Recreational target shooting would be prohibited on approximately 485,264 acres, or 99.8 percent, of the SDNM determined to be unsuitable for continued recreational target shooting. Recreational target shooting would continue in five areas totaling 1,136 acres, or 0.2 percent, of the SDNM where it was found to be moderately or highly suitable. Hunting would be allowed in accordance with applicable federal, state and local laws (See Appendix G , SDNM Recreational Target Shooting Analysis and Map 2-13c).
	SDNM			D		RM-4.2.16: Recreational target shooting would not be allowed in the SDNM however hunting would be allowed in accordance with applicable federal, state and local laws.
	SDNM				E	RM-4.2.17: Recreational target shooting would be allowed on National Monument lands except as specifically restricted in this land use plan or prohibited by federal and state law. This activity may be restricted or prohibited in specific areas where public safety and resource conflicts exist, including the need to protect Monument objects. For the protection of Monument objects, to avoid undue degradation of natural resources, and for the safety of visitors, supplementary rules will be developed to allow enforcement of actions as described in the Administrative Actions following the Recreation Section of this plan, and shooters are encouraged to follow best management practices as outlined in Appendix H , Best Management Practices & Standard Operating Procedures.
Special Recreation Permits (SRPs)						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.18: At the discretion of the authorized officer, SRPs would be authorized on a case-by-case basis as outlined in 43 CFR 2930.5; in subsequent policies and guidance (See Appendix H , Best Management Practices & Standard Operating Procedures); and in the decisions below.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.19: Organized groups numbering greater than 25 participants would require a special recreation permit.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.20: To assure protection of Monument objects, permits would not be issued for organized groups of more than 200 participants at one site.

**Table 2-32
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Recreation Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.21: Competitive motor sports would not be allowed in the SDNM.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.22: All commercial, other competitive, and vendor activities would be permitted on a case-by-case basis if Monument objects are protected.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.23: Certified weed-free feed would be required for all equestrian and stock animal uses authorized under SRPs.
Paintball Activities						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	RM-4.2.24: Paintball activities would be prohibited.

Administrative Actions

- Coordinate with partners and nearby land owners/managers to develop joint campgrounds on and off public lands to provide for public camping needs.
- Develop partnerships and volunteer opportunities with local clubs, organizations, and communities to maintain and monitor routes, recreation sites, and other areas.
- Develop brochures, maps, and information sheets to disseminate recreation use information to the public
- Coordinate with adjoining landowners; Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal counties; and local communities to enhance visitor and resident safety, improve resource protection, and manage recreation use and access that is compatible with protecting resources.
- Plan, designate, and develop recreation areas, routes, trails, tours, and management strategies through interdisciplinary plans with community and user input. Project plans would establish use indicators and standards for monitoring and evaluation. All development must be compatible with SRMAs, VRM classes, and resource management objectives. Areas may be developed as needed for the following purposes:
 - Protecting resources,
 - Improving visitor safety,
 - Maintaining desired recreational setting and experiences.

Administrative Actions Specific to the SDNM Decision Area

- The BLM will collaborate with the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council, other interested stakeholders, and the public to consider management of recreational target shooting in the future.

- Coordinate with partners and nearby land owners/managers to develop regional shooting ranges outside the SDNM boundaries to support concentrated recreational target-shooting activities.
- Coordinate with interested shooting enthusiasts to develop partnerships for educating the shooting public in appropriate recreational and shooting behaviors and ethics.
- The BLM will work collaboratively with adjoining landowners, local communities, and interested individuals and organizations to incorporate the allowable uses and desired outcomes of this land use plan into comprehensive, activity-level recreation planning for the SDNM. Such activity-level planning and related site-specific projects will be designed to protect Monument objects, resources and visitor safety while providing desired recreation experiences and settings. For example, the BLM may consider recreational target shooting with further travel management planning (e.g. locating roads, trails and facilities that support motorized and non-motorized travel in the SDNM) hiking trails and trailheads, or other visitor facilities. Additional planning will include appropriate NEPA analysis to address potential site specific impacts.
- Educational materials and signage will be developed to inform the public about how to conduct target shooting activities in ways that avoid impacts to natural resources and monument objects. These materials will also educate visitors about the laws concerning littering, unnecessary damage to natural resources, 'Leave No Trace!' principles, and Arizona Cactus and native plant laws as they apply. These materials will be developed and installed or distributed to the public as soon as possible after the RMP is approved.
- Sufficient law enforcement will be dedicated to the National Monument to assure continued illegal conduct will cease and Monument objects will be protected. This will be particularly important after the RMP is approved, and until users become accustomed to the new rules created by this RMP, and until the partnerships described above are able to assist with management of recreational target shooting on the Monument.
- The monument will remain open to recreational target shooting. However, in order to minimize any adverse impacts of recreational shooting, the BLM will, as necessary, prepare supplementary rules, closure or restriction orders, and/or enforcement of the rules of conduct applicable to public lands.

Pursuant to its authority under 43 CFR 8365.1-6 (including appropriate NEPA analysis) the BLM may prepare supplementary rules in order to provide BLM Law Enforcement full authority to enforce certain restrictions on the monument with regard to target shooting. For example, a future supplementary rule could include, although not be limited to, the following:

- (a) Only retrievable, freestanding paper targets or targets commercially manufactured for the specific purpose of target shooting are allowed.
- (b) Shooting glass objects, electronic items and waste, and items that may contain hazardous materials (i.e. paint, spray paint, gasoline, Freon, propane, etc.) is prohibited.

- (c) Depositing or shooting appliances, furniture, electronic gear, toys, trash, household or construction products/refuse, or other debris determined to be garbage, refuse or waste by law enforcement or other authorized officers is prohibited.
 - (d) Attaching or placing targets on or in front of plants, rocks, or solid objects, signs and public infrastructure is prohibited.
 - (e) Shooting, injuring, defacing, harming or destroying plants, signs, outbuildings, public property, or other objects on federal lands that are for the public's enjoyment is prohibited.
 - (f) Shooting across or along any numbered BLM road, primitive road, vehicle route or trail, or within any BLM-designated recreation site, facility, trailhead, parking or staging area is prohibited.
 - (g) Persons engaged in target shooting shall pick up and remove shell casings, brass, targets, shrapnel, clay pigeon fragments, and all other debris resulting from target shooting activities.
 - (h) Discharge of a firearm is prohibited from ½ hour after sunset to ½ hour before sunrise.
 - (i) Using bullets to detonate explosives or an explosive device is prohibited.
- Recreational target shooting sites would be patrolled and monitored. Monitoring would include a range of possibilities from regular periodic visits to take pictures and document visible changes, to repeated measurement of site characteristics including vegetation, soils, barren areas, trash, or other characteristics as appropriate. BLM would collaborate with interested public to develop monitoring standards and methodologies for recreation activities on the Monument that address protection of Monument objects. Monitoring of activities such as recreational target shooting, camping, motorized recreation, visitation in wilderness areas, and others, will be conducted to assure future protection of Monument objects and to inform appropriate changes in Monument management.
 - The BLM would also exercise its authority pursuant to 43 C.F.R. 8364.1 (including appropriate NEPA analysis) to close areas or restrict recreational target shooting in order to protect persons, property, and public lands and resources.
 - As set forth in the BLM's regulations at 43 CFR Subpart 8365, the rules of conduct applicable to the public lands apply in the SDNM and LS planning areas. Violation of these regulations will result in penalties as set forth in 43 CFR 8360.0-7.

NOTE: As with all decisions in an RMP, implementation of these Administrative Actions will be subject to available funding and staffing.

2.11.5 TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

Comprehensive travel management strives to provide manageable access to public lands while balancing resource protection. The allocation of areas as open, closed or limited to OHV, also described as "off-road vehicles" in 43 CFR 8340-8342, directs the management approach for vehicular travel on public lands. Implementation-level actions such as designating routes as part of a planned network help create a balance between human use and resource protection. Administrative uses of vehicles such as military,

fire, or police actions are expressly defined as not being an off-road vehicle and are therefore exempt from vehicle regulations 43 CFR 8342.

Open-area allocation, where cross-country travel is allowed, is largely unused in central Arizona due to resource constraints presented by efforts to protect Sonoran Desert Tortoise, other wildlife disturbance, and concerns about public safety, such as those presented by abandoned mines. Several policies issued by national and Arizona State Office BLM direct local offices to be sensitive to resources/resource uses that may be affected by route designation. These policies include direction to:

- Complete route designation within 5 years of RMP completion (BLM Land Use Planning Handbook 1600-1).
- Follow archaeological and biological policies to ensure land health and compliance with protection laws. Specifically, IM-2007-030 and state manual supplements address National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 compliance for archaeological survey requirements where the federal action of designating the route network would have an effect on cultural resources.
- Not designate motorized routes within lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Specifically, BLM Manual 1626 and WO IM 2011-154 addresses the designation of routes in these areas, indicating that routes would not be designated as roads, trails or primitive roads and would remain as “primitive routes”. No maintenance requirements compiled by the BLM’s Facilities and Asset Management System (FAMS) for future funding or specific management would occur.
- Implement travel management (BLM Manual 1626) by addressing all routes, motorized and non-motorized, for designation for public or administrative use.
- Designate transportation assets as roads, primitive roads, and trails using the travel-management process (BLM Manual 1626). (See **Appendix U**, Definition of Transportation Asset Type, Functional Class, and Maintenance Intensity).

In this plan, the inventoried routes in the SDNM would be the basis for transportation assets designations as roads, primitive roads, or trails as defined in **Appendix U**. Routes in the Lower Sonoran Decision Area, outside the SDNM, would be designated within 5 years of RMP approval. Currently, all routes in the Lower Sonoran have been evaluated for potential conflict with the goals and objectives of resource programs and for their necessity for public use. Model route networks have been created for Alternatives B and D to assess the possible impacts to the resource programs when the actual route designations are completed. No individual route designations have been enacted, not even for ACECs or special wildlife management areas.

2.11.5.1 Current Temporary Closure on the SDNM

A temporary closure is currently in place in the SDNM to restore damaged lands predominately located north of SR 238 in the vicinity of the Anza NHT. No camping or vehicle use is permitted on 54,817 acres, including 89 miles of existing primitive roads. This temporary closure began on June 13, 2008 and is now under a court ordered settlement agreement. It is to remain in effect until the RMP is approved

and when the damaged lands are restored to the extent possible and when adequate measures and major components of the RMP have been implemented to prevent recurrence of such damage. See **Appendix S** for a description of the process for revising route designations in the planning areas.

2.11.5.2 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A - No Action for Travel Management

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable (see **Map 2-14a**).

Goldwater Amendment – Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1990)

(Applicable to public lands in the Sand Tanks Mountains “Area A” within the SDNM and lands south of Interstate 8 named the Sentinel Plains)

- Maintain and enforce public access permit requirements for visitation into Area A (Sand Tank Mountains) and other areas as required under Public Law 99-606.
- Designate the Sand Tank Mountains (Area A) and Sentinel Plain areas, and other lands under BLM jurisdiction, as limited off-road vehicle use areas, with vehicle use restricted to designated routes in ACECs and established roads elsewhere.
- Develop transportation plan for Area A.
- Permit no open or unrestricted OHV use areas or competitive OHV use or events.
- Prohibit public off-road travel or cross-country vehicle use in all areas.
- Adopt the US Air Force General Vehicle Operating Rules.

Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan (1983)

(Applicable to public lands in the Saddle Mountain area)

- No new roads would be allowed in the Saddle Mountain block of public land. About 5,500 acres area’s center encompassing Saddle Mountain would be established as a recreation and rock hound area if Congress did not designate the lands as wilderness (RR-12).

Lower Gila Resource Management Plan Amendment (2005)

(Applicable to a portion of lands in the LSFO and all lands within the SDNM Planning Areas)

- The Vekol Valley Grassland and Coffee Pot Botanical Area ACECs would be closed to recreational OHV use in accordance with 43 CFR, Part 8340, and Subpart 8342. (Not numbered)
- All public lands described in the MFP and RMP are designated as “limited” except wilderness, which is closed to motor vehicles, and relinquished portions of the BGR, which remain

restricted to entry by permit only. OHV and special-recreation vehicles are limited to existing designated roads and vehicle routes. No unauthorized cross-country vehicle travel is permitted. Creation of unauthorized new trails, as well as widening or extension of existing trails, is not permitted (RR-9).

- Single- or multiple-use OHV and special-recreation vehicle areas, routes, and management strategies would be designated and developed through interdisciplinary plans. Planning shall address limits of acceptable change indicators and standards, conflicts, issues, and solutions to vehicle-management problems (RR-10).
- Roads and trails used as race courses would be evaluated for no action, closure, rehabilitation, or modification and authorization as race courses (RR-11).
- Site-specific inventories would be conducted to delineate existing roads and vehicle routes as requested by the authorized officer (RR-12).
- Approved hiking and equestrian trails are closed to unauthorized motorized use (RR-13).
- Road or area closures would be enacted where OHV or special-recreation vehicle use is determined to be inconsistent with established ROS classifications or such use is causing harm to natural or cultural resources (RR-14).
- Cross-country vehicle travel would be permitted only when specifically authorized to complete a task requiring such use, and only in areas where such use would not cause unnecessary or undue resource impacts (RR-15).
- OHV designations for relinquished portions of the BGR are retained – a permit is required for entry to these lands, and motorized travel is limited to designated, established routes (RR-16).
- Wilderness is closed to mechanized use. The provisions of existing wilderness-management plans and wildlife operations and maintenance plans pertaining to motorized and mechanized administrative uses in wilderness would remain in effect (RR-17).
- Self-contained or vehicle-based camping would be permitted within 50 feet of the centerline of designated or existing routes. Cross-country travel to campsites is not permitted (RR-54).

Phoenix Resource Management Plan (1989)

(Applicable to public lands in the extreme eastern part of the Planning Area)

- The RMP presented both area designations and included language for route designations.
- The 6,800-acre San Tan Mountains Regional Park was retained as a Cooperative Recreation Management Area in association with Maricopa County Parks and Recreation. (Travel management decisions were addressed subsequently in the San Tan Mountains Regional Park Master Plan). This agreement expires in 2013.

SDNM Current Management Guidance (2002)*(Applicable to lands in the Sonoran Desert National Monument)*

- For the purpose of protecting Monument objects, all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road will be prohibited, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes.
- In order to protect the public during operations at the adjacent BGR and to continue management practices that have resulted in an exceptionally well preserved natural resource, the current procedures for public travel and access to the portion of the Monument depicted as Area A shall remain in full force and effect, except to the extent that the US Air Force agrees to different procedures which the BLM determines are compatible with the protection of the objects identified in this proclamation.

2.11.5.3 Action Alternatives for Travel Management**Program Goals**

- Goal 1: All public land would be classified as open, closed or limited per 43 CFR 8342.1.
- Goal 2: Public use, resource management, and regulatory needs are met by development of a travel management plan and implementation of a travel management system.
- Goal 3: Protect Monument objects and purposes from human impacts associated with motorized and non-motorized travel within the SDNM.
- Goal 4: Protect Monument objects and resources, meet conservation and restoration goals, ensure sustainable public use and enjoyment, and satisfy public safety and regulatory requirements by developing a travel management plan and implement a sustainable and compatible travel management system.
- Goal 5: Manage the travel management system for the LSFO area to protect resources and maintain desired recreation experiences.

Allocations Summary (Planning-level)

**Table 2-33
Off-Highway Vehicle Area Designations by Alternative**

	Alternative (BLM acres)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Lower Sonoran					
Open	0	40	0	0	0
Closed	100,000	91,100*	91,100	342,700	91,100
Limited to existing roads and trails	830,200	0	0	0	0
Limited to Designated Routes	0	839,060	839,100	587,500	839,100
<i>Total</i>	930,200	930,200	930,200	930,200	930,200

Table 2-33
Off-Highway Vehicle Area Designations by Alternative

	Alternative (BLM acres)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
SDNM					
Open	0	0	0	0	0
Closed	161,200	157,700	157,700	313,600	157,700
Limited to existing roads and trails	325,200	0	0	0	0
Limited to Designated Routes	0*	328,700	328,700	172,800	328,700
<i>Total</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400</i>	<i>486,400</i>

* The amount of closed lands are less in B, C, and E alternatives than in alternative A because the Vekol ACEC, which is currently closed to motorized use, is not proposed to be carried forward, thereby adding the total of lands in the limited classification category.

The closures in Alternatives B, C, and E represent designated Wilderness acreage. Alternative D acreage includes designated Wilderness and lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics.

Allocations Summary for the SDNM (Implementation-Level)

Table 2-34, Route Designations in the SDNM by Alternative, describes proposed route designations in the SDNM.

Table 2-34
Route Designations in the SDNM by Alternative

	Alternative (miles)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Total Route Inventory	623.7	631.7	623.7	623.7	631.7
Total Proposed Route System ¹	617.1	559.6	446.8	253.3	410.9
Road Closures ²	6.6	72.0	176.8	370.3	220.4
Road Closure Percentage ³	1.0%	11.4%	28.3%	59.4%	35%
Current Asset Type					
Road - Maintained	17.7	32.6	24.6	24.6	32.6
Open	17.7	24.2	24.2	24.2	24.2
Limited to Admin Use Only	0	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Closed	0	0	0	0	0
New	0	8.0	0	0	8.0
Primitive Road - Unmaintained	580.4	570.2	570.2	570.2	570.2
Open	573.8	494.4	356.4	200.2	323.8
Seasonally Limited (Closed April 15 to Aug. 31)	0	0	0	0	26.0
Seasonally Limited (Closed Feb. 1 to Sept. 15)	0	0	37.3	0	0
Limited to vehicles 50" wide or less	0	3.9	0	0	0

Table 2-34
Route Designations in the SDNM by Alternative

	Alternative (miles)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Limited to Non-Motorized Use ⁴	0	3.2	8.4	12.2	8.3
Limited to Admin Use Only	0	0	17.3	36.9	7.8
Closed	6.6	68.4	150.7	320.8	204.3
Trail	25.6	28.9	28.9	28.9	28.9
Open to non-motorized/mechanized travel	0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Open to non-motorized/non-mechanized travel (wilderness trails)	25.6	25.6	25.6	25.6	25.6

¹Total Proposed Route System (Miles) equals the sum of open roads, primitive roads, trails (including those limited by season, width, and non-motorized use), and new roads. The total excludes roads and primitive roads limited to administrative use. See **Maps 2-15a, 2-15b, 2-15c, 2-15d, and 2-15e**.

²Road Closures (Miles) equals the sum of closed roads and primitive roads, roads and primitive roads limited to administrative use, and primitive roads limited to non-motorized use.

³Road Closure Percentage equals the miles of road closure divided by the total route inventory (631.5 miles). Note: Primitive roads limited to non-motorized use are included here because no vehicular use would be permitted.

⁴Applies to the Anza NHT, where bicycles and handcars would be allowed, but not motor vehicles.

NOTE: Large format (36"x36") maps showing the proposed roads, primitive roads, and trails by route number are available for viewing on the PRMP/FEIS CDs, or on the BLM website at www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/planning/son_des.html.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-35, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management, describes management and allowable uses for travel management. **Table 2-36**, Model of Potential Maintenance Level Assignments for Each Alternative, describes potential maintenance level assignments for each alternative.

Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: All public land should be classified as open, closed or limited per 43 CFR 8342.1.		
Objective 1.1: Manage areas to sustain experiences of unstructured travel throughout the life of the plan using the OHV area allocation open.		
LS	B	TM-1.1.1:40 acres would be designated as an open motorized and mechanized vehicle-use area in the Ajo SRMA (T12S R6W Sec4; Map 2-14b). Within this area, vehicles would not be restricted to vehicle routes. The area would be signed and fenced. Local partners would be sought to monitor use, provide on-site management, and educate users in environmental stewardship.

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B				TM-1.1.2: Within the 40-acre open area described under TM-1.1.1, campsite access would be allowed by any travel mode to any location
LS			C	D	E	TM-1.1.3 No areas would be allocated for open motorized vehicle use.
<u>Objective 1.2:</u> Manage areas for resource protection, conservation, restoration, and public safety using the OHV area allocation closed.						
LS		B	C		E	TM-1.2.1: Approximately 91,100 acres would be closed to motorized use (designated wilderness).
LS				D		TM-1.2.2: Approximately 313,600 acres would be closed to motorized use. These areas would include designated wilderness areas, and lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics..
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-1.2.3: Camping would be allowed in closed areas when accessed by non-motorized, non-mechanized means.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-1.2.4: The use of wheeled game carriers would be prohibited in wilderness areas. Elsewhere, non-motorized, hand-powered, wheeled game carriers would be permitted to travel cross-country for the purpose of retrieving downed game. Retrieval of downed game by cross-country motor vehicle use is prohibited.
<u>Objective 1.3:</u> Manage areas by structuring travel for visitor use and enjoyment, resource protection, conservation, and restoration using the OHV area allocation limited over the lifetime of the plan.						
LS		B				TM-1.3.1: Approximately 839,060 acres would be limited to existing roads and trails (based on current BLM route inventories) until such time as route designations are completed. When this is completed, travel would be restricted to designated roads, primitive roads, and trails. Non-motorized vehicles (e.g., bicycles, hang gliders, other devices for conveyance and stock drawn carts/wagons) would be limited to designated roads, primitive roads, and trails.
LS			C	D	E	TM-1.3.2: The 40-acre parcel in T12S, R6W, Sec.4 used for motocross riding would be managed the same as the surrounding area where motorized and mechanized vehicles would be restricted to designated routes and maintain the "motocross experience" area. Local partners would be obtained to monitor use and provide training in environmental stewardship to users of the area and provide on-site management.
	SDNM		C		E	TM-1.3.3: Routes within washes would be closed from April 15-August 31 during the travel management route designation process to address the forage, shelter, breeding, and thermal cover protection provided by washes as a component of wildlife habitat. In Alternative B, this management action would apply to routes 8008H, 8013, 8016B, 8017, 8018, 8019, and 8026B. In Alternative E, this management action would apply to routes 8013, 8018, and 8019.
LS			C		E	TM-1.3.4: Approximately 839,060 acres would be limited to existing roads and trails (based on current BLM route inventories) until such

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						time as route designations are completed. When this is completed, travel would be restricted to designated roads, primitive roads and trails. Non-motorized vehicles (e.g., bicycles, hang gliders, other devices for conveyance and stock drawn carts/wagons) would be limited to designated roads, primitive roads and trails.
LS		B	C		E	TM-1.3.5: One-time travel off of designated routes may be approved with written authorization from the authorized officer to access sick or injured livestock. Use of vehicles for livestock herding in a cross-country manner is prohibited.
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>TM-1.3.6: The use of motorized or mechanized vehicles off designated routes would be prohibited in OHV areas designated as limited to designated routes, closed for motorized vehicles, and in all travel-management areas designated for non-motorized vehicles except as noted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per Arizona BLM policy, motorized vehicles would be allowed to pull off 100 feet on either side of the centerline of a designated route for vehicle passing, emergency stopping parking or camping as long as soils, drainages, and woody vegetation are not damaged. This use shall be monitored on a continuing basis. If monitoring results show effects that exceed limits of acceptable change, motorized vehicles would not be allowed to pull off a designated route 100 feet on either side of the centerline. Outside of wilderness, hand-powered, non-motorized wheeled game carriers would be allowed to travel cross-country for the purpose of retrieving downed game. Motorized cross-country use would only be permitted with written authorization from the BLM authorized officer, or when necessary for emergency situations involving public health and safety.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-1.3.7: Retrieval of downed game by cross-country motor vehicle use is prohibited.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-1.3.8: Travel within the Painted Rock camping closure area (see Map 2-12a) is limited to signed open and/or designated routes.
<u>Objective 1.4: Secure legal access to public lands at all designated entry points to public land within ten years of completing route designations.</u>						
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-1.4.1: The BLM would enter into access agreements for long-term legal access.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-1.4.2: The BLM would acquire easements or real property from private land owners or other jurisdictions as necessary to maintain or reestablish access to public lands. The locations are identified in Appendix BB and would be prioritized to maintain the preliminary or

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						existing road and trail network.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-1.4.3: Access to public lands along urban interface areas would be limited to designated legal access routes as established by travel management planning.
Goal 2: Public use, resource management, and regulatory needs are met by development of a Travel Management Plan and implementation of a travel management system.						
<u>Objective 2.1: Complete the designation of roads, primitive roads, and trails within 5 years of plan completion.</u>						
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.1: Develop Travel Management Plans for specific travel management areas to accomplish final route designations within five years of completion of the Approved RMP. In general, Travel Management Area boundaries would correspond to the boundaries set forth in this plan.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.2: A standardized method for identifying uses and impacts to routes and areas would be employed following established selection criteria and proposing route designations. An example of such a process is shown in Appendix S , Route Evaluation Methodology and Impact Analysis.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.3: Criteria to guide route designations would be established based on management actions for recreation wildlife, vegetation, cultural resources, lands/realty, mining, and other resources or resource uses as appropriate. (See administrative actions section for a listing of criteria).
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.4: Mitigation strategies would be identified and used to reduce the impacts of travel routes and their use on the resources. Examples of typical actions are shown in Appendix T , Route Mitigations.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.5: Route-designation decisions would be incorporated into planning for all resources or resource uses and would be based on the route networks portrayed on final designation maps and written guidance contained within travel management plans. This would include the management action from WL-1.1.4.
LS		B	C	D	E	<p>TM-2.1.6: New permanent or temporary routes may be added to route networks to address changed conditions or demands (including access to areas for minerals extraction, rights-of-way, recreation developments, etc.) following NEPA-Compliant analyses. In addition to Standard Operating Procedures outlined in Appendix H, priority for approval of new routes would include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access replacing existing routes and involving lower environmental impact, 2. Selection of a low environmental impact route from among alternatives considered, 3. Routes to be added to the network of designated routes, and 4. Routes needed temporarily that would require rehabilitation after the need for access has ended.

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.7: Ensure recreation objectives and settings prescribed in the Recreation section and the RAC Guidelines for OHV Management would be met when designating routes within TMAs.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.8: Casual and authorized recreational uses of the travel system would be addressed when authorizing actions. Where major arteries in the recreational route network would be truncated or considerably altered by the authorization, mitigation would be required
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.9: Develop long distance roads, primitive roads, or trails that connect communities, adjacent lands, and areas of interests.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-2.1.10: Complete travel planning as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2013/2014 – Ajo and Saddle Mountain TMAs • FY 2014/2015 Buckeye Hills and Rainbow Valley TMAs • FY 2015/2016 Gila Bend Mountains TMA • FY 2017/2018 East Valley and Globe/Miami TMAs

Objective 2.2: Delineate areas where community interests or a manageable geographic boundary exists and address landscape issues in a programmatic manner.

LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-2.2.1: The following travel management areas (TMAs) would be created. (See Maps 2-14b-e.) <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Travel Management Areas (Acres)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>TMA</th> <th>Total</th> <th>BLM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ajo</td> <td>190,200</td> <td>177,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SDNM</td> <td>496,400</td> <td>486,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gila Bend Mountains</td> <td>744,900</td> <td>517,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Globe/Miami</td> <td>119,600</td> <td>5,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rainbow Valley</td> <td>349,100</td> <td>108,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Buckeye Hills</td> <td>219,700</td> <td>55,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East Valley</td> <td>497,700</td> <td>15,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Saddle Mountain</td> <td>184,100</td> <td>50,400</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Travel Management Areas (Acres)			TMA	Total	BLM	Ajo	190,200	177,800	SDNM	496,400	486,400	Gila Bend Mountains	744,900	517,500	Globe/Miami	119,600	5,600	Rainbow Valley	349,100	108,400	Buckeye Hills	219,700	55,500	East Valley	497,700	15,000	Saddle Mountain	184,100	50,400
Travel Management Areas (Acres)																																				
TMA	Total	BLM																																		
Ajo	190,200	177,800																																		
SDNM	496,400	486,400																																		
Gila Bend Mountains	744,900	517,500																																		
Globe/Miami	119,600	5,600																																		
Rainbow Valley	349,100	108,400																																		
Buckeye Hills	219,700	55,500																																		
East Valley	497,700	15,000																																		
Saddle Mountain	184,100	50,400																																		

Goal 3: Protect Monument objects and purposes from human impacts associated with motorized and non-motorized travel within the SDNM.

Objective 3.1: Close areas of the SDNM to motorized-vehicle activities for the purposes of protecting Monument objects and resources; and meeting associated conservation, restoration, and public safety goals over the lifetime of the plan.

	SDNM	B	C		E	TM-3.1.1: Approximately 157,700 acres of designated wilderness would remain closed to motorized use.
	SDNM			D		TM-3.1.2: Approximately 310,700 acres would be closed to motorized

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						use. These acres include designated wilderness and lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics.
<u>Objective 3.2:</u> Limit motorized vehicle use in certain SDNM areas to designated roads, primitive roads to minimize impacts to Monument objects; other resources; and to reduce or eliminate resource, visitor, and behavior-based conflicts over the lifetime of the plan.						
	SDNM	B	C		E	TM-3.2.1: Approximately 328,700 acres would be limited to designated roads, primitive roads and trails. All other vehicles (e.g., bicycles, stock drawn carts/wagons, and other devices for conveyance) would be limited to primitive roads designated as open for such use.
	SDNM			D		TM-3.2.2: Same as Alternative C except motorized travel and bicycle use in acres would be limited to designated roads, primitive roads.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-3.2.3: Motorized vehicles would be required to be “street legal” (licensed and registered), display a valid Arizona OHV sticker, be compliant with current or future state, county or local licensing, certification or authorization requirements, and be operated by licensed drivers.
	SDNM			D		TM-3.2.4: The following vehicle types: all-terrain (ATV, UTV and quad), motorcycle (dirt and dual-sport), and vehicles weighing less than 1,800 pounds, would be prohibited on primitive roads.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-3.2.5: Restrictions from other resource section management actions would apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WL-1.1.4
Goal 4: Provide a comprehensive travel management system that supports protection of Monument objects, facilitates resource protection, and provides sustainable public use and enjoyment.						
<u>Objective 4.1:</u> Pursue and secure legal access when possible over the lifetime of the plan.						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-4.1.1: Legal or permissive access would be secured to all identified access points to designated routes within 10 years of final route designation. Identified access points including legal descriptions may be found in Appendix BB .
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-4.1.2: Access to public lands would be restricted along urban interface as needed to protect Monument values and objects or at the request of adjoining land owners.
<u>Objective 4.2:</u> Assign BLM road maintenance intensity levels on designated roads as a part of travel management planning and make adjustments as needed as maintenance of the travel management plans.						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-4.2.1: Roads and primitive roads could be redeveloped to meet either Level 5 maintenance intensity (the highest BLM standard) or the Level 3 standard as necessary to satisfy Objective 4.2 and prescriptions in TM-4.2.2 or TM-4.2.3 . Level 1 roads are primitive and would not be maintained except to correct safety hazards or resource problems such as erosion.
	SDNM	B	C			TM-4.2.2: Up to 20 percent of designated Monument roads/primitive

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area	Alternative			Management Actions and Allowable Uses
				<p>roads could be assigned to Level 5 maintenance standards (passenger-car access) or Level 3 maintenance standards. Level 5 and 3 maintenance level assignments would be adjusted or assigned as necessary to ensure that motorized travel routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are compatible with protection of Monument objects and resources; • Achieve the Monument’s desired social and managerial recreation settings; • Meet established limits of acceptable change indicators and standards; • Satisfy biological and ecological land health standards; • Protect or mitigate effects on cultural resources; • Ensure visitor and agency staff safety; • Resolve erosion, air quality, or resource damage issues; • Offer sustainable access to popular Monument features, as well as recreation and national historic trail attractions; and • Meet water quality standards for influenced drainages and watersheds. <p>See Table 2-35, Model of Potential Maintenance Level Assignments for Each Alternative, for a model of potential maintenance level assignments for each alternative.</p>
SDNM		D	E	<p>TM-4.2.3: Up to 10 percent of designated Monument roads/primitive roads could be assigned to Level 5 maintenance standards (passenger-car access) or Level 3 maintenance standards. Level 5 and 3 maintenance level assignments would be adjusted or assigned as necessary to ensure that motorized travel routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are compatible with protection of Monument objects and resources; • Achieve the Monument’s desired social and managerial recreation settings; • Meet established limits of acceptable change indicators and standards; • Satisfy biological and ecological land health standards; • Protect or mitigate effects on cultural resources; • Ensure visitor and agency staff safety; • Resolve erosion, air quality, or resource damage issues; • Offer sustainable access to popular Monument features, as well as recreation and national historic trail attractions; and • Meet water quality standards for influenced drainages and watersheds. <p>See Table 2-35, Model of Potential Maintenance Level Assignments for Each Alternative.</p>

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
	SDNM	B	C		E	TM-4.2.4: One-time travel off of designated routes may be approved with authorization from the authorized officer to access sick or injured livestock. Use of vehicles for livestock herding is prohibited.
<u>Objective 4.3:</u> Minimize the effects of the route system on the Monument and its objects and implement mitigation strategies as needed to resolve conflicts.						
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-4.3.1: Mitigation strategies would be identified and required to reduce the effects of routes and their use. Examples of typical actions are shown in Appendix S , Route Evaluation Methodology and Impact Analysis.
Goal 5: Manage the travel management system to protect resources and maintain desired recreation experiences.						
<u>Objective 5.1:</u> Determine the compatibility of emerging issues such as new vehicle technology or new or proposed recreation uses or use areas such as technical vehicle-use sites or motorcycle-observed trails. Proposals for using new recreation technologies or activities would be evaluated and a decision made to proceed or deny the use or proposal as funding and staffing allows.						
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-5.1.1: Technical vehicle use sites or other specialized recreation sites would be delineated through activity level planning.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-5.1.2: Technical vehicle use sites would be evaluated and established on a case-by-case basis with community and user input. Sites would be developed as needed to ensure visitor safety, meet enthusiast needs, improve recreation experiences, and increasing recreation opportunities. Site plans would establish limits of acceptable change indicators and standards. All sites would be compatible with social and managerial recreation settings and VRM standards; would satisfy biological and ecological land health standards; would protect or mitigate cultural resources; and would meet water quality standards for influenced drainages and watersheds.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-5.1.3: Travel management assets or their maintenance intensity shall not be changed without NEPA and a travel plan amendment. Road maintenance activities can only be completed with approval of the authorized BLM officer. This includes all permitted activities that use designated routes such as ranching, mining and other authorized activities.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-5.1.4: Adjustments to the designated route network may be requested by the public following the process set forth in Appendix S , Route Evaluation Methodology and Impacts Analysis.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-5.1.5: Areas affected by legal off-route travel, such as law enforcement-pursuit and wildfire suppression, would be restored within one year of the incident.
LS		B	C	D	E	TM-5.1.6: Establish the travel system as an asset and consider its values when authorizing land use actions and other activities. All land use

**Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management**

Decision Area	Alternative					Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						authorizations, permits, and other activities would be required to use designated routes. The BLM would authorize new roads or cross-country use for land use authorizations only as a last resort.
<u>Objective 5.2:</u> All travel modes and uses on the SDNM travel system must be consistent with the travel management plan and Monument objects and resources. The BLM shall respond promptly to proposals for additional travel modes and uses (as funding and staffing allows).						
SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-5.2.1: New travel technologies and uses would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis with community and user input. Compatibility evaluations would be developed as needed to ensure protection of Monument objects and resources, provide compatible and sustainable experiences based on Monument Objects and resources, and visitor safety. The compatibility analysis would establish limits of acceptable change indicators and standards. All uses would be compatible with protection of Monument objects, the Monument's social and managerial recreation settings and VRM standards; the Monuments biological and ecological land health standards; protection of cultural resources; and water quality standards for influenced drainages and watersheds.	
Goal 6: Protect Monument objects and resources, meet conservation and restoration goals, ensure sustainable public use and enjoyment, and satisfy public safety and regulatory requirements by developing a travel management plan and implementing a sustainable and compatible travel management system.						
<u>Objective 6.1:</u> Plan and implement a networked system of roads, primitive roads and trails within 1 year of plan completion.						
SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-6.1.1: The use of motorized or mechanized vehicles off designated roads or primitive roads would be prohibited with the following management restrictions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized and mechanized use would be limited to areas within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping, or parking unless otherwise posted Non-motorized, hand-powered wheeled game carriers would be permitted to travel cross-country (except in wilderness areas) for the purpose of retrieving downed game on public lands. 	
SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-6.1.2: A travel management plan would be developed and implemented upon plan approval, including designating roads, primitive roads and trails that are open, closed or limited by use type or time, and allocating maintenance class.	
Travel Management Implementation Actions for the SDNM						
SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-6.1.3: A network of routes would be designated upon plan approval to include roads, primitive roads and trails that are open, closed or limited in their use as specified Table 2-33 .	

Table 2-35
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Travel Management

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						For route locations, refer to the route maps on the CD, web site, or hard copies by request to the LSFO.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	TM-6.1.4: Develop legal public access along Interstate 8, in cooperation with ADOT and FHWA, to designated roads and primitive roads in SDNM.

Table 2-36
Model of Potential Maintenance Level Assignments for Each Alternative

Maintenance Intensity Levels	A		B		C		D		E	
	5 or 3	1								
Road miles maintained	18	0	106	0	81	0	27	0	41	0
Primitive road miles (not maintained)	0	578	0	423	0	355	0	246	0	363
Total road miles available for travel*	568		531		403		235		404	

* From **Table 2-33**, the Total Proposed Route minus Trail Miles equals the Total Road Miles available for Travel.

Administrative Actions

General

- The development of standards for monitoring the route system would be directed by compliance with laws, regulations, and travel management plan goals and objectives
- Agreements with local interest groups and communities would be established for long-term route maintenance and community support.
- Participate in regional or municipal transportation planning and promote appropriate legal access consistent with the land use plan.
- Establish a framework for reviewing the travel management program and make necessary changes to meet land health standards, area management, and recreation goals.
- Casual and authorized recreational uses of the travel system would be addressed when authorizing actions. Where major arteries in the recreational route network would be truncated or considerably altered by the authorization, mitigation would be required
- Consider adjustments to route designations, including adding, removing, and redeveloping routes and access, when necessary. Criteria for route designation adjustments can be found

in **Appendix S**, Route Evaluation Methodology and Impact Analysis and **Appendix H**, Best Management Practices and Standard Operating Procedures, Travel Management subsection.

- Develop brochures, maps, access guides, and information sheets to disseminate targeted recreation opportunity information to the public.
- Develop and maintain a monitoring system to support implementation and management of motorized and non-motorized use of the public lands, including routes and access points.
- Create an acquisition plan including a list of parcels where legal access needs to be secured.
- Implement route-mitigation techniques when designing and implementing the route system.
- Identify and manage for a wide range of issues in travel management areas.
- In areas where access permits are required, coordinate with other agencies that issue use permits on public lands to provide reasonable access for their permitted activities. For example, the BLM and AGFD would coordinate hunter access into permit-required access areas for hunters with valid hunting licenses for the affected hunting unit.
- Promote the establishment of additional areas open to motorized and/or non-motorized vehicle use outside of public lands if regional public demand for off-road motorized and/or non-motorized vehicle recreation would support such activities.
- Support the development and implementation of regional or municipal transportation plans that protect or promote appropriate legal access to public lands and are consistent with resource and use objectives.
- Establish relationships and enter into agreements with local OHV groups and other groups and communities for long-term route maintenance and community support.
- Respect valid existing rights.

Specific to the Lower Sonoran Decision Area

- Publish a map of the approved travel system depicting the route designation and associated access points for public access.
- Sign routes and associated access points as needed to identify public lands and disseminate information.
- Partner with neighboring BLM offices, counties, municipalities and user groups to identify, plan, implement, and maintain long-distance motorized routes and non-motorized trail systems.
- Apply route-mitigation techniques when designing and implementing the route system.

- Assess the level of success in managing designated access points and unauthorized routes at least bi-yearly.
- Conduct condition assessments of designated and unauthorized routes and associated access points relative to the standards prescribed by the travel management plan.
- Identify use patterns, including the types, frequency, intensity, and distribution of authorized and unauthorized travel and transportation activities.
- Improve visitor compliance with outdoor ethics through education.
- Identify public-safety issues related to the travel system.
- Publish policies and procedures for travel-system administration.
- As part of the travel management implementation, develop fences, signs, gates, and other methods to manage access, address public safety concerns, and eliminate use of vehicles off of designated routes.

Specific to the SDNM Decision Area

- Support development and implementation of regional and municipal transportation plans that protect or provide appropriate legal access to the SDNM and protect its resources and management objectives.
- Where needed, the SDNM boundary should be identified with appropriate fencing, signs, and other structures.
- Portions of the SDNM may be closed as needed to accommodate safety, climate, resource protection, specific projects, or staffing constraints.

2.12 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

2.12.1 AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACEC)

Areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) are sections of public land that require special management to prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values; wildlife resources; other natural systems or processes; and to protect life and provide safety from natural hazards.

Authority to designate ACECs is provided for in FLPMA and in Title 43 CFR, Part 1610.7. Not only must ACECs require special management; they must meet relevance and importance criteria. In accordance with FLPMA, to qualify as ACECs areas must have substantial significance and value, including qualities “of more than local significance and special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern.” These values are considered the highest and best use for those lands, and protecting them takes precedence over the BLM’s mandate to manage public lands for multiple uses.

According to law, areas with the potential for designation and associated management protection actions must be identified during the land use planning process. In the Proposed RMP (Alternative E), this plan proposes to designate four new ACECs in the Lower Sonoran, carry forward one existing ACEC, and no longer designate the existing Vekol Valley Grasslands ACEC. Evaluations for all ACECs can be found in **Appendix V**, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Evaluations.

2.12.1.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. (See Map 2-16a) Because none of these current land use plans encompass the current Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward. Instead they are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (1989)

- Closes Vekol Valley ACEC to recreational off-road vehicle use in accordance with 43 CFR, Part 8340, and Subpart 8342. (RR-08)
- Closes the Coffee Pot ACEC to recreational off-road vehicle use in accordance with 43 CFR, Part 8340, and Subpart 8342. (RR-09)
- Requires the BLM to place special emphasis on the protection of four significant botanical areas important in studying the original plant communities in the Sonoran Desert: Eagletail Mountains, Coffee Pot Botanical, Table Top area, and Sierra Estrella area (SM-17).
- Does not designate the Sierra Estrella area as an ACEC (SM-18).
- Does not designate Table Top area as an ACEC (SM-19).
- Designates two areas within the Lower Gila South Planning Area boundaries as ACECs: Vekol Valley grassland and the Coffee Pot Botanical area. The purpose is to provide more intensive management and protection for existing and potential resource values. Management plans, which are to identify specific resource management practices, are required for each ACEC (SM-20).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (Goldwater Amendment) (1990) (Applies to the three relinquished Sentinel Plain, Sand Tank Mountains, and Ajo Airport parcels.)

- Prohibits woodcutting and collection of dead and down wood in ACECs. (no number)

2.12.1.2 Action Alternatives for ACECs

Program Goals

- **Goal 1:** Provide increased protection for resources of substantial significance and value, which include specific cultural resources, outstanding and scenic features, and priority and special status species while continuing to provide the public access to enjoy these resources.

Allocations Summary

Table 2-37, ACEC Acres Based on Alternative, describes ACEC acreage by alternative.

**Table 2-37
ACEC Acres Based on Alternative**

ACEC Name	Alternative (BLM Acres)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Coffeepot Botanical	8,900	8,900	Not Designated		8,900
Coffeepot-Batamote	Not Designated		63,300	77,600	Not Designated
Cuerda de Lena	Not Designated			60,900	58,500
Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails	Not Designated			82,500	82,500
Saddle Mountain	Not Designated			48,500	48,500
Vekol Valley Grasslands	3,500	No longer designate as ACEC			

Management Actions for ACECs

Table 2-38, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for ACECs, describes management actions and allowable uses for ACECs.

**Table 2-38
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for ACECs**

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions				
Goal 1: Provide increased protection for resources of substantial significance and value, which include specific cultural resources, outstanding and scenic features, and priority and special status species while continuing to provide the public access to enjoy these resources.						
Common to All Unless Otherwise Noted in Specific ACEC Section						
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.1: All public lands within the ACEC would be retained and private and state lands would be acquired as parcels become available and funds allow, on a willing seller, willing buyer basis.
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.2: Core roadless areas would be maintained for wildlife while new facilities, including motorized routes, non-motorized trails, and trailheads that concentrate or increase use in these areas would be avoided.
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.3: Maintaining and managing the biological, geological, and cultural resources would be emphasized and given priority.
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.4: Areas would be managed to protect the natural landscape and visual values that provide the visitor with an opportunity to appreciate the character of the area.

Table 2-38
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for ACECs

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.5: Opportunities for recreation would be provided with an emphasis on undeveloped, dispersed recreation, where it is compatible with protecting the natural and cultural resources.
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.6: The visual and scenic values of the area would be managed to maintain the natural character, including designating appropriate visual resource management (VRM) classes.
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.7: Treatments of invasive species would be allowed within the ACECs if they can be designed to have a minor or negligible impact to resource values within the ACEC.
LS				D	E	AC-1.1.8: The construction of non-motorized trails would be permitted if they are consistent with ACEC and resource objectives and do not conflict with botanical resources or wildlife and threatened and endangered species management.
LS		B	C			AC-1.1.9: All LUAs, including utility-scale renewable energy development, would be avoided, mitigated, and otherwise managed to be consistent with management objectives. Recreation developments may be allowed if necessary to manage public use or provide for public safety.
LS				D	E	AC-1.1.10: ACECs would be exclusion areas for utility-scale renewable energy development and exploration, and multiuse utility corridors.
LS				D	E	AC-1.1.11: New major linear LUAs would be excluded outside of the corridors. Utilities would be required to be installed underground within the existing multiuse utility corridors to retain the viewshed.
LS				D		AC-1.1.12: ACECs would be closed to all locatable and leasable minerals exploration and development and mineral material disposals including free-use permits. Public lands in the ACECs would be recommended for withdrawal.
LS					E	AC-1.1.13: ACECs would be open to all locatable and leasable minerals exploration and development unless otherwise restricted. (For leasable minerals only, Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails ACEC is open with No Surface Occupancy and Cuerda de Lena is closed February 1 to September 15)
LS					E	AC-1.1.14: ACECs would be closed to mineral material disposals, including free use permits, except for the former free use site in the Saddle Mountain ACEC (see AC-1.1.46).
LS		B	C	D	E	AC-1.1.19: The route system would be designed to minimize impacts to the relevance and importance values for which the ACEC was designated. Motorized vehicle routes that conflict with the values described in the Importance and Relevance descriptions would be closed, limited, or mitigated. New route construction would not be allowed except as needed for resource protection, public safety, emergency or other administrative uses as determined by the authorized officer.

**Table 2-38
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for ACECs**

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions
Coffeepot Botanical ACEC					
LS		B		E	AC-I.1.15: The Coffeepot Botanical ACEC designation of approximately 8,900 acres would be retained to protect the outstanding botanical diversity of the native and rare plant communities such as the Acuña cactus (Map 2-16b). All management actions (including remaining open to lands and minerals actions) would be the same except the ACEC would not be closed to OHV use.
LS		B		E	AC-I.1.16: Livestock facilities would not be developed where they would increase livestock use within an area of known or newly discovered populations of Acuña Cactus. Livestock facilities could be developed to improve natural resource conditions by improving livestock distribution. Adaptive management and best management practices would be utilized to avoid conflicts with wildlife resources
LS				E	Existing range improvements would remain in place unless the improvement is no longer needed for livestock operations or wildlife water distribution.
Coffeepot-Batamote ACEC					
LS			C		AC-I.1.18: An area of approximately 63,300 acres would be designated as the Coffeepot-Batamote ACEC to protect for outstanding botanical diversity of the native and rare plant communities (including the Acuña cactus); lesser long-nosed bat, cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl and desert bighorn sheep habitat; and other wildlife populations along with unique landscape and scenic features (Map 2-16c).
				D	AC-I.1.18: An area of approximately 77,600 acres would be designated as the Coffeepot-Batamote ACEC to protect for outstanding botanical diversity of the native and rare plant communities (including the Acuña cactus); lesser long-nosed bat, cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl and desert bighorn sheep habitat; and other wildlife populations along with unique landscape and scenic features (Map 2-16d).
LS			C		AC-I.1.20: Routes within washes would be prohibited.
LS			C		AC-I.1.21: The ACEC would be open to leasable exploration and development but closed to mineral materials disposals including free-use permits.
LS				D	AC-I.1.23: Recreational development would be limited to the minimum required to protect resources and provide for public safety
Cuerda de Lena ACEC					
LS				D E	AC-I.1.27: Areas of 60,900 and 58,500 acres would be designated as the Cuerda de Lena ACEC in alternatives D and E, respectively. Its purpose would be to protect the endangered Sonoran pronghorn; habitat for other wildlife species, including the cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl; and to protect cultural resources (Maps 2-16d and e).

**Table 2-38
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for ACECs**

Decision Area		Alternative			Management Actions
LS				D E	AC-I.1.28: In addition to the exclusions addressed in the common to all section, the ACEC would be closed to the public for general recreational use during pronghorn fawning between March 15 and July 15 or as determined annually by the Sonoran pronghorn recovery team. Minor non-linear LUAs would also be prohibited unless deemed necessary by the authorized officer. Federal, state and local government employees and permit holders operating within the scope of their authorizations would be exempt from the closure.
LS				D E	AC-I.1.29: Camping would be limited to dispersed and undeveloped sites.
LS				D E	AC-I.1.30: Developed recreational sites would be prohibited within the ACEC except for small, non-intrusive-information, and interpretation facilities.
LS				D E	AC-I.1.31: Tertiary, single-track, and reclaimed vehicle routes that fragment habitat would be closed; however, access would be provided for administrative use and public safety.
LS				D E	AC-I.1.32: Routes in washes would be prohibited except to provide legal access for law enforcement and other authorized use. New travel routes in washes would be prohibited. New routes would only be considered if deemed necessary for emergency or other authorized administrative uses.
Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails ACEC					
LS				D E	AC-I.1.33: An area of 82,500 acres would be designated as the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails ACEC.
LS				D	AC-I.1.34: Additional public use sites would not be allocated.
LS				D	AC-I.1.35: Scientific research would be permitted only if it is not ground disturbing.
LS				D	AC-I.1.36: Existing developments and disturbed areas that are damaging or incompatible with the trail integrity would be evaluated and removed, rehabilitated or mitigated, or otherwise managed to diminish the overall disturbance area.
LS				E	AC-I.1.37: Public use sites would be allocated if they could be designed to have negligible or minor impacts.
LS				E	AC-I.1.38: The ACEC would remain open to all leasable minerals actions but any lease would contain a No Surface Occupancy stipulation.
LS				E	AC-I.1.39: Portions of the ACEC would be closed to seismic exploration and mineral material disposals. The remaining portion of the ACEC would be open to mineral material disposals however surface disturbance would be minimized where possible through mitigation measures and special stipulations.
LS				E	AC-I.1.40: Selected parcels along the historic trails corridor within the ACEC, would be closed to locatable mineral exploration and development.

Table 2-38
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for ACECs

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions
LS					E	AC-I.1.41: Scientific research, including excavation, that enhances our understanding of the cultural resources would be permitted and encouraged if approved research design and qualified researcher by BLM standards.
Saddle Mountain ACEC						
LS				D	E	AC-I.1.42: An area of 48,500 acres would be designated as the Saddle Mountain ACEC.
LS				D	E	AC-I.1.43: Sites containing natural or cultural resources or geological and wildlife resources would be developed for interpretation and environmental education when research opportunities and resource values can be protected.
LS					E	AC-I.1.44: Vehicle-based camping would be limited to existing or designated sites.
LS					E	AC-I.1.45: The ACEC would be open to leasable minerals exploration and development. Surface disturbance would be minimized where possible through mitigation measures and special stipulations.
LS					E	AC-I.1.46: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material disposals with the exception of the former free use permit site (Courthouse Pit; T2N, R7W, Sec. 31). A new permit could be allowed provided the proposed disturbance area remains within the previously authorized area.
Vekol Valley Grasslands ACEC						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	AC-I.1.47: The 3,500-acre Vekol Valley Grasslands ACEC would be no longer designated as an ACEC because Monument designation provides adequate protection for the resources of the grassland.

Administrative Actions

Inventory

- Perform proactive cultural inventories on ACECs, with a special emphasis on the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails ACEC and the Saddle Mountain ACEC and thoroughly document the cultural resources.

Monitoring

- Continue to work with and support the Arizona Site Steward Program to assure adequate monitoring of the sites on the ACECs.
- Implement procedures for systematic monitoring of selected cultural sites within the ACEC's.

Restoration

- Perform mitigation and/or landscape restoration in priority areas of the ACECs, where incompatible activities have altered the natural and cultural landscape and visual settings.

Research

- Complete documentary research and oral histories to gain a better understanding of the cultural history of the ACEC's, relates to homesteading, mining, ranching, and prehistoric archaeological occupations.

Interpretation and Education

- Develop interpretive materials and facilities for selected sites and topics.
- Provide educational materials and opportunities to the public pertaining to the ACEC resources.

Tribal Consultation

- Continue to consult with the Gila River Indian Community, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, Fort Yuma – Quechan Tribe, and other interested Indian tribes to identify places of traditional importance and to collaborate on issues and projects affecting the ACEC's.

Partnerships

- Coordinate with partner groups, interest groups, interested individuals, local communities, and other stakeholders on ACEC issues and projects.

2.12.2 NATIONAL BYWAYS

The National Byways program was established by the US Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 and reauthorized under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century in 2003. The BLM Back Country Byway system is a component of the National Byway System and guidance is found in BLM Handbook H-8357-1. In accordance with the handbook, BLM back country and scenic byway designations are approved by the State Director within the parameters established for the state byway program.

The primary objectives of the program are to showcase the BLM's multiple-use mission and potential contributions to local or regional economies through increased travel and tourism.

To be eligible for designation, a road must have attractions that are important on a state and national basis. Attractions may include historical, recreational, cultural, archaeological, scientific, and/or natural features. Cooperation with all local, state, and federal agencies that have jurisdiction over road segments and legal access for any private land segments is also necessary.

2.12.2.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternatives A (No Action) National Byways

Decisions are listed in chronological order by plan. The following decisions are extracted from the existing land use plans and amendments and are listed in chronological order. Because none of these current land use plans encompass the entire Planning Area, very few of these decisions are being carried forward as common to all alternatives and are restated as new action alternatives where applicable.

Lower Gila Resource Management Plan Amendments (2005)

- Scenic corridors and potential back country byways will receive priority evaluation of visual resources to determine appropriate future classifications (RR-6).

Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan - Goldwater Amendment (1990)

(Applies to the three relinquished BGR parcels)

- Protect the visual resource quality on lands adjacent to the highways (I-8 and SR-85) by:
- Establishing portions of these roads as scenic byways in cooperation with the Arizona Department of Transportation, the US Air Force, and the US Marine Corps.
- Use the VRM process during activity planning to maintain appropriate visual resource-management objectives established for these byways (Not numbered).

2.12.2.2 Action Alternatives for National Byways

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Provide opportunities for the American public to see and enjoy unique scenic and historic landscapes on public lands deemed to have state or national significance.
- Goal 2: Promote regional development of eco- and recreational tourism through designation of BLM National Scenic and Back Country Byways and by managing public lands along potential byway corridors to protect the quality of scenic values.

Allocations Summary

Potential byways to be evaluated by alternative are presented in **Table 2-39**, Potential Byway Designations by Alternative below.

**Table 2-39
Potential Byway Designations by Alternative**

	Alternative (BLM Miles)				
	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Lower Sonoran					
Agua Caliente (not paved)	0	21	21	0	21
SDNM					
Interstate 8	0	21	0	0	21
H-238 Maricopa Road (paved)	0	18	18	0	18

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-40, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Byways, describes management actions and allowable uses for national byways.

**Table 2-40
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Byways**

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses				
Goal 1: Provide opportunities for the American public to see and enjoy unique scenic and historic landscapes on public lands deemed to have state or national significance.						
<u>Objective 1.1:</u> Identify and evaluate potential roads that meet nomination criteria for BLM National Scenic or Back Country Byway designation.						
LS		B	C		E	NB-1.1.1: Approximately 21 miles of Agua Caliente Road would be evaluated as a potential BLM national back country byway (Maps 2-16b and 2-16c).
	SDNM		C	D	E	NB-1.1.2: Approximately 18 miles of Highway 238 (Maricopa Road) would be evaluated as a scenic byway (Maps 2-16c, 2-16d and 2-16e).
	SDNM			D	E	NB-1.1.3: Approximately 21 miles of I-8 would be evaluated as a scenic byway (Maps 2-16d and 2-16e).
Goal 2: Promote regional development of eco- and recreational tourism through designation of BLM National Scenic and Back Country Byways and by managing public lands along potential byway corridors to protect the quality of scenic values.						
<u>Objective 2.1:</u> Maintain open space and the undeveloped natural character of landscapes within the specified byway corridor. Desert landscapes provide visitors with unique scenic and back country experience while traversing the diverse Sonoran Desert, including saguaro cactus stands, rugged mountains, and vast valleys. These landscapes also offer glimpses of traditional western uses, including historic trail corridors, mining, agriculture, and ranching.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NB-2.1.1: Surface-disturbing uses and activities along byways would exceed or at minimum maintain the visual quality consistent with the established VRM setting through project design or mitigation.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NB-2.1.2: Protective measures would be provided in wildlife-movement corridors to protect wildlife. Measures may include setting speed limits, installing speed bumps or other speed-limiting devices, and installing cautionary signs.

**Table 2-40
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Byways**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NB-2.1.3: No motorized competitive speed events would be authorized on the byways.
LS		B	C		E	NB-1.1.4: Road design and maintenance would be coordinated with the county to retain the character of the byway and ensure it remains suitable for passenger car- and truck-based sightseeing. Prescriptions would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No paving • No widening beyond existing widths unless required for public safety • Stabilize road surfaces to maintain air quality • Install speed-limit, directional, and vehicle-safety signs where appropriate.

2.12.3 NATIONAL TRAILS

The National Trails System Act, 16 USC 1241, was enacted in 1968 to bring the national scenic, historic, and recreational trails into one unified system. The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (Anza NHT) was established in 1990. It is one of 30 national scenic and historic trails designated by Congress to “provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which such trails may pass” (PL 90-543, as amended through PL 109-418). The national historic trails are “extended trails which follow as closely as possible and practicable the original trails or routes of travel of national historical significance” (ibid).

The National Park Service (NPS) administers the trail but works in partnership with federal, state, and local government agencies, as well as private landowners who manage or own lands along the trail route. Because the Anza expedition moved along the trail on horses and pack animals more than 200 years ago, no reliable trail signature remains to be seen in the modern era. Historians have studied the diaries and journals of Juan Bautista de Anza and Father Font and have determined a wide corridor through which the trail route originally passed. Today we face the challenge of conserving the natural visual setting along the trail corridor and constructing a recreational retracement route for non-motorized use in the future.

As cited in the Comprehensive Management and Use Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (NPS 1996) (Anza CMP), the nature and purpose of the trail is to “...create the visitor experience through establishing and marking the trail alignment and interpreting and preserving significant resources associated with the trail.” The Anza CMP goes on to state: “that the goals of NPS trail administration are to protect a trail right-of-way, to protect cultural and scenic resources along the trail, to foster public appreciation and understanding, to encourage facilities for resource protection and public information and use, and to promote cooperative management of trail resources and programs.”

The BLM's goals and objectives for National Scenic and Historic Trails are: 1) to prevent substantial interference with the nature and purposes of the trail, 2) to make reasonable efforts to avoid activities that are incompatible with the purposes for which the National Trail was established, and 3) to conserve, protect, and restore National Trail resources, qualities, values, and associated settings, subject to valid existing rights.

For the Anza NHT, a Management Area allocation would be established. The location of a Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail Management Area would be based on the Congressionally designated Anza NHT route, BLM inventories, and GIS viewshed analysis. A Management Area encompasses the area identified along a National Trail that meets certain criteria. Criteria include a segment of National Historic Trail that qualifies as a "high potential route segment" and/ or has a "high potential historic site" within or along it. "High potential route segments" are portions of the trail that would afford a high quality recreation experience in a portion of the route having greater than average scenic values or affording an opportunity to vicariously share the experience of the original users of a historic route. A "high potential historic site" is a site that is related to the route or a site in close proximity with the route, which provides opportunity to interpret the historic significance of the trail during the period of its major use. A "high potential historic site" must have historic significance, must have visible historic remnants, scenic quality, and relative freedom from intrusion. The area around the high potential route segment and high potential historic sites (if present) would be identified as a National Historic Trail Management Area determined by the results of GIS viewshed analysis. A National Historic Trail Management Area is defined as an area extending three miles out or to the visual horizon from the NHT corridor.

Two segments of the Anza NHT meet the criteria for identification as "high potential route segments." The segment of the trail that lies primarily within the SDNM is clearly indicated by the descriptions in the historic diaries and journals of Anza and Fr. Font. Congress recognized the importance of the strength of historic documentation and designated the trail corridor within a tightly described area in this section. Modern public use of this area and this segment of trail has been increasing due to the ease with which they can access the area, and more importantly, due to the qualities of the recreational experiences along this segment. The visitor does not have to work hard to experience vicariously what historic trail users once felt. The segment of the Anza NHT stretching from the Painted Rock Mountains to the west end of the Decision Area carries a similar set of values in that the visitor may experience a quality recreational experience. This experience would vary in terms of the individual locations, but the potential for high quality interpretive development and historic settings are outstanding.

2.12.3.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)

No specific management prescriptions for National Trails are included in the existing LUPs.

2.12.3.2 Action Alternatives for National Trails

Program Goals

- **Goal I:** Manage the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail corridor through the LSFO through focused management strategies.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-41, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Trails, describes management actions and allowable uses for national trails.

**Table 2-41
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Trails**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Manage the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail corridor through the LSFO through focused management strategies.						
Objective 1.1: Manage the historic trail corridor on the Lower Sonoran to enhance the experience of visitors, maintain the integrity of the historic trail and associated trail sites, and the visual setting.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.1: The Juan Bautista de Anza NHT corridor would be managed consistent with the National Park Service (NPS) management plan and in cooperation with the NPS (Map 2-16a).
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	NT-1.1.2: Allocate two Juan Bautista de Anza NHT Management Areas (Maps 2-16c, d, and e).
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.3: Retain public lands and acquire available state and private lands and/ or easements to assure long-term use, protection, and access to areas along the Juan Bautista de Anza NHT corridor and within the two Anza NHT Management Areas. Lands along the Anza NHT corridor and within the two Anza NHT Management Areas shall not be made available for Recreation and Public Purposes Act sales or leases, agricultural entries, or state grants, and shall be classified for retention in accordance with 43 CFR 2400.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.4: The Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and the adjacent segment of Anza NHT would be allocated to public use for heritage tourism and interpretation.
LS		B	C		E	NT-1.1.5: The Anza NHT corridor and the Anza NHT Management Areas would remain open to leasable minerals exploration and development actions but any proposed action would contain a No Surface Occupancy stipulation.
LS		B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.6: The Anza NHT corridor and the Anza NHT Management Areas would be closed to all mineral material disposals.
LS				D		NT-1.1.7: The Anza NHT corridor and the Anza NHT Management Areas would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral exploration and development and closed to all leasable and minerals disposals exploration and development actions, including free use permits.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.8: The Anza NHT corridor and the Anza NHT Management Areas would remain closed to all minerals actions.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	NT-1.1.9: The Anza NHT corridor and the two Anza NHT Management Areas would be an exclusion area for major utility-scale renewable energy development and new major linear LUAs. In the Lower Sonoran, utility development could continue on a case-by-case basis in existing utility multiuse corridors and only if impacts are determined to have a negligible to

**Table 2-41
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Trails**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						minor effect to resources.
LS	SDNM		C	D	E	NT-1.1.10: The Anza NHT corridor would be an exclusion area for all minor linear and nonlinear LUAs except as described in the Lands and Realty section (See Section 2.11.1). LUAs would be mitigated to be consistent with management objectives and prescriptions, and only if impacts are determined to have a negligible to minor effect to resources.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.11: Identify and obtain rights-of-way on selected areas along the Anza NHT corridor and within the two Anza NHT Management Areas to support National Trail purposes and further trail management objectives.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.12: Cultural sites along the NHT and the Anza NHT Management Areas would be identified and developed as allocated in the appropriate use categories and according to management actions and prescriptions identified in the Cultural and Heritage Resources section for all use categories. (See Section 2.10.3)
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.13: Recreation opportunities would be provided consistent with the Anza NHT objectives. Facilities would be developed outside the trail corridor to protect resource values, provide for visitor safety, and support selected use opportunities. Facilities would be developed within the trail corridor only when needed to protect trail integrity and resources, or to establish an Anza NHT recreation retracement route.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.14: Access points and routes needed to access the Anza NHT corridor and the two Anza NHT Management Areas would be identified and prioritized during travel management planning. Legal access would be secured within 5 years of route designation to assure public access to the areas.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.15: The Anza NHT Corridor and the two Anza NHT Management Areas would be managed in concert with the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA (Alt. C), the Lower Gila Historic Trails ERMA and the Anza Historic Trail RMZ (Alts. C and E) as identified in the Cultural and Heritage Resource and Recreation Management sections. (See Sections 2.10.3 and 2.11.4)
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.16: The historic landscape and visual values of the Anza NHT corridor and the two Anza NHT Management Areas would be protected to provide the visitor with an opportunity to appreciate the historic character of the area.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.17: Vegetation would be rehabilitated and restored in the Anza NHT corridor and the two Anza NHT Management Areas consistent with the natural resource restoration objectives to restore or maintain the integrity of the landscape.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.18: A strategy would be developed to encourage scientific and historical research within the Anza NHT corridor and the two Anza NHT

**Table 2-41
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for National Trails**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						Management Areas as appropriate with management prescriptions and only if designed to have a negligible or minor affect to resources.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.19: Scientific and historical studies of cultural landscapes, sites, historic trails, and other resources, including excavation, would be allowed by qualified researchers on a case-by-case basis within the Anza NHT corridor and the two Anza NHT Management Areas and with written authorization from the BLM.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.20: Heritage tourism would be allowed at the Painted Rock Petroglyph Site and along the Anza NHT auto route when use is compatible with protecting the cultural and historical resources and visual values.
LS	SDNM	B	C		E	NT-1.1.21: The Anza NHT auto route would be marked and promoted as appropriate and consistent with Cultural and Heritage Resource and Travel Management actions designations and prescriptions identified in this plan. (See Sections 2.10.3 and 2.11.5)
LS	SDNM			D		NT-1.1.22: The Anza NHT auto route would be marked, but not promoted, as appropriate and consistent with Cultural and Heritage Resource and Travel Management actions designations and prescriptions identified in this plan. (See Sections 2.10.3 and 2.11.5)
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.23: The Anza NHT corridor within the SDNM would be managed to retain, and restore where appropriate, the physical integrity of the sites and trails through inventory, evaluation, rehabilitation and restoration of vegetation.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	NT-1.1.24: Acquire parcels that exhibit characteristics consistent with the landscape setting, or important to management of the NHT, from willing buyers when funds are available and the parcels are reasonable priced.

Administrative Actions

Inventory

- Perform field inventories, document, and map historic trail resources and associated cultural resources along the Anza NHT.
- Perform recreational inventories along the Anza NHT to identify high potential sites and segments. Make determinations of suitability for installation of recreational trail tread and interpretive developments.
- Perform viewshed analysis on selected Anza NHT segments with priority given to high potential route segments.
- Collect GPS data to BLM standards on the Anza NHT resources and use GIS mapping (BMP).

Monitoring

- Perform condition assessments on selected segments of the Anza NHT, with a priority on the high potential route segments.
- Implement procedures for systematic monitoring of the Anza NHT management corridor, including associated sites and trail resources.

Restoration

- Perform mitigation and/ or landscape restoration in priority areas along the Anza NHT, where incompatible activities have altered the historic landscape and visual setting of the trail.

Research

- Perform archival research on the history and subsequent uses of the Anza NHT.
- Establish collaborative partnerships with academic institutions, professional and non-profit organizations, individual scholars, tribes, and other entities to perform research on Anza NHT related topics.

Interpretation and Education

- Develop interpretive materials and facilities for selected sites.
- Provide educational materials and opportunities to the public pertaining to the Anza NHT.

Tribal Consultation

- Continue to consult with the Gila River Indian Community, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, Fort Yuma – Quechan Tribe, and other interested Indian tribes to identify places of traditional importance.

Partnerships

- Coordinate with partner groups, interest groups, interested individuals, local communities, and other stakeholders on Anza NHT issues and projects.
- Consult and collaborate with the NPS, the administrator of the Anza NHT.

2.12.4 FRED J. WEILER GREEN BELT RESOURCE CONSERVATION AREA

The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt along the Gila River was established as an RCA in 1970 and allocated for management of wildlife, recreation, and cultural resources. The parts of the green belt that fall within the Planning Area include 45,978 acres of the Gila River channel and floodplain from Sierra Estrella Park

on the east to the Planning Area boundary on the west. Approximately 20,000 additional acres fall within the BLM's Yuma Field Office for a total of approximately 63,000 acres in the green belt. Only the acres that fall within the Planning Area would be discussed further in this document.

Within the area now known as the Green Belt, Public Land Order 1015 (PLO 1015) withdrew 6,896 acres of land from the DOI to the USFWS in 1954. At this time, the USFWS entered into a cooperative management agreement with the AGFD to manage these withdrawn lands for wildlife, notably waterfowl and migratory birds. These lands were segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws but not the mineral leasing laws. Grazing and existing withdrawals for power purposes were specifically exempted from the segregation.

In 1967, approximately 63,000 acres in the Gila River floodplain, including the PLO 1015 lands, were studied, and it was determined that they would be retained under the Classification for Multiple Use Act of 1964. A classification for multiple use was placed on the subject lands, segregating the 63,000 acres from appropriation under the public land and mining laws. Mineral leasing, however, was not excluded. The multiple-use classification was established to allow for the management of nesting areas for white-winged dove, mourning dove, and songbirds; public recreation; historical significance; and flood and erosion control. In 1970, the 63,000 acres were designated as the Fred J. Weiler Green Belt Resource Conservation Area.

Since the Green Belt was designated in 1970, the AGFD has continued to manage the PLO 1015 lands within the Green Belt as part of their Lower Gila River Wildlife Management Area Complex. However over the past 30 years new laws have been enacted, along with the implementation of new policy and guidance, and the cooperative agreements between the BLM, USFWS and AGFD have not been updated accordingly. The jurisdictional management responsibility remains unclear for certain resources and uses, such as cultural resources and travel management. The BLM believes that management of some of these still belong to the BLM and certain management decisions have been made in this RMP with that assumption. The BLM would work in cooperation with the AGFD to ensure that access to, and management of, their wildlife management complex would not be impacted by designations or management actions in the final RMP.

2.12.4.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action)

No specific management prescriptions the Fred J. Weiler Green Belt RCA are in existing LUPs.

2.12.4.2 Action Alternatives for Fred J. Weiler Green Belt Resource Conservation Area

Program Goals

- Goal 1: The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt would be a productive and functioning riparian system supporting healthy, diverse, and abundant populations of wildlife and riparian-dependent wildlife and plant species with an emphasis on migratory birds.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-42, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Resource Conservation Areas, describes management actions and allowable uses for resource conservation areas.

**Table 2-42
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Resource Conservation Areas**

Decision Area	Alternative	Management Actions and Allowable Uses				
Goal 1: The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt would be a productive and functioning riparian system supporting healthy, diverse, and abundant populations of wildlife and riparian dependent wildlife and plant species with an emphasis on migratory birds.						
Objective 1.1: Manage the Fred J. Weiler Green Belt to support migratory birds and other native wildlife and plant species.						
LS		B	C	D	E	GB.1.1: The Fred J. Weiler Green Belt would continue to be managed as a RCA as designated in 1970 (63,000).
LS		B	C	D	E	GB-1.2: The Green Belt would be managed consistent with the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails SCRMA in alternatives B and C, and consistent with the Lower Gila Terraces and Historic Trails ACEC in alternatives D and E.
LS		B	C	D	E	GB.1.3: The use of mechanical, chemical, and biological treatment methods would be coordinated with AGFD and USFWS to remove invasive plants such as tamarisk in the Green Belt for the purpose of restoring ecological conditions and function and reducing fuel hazards.
LS		B	C	D	E	GB.1.4: The Green Belt would be managed with an emphasis on protection and restoration, and treatments would focus on reestablishment of willows and cottonwoods, as well as other riparian vegetation, to support migratory game birds and other wildlife species.
LS		B	C	D	E	GB-1.5: The existing withdrawal for locatable mineral entry and all public land laws within the PLO 1015 portions of the Green Belt would remain in effect.
LS		B	C	D	E	GB-1.6: The Green Belt would be closed to mineral leasing and mineral material disposals including sales and free use permits. The three inactive free use community pits (Buckeye Hills in T1S, R3W, Secs. 20 and 30; T1S, R4W, Sec. 25) would be terminated, and the former free use site (Narramore Pit in T1S, R3W, Sec. 24) would not be available for reauthorization.
LS		B	C	D	E	GB-1.7: The Green Belt would be an exclusion area for utility-scale renewable energy development and exploration, and major linear LUAs (multiuse utility corridors).
LS		B	C	D	E	GB-1.8: The Green Belt would be an avoidance area for minor LUAs and utility-scale renewable energy development and exploration, and multiuse utility corridors.
LS		B	C	D	E	GB-1.9: The portions of the Green Belt outside of the PLO 1015 lands would be an avoidance area for minor linear and nonlinear LUAs. Permits would be approved on a case-by-case basis if management objectives of the area are mitigated.

2.13 TRIBAL INTERESTS, PUBLIC SAFETY, AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

2.13.1 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND PUBLIC SAFETY

There are many federal, state and local laws and regulations, in addition to bureau policies and guidance which govern public safety, hazardous materials and solid wastes. Federal laws and regulations include:

- The Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA; 42 USC 9601 et seq.);
- Federal Aid Highways Act (23 USC 317);
- Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards (EO 12088, October 13, 1978);
- Federal Compliance with Right to Know Laws and Pollution Prevention Requirements (EO 12856, August 3, 1993);
- Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act (7 USC 136); Pollution Prevention Act (42 USC 13101 et seq.);
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 USC 6901 et seq.);
- Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 USC 6901 et seq.);
- Superfund Implementation (EO 12580, January 23, 1987) and
- Toxic Substances control Act (15 USC 2601 et seq.)

The BLM has to address many public health and safety concerns within the LSFO-SDNM. The primary concerns in the Planning Area are:

- Abandoned Mines,
- Unexploded Ordnance (UXO),
- International Border issues and
- Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste.

See Chapter 3, Affected Environment for a full discussion of these issues. The BLM would continue to respond to all known, or reports of, illegal activities related to these issues and evaluate all proposed actions to minimize impacts to public health and safety and future occurrences of hazardous materials and dumping on public lands.

2.13.1.1 Existing Management Decisions, Alternative A (No Action) for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

Since most actions are governed by existing laws and regulations, there were no valid existing management decisions from previous land use plans.

2.13.1.2 Action Alternatives for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

Program Goals

- Goal 1: Manage hazards and public use to protect public health and safety.
- Goal 2: Protect public safety by dealing with all hazardous materials and solid wastes on public lands.
- Goal 3: Minimize or eliminate the potential for intentional or accidental releases of hazardous materials or wastes and solid waste.

Land Use Allocations Summary

Not applicable.

Management Actions and Allowable Uses

Table 2-43, Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety, describes management actions and allowable uses for hazardous materials and public safety.

**Table 2-43
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
Goal 1: Manage hazards and public use to protect public health and safety.						
<u>Objective 1.1</u> : Identify naturally occurring or manmade public safety hazards on public lands and take appropriate action to protect public health and safety.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-1.1.1: Priorities for remediation of physical safety hazards would be set using the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where a death or injury has occurred; • Where site is on or in immediate proximity to a recreation site or a known high use area; • Where a formal risk assessment has determined a high or extremely high risk level. • The site is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines Cleanup Module of Protection and Response Information System
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-1.1.2: Priorities for remediation due to water quality issues would be set using the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state has identified the watershed as a priority based on:

**Table 2-43
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						water laws or regulations, threat to public health or safety, threat to environment; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is a collaborative effort among multiple agencies or jurisdictions.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-1.1.3: Post signs to identify hazardous situations when warranted to protect public safety. Emphasize the risks to visitors of entering public lands and taking responsibility for their own safety.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-1.1.4: If illegal activities threaten the safety of the public or BLM employees, or damage Monument objects, areas can be closed to access by the authorized officer. The area can be closed for up to 90 days pending a study or review of the level of impacts and longer term actions may be necessary to provide public safety
LS		B	C	D	E	PS-1.1.5: The Sentinel Plain area south of I-8 is restricted to entry by permit only to protect the public from possible unexploded ordinances.
	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-1.1.6: The Sand Tank Mountains south of I-8, formerly known as "Area A," is restricted to entry by permit only
Goal 2: Protect public safety by dealing with all hazardous materials and solid wastes on public lands.						
Objective 2.1: Investigate all reported hazardous-materials and solid-wastes sites. Plan necessary containment and/or cleanup responses on a case-by-case basis as soon as possible upon report.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-2.1.1: Establish priorities for investigating releases and planning/implementing responses based on the order in which releases are discovered unless other factors, such as the immediacy of the public-health threat, elevate the response urgency.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-2.1.2: Identify the probable scope of needed containment and clean-up efforts.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-2.1.3: Rank all sites according to relative priority for treatment planning and action. Priorities to consider include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High levels of heavy metals in waste, Ground- or surface-water quality degradation, Ongoing, active resource damage, Safety hazards near established recreation areas or other areas frequented by public land users, Other site-specific factors
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-2.1.4: Inspect mining and milling sites to determine appropriate management for hazardous materials.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-2.1.5: Conduct active investigations to identify potentially responsible parties and recover planning, containment, cleanup, monitoring, investigation, and enforcement costs associated with spill/release responses.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-2.1.6: Complete site-specific inventories when lands are being disposed or acquired. It is departmental policy to minimize potential liability of the

**Table 2-43
Management Actions and Allowable Uses for Hazardous Materials and Public Safety**

Decision Area		Alternative				Management Actions and Allowable Uses
						DOI and its bureaus by acquiring property that is not contaminated unless directed by Congress, court mandate, or as determined by the Secretary.
Goal 3: Minimize or eliminate the potential for intentional or accidental releases of hazardous materials or wastes and solid waste.						
Objective 3.1: Pursue locations of solid waste and wildcat dumpsites. Remove hazardous materials and solid waste, remediate, and, if appropriate, restore sites.						
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-3.1.1: Investigate all reported hazardous-materials and solid-waste sites.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-3.1.2: Establish a reporting system and encourage other agencies and citizens to report suspected spill and dump sites or suspected dumping activities.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-3.1.3: Establish an inventory of known historic and active mining sites and other areas on public lands where hazardous materials or solid wastes are known or suspected to be present.
LS	SDNM	B	C	D	E	PS-3.1.4: Evaluate all BLM actions (including land use authorizations, mining and milling activities, and unauthorized land uses) for their potential to prevent production or dumping of hazardous or solid wastes on public lands. Minimize releases of hazardous materials through compliance with current regulations. Identify appropriate mitigation for activities associated with all types of hazardous materials and waste management and all types of fire management.

Administrative Actions

- Provide public safety information through BLM visitor-use brochures, websites, the BGR/Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)/Sand Tank Mountains visitor-entry permit system, and various direct contacts with members of the public. Include information on hazards associated with abandoned mines, recreational shooting, unexploded ordnance, smuggler and undocumented alien (UDA) traffic, other criminal activities, natural resource conditions, or other conditions.
- Post signs in the field to identify certain hazardous situations when warranted to protect public safety. Emphasize visitor acceptance of the risks of entering public lands and responsibility for their own safety.
- To reduce human-caused fires, the BLM would undertake education, enforcement, and administrative fire-prevention measures. Education measures would include various outreach efforts, including a signing program, information as to the natural role of fire within local ecosystems, and participation in fairs, parades, and public contacts. Enforcement would be accomplished by providing training opportunities for employees interested in fire cause

determination. Administration includes expanded prevention and education programs with other cooperator agencies.

2.14 SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND PUBLIC OUTREACH

2.14.1 SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

The BLM would partner with agencies and the academic and scientific community to develop a strategy for orderly scientific research of public lands. Scientific research would be evaluated and approved on a case-by-case basis. A priority would be placed on research likely to enhance management and understanding of public land resources and public uses. Researchers would be required to coordinate with the BLM, including providing a research plan, on proposed research and provide reports and supporting data that describe the outcome of the research.

Approved scientific research would contribute to management of natural and cultural resources and achieving desired future conditions. The collection of any objects in the Monument is authorized only by permit for scientific research or use to ensure compatibility and reporting of results. A reasonable amount of disturbance to soils and/or vegetation may occur during approved research activities in order to meet the research goals. Effects of disturbance are likely to be transient or may require mitigation or rehabilitation of sites.

Collaborative research partnerships would be established with interested organizations, such as local scientific museums or organizations, agencies, academic institutions, professional and nonprofit organizations, vocational organizations, and other entities, for an orderly process of research, recordation, and education about public land resources and uses. These partnerships would support survey, evaluation, recordation, mitigation, protection, and management of various resources, including biological, cultural, scenic, paleontological, geologic, and caves, and public uses including recreation, grazing, mining, and others.

By developing a strategy to encourage scientific research and inventory, the understanding of resources and management needs would improve. A priority would be placed on the development and implementation for inventory, recording, and evaluation of the Monument, ACECs, and other sensitive areas and resources.

Increased monitoring of public use, vegetation and wildlife habitat, cultural sites, and other resources, with particular focus on sensitive resources and easily accessible and regularly visited areas, would help to ensure the integrity of resources are maintained. Monitoring of public uses, wildlife, and other resources would be enhanced by the use of volunteers, scientific and academic organizations, and other interested groups.

2.14.2 INTERPRETATION, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH

The BLM would work with partners in agencies, academia, and other organizations to develop an effective environmental education and outreach strategy to enhance public understanding and

appreciation of public land resources, and help the BLM achieve its mission and the desired outcomes of this PRMP.

The BLM would support existing educational and interpretive programs and initiatives such as Project Archaeology, Leave No Trace, Tread Lightly!™, Project Learning Tree, and other proven national, state, regional, and local programs. An emphasis would be placed on reuse of existing educational materials.

Additionally, the BLM would work with partners to pursue interpretation and environmental education opportunities, outreach, development, and implementation of on-site and off-site programs for adults and children. The office would work with willing staff from schools, school districts, and other learning institutions to develop curricula that incorporate various learning styles in program design and delivery and focus on the BLM's mission.

To help disseminate information to the public, websites, brochures, maps, access guides, and information sheets would be developed. BLM personnel would also participate in public events, such as fairs and open houses, with information and displays showing public land management. Information would emphasize Leave No Trace and Tread Lightly!™ practices.

Topics may include:

- Resource protection and management,
- Recreational access,
- Use etiquette,
- OHV rules and regulations,
- Public safety,
- Fire,
- OHV and special recreation vehicle information,
- Other information as needed.

2.14.2.1 Resources Education

Throughout the area, (with particular focus sensitive resource areas, including the Monument, ACECs, WHAs, SCRMAAs, and threatened and endangered species habitat), emphasis would be placed on resource importance through interpretation, education, signing, and/or brochures.

A public education program would accomplish the following:

- Provide information about resources and their importance,
- Provide information directly related to procedures to be followed if sensitive resources are found,

- Provide safety information to the public and identify any resource protection actions required for public use,
- Specify any pertinent fines for resource damage.

2.14.2.2 Public Uses and Visitor Information

Visitor information would be developed to guide recreational uses in the Decision Areas. Information could include identifying recreational opportunities, locations where certain uses are or are not appropriate, an appreciation and respect for other public land users and uses, and methods to avoid conflict.

2.14.2.3 Public Safety and Fire Education

Educational material would be available regarding public safety, definitions of hazardous materials and solid wastes, and regulations controlling the use and disposal of hazardous materials and solid wastes on public lands. Methods to disseminate information may include brochures at recreational sites, websites, signs at known or likely dumping sites, BGR/Cabeza Prieta NWR/Sand Tank Mountains visitor entry permit system, and various types of direct contact with visitors. Information on hazards associated with abandoned mines, recreational shooting, unexploded ordnance, smuggler and UDA traffic, natural resource or other conditions also may be included.

To protect public safety, when warranted, signs would be posted to identify certain hazardous situations.

Visitor acceptance of the risks of entering public land and responsibility for their own safety would be emphasized.

The BLM would undertake education, enforcement, and administrative fire prevention mitigation measures to reduce human-caused fires. Education measures may include various media, including signs, information on the natural role of fire within local ecosystems, participation in fairs or parades, and other public contacts. Enforcement would be accomplished by providing training opportunities for employees interested in fire caused determinations. Administration includes expanded prevention and education programs with other cooperating agencies.

2.15 IMPLEMENTATION, ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT, AND MONITORING

2.15.1 IMPLEMENTATION AND PARTNERSHIPS

Many LUP decisions are implemented or become effective upon approval of the RMP's record of decision (ROD). These decisions include:

- Goals and objectives,
- Land use allocation decisions,
- All special designations, such as ACECs.

Management actions that require more site-specific project planning would require further environmental analysis. Where implementation decisions are made as part of the land use planning process, they are still subject to the appeals process (to the Office of Hearing and Appeals, Interior Board of Land Appeals) or other administrative review as prescribed by the specific resource program regulations.

To succeed in achieving the goals, objectives, and actions of this plan, the BLM, along with other agencies, organizations, and the public, must make a long-term commitment of working together.

Implementation of this plan would require the involvement of many partners. The BLM invites citizens to help the implementation of this plan and achieve the goals laid out. The BLM would continue to involve and collaborate with the public while implementing this plan. Opportunities to become involved in the plan implementation and monitoring would include development of partnerships and community-based citizen working groups. The BLM and citizens can collaboratively develop site-specific implementation plans that mutually benefit public land resources, local communities, and the people who live, work or play on public lands.

- Motorized route and non-motorized trail maintenance and monitoring;
- Development, maintenance, and monitoring of recreational facilities;
- Development of interpretive materials;
- Restoration of wildlife habitat;
- Monitoring of biological and cultural resources;
- Prevention and restoration of areas impacted by litter/dumping;
- Development of community support;
- Delivery of environmental and resource education.

Collaborative efforts may help ensure consistent management between partners, enhance the public experience, maintain open space, provide use opportunities, and protect natural and cultural resources. By engaging a diverse group of stakeholders in a collective effort to conserve and manage the ecological, cultural, open space, recreation, and other use values, resources can be sustainably managed for the long-term, and the area remain a place where people want to live, work, and recreate.

2.15.2 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management is a formal, systematic, and rigorous approach to learning from the results of management actions, accommodating change, and improving management. It involves synthesizing existing knowledge, exploring alternative actions, and making explicit forecasts about their results. Management actions and monitoring programs are carefully designed to generate reliable feedback and clarify the reasons underlying results. Actions and objectives are then adjusted based on this feedback and improved understanding to try to achieve the desired outcomes. In addition, decisions, actions, and

results are carefully documented and communicated to others so that knowledge gained through experience is passed on, rather than lost when individuals move or leave the organization. Desired outcomes (goals and objectives), as well as the boundaries of land use allocations or special designations are not adaptable and require an RMP amendment to change. Actions to achieve the desired outcomes may be adapted to achieve the desired outcomes. Implementation or activity level decisions also may be adapted.

This PRMP recommends an adaptive management strategy. This process is flexible and generally involves four phases: planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. As the BLM works with partners to obtain new information, it is able to evaluate monitoring data and other resource information to periodically refine and update management decisions and actions. This allows for the continual refinement and improvement of management prescriptions and practices.

2.15.3 MONITORING AND PARTNERSHIPS

Monitoring of actions related to implementing LUPs is an important part of adaptive management because it provides information on the relative success of strategies. Monitoring is the collection and analysis of repeated observations to track the status of a variable or system, and can be used to determine whether management actions are being implemented as written (implementation monitoring) or to evaluate success in achieving desired outcomes (effectiveness monitoring).

Adaptive management relies on monitoring that is sufficiently sensitive to detect relevant ecological changes. Ongoing monitoring helps to adjust management decisions and strategies related to implementing LUPs. The BLM monitors many activities and events; grazing utilization and vegetation trends are measured to support decisions on allotment Standards and Guidelines evaluations. OHV events are monitored to determine if permit stipulations are followed and necessary site rehabilitation undertaken.

This PRMP recognizes that many monitoring needs would require further design and planning. There are several ways to design an effectiveness-monitoring program. Model-based approaches rely on a small number of sites to represent an ecosystem class; however, it can be exceedingly difficult to find these, and it sometimes is difficult to draw broad conclusions from those sites. Design-based approaches rely on a carefully planned sampling. In this approach, the sample size must be large enough to make reliable references, which may be costly. A significant challenge in designing a program to monitor ecological conditions is integrating habitat monitoring with the species of special interest. Additionally, the BLM faces the challenge of monitoring uses on public lands. The BLM invites citizens and partners to help it develop an effective monitoring and evaluation plan for implementation decisions on public land resources, local communities, and users.

2.16 REQUIREMENTS FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This PRMP/FEIS is a programmatic statement describing the impacts of implementing the LUP decisions and management actions described for the Planning Area.

Decisions that are implemented upon approval of the RMP do not require any further environmental analysis or documentation. Whenever implementation-level plans (e.g., ACEC management plans) are

prepared, more environmental analysis and documentation is required. Individual management actions or projects requiring more site-specific project planning require more environmental analysis.

Site-specific environmental analysis and documentation, including the use of categorical exclusions and determinations of NEPA adequacy, where suitable, may be prepared for one or more individual projects in accordance with management objectives and decisions established in the approved LUP. In addition, the BLM would ensure that the environmental review process includes evaluation of all critical elements to include cultural resources and threatened and endangered species, and completes required USFWS Section 7 consultations and coordination with SHPO in accordance with the BLM Cultural Resources National Programmatic Agreement and Arizona's BLM-SHPO Protocol.

Interdisciplinary impact analysis would be based on this and other applicable EISs. If the analysis prepared for site-specific projects finds potential for significant impacts not already described in an existing EIS, additional NEPA analysis for that site-specific project may be warranted.

Upon providing public notice of a decision, supporting environmental documentation would be sent to all affected interests and made available to other publics on request. Decisions to implement site-specific projects are subject to administrative review when such decisions are made.

2.17 INTERRELATIONSHIPS

The BLM conducts many activities that require coordination between itself and state or other federal agencies. Coordination has been ongoing throughout this planning effort. Coordination is required when implementing LUP decisions through project development and site-specific activities.

As a part of this planning effort and implementing on-the-ground activities, the BLM conducts Section 7 consultation with the USFWS, as prescribed under the ESA. In 2003, the BLM and USFWS finalized a consultation agreement to establish an effective and cooperative Section 7 consultation process. The agreement defines the process, products, actions, schedule, and expectations of the BLM and USFWS on project consultation. One biological assessment (BA) would be prepared to determine the effect of the PRMP on all relevant listed, proposed, and candidate species and associated critical habitat. The BA would disclose all expected environmental effects, conservation actions, mitigations, and monitoring, including analysis of all direct and indirect effects of plan decisions and any interrelated and interdependent actions. As this plan's decisions are implemented, actions determined through environmental analysis to potentially affect listed or candidate species would initiate more site-specific consultation on those actions.

Consultation with the Arizona SHPO is also conducted in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA. The BLM's actions would also comply with other federal environmental legislation, existing programmatic environmental analyses, LUPs, and vegetation treatment documents, such as the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and with state and local government regulations (**Appendix B, Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Policies**).

The Sikes Act (16 USC 670 et seq.) authorizes the DOI, in cooperation with state agencies responsible for administering fish and game laws, to plan, develop, maintain, and coordinate programs for conserving and rehabilitating wildlife, fish, and game on public lands within its jurisdiction. The plans must conform to overall land use and management plans for the land involved. The plans could include habitat-

improvement projects and related activities, and adequate protection for species of fish, wildlife, and plants considered endangered or threatened.

The BLM must also coordinate with suitable state agencies in managing state-listed plant and animal species when the state has formally made such designations.

The BLM is responsible for managing wildlife habitats on public lands, while AGFD is responsible for managing wildlife populations and game harvest. Proclamation 7397 states, "Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction of the State of Arizona with respect to fish and wildlife management." Continued efforts would be made to coordinate with AGFD to enhance wildlife habitat, species diversity, and riparian health. Coordination occurs between the agencies on management plans and activities to achieve the optimum health of wildlife species and populations. Currently, coordination efforts are conducted consistent with a statewide MOU. In addition, an MOU has been signed giving AGFD cooperating agency status on RMP efforts in Arizona. To further promote interagency coordination, a cooperative agreement was signed between the agencies, establishing a liaison position in the AGFD. This liaison is assigned coordination responsibility on all ongoing LUPs and spends a portion of his/her work schedule in the Arizona State Office.

Regional transportation planning and construction of roadways and highways is generally conducted by state or regional agencies, such as ADOT, county departments of transportation, and city transportation departments. Coordination efforts would be consistent with MOUs (e.g., ADOT, BLM, or FHWA MOUs) or other documents in effect at the time of the project. When these agencies plan and develop roadways that cross public lands, the BLM is involved in their design and contributes to environmental impact analysis. In that process, the BLM would coordinate with the responsible agency to develop design features that minimize the fragmenting effect of the planned roadway. It would work with the responsible agency to evaluate and incorporate safe and effective wildlife crossings to ensure long-term species viability and maintain habitat connectivity. Where planned roadways potentially fragment other resources, such as but not limited to recreation routes, grazing allotments or mining operations, the BLM would work with the responsible agency to provide continued connectivity for those purposes as well. The BLM also would work with the agency to provide continued safe access to public land from any developed roadway for recreation and other public uses.

2.18 COMPARISON OF IMPACT INTENSITIES

In an effort to demonstrate the intensity of an impact, a range of qualitative terms have been created to summarize impacts from one management program on another. Some programs have specifically defined these terms for their managed resource or resource use with clearly outlined thresholds. Program specific intensity definitions can be found in the beginning of each program's impacts analysis in **Chapter 4**, Environmental Consequences, while the general definitions of these terms can be found in **Section 4.1.5**, Qualitative Terms for the Intensity of Impacts. For impacts that reach the major intensity level, a summary of those impacts is provided within the tables.

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Impacts on Air Resources					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cave Resources					
Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Paleontological Resources					
Soil Resources					
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Visual Resource Management					
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor				
Wildland Fire Management					
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor			Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Impacts on Climate Change					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cave Resources					
Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Paleontological Resources					
Soil Resources					
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Water Resources					
Wild Horse and Burro Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Wildland Fire Management					
Wildlife and Special Status Species					

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Livestock Grazing Management					
Minerals Management					
Recreation Management					
Travel Management					
Special Designations					
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Impacts on Cave Resources					
No caves and cave resources have been identified in the Decision Areas, though Paleozoic limestone outcrops and lava tubes do exist.					
Impacts on Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible	
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran Negligible; SDNM: Negligible			
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major				
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Negligible
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate				
Impacts on Geologic and Paleontological Resources					
Limited paleontological resources have been found in the Planning Area; therefore impacts on these resources are not discussed in detail.					
Impacts on Soil Resources					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Cave Resources					
Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Paleontological Resources					
Soil Resources					
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Water Resources					
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major				
Wildland Fire Management					
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible			

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Major; SDNM: None to Moderate			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		Lower Sonoran: Major; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major SDNM: Negligible to Major				
Impacts on Vegetation Resources					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cave Resources					
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate				
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: None to Moderate			Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: None
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Impacts on Visual Resources Management					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cave Resources					
Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Paleontological Resources					
Soil Resources					
Vegetation Resources					

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate;	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics					
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor				
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Major				
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials					
Impacts on Water Resources					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Paleontological Resources					
Soil Resources					
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: None			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None	
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Water Resources					
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics					
Wildland Fire Management					
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: None		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: None to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: None to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: None to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: None to Minor
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Impacts on Wild Horse and Burro Management					
The intent of the existing decisions and proposed alternative decision is to remove all wild horses and burros from the Painted Rock Herd Area, and any impacts from other program areas on the Wild Horse and Burro program would be negligible. Therefore, impacts from other resources would not be discussed in detail.					
Impacts on Wilderness Characteristics					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate				
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major		Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major SDNM: Negligible to
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Major		Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Moderate
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Impacts on Wildland Fire Management					
Air Quality			Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		
Cave Resources			Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None		
Cultural and Heritage Resources			Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		
Paleontological Resources			Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None		
Soil Resources			Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		
Vegetation Resources			Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible		
Visual Resource Management		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	
Water Resources			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Wild Horse and Burro Management			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Wilderness Characteristics		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	
Wildland Fire Management			Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor		
Wildlife and Special Status Species			Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor		
Lands and Realty		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible;		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate;	Lower Sonoran: Negligible;

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
	SDNM: Negligible			SDNM: Minor to Moderate	SDNM: Negligible
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible			Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor				
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major SDNM: Minor to Major				
Impacts on Wildlife and Special Status Species					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Cave Resources					
Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Paleontological Resources					
Soil Resources					
Vegetation Resources					
Visual Resource Management					
Water Resources					
Wild Horse and Burro Management					

Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible		
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major SDNM: Negligible to Major				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major. SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Moderate
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate SDNM: Negligible to Minor				Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major SDNM: Negligible to Minor		

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: None
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Impacts on Lands and Realty Management					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible				
Vegetation Resources	SDNM: Minor				
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Moderate

Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor				
Wild Horse and Burro Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		Lower Sonoran: Moderate SDNM: Moderate		
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Moderate SDNM: Negligible		
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Minor to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Major	
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Minor				
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Minor
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major		Lower Sonoran: Major SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Negligible
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Major SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Impacts on Livestock Grazing Management					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: None				
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Major				
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Major			Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Major
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Negligible
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Major SDNM: Major	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Major SDNM: Major	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Major
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Negligible			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Minor				
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Impacts on Minerals Management					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor				
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor			
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: None				
Soil Resources	SDNM: None				
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate SDNM: Minor to Moderate				
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Wild Horse and Burro Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: None
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor				
Travel Management	SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate		
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor				
Impacts on Recreation Management					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major SDNM: Moderate to Major				
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Major; SDNM: Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor	
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor			
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major SDNM: Minor to Major				
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor				
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible				
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Negligible to Moderate			
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor				
Impacts on Travel Management					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Minor
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Moderate SDNM: Moderate		
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor			Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Minor
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wild Horse and Burro Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None		Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate SDNM: Major	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: None; SDNM: None				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Major	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Minor
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: None	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Minor
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Moderate				Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate to Major; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor to Major	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Major	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Major:	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Major

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Major; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Moderate
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Impacts on Special Designations					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: Negligible			
Cave Resources	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: Negligible				
Cultural and Heritage Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible
Paleontological Resources	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Soil Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible
Vegetation Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Visual Resource Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Negligible; SDNM: Minor to Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor

Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Water Resources	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major SDNM: Negligible				
Wild Horse and Burro Management	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible		
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate SDNM: Negligible to Moderate				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Moderate				
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate SDNM: Negligible to Moderate				
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor	
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor	

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Special Designations Public Safety and Hazardous Materials	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Impacts on Hazardous Materials and Public Safety					
Air Quality	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Cave Resources					
Cultural and Heritage Resources					
Paleontological Resources					
Soil Resources					
Vegetation Resources					
Visual Resource Management					
Water Resources					
Wild Horse and Burro Management					
Wilderness Characteristics					
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major SDNM: Major				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None				
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor			Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible	Lower Sonoran: Minor; SDNM: Minor

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Minerals Management			Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major SDNM: Minor to Major		
Recreation Management			Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate SDNM: Minor to Moderate		
Travel Management			Lower Sonoran: Moderate SDNM: Moderate		
Special Designations			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor		
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials			Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major SDNM: Moderate		
Impacts on Socioeconomics					
Air Quality			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Cave Resources			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Cultural and Heritage Resources			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor		
Paleontological Resources			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Soil Resources			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Vegetation Resources			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Visual Resource Management		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Negligible to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	
Water Resources			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Wild Horse and Burro Management			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Wilderness Characteristics	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate		Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Minor to Moderate	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate; SDNM: Minor to Moderate
Wildland Fire Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				
Wildlife and Special Status Species	Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor				
Lands and Realty	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Major SDNM: Negligible to Minor				
Livestock Grazing Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Minor to Major; SDNM: Minor to Major	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor
Minerals Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Moderate SDNM: Negligible				
Recreation Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Moderate SDNM: Negligible to Minor			
Travel Management	Lower Sonoran: Negligible; SDNM: Negligible to Minor	Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor			
Special Designations	Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible				

**Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities**

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Impacts on Tribal Interests					
Air Quality			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Cave Resources			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Cultural and Heritage Resources			Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor		
Paleontological Resources			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Soil Resources			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Vegetation Resources			Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor		
Visual Resource Management			Lower Sonoran: Minor to Moderate SDNM: Minor to Moderate		
Water Resources			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Wild Horse and Burro Management			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		
Wilderness Characteristics			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Wildland Fire Management			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Wildlife and Special Status Species			Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor		
Lands and Realty			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor		
Livestock Grazing Management			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor		
Minerals Management			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor		

Table 2-44
Comparison of Impact Intensities

From:	A (No Action)	B	C	D	E (Proposed RMP)
Recreation Management			Lower Sonoran: Negligible SDNM: Negligible		
Travel Management			Lower Sonoran: Negligible to Minor SDNM: Negligible to Minor		
Special Designations			Lower Sonoran: Minor SDNM: Minor		
Public Safety and Hazardous Materials			Lower Sonoran: None SDNM: None		

This page intentionally left blank.