

Additional Tables

From Chapter Two:

Table 2-7. Desired Future Conditions and Land Use Allocations for Vegetation Communities in Arizona

| Vegetation Community Type | Desired Future Conditions (DFC) | | Land Use Allocation |
|--|--|--|---------------------|
| Upland Sonoran Desert Scrub | DFC are for an adequate cover and mix of natural plant species that have good vigor. For fire management and fire ecology, DFC are for fire to control or reduce the exotic annual weeds such as red brome and limit woody vegetation to nonhazardous levels. | | 2 |
| Lower Sonoran Desert Scrub | DFC are for an adequate cover and a mix of natural plant species that have good vigor. For fire management and fire ecology, DFC are for fire to control or reduce the exotic annual weeds such as red brome and to limit woody vegetation to nonhazardous levels. | | 2 |
| Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland | DFC are for annual weeds such as cheatgrass to be controlled; ladder fuels and downed woody debris to be limited or not present; and juniper and piñon pine tree densities and cover to occur at their historic range of variation. | | 1 |
| Great Basin Desert Scrub | DFC are for fire to naturally reduce annual weed densities and cover, limit, or reduce the invasion of juniper. Densities of shrubs, such as big sagebrush, are to be maintained within their historic range of variability. | | 1 |
| Plains and Great Basin Grasslands | DFC are for a predominance of perennial grass cover and a reduced cover of annual grasses. DFC are for fire to naturally inhibit the invasion of woody shrubs such as rabbitbrush, snakeweed, and big sagebrush. | | 1 |
| Semi-desert Grassland | DFC are for perennial grass to cover its historic range of variability and annual grass cover to be reduced. DFC are for fire to naturally inhibit the invasion of woody plants such as juniper, tarbush, whitethorn, and creosotebush. | | 1 |
| Interior Chaparral | DFC are for fire to naturally maintain shrub cover while reducing annual grass cover, control the invasion of wood plants such as juniper and piñon pine, and reduce the average age of chaparral stands through controlled fire or mechanical treatment. | | 1 |
| Riparian | DFC are for annual weed cover and density to be controlled and ladder fuels and downed woody debris to be limited or not present. Disturbances such as livestock grazing, mining, and OHV travel, which can potentially reduce natural vegetation cover and vigor, are managed to maintain adequate cover and mix of natural plant species. | | 2 |
| Land Use Allocation 1: | Wildland Fire Use | Areas suitable for wildland fire use for resource management benefit. | |
| Land Use Allocation 2: | Non-Wildland Fire Use | Areas not suitable for wildland fire use for resource management benefit. | |

From Chapter Three:

Table 3-5. Population and Household Characteristics

| | State | County | | Human Resource Unit (HRU) | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|---------|
| | Arizona | Maricopa | Yavapai | Wickenbur | Prescott | Lake Pleasant | Phoenix | Buckeye |
| <u>Total Population</u> | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 3,665,228 | 2,122,101 | 107,714 | 8,363 | 59,515 | 117,996 | 1,952,531 | 21,794 |
| 2000 Census | 5,130,632 | 3,072,149 | 167,517 | 10,744 | 92,826 | 292,540 | 2,677,213 | 40,918 |
| % Change | 40 | 45 | 56 | 28 | 56 | 148 | 37 | 88 |
| <u>Total Households</u> | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 1,368,843 | 807,560 | 44,778 | 3,711 | 24,655 | 54,220 | 735,648 | 6,877 |
| 2000 Census | 1,901,327 | 1,132,886 | 70,171 | 4,972 | 38,901 | 123,327 | 973,292 | 12,114 |
| % Change | 39 | 40 | 57 | 34 | 58 | 127 | 32 | 76 |
| <i>Note:</i> HRUs represent distinct areas and do not necessarily coincide with jurisdictional boundaries. | | | | | | | | |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau and JKA. | | | | | | | | |

Table 3-6. Comparison of Total Housing Units and Average Value of Homes

| | State | County | | Human Resource Unit | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Arizona | Maricopa | Yavapai | Wickenburg | Prescott | Lake Pleasant | Phoenix | Buckeye |
| <u>Total Housing Units</u> | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 1,659,430 | 952,041 | 54,805 | 5,067 | 59,515 | 67,391 | 864,337 | 9,015 |
| 2000 Census | 2,189,189 | 1,250,231 | 81,730 | 6,414 | 92,826 | 142,337 | 1,068,075 | 13,536 |
| % Change | 32 | 31 | 49 | 27 | 56 | 111 | 24 | 50 |
| 1990 Avg. Val., Owned Home | \$80,100 | \$102,650 | \$101,911 | \$88,711 | \$104,881 | \$102,131 | \$101,553 | \$75,185 |
| 2000 Avg. Val., Owned Home | \$121,300 | \$166,098 | \$170,962 | \$151,261 | \$168,944 | \$197,433 | \$158,426 | \$143,723 |
| % Change | 51 | 62 | 68 | 71 | 61 | 93 | 56 | 91 |
| <i>Note:</i> HRUs represent distinct areas and do not necessarily coincide with jurisdictional boundaries. | | | | | | | | |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau and JKA. | | | | | | | | |

Table 3-10. 2002 Primary Property Tax Levies

| County | Net Assessed Valuation | State | County | Cities & Towns | Community Colleges | Schools | All Other | Total | Primary Rate |
|---|------------------------|-------|--------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Maricopa | \$24,457,047,282 | \$0 | \$31,721,521 | \$175,207,012 | \$36,526,312 | \$603,369,737 | \$113,194,334 | \$960,018,916 | 3.93 |
| Yavapai | \$1,450,497,580 | \$0 | \$3,072,096 | \$1,667,615 | \$5,735,780 | \$12,506,662 | \$18,727,476 | \$41,709,629 | 2.88 |
| Source: Arizona Department of Revenue, 2002 Annual Report | | | | | | | | | |

Table 3-12. Ethnic Population Characteristics

| % of Total Population (by Race) | County | | Human Resource Unit | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|---------------------|----------|---------------|---------|---------|
| | Maricopa | Yavapai | Wickenburg | Prescott | Lake Pleasant | Phoenix | Buckeye |
| <u>White</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 85 | 96 | 95 | 96 | 92 | 85 | 72 |
| 2000 Census* | 80 | 94 | 94 | 95 | 93 | 78 | 75 |
| % Change | 6 | -2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 3 |
| <u>Black or African American</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| 2000 Census* | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| % Change | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 100 |
| <u>American Indian/Alaska Native</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| 2000 Census* | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| % Change | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -38 |
| <u>Asian/Hawaiian/Pac. Island</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 2000 Census* | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| % Change in Asian Population | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 200 | 50 | 0 |
| <u>Hispanic/Latino</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1990 Census | 16 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 22 |
| 2000 Census | 25 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 27 | 26 |
| % Change | 56 | 67 | 38 | 33 | -10 | 59 | 18 |
| <i>Notes:</i> | | | | | | | |
| *Race counts exclude those who indicated that they are of two or more races. That is, 2000 race variables only include those who said they are of one race. | | | | | | | |
| HRUs represent distinct areas and do not necessarily coincide with jurisdictional boundaries. | | | | | | | |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau and JKA. | | | | | | | |

From Chapter Four:

Table 4-2. Population Growth and Emissions Generated by Land Disposal Parcels Inside Air Quality Nonattainment Areas

| Alternative | Emission Factors | | Parcels Within Ozone Nonattainment Area | | | Parcels Within PM ₁₀ Nonattainment Area | | |
|---|--|---|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| | NO _x ⁽¹⁾ (Tons/year per capita) | PM ₁₀ ⁽²⁾ (Tons/year per acre of developed land) | Land Disposal Acres | 2025 Population | NO _x Emissions (tons/yr) | Land Disposal Acres | 2025 Population | PM ₁₀ Emissions (tons/yr) |
| A | 0.027 | 0.0487 | 980 | 3,390 | 92 | 1,060 | 4,060 | 51 |
| B | 0.027 | 0.0487 | 990 | 3,415 | 92 | 10,870 | 18,755 | 529 |
| C (160 acre parcels) | 0.027 | 0.0487 | 325 | 1,785 | 48 | 405 | 1,910 | 20 |
| C (5000 acres or less) | 0.027 | 0.0487 | 1,925 | 4,535 | 122 | 3,640 | 5,515 | 177 |
| D | 0.027 | 0.0487 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| E | 0.027 | 0.0487 | 1,290 | 3,020 | 82 | 2,170 | 4,450 | 106 |
| | | | Total Regional NO _x Emissions from All Existing Sources Within Ozone Nonattainment Area (Year 1999) | | 81,000 ⁽¹⁾ | Total Regional PM ₁₀ Emissions from All Existing Sources Within PM ₁₀ Nonattainment Area (Year 2001) | | 79,500 ⁽³⁾ |
| (1) Based on emission and population data from 1999 Periodic Ozone Emission Inventory (MAG, 2002) | | | | | | | | |
| (2) Based on regional PM ₁₀ modeling data from MAG (Chiou personal communication) | | | | | | | | |
| (3) Regional PM ₁₀ emission estimate from MAG, 2000. | | | | | | | | |

Example calculation (NO_x Emissions, Alternative A)

NO_x emission factor = 0.027 tpy/capita

Alternative A population increase = 6,100 persons

Annual NO_x emissions = (0.027 tpy/capita) x (6,100 persons) = 165 tons/yr of NO_x

Example calculation (PM₁₀ Emissions, Alternative A)

PM₁₀ emission factor = 0.0487 tpy/acre of developed land

Alternative A land disposal acreage = 1,355 acres converted to developed land

Annual NO_x emissions = (0.0487 tpy/acre) x (1,355 acres) = 66 tons/yr of PM₁₀

Table 4-4. Acres Closed to Mining by Alternative

| Alternative A | |
|------------------------------|---------|
| Closed to Saleable Minerals | 172,510 |
| Closed to Locatable Minerals | 171,680 |
| Closed to Leasable Minerals | 171,680 |
| Alternative B | |
| Closed to Saleable Minerals | 268,260 |
| Closed to Locatable Minerals | 171,680 |
| Closed to Leasable Minerals | 171,680 |
| Alternative C | |
| Closed to Saleable Minerals | 325,970 |
| Closed to Locatable Minerals | 188,450 |
| Closed to Leasable Minerals | 188,190 |
| Alternative D | |
| Closed to Saleable Minerals | 469,680 |
| Closed to Locatable Minerals | 446,440 |
| Closed to Leasable Minerals | 453,550 |
| Alternative E | |
| Closed to Saleable Minerals | 172,780 |
| Closed to Locatable Minerals | 171,940 |
| Closed to Leasable Minerals | 171,680 |

Table 4-7 - Acres of Inventoried Mineral Potential that would be Closed by Alternative.

| Alternative | Mineral Type | Mineral Potential | Federal Acres | Federal Acres Closed | % closed |
|---|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------|
| A – No Action | Saleable | Volcanic and Intrusive Rock | 278,890 | 32,750 | 11.7 |
| | | Marble | 6,170 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | | Sand and Gravel | 7,060 | 450 | 6.4 |
| | Leasable | Geothermal | 45,830 | 370 | 0.8 |
| | | Oil and Gas | 790 | 6 | 0.8 |
| | | Salt Deposit | 45,480 | 1,620 | 3.6 |
| | Locatable | High Potential | 94,100 | 3,170 | 3.4 |
| | | Moderate Potential | 737,400 | 60,820 | 8.2 |
| B | Saleable | Volcanic and Intrusive Rock | 278,890 | 48,910 | 17.5 |
| | | Marble | 6,170 | 6,090 | 98.7 |
| | | Sand and Gravel | 7,060 | 350 | 5.0 |
| | Leasable | Geothermal | 45,830 | 360 | 0.8 |
| | | Oil and Gas | 790 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | | Salt Deposit | 45,480 | 1,670 | 3.7 |
| | Locatable | High Potential | 94,100 | 3,950 | 4.2 |
| | | Moderate Potential | 737,400 | 120,430 | 16.3 |
| C | Saleable | Volcanic and Intrusive Rock | 278,890 | 65,220 | 23.4 |
| | | Marble | 6,170 | 5,620 | 91.1 |
| | | Sand and Gravel | 7,060 | 350 | 5.0 |
| | Leasable | Geothermal | 45,830 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | | Oil and Gas | 790 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | | Salt Deposit | 45,480 | 1,670 | 3.7 |
| | Locatable | High Potential | 94,100 | 12,920 | 13.7 |
| | | Moderate Potential | 737,400 | 152,510 | 20.7 |
| D | Saleable | Volcanic and Intrusive Rock | 278,890 | 93,870 | 33.7 |
| | | Marble | 6,170 | 5,620 | 91.1 |
| | | Sand and Gravel | 7,060 | 450 | 6.4 |
| | Leasable | Geothermal | 45,830 | 2,030 | 4.4 |
| | | Oil and Gas | 790 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | | Salt Deposit | 45,480 | 14,410 | 31.7 |
| | Locatable | High Potential | 94,100 | 47,000 | 49.9 |
| | | Moderate Potential | 737,400 | 314,990 | 42.7 |
| E – Agency Preferred Alternative | Saleable | Volcanic and Intrusive Rock | 278,890 | 48,250 | 17.3 |
| | | Marble | 6,170 | 300 | 4.9 |
| | | Sand and Gravel | 7,060 | 630 | 8.9 |

Additional Tables

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|--------------------|---------|---------|------|
| | Leasable | Geothermal | 45,830 | 370 | 0.8 |
| | | Oil and Gas | 790 | 6 | 0.8 |
| | | Salt Deposit | 45,480 | 1,690 | 3.7 |
| | Locatable | High Potential | 94,100 | 3,950 | 4.2 |
| | | Moderate Potential | 737,400 | 112,070 | 15.2 |