

Appendix N – Bradshaw-Harquahala Route Model

The following table is an estimate of the effect of the management decisions described in the Alternatives Chapter of this document on the vehicle route network. The table is simply a possible outcome based on a set of conditions that represents a way to compare alternatives and to estimate environmental impacts. ***This table is a tool for RMP level analysis and not an RMP decision.*** The methodology for estimating the percentage of open, closed and new routes in the planning area was derived by interpreting land use allocations and the specific prescriptions that come with these allocations and making an estimate of the effects on the route system. This table is only an estimate of possible foreseeable outcomes of how the range of alternatives could affect route designation scenarios. Since actual route designation is likely to take several years to complete, detailed route-by-route analysis was not done. Instead, the potential affect of alternative decisions on the overall vehicle route network is displayed as estimated percentages of open, closed, and new routes. It was felt by the planning team that this was the most informative way to convey the possible effects of management actions in the alternatives.

Table N-1. Route Models

Special Designations and Allocations	Alternative A		Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D		Alternative E	
	mi	%	mi	%	mi	%	mi	%	mi	%
ACECs										
Total Routes	0.0		2.0	0.09	189	8.44	299	13.35	166.0	7.41
open	N/A	N/A	0.2	10	18.9	10	0.0	0	143.5	86
closed	N/A	N/A	1.8	90	170.1	90	299.0	100	22.5	14
new ²	N/A	N/A	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0
subtotal open			0.2		18.9		0.0		143.5	
Areas Allocated to Maintain or Enhance Wilderness Characteristics										
Total routes	0		158.0	7.05	92.0	4.11	113.5	5.07	126.5	5.65
open	N/A	N/A	47.4	30	9.2	10	0.0	0	35.0	28
closed	N/A	N/A	110.6	70	82.8	90	113.5	100	91.5	72
new ²	N/A	N/A	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0
subtotal open			47.4		9.2		0.0		35.0	
SRMA										
Total routes	0.0		667.0	29.78	664.0	29.64	277.0	12.37	1277.0	57.01
open	0.0	100	653.7	98	630.8	95	249.3	90	1213.2	95
closed	0.0		28.3	2	64.8	5	155.1	10	63.9	5
new ²	0.0		7.1	0.5	13.0	1	31.0	2	26	2
subtotal open	0.0		660.7		643.8		280.3		1238.7	
ERMA										
Total routes	0.0		1413.0	63.08	1295.0	57.81	1550.5	69.22	670.5	29.93
open	0.0	100	1384.7	98	1230.3	95	1395.5	90	637.0	95
closed	0.0		28.3	2	64.8	5	155.1	10	33.5	5

Special Designations and Allocations	Alternative A		Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D		Alternative E	
New ²	0.0		7.1	0.5	13.0	1	31.0	2	13.4	2
subtotal open	0.0		1391.8		1243.2		1426.5		650.4	
Total ¹	2240.0		2240.0		2240.0		2240.0		2240.0	
Total open	2240.0		2086.0		1889.2		1644.8		2028.6	
Total closed	0.0		168.9		382.4		722.6		211.4	
Total new*	0.0		14.1		25.9		62.0		39.0	
Net Route Mi. Closed ³	0.0		154.8		356.5		660.6		172.4	
% Closed (of exist. 2240)	0.0		6.9%		15.9%		29.5%		7.7%	

1. Total routes in Bradshaw-Harquahala – 2,240 miles

Route total based on GPS route inventory data where complete and Arizona Land Resource Information System data where GPS data collection has not yet been collected. Total miles excludes state and county highways.

2. New routes (as % of total within management areas) developed to maintain connectivity of network as mitigation for closures for resource protection

3. Total closed, less new routes

The following lists explain some of the conditions that were considered in developing the percentages in the table of open, closed, and new routes:

Within SRMA/RMZ - Intent is to manage, at a higher level, specific activities and uses such as motorized/mechanized/equestrian use.

Factors that were considered:

1. Routes that meet Land Health Standards for erosion, desired plant communities, riparian management and other standards would generally be retained.
2. Routes consistent with management of the SRMA/RMZ intent would be retained. Areas allocated to day use recreation may have more looping route opportunities, while primitive areas may create more "cherry stem" spur route opportunities to maximize primitive recreation opportunities.
3. Spur routes for parking and camping would be designated open if no resource concerns exist.
4. New routes would be considered when needed to:
 - o Mitigate routes not meeting Land Health Standard criteria.
 - o Replace lost access opportunities
 - o Enhance recreation opportunities
5. Utility Rights-of-Way would generally be left open to public use.
6. Access to private property would be generally left open to public use.
7. Routes to wildlife water catchments would generally be left open for public use.
8. Motorized routes that cause conflict with other land uses or resources would be mitigated or closed (per 43 CFR 8342.1)

Within ACEC - Intent is to limit activities that diminish the purpose of the ACEC.

Factors that were considered:

1. Routes that facilitate an increase in human activity that may be damaging, such as camping spur routes, may be closed.
2. Routes that are determined to fragment habitat would be closed or limits placed on their use.
3. “Through” routes compatible with management will be left open. Analysis would attempt to identify important connecting routes.
4. The ACEC allocation would generally prohibit building new routes unless required for management.
5. Utility Rights-of-Way may be closed to public use if determined that use of the route is incompatible with the ACEC’s purpose.
6. Access to private property may be closed to public use, and a Right-of-Way grant required for access by property owners.
7. Routes to wildlife water catchments would generally be left open for public use.
8. Motorized routes that cause conflict with other land uses or resources would be mitigated or closed (per 43 CFR 8342.1)

Within areas allocated to maintain or enhance wilderness characteristics/Backcountry and Passage Zone - Intent is to manage generally for semi-primitive non-motorized and primitive experiences.

Factors that were considered:

1. Routes that facilitate an increase in motorized activity, such as vehicle camping spur routes and “through” routes with intensive motorized use, may be closed.
2. Routes incompatible with maintaining the primitive values, such as redundant routes and routes no longer needed for management or other land uses would be closed.
3. “Through” routes compatible with management would be left open. Analysis would attempt to identify important connecting routes.
4. New routes would generally be prohibited unless required for management.
5. Routes to wildlife water catchments would generally be left open for public use.
6. Utility Rights-of-Way would generally be left open to public use.
7. Access to private property may be closed to public use, and a Right-of-Way grant required for access by property owner.
8. Motorized routes that cause conflict with other land uses or resources would be mitigated or closed (per 43 CFR 8342.1)