

Table 2-8:
Summary Comparison
of Impacts by
Alternative

Table 2-8. Summary Comparison of Impacts by Alternative

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.6 Impacts to Special Area Designations					
4.6.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	No impacts.	-Increased visitation along Bloody Basin Rd Back Country Byways could lead to potential degradation of suitable WSR values. -Similar effects in Hassayampa River Wilderness from Constellation Mine Rd Byway.	-Impacts similar to Alt B. No impact is expected from WSR evaluations or ACECs. -Harquahala Mountain ACEC would reduce effects of vehicles on the Harquahala Mountains Wilderness.	Impacts similar to Alt C except no new byways.	-No new byway impacts. -Impacts of Harquahala Mountain ACEC similar to Alt C. -Protection of river values along Agua Fria tributaries eligible for consideration as wild and scenic rivers.
4.6.2 From Lands and Realty Management	-No expected impacts. -Acquiring lands within wilderness areas and WSR corridors would benefit management and prevent development activities that increase disturbance. -Retaining Yarnell utility corridor could degrade the wilderness values.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.6.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	-No impacts are expected. -Air quality standards could reduce fugitive dust in ACECs. -Inventorying and filing water rights in Wilderness Areas would preserve the wilderness values of water sources.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.6.4 From Biological	-Management could	-Elimination of Larry	-Management of	-Effects of management	-The movement corridors

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
Resource Management	enhance suitable WSR segments, wilderness areas (WA), and ACECs.	Canyon ACEC would have no effect. -Management of Harquahala Mountain WHA would enhance values in Harquahala Mountains Wilderness. -New wildlife waters may slightly reduce naturalness in wilderness areas.	pronghorn WHAs could enhance suitable WSR segments. -Controls on vehicle routes and recreational development would help maintain biological resources. -Management of the Harquahala/Belmont/Big Horn wildlife corridor/ the Belmont/Big Horn WHA would enhance values in wilderness.	for wildlife in the AFNM would be similar to Alt C. -Impacts of new wildlife waters would be similar to Alt B.	would protect wildlife habitat and help maintain natural conditions and enhance values in wilderness. -Impacts of new wildlife waters would be similar to Alt B.
4.6.5 From Cultural Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	-Development of sites for public use could increase wildlife disturbance and litter. This could slightly decrease naturalness in wilderness areas. -Increased visitor education and presence of people may reduce illegal dumping and other undesirable uses, but may reduce opportunities for solitude -Conducting cultural inventory could reduce opportunities for solitude during data collection.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except the Badger Springs petroglyph site would have fewer facilities/create fewer impacts.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except Wickenburg-Vulture SCRMA no public use reducing impacts in this area.	-Potential impacts would be limited to Harquahala Mountains Wilderness Area and would be the same as described for Alt B.
4.6.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.6.7 From Recreation Management	-Increased visitation is expected to increase	-Back Country allocations should protect values	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt B.	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt B.	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>motorized use in suitable WSR segments and wilderness areas. This could progressively degrade values of these areas.</p> <p>-Impacts to ACECs are not expected.</p>	<p>along suitable WSR segments.</p> <p>-Front Country/developed campgrounds could increase motorized visits/area of people to suitable WSR segment, degrading values. - Hieroglyphic Mtn SRMA could diminish solitude.</p> <p>-Increased vehicle use could increase fugitive dust entering Hells Canyon Wilderness, obscuring vistas.</p>	<p>-Impacts on Hells Canyon Wilderness from the Hieroglyphic Mountains SRMA would be similar to those described for Alt B.</p>	<p>-The phase-out of motorized activity in the Hieroglyphic Mountains would enhance solitude, naturalness, and visitor experience.</p>	<p>-The Hieroglyphic Mountains SRMA would be similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-No SRP-related impacts on wilderness areas, ACECs, or back country byways are expected.</p>
4.6.8 From Visual Resource Management	<p>-In the AFNM no impacts are expected.</p> <p>-Within Bradshaw-Harquahala, proposed projects could lessen the quality of the recreation setting and viewshed by allowing human intrusions into visual landscapes.</p>	<p>-Managing the Front Country to VRM Class III could allow visual intrusions that degrade the scenic quality of the suitable WSR segments.</p> <p>-Other Special Area Designations are not expected to be affected by VRM management.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt B except that they would mainly be limited to the northern WSR segment.</p> <p>-Managing the Hassayampa River Wilderness to VRM Class II objectives would restrict visual impacts of projects.</p>	<p>-Impacts to WSR would be similar to Alt C.</p> <p>- Managing the Harquahala Mountains ACEC to Class I would maintain the appearance of naturalness across a large landscape.</p> <p>-Managing the Sheep Mountain RNA ACEC and the Black Butte ONA ACEC to Class I would retain the natural settings of those areas.</p>	<p>-Impacts to WSR would be similar to those under Alt C.</p> <p>-Impacts to wilderness areas would be similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Managing Harquahala Mtn and Black Butte ACECs to VRM Class II would restrict visual intrusions into the landscape.</p>
4.6.9 From Rangeland Management	<p>-Applying land health standards should maintain or improve habitat characteristics.</p> <p>-No impacts to wilderness areas,</p>	<p>-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A, except riparian grazing would be limited to the winter season.</p> <p>-Riparian and overall ecological conditions in</p>	<p>-Impacts to the riparian corridors would be similar to those described for Alt B, except that year-round restriction of grazing would further improve and enhance the</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to those described for Alt C.</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to Alt B.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	ACECs, or back country byways are expected.	the WSR corridor/the riparian corridor in the Hassayampa River Canyon Wilderness would improve.	wildlife and scenic values.		
4.6.10 From Minerals Management	-No impacts are expected in the AFNM. -Mining near wilderness areas and along Back Country byways could reduce solitude, increase noise, dust, and traffic; and detract from the visual setting. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala there is little or no leasable or locatable mineral potential, and no impacts are expected from future development.	-Impacts would be similar to Alt A, -closing Tule Creek ACEC to all mineral development would benefit the resources that are important to ACEC designation.	-Impacts would be similar to Alt B, except areas allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics would be closed, thereby reducing the potential area for ground disturbance and maintaining the primitive open space.	-Impacts from managing Tule Creek ACEC would be similar to those described for Alt B, except that more area would be closed to mining.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.6.11 From Fire Management	-Prescribed burning would affect the WSR by reducing visual values over the short term, until vegetation regenerates. -Air quality/visibility could also be negatively affected. -Prescribed fire could temporarily increase runoff and erosion along the Agua Fria River. -Over the long term, use of fire as a natural process in the AFNM should lead to increased	-Impacts similar to Alt A. -Visitors would be restricted from parts of the wilderness during prescribed burns. The fire damage would detract from the visual setting until the vegetation recovers.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	ecosystem health.				
4.6.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	-Impacts of vegetation damage, soil and vegetation trampling in gathering areas / trailing would continue to diminish the natural setting, especially near water sources and in canyons. -Natural landscape settings would continue to exist in most areas.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	-Removing burros from the Harquahala HA would eliminate impacts to some Wilderness Areas. -Trailing and vegetation impacts now occurring in Hells Canyon Wilderness would continue.	Impacts similar to Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt C.
4.6.13 From Management of Travel Management	-No impacts are expected on existing ACECs, the five wilderness areas, or the Harquahala Mountain Summit Road Back, Country Byway. -Routes and developments are restricted to protect values, including riparian habitat and wildlife in proposed suitable WSR segments.	-Impacts of establishing the Hieroglyphic Mountains SRMA could concentrate OHV use, and increase traffic, noise, and dust at the southwest edge of the Hell's Canyon wilderness. -Impacts on suitable WSR segments would be similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	-Would enhance non-motorized recreation settings and opportunities within the Hells Canyon wilderness. -Impacts on suitable WSR segments would be the same as for Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.6.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	-No direct impacts are expected. Indirect benefits could retain more primitive and natural conditions.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.7 Impacts on Lands and Realty Management					

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.7.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	<p>-Wilderness areas would remain closed to rights-of-way and land use authorizations.</p> <p>-Acquiring inholdings would block up federal ownership in sensitive resource areas.</p>	<p>-Special Area Designations would not preclude developing an urban transportation network.</p> <p>-Stipulations consistent with the protection of Tule Creek ACEC would be written into future authorizations.</p> <p>-Locations, or the terms of use and rights-of-way could be restricted to protect Tule Creek.</p> <p>-The effects of wilderness areas would be the same as in Alt A.</p>	<p>-Lands adjoining Harquahala Mountains ACEC would be of higher priority for acquisition than other lands.</p> <p>-A utility corridor width of 2 miles would avoid impacts to archaeological sites.</p> <p>-The effects of wilderness areas would be the same as in Alt A.</p> <p>-The impacts from Tule Creek on lands actions would be the same as Alt B.</p>	<p>-Designating the Agua Fria Riparian Corridor ACEC would constrain the location of rights-of-way in the Black Canyon corridor.</p> <p>-The impacts from Tule Creek and Harquahala Mountains ACECs same as Alt B.</p> <p>-No new rights-of-way would be permitted in the Baldy Mtn ONA.</p> <p>-The effects of WAS would be the same as Alt A.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.7.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<p>-In the AFNM, land ownership would not change. No new or widened transportation corridors would be designated, though BLM might permit new rights-of-way.</p> <p>- Lands suitable for R&PP use would be issued on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>-Major rights-of-way and communication sites would be issued across public lands on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt A, except that the existing corridor would be narrowed.</p> <p>-Future utility uses would locate in undisturbed areas, resulting in possible increased costs.</p> <p>-Land acquisition would consolidate management in five MUs and would likely reduce costs.</p> <p>-Impacts of land leases and patents for R&PP would be the same as Alt A.</p> <p>-Designating corridors would prevent the</p>	<p>-BLM would issue no leases or patents for land within the AFNM to local govts or non-profit organizations under the R&PP Act.</p> <p>-Rights-of-way and communication sites would be similar to Alt B, except the existing corridor would be eliminated from the AFNM.</p> <p>-Land acquisition would be similar to Alt B, except that the lands would be consolidated into six MUs</p>	<p>-Impacts of new rights-of-way would be similar to Alt B, except that the corridor in Bradshaw-Harquahala would be extended, not widened.</p> <p>-Land acquisition would be similar to similar to Alt B, except that lands would be consolidated into seven MUs.</p> <p>-Land use authorizations would be similar to Alt B, except that no new electric or gas corridors would be designated.</p>	<p>-Impacts of new rights-of-way within the AFNM would be the same as Alt B.</p> <p>-Land acquisition would be similar to Alt C.</p> <p>-Impacts of land leases and patents for R&PP use would be similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Land use authorizations would be the same as Alt B; however the Black Canyon corridor modifications would better meet projected demands.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		proliferation of major utility systems across public lands.			
4.7.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	-Efforts to minimize impacts to soils, water, and air would result in increased project costs and possible project redesign or shifted location.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.7.4 From Biological Resource Management	-Acquisition of lands to enhance management of species is given a high priority and would result in acquisition of those areas in preference to others.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.7.5 From Cultural Resource Management	-The potential discovery of cultural and historical sites could cause restricted land use authorizations. Mitigation could increase project costs.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.7.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	-No impact is expected, but should resources be discovered, land use authorizations could be restricted or relocated.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.7.7 From Recreation Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.7.8 From Visual Resource Management	-Modification of rights-of-way to achieve VRM objectives could lead to	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	increased costs.				
4.7.9 From Rangeland Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.7.10 From Minerals Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.7.11 From Fire Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.7.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.7.13 From Management of Trans and Public Access	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.7.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts expected.	-Allocations to maintain wilderness characteristics would be closed to rights-of-way and inconsistent land use authorizations. Future utilities and private requestors would find other routes through these areas.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.8 Impacts on Soil Resources					
4.8.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	-70,900 acres of AFNM, including Perry Mesa ACEC (9,580 acres) would be protected from increased erosion and decreased soil moisture/productivity by limiting motor vehicle use. -Existing designated Wilderness would be	-Impacts similar to Alt A for suitable WSR segments. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala closing the fenced area of the Tule Creek ACEC (640 acres) to motorized vehicles and grazing could reduce soil disturbance and compaction.	-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A for suitable WSR corridors. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala 8 ACECs, totaling 55,710 acres, would reduce soil erosion and improve soil moisture and productivity.	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt C. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala 10 ACECs, totaling 192,800 acres, impacts similar to those under Alt C.	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt C. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, ACEC (89,970 acres) impacts similar to Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	managed to maintain soil productivity.				
4.8.2 From Lands and Realty Management	-Short term disturbance may occur from current activities. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, land disposal and subsequent development could result in loss of soil productivity. Short term disturbance could result from utility, transportation/communications rights-of-way. -Impacts from utility and utility corridor development would be mitigated.	-In the AFNM, no impacts are expected from land tenure adjustments or from utility and transportation corridors or communication sites. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.8.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	-In the AFNM, soil resources are expected to improve through measures to reduce loss/improve productivity. -No impacts expected in the Bradshaw-Harquahala.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.8.4 From Biological Resource Management	-Proposals to improve habitat would contribute to soil improvement at specific locations, resulting in an overall slight improvement.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.8.5 From Cultural Resource Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.8.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.8.7 From Recreation Management	<p>-In the AFNM, current recreation management practices could cause localized soil loss and reduced soil productivity.</p> <p>-Lack of OHV management in Bradshaw-Harquahala could lead to progressively increasing soil erosion, compaction, and overall loss of soil productivity.</p> <p>-Concentrated recreation, both motorized and non-motorized use could result in the loss of or reduced vegetation cover, soil compaction, and streambank instability in riparian and wash areas, thus reducing soil moisture and soil productivity.</p> <p>-SRP authorizations are mitigated but impacts are similar to concentrated recreation use.</p>	<p>-Impacts might occur in the Front Country and Passage RMZ as recreation use increases.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, vehicle route designations and closures in Tule Creek ACEC and allocations to maintain wilderness characteristics would slightly reduce soil impacts.</p> <p>-Area designations within the Castle Hot Springs and Harquahala MUs, would slightly reduce soil disturbance, erosion, and compaction by OHV use.</p> <p>-Selected route closures and planned, sited, and engineered recreation facilities are designed to reduce soil impacts of recreation activities.</p> <p>-Soil loss or damage by intense non-motorized cross-country travel similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-SRP impacts would increase from current levels but are capped.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt B, but MUs would slightly reduce soil disturbance, erosion, and compaction by OHV use.</p> <p>-Soil erosion from improper events and OHV use would be lessened by implementing vehicle route designations throughout the Bradshaw-Harquahala.</p> <p>-Soil loss or damage by intense non-motorized cross-country travel similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-SRP caps are lower, impacts would be less than Alt B.</p>	<p>Impacts in AFNM similar to Alt C, though more area would be allocated to Back County RMZ.</p> <p>-Impacts would be reduced in the southern portion of the castle Hot Springs MU by phasing out motorized uses.</p> <p>-Eliminating recreational vehicle use in designated MUs would reduce soil erosion.</p> <p>-Increased BLM signing, OHV route development and connectivity, public education, and better managed motorized and non-motorized recreation in SRMAs would lessen impacts to soils over the long term.</p> <p>-Soil loss or damage by intense non-motorized cross-country travel similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-No SRP impacts in AFNM, elsewhere, impacts similar to Alt B.</p>	<p>Impacts in AFNM similar to Alt C and D</p> <p>-Impacts in the Bradshaw-Harquahala similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-Soil loss or damage by intense non-motorized cross-country travel similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-SRP impacts on the AFNM similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Impacts similar to Alt B elsewhere.</p>
4.8.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.8.9 From Rangeland Management	-Implementing guidelines adopted in Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration would improve soil conditions.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, except grazing limited in riparian areas to the winter. -Rapid recovery of riparian vegetation and reduced impacts to soils from grazing are expected.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except grazing in riparian areas would be eliminated, increasing soil cover and reducing streambank damage.	-Cessation of grazing throughout the planning area would give the greatest benefit to soils of any Alt.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.8.10 From Minerals Management	-No impact is expected on the AFNM. -Within the Bradshaw-Harquahala, mining activities could cause disturbance, compaction and erosion. Impacts would be mitigated. Residual impacts are likely to be relatively small.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	-Impacts on AFNM similar to Alt A. -Within the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would be similar to Alt A except that the closure of some areas to mineral entry would reduce impacts.	-Impacts on AFNM similar to Alt A. -Within the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would be similar to Alt C except that the closure of more areas to mineral entry would reduce impacts.	In both areas soil impacts similar to Alt A.
4.8.11 From Fire Management	-The use of heavy equipment and mechanical thinning of trees could increase the potential for erosion. Soil moisture and productivity could be reduced in the short term, but increased in the long term. -Prescribed burning would reduce soil erosion. -Full suppression in fire adapted communities could cause herbaceous cover to decline with	-Impacts are similar to Alt A, except that fire use would be allowed in adapted ecosystems. -When natural fires occur, larger wildfires could be allowed, resulting in short term increases in soil loss.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	related soil effects.				
4.8.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	-No impact in the AFNM.-Impacts in the Lake Pleasant HMA would be limited through management. -Impacts in the Harquahala HA would eventually be eliminated through animal removal.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.8.13 From Management of Travel Management	-Increased soil erosion is expected from increased visitation, multiplying numbers of routes, and greater use of OHVs. Bank washes could be broken down and made unstable in wash “play” areas.	-In the AFNM, impacts might occur in the Front Ctry and Passage Zones. -The net reduction of 33 mi of routes would likely reduce these effects. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala route closures in Tule Creek ACEC and allocations to maintain wilderness character could slightly reduce soil disturbance, erosion, and compaction by OHV use.	-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt B, except the net reduction of 48 miles of route would marginally protect more soil resources. -Reducing vehicle traffic routes in the MUs would slightly reduce soil disturbance, erosion, and compaction by OHV use.	-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt C, except would provide the most protection due to route closures. -Restricting vehicle use to designated routes would further reduce soil impacts in all other parts of the planning area.	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt C. The reduction in route mileage would reduce soil disturbance more than Alt B and C, but less than Alt D. -Soil erosion caused by vehicular travel would be curtailed in Tule Creek ACEC, and by reducing cross-country travel.
4.8.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts expected.	-56,040 acres would be allocated for wilderness character. -Soil disturbances, compaction, and erosion caused by human induced activities would be reduced.	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B except that 107,843 acres would be allocated. -Soil disturbance would be reduced the most in this Alt.	-Impacts would be similar to Alt B except that 140,235 acres would be allocated. This would provide more protection than Alt B, but less than other alternatives.	-Impacts are similar to Alt B except that 88,179 acres would be allocated. -Soil protection would be more than Alts B and D, but less than Alts C and D.
4.9 Impacts on Air Quality					
4.9.1 From Management	-Restrictions resulting	-Recreation prescription	-Designation of Bk Ctry	-The relative shift in air	-Site-Specific

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
of Special Area Designations	<p>from Special Area Designations are likely to increase emissions because of population growth and increases in OHV use.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, BLM would continue to prohibit OHV use in five wilderness areas (96,820 acres) and encourage OHV use on one back country byway (Harquahala Mountain Summit Road).</p>	<p>in ACECs, RNAs and SRMAs would shift OHV users to sites where OHV recreation is allowed and intensify use in remaining areas. The result would be (1) reduced localized air quality impacts in the new restricted areas and (2) increased temporary and localized, degraded air quality in the remaining OHV areas.</p>	<p>byways could attract more regional OHV users. This is not expected to increase regional OHV use or regional fugitive dust emissions.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, seven ACECs would further shift OHV use and possible air quality impacts.</p>	<p>quality impacts between newly restricted areas and the remaining accessible areas would be greatest.</p> <p>-Air quality effects and fugitive dust emissions from vehicular travel and OHV use would be curtailed by eliminating or mitigating recreation vehicle use in the Sheep Mountain RNA.</p>	<p>prescriptions and restrictions applied on ACECs along with cultural and wildlife management prescriptions would shift the locations of increases in OHV use and resulting fugitive dust and emissions.</p>
4.9.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<p>-Land disposal actions would not delay the region's compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>-New residential development on previously rural BLM land would have a minor effect immediately downwind from each new development.</p> <p>-Implementing available dust control best management practices during construction of facilities, roads and utilities would ensure that impacts would be temporary and limited to the immediate area of the construction.</p> <p>-Ongoing maintenance</p>	<p>-Narrowing the existing utility corridor is not expected to affect air quality, but it would shift the location of future air quality emissions into a smaller area.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala new utility corridors would be designated for future expected demands. Any such construction would likely generate fugitive dust and tailpipe emissions.</p> <p>-Impacts from ongoing maintenance and improvements of facilities and roadways would be similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, elimination of Black Canyon utility corridor would maintain current emissions. Impacts from ongoing maintenance would be similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts would be similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-Any construction in non-attainment areas would be subject to comply with county air quality rules.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to those described for Alt C.</p> <p>-The portion of the Black Canyon Multi-Use corridor would be extended. If utilities elect to use this corridor in the future, they would generate criteria pollutants and fugitive dust through the use of heavy equipment.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt C.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	and improvement of facilities and roadways would require use of construction equipment. This would generate fugitive dust and tailpipe emissions.				
4.9.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	Improvements resulting from management of soil, water, and air resources are expected to reduce emissions of fugitive dust.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.9.4 From Biological Resource Management	-In the AFNM, measures to protect biological resources, including the use of prescribed fire may result in small amounts of temporary, localized emissions. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, measures to protect ground cover, biological areas, and habitats would minimize impacts. -Implementation of Land Health Standards would reduce production of windblown fugitive dust not related to roads.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	-Limitations in WHAs and ACECs would improve air quality in these areas. Emissions might increase in remaining areas where OHV use and recreational site developments are allowed.	-Motor vehicle routes that fragment pronghorn habitat and cross known movement corridors would be closed, limited, or mitigated. -The shift in impacts between newly restricted areas and the remaining areas would be greatest under Alt D.	Impacts similar to Alt C.
4.9.5 From Cultural Resource Management	No impacts expected.	-Increased visitation to cultural sites developed for public use is expected to slightly increase emissions of criteria	-Impacts similar to Alt B except to a lesser degree due to less High Public Use designations.	-In the AFNM, impacts from vehicle traffic would be limited to Bloody Basin Road and the Pueblo la Plata	-In the AFNM, impacts would be lower than Alt B and greater than Alt C and D. -In the Bradshaw-

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		pollutants and fugitive dust.		area. Levels of airborne pollutants would be lower than under Alts B or C. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts generated by site visits would be lower than Alts B and C.	Harquahala, impacts would likely be lower than Alt B and greater than Alt C and D.
4.9.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.9.7 From Recreation Management	-Current recreation uses could generate emissions of criteria pollutants and fugitive dust from OHV travel, as well as emissions and smoke from campfires and stoves. -Prohibiting cross-country, OHV use in the AFNM would reduce levels of criteria pollutants and fugitive dust. In Bradshaw-Harquahala OHV travel would generate increased emissions of criteria pollutants and fugitive dust. -Non-motorized cross-country travel can cause trailing, erosion and dust.	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A, except increased management actions in SRMAs and RMZs are expected to locally address production of fugitive dust and could reduce dust emissions in those areas. -Building and maintaining roadways, trails, and recreation facilities would generate temporary and short-lived emissions of criteria pollutants and fugitive dust from heavy equipment and earthmoving. -Impacts from non-motorized recreation similar to Alt A.	-In the AFNM impacts would be similar to Alt B, except that more vehicle routes would be closed or limited to motorized vehicles. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except BLM would designate seven ACECs, further shifting OHV use and possible air quality impacts. -Implementation of SRMAs could reduce air quality effects/fugitive dust emitted by improper activity, scheduled OHV events/ intensive OHV use. -Impacts from non-motorized recreation similar to Alt A.	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt C except that: The relative shift in impacts between newly restricted areas and the remaining areas would be greatest because of restrictions on the most land. -In the AFNM, BLM would issue no SRPs. This would lead to a decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants. -Closing more routes would improve air quality and lessen dust emissions. -Impacts of SRMAs similar to Alt C. -Impacts from non-motorized recreation similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt C. -Impacts from non-motorized recreation similar to Alt A.
4.9.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts expected.	Restrictions to development may slightly	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		reduce dust emissions.			
4.9.9 From Rangeland Management	-May increase production of windblown dust in areas denuded by frequent livestock concentration. -Implementation of Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines for Grazing Management is expected to reduce dust emissions by increasing ground cover.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, except winter season use of riparian areas would lead to increased vegetation densities in those areas, slightly reducing localized windblown dust.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except closure of riparian areas to livestock grazing year round would lead to higher vegetation densities and more rapid growth than Alt B.	-Cessation of grazing would result in overall increases in ground cover, reducing windblown dust emissions more than any other alternative.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.9.10 From Minerals Management	-No impact is expected on the AFNM. -Within the Bradshaw-Harquahala, mining/associated activities could cause localized increases in fugitive dust/ vehicular exhaust. These are expected to be relatively small.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	-Alt D would reduce the amount of land open mining more than other alternatives. This action would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and fugitive dust.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.9.11 From Fire Management	-Use of prescribed fire would generate short term smoke emissions. Fire prescriptions minimize smoke drift into populated areas and Class I or II airsheds. -The use of heavy equipment and the mechanical thinning of trees would generate emissions of criteria pollutants as well as	-Impacts similar to Alt A except: Naturally occurring wildfires could be managed to meet resource objectives. -The opportunity for smoke drift into populated areas and/or Class I or II airsheds would increase over Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	fugitive dust.				
4.9.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.
4.9.13 From Management of Travel Management	-Prohibiting cross-country OHV use in the AFNM would reduce levels of criteria pollutants and fugitive dust. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala OHV travel would generate increased emissions of criteria pollutants and fugitive dust.-Any potential opening of new routes would increase fugitive dust during construction as well as increase emissions created by vehicles once the route is opened.	-In the AFNM, 134 miles of route would be left open and 37 net miles of route would be closed. Route closures could impact. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala routes would be reduced by 169 miles. Route closures would concentrate more vehicles on remaining roads and thereby increase localized air quality impacts and fugitive dust levels. -Building and maintaining routes would generate temporary and short-lived emissions and fugitive dust from heavy equipment and earthmoving.	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except that more vehicle routes would be closed or limited to motorized vehicles (48 miles) with 123 miles of route would be left open. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts of OHV use would be similar to Alt B except BLM would designate seven ACECs, further shifting OHV use and possible air quality impacts.	-In the AFNM, negative impacts would be the least due to the highest amount of route closures over other Alt (123 miles). -In Bradshaw-Harquahala 723 miles of routes would be closed. The route closures would reduce opportunities for air quality emissions and fugitive dust.	-In the AFNM, Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B, except that more net route miles would be closed (52 miles). -Impacts in the Bradshaw Harquahala Planning Area similar to Alt B.
4.9.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts expected.	-56,040 acres would be allocated to the management of wilderness characteristics, which would limit or restrict vehicle use. This could intensity vehicle travel into remaining areas resulting in reduced localized air quality	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B, except that more area would be allocated to the management of wilderness characteristics (107,843 acres).	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt C, except that more area would be allocated to the management of wilderness characteristics (140,232 acres).	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt D except that more area would be allocated to the management of wilderness characteristics (88,179 acres).

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		impacts in newly restricted sites and increased impacts in other areas.			
4.10 Impacts on Water Resources					
4.10.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	<p>-Perry Mesa ACEC is likely to continue to experience minor degradation of water quality.</p> <p>-Eligible WSR segment would continue to be managed for nonimpairment to WSR values.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala management of wilderness areas would improve hydrologic function.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts in wilderness areas would be the same as for Alt A. In addition, withdrawal of Tule Creek from mineral development would eliminate disturbance to streambanks, soils, and ground cover.</p>	<p>-Designating 4 ACECs in the AFNM would close the areas to grazing/vehicles. This would encourage revegetation of disturbed areas/would improve hydrologic function.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala designation of six ACECs would have effects similar to those described above.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to those described for Alt A.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts would be similar to Alt C, but Alt D would close more areas to mineral entry.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM are expected to be similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, management prescriptions for four ACECs would result in impacts similar to Alt C.</p>
4.10.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<p>-Water quality could be affected by construction, maintenance of facilities authorized under right-of-way. Mitigation for water impacts would be essentially the same as for soils impacts.</p> <p>-Impacts from land disposal of 54,370 acres include the potential loss of vegetation from development/possible increased erosion and sediment yield.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, narrowing Black Canyon utility corridor could reduce options for locating towers or other facilities, which could result in slightly higher than normal impacts.</p> <p>-Impacts of disposal of 58,400 acres of public land similar to those described for Alt A.</p> <p>-Water quality could be affected by construction, maintenance of facilities</p>	<p>-Impacts of rights-of-way are similar to Alt A. Eliminating the Black Canyon utility corridor would prohibit more utility right-of-way allocations.</p> <p>-The impacts of disposing of 49,100 acres of BLM-managed lands would be similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-Utility corridors and communication sites would have impacts similar to Alt B.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be the same Alt C.</p> <p>-The impacts on water resources from acquiring private or State lands would be similar to those described for Alt B.</p> <p>-Utility corridors and communication sites would have impacts similar to Alt B.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	-Acquiring larger blocks of BLM-managed land could improve vegetation conditions/reduce stream sedimentation.	authorized under right-of-way. Mitigation for water impacts would be essentially the same as for soils impacts.			
4.10.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	Management actions designed to improve soil conditions would have the affect of improving water quality.	Alt B would provide more protection for water resources than Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B, but more protection of water resources.	Would provide the most protection of water resources.	Impacts similar to Alt C.
4.10.4 From Biological Resource Management	-Designating the Agua Fria River riparian corridor would improve functional condition of the riparian zone. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts are expected from acquiring water rights to maintain or enhance spring/riparian habitats.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.10.5 From Cultural Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.10.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.10.7 From Recreation Management	-Areas disturbed by concentrated recreation use would continue to contribute to stream sediments and turbidity. -Cross-country OHV use	-In Front Country and Passage RMZs in the AFNM, OHV use would degrade water resources. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except the Front Country RMZ would be reduced and the Passage RMZ would be reduced.	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt C, except the Front Country RMZ would be reduced and the Passage RMZ would be increased.	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt C and D. Riparian and upland vegetation would benefit from decreased access, resulting in improved

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	could increase soil erosion, sediment yield, damage to banks of drainages, and sediment deposition. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts are expected from the increased water use by visitors and the proliferation of unplanned and unmanaged recreational trails and facilities.	allocating eight SRMAs and two areas to maintain wilderness characteristics for management of recreation use could reduce soil erosion and sediment yield into drainages.	-Impacts under Alt C are expected to be similar to those described for Alt B, but to a lesser degree.	-In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts are expected to be similar to those described for Alt C, but to a lesser degree.	functional condition of riparian zones. -Impacts In Bradshaw-Harquahala are expected to be similar to those described for Alt C.
4.10.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	Implementation of VRM standards could reduce the disturbance of new projects, reducing sediment loading and improving water quality.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.10.9 From Rangeland Management	-Impacts would include trampling and reduced vegetation, resulting in increased soil erosion and reduced streambank stability in riparian areas. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala implementation of the Land Health Standards and the Guidelines for Rangeland Health would result in overall water quality improvements.	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A, except limiting grazing in riparian areas to the winter season would reduce bank instability and increase riparian vegetation cover, slightly reducing grazing impacts to water resources.	-Impacts are expected to be similar to those describe for Alt A, except the prohibition of grazing in riparian areas would result in more rapid bank and vegetation recovery, further increasing riparian vegetation cover and bank stability, reducing grazing impacts to water resources.	-Alt D would cause the greatest improvement for water resources and riparian zone vegetation.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.10.10 From Minerals Management	<p>-No impacts are expected impact in the AFNM.</p> <p>-Mining is expected to somewhat degrade water quality through increased sedimentation.</p> <p>-Extraction of saleable mineral from flood plains could impair stream hydrologic function.</p>	<p>-No impacts are impacts expected in the AFNM.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala Impacts would be similar to those discussed in Alt A.</p>	<p>-No impacts are expected in the AFNM.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts would be substantially lower than Alt B because more land would be removed from mineral development.</p>	<p>-No impacts are impacts expected in the AFNM.</p> <p>-Impacts In Bradshaw-Harquahala would be lowest under this Alt since the most amount of land would be removed from mineral development.</p>	<p>-No impacts are expected in the AFNM.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts would be similar to Alt A, except that riparian areas in the Black Canyon corridor would be closed to mineral material disposal.</p>
4.10.11 From Fire Management	<p>-Prescribed fire would temporarily result in increased surface water turbidity and sedimentation.</p> <p>Vegetative composition would improve in the long-term.</p> <p>-Full suppression of wildfires could lower infiltration, increase runoff, increase erosion, and increase sedimentation.</p> <p>-Use of heavy equipment and construction could increase soil loss and turbidity and sedimentation of waterways.</p>	Fire use would have impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.10.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	-No impacts are expected to AFNM. In Bradshaw-Harquahala, maintaining AMLs in the Lake Pleasant HMA and	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	removing burros in the Harquahala HA, would allow heavily used areas to recover/minimize impacts to water quality/hydrologic function.				
4.10.13 From Management of Travel Management	<p>-Unplanned and unmanaged routes could continue to degrade stream bank stability and water resources.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala unlimited cross-country OHV use on the public lands west of Highway 93 could increase soil erosion, sediment yield, damage to banks of drainages, and sediment deposition.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM OHV use could continue to degrade water resources.</p> <p>-Closing routes would reduce impacts.</p> <p>-Riparian and upland vegetation would benefit from decreased access, resulting in improved functional condition of riparian zones.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, maintaining a diverse network of motorized vehicle routes would harden some areas.</p>	Impacts are expected to be similar to those described for Alt B, but to a lesser degree due to an increase in closed miles of motorized routes.	-Impacts are expected to be similar to those described for Alt C, but to a significantly lesser degree due to a greater net closure of motorized travel routes.	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt C and D.</p> <p>-Impacts in Bradshaw-Harquahala are expected to be similar to those described for Alt C.</p>
4.10.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected	<p>-In the AFNM, no impacts are expected.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, 56,040 acres would be allocated for the management of wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>-This could reduce soil erosion and sediment yield into drainages.</p>	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B, except that a larger area would be allocated for management of wilderness characteristics (107,843 acres).	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B except that 140,235 acres would be allocated for management of wilderness characteristics.	-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B except that 88,179 acres would be allocated for management of wilderness characteristics.
4.11 Impacts on Biological Resources					

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.11.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	<p>-Managing WSR suitable segments would reduce vehicle impacts to wildlife and habitat; reduce stream bank erosion, water quality degradation, and disturbance to riparian vegetation.</p> <p>-Within Bradshaw-Harquahala, vehicles on the Harquahala Mountain Summit Scenic Road Back Country Byway would occasionally disturb bighorn sheep and kill desert tortoise.</p> <p>-Management of designated Wilderness protects vegetation and wildlife habitat through prohibition of OHV use.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, management of WSR segments would have impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Within Bradshaw-Harquahala, Tule Creek ACEC would improve Gila topminnow and riparian habitat, as well as desert tortoise habitat.</p> <p>-Increased recreational use of the Constellation Road Back Country Byway would increase wildlife disturbance.</p> <p>-Making Bloody Basin Road into a Back Country Byway could increase wildlife deaths from vehicle impacts, as well as impede pronghorn movement and breeding.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, ACECs would have no new impacts to wildlife.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, management of seven ACECs would increase bighorn sheep forage; protect unique vegetation communities; reduce habitat fragmentation; protect spring sources, riparian areas, high value desert tortoise habitat; and important raptor nesting sites.</p> <p>-The designation of these 10 ACECs would add additional protection to desert tortoise habitat as well as emphasize protection of 10.4 miles of riparian habitat.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt C.</p> <p>-Within the Bradshaw-Harquahala, the eight ACECs would have impacts similar to those described in Alt C, but over a larger area.</p> <p>-The designation of these nine ACECs would add additional protection to significantly more desert tortoise habitat than Alt C as well as emphasize protection of 49.5 miles of riparian habitat.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts of designating Bloody Basin Road as a back country byway would be similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, management of four ACECs would be similar to Alt C.</p> <p>-Management of designated Wilderness impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Designation of 4 ACECs would add additional protection to desert tortoise habitat, as well as emphasize protection of 1.7 miles of riparian habitat.</p>
4.11.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<p>-In the AFNM, existing utility right-of-ways could temporarily disturb vegetation for wildlife habitat, and provide sites for invasive species encroachment.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, acquisition of lands to consolidate BLM management would improve wildlife habitats.</p> <p>-Increased corridors, along with more</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, narrowing the utility corridor would reduce the likelihood of impacting wildlife habitats.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, disposal of 58,400 acres would reduce wildlife habitat, including 10,709 acres of desert tortoise habitat.</p> <p>-Acquisition of lands would help consolidate blocks of BLM land and</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, eliminating the utility corridor would reduce the potential for the impacts described in Alt A.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from acquisition would be similar to Alt B. Disposal of 49,100 acres of BLM land would also have similar impacts to Alt B.</p> <p>-Transportation and utility corridors would</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt C</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, building and maintaining facilities in transportation and utility corridors and at communication sites would have impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-The Black Canyon would be expanded south. This may increase the possibility of having power line towers</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from acquisition and disposal would be similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-Impacts of utility and transportation corridors would be similar to Alt B and C as the Black Canyon Corridor would be widened.</p> <p>-Impacts from acquiring</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>communication sites, could lead to more habitat disturbance, prevent wildlife movement, result in loss of habitat, result in human presence and harassment, displace individual animals, and facilitate long-term human population growth.</p> <p>-Building and operating facilities in these corridors could create barriers to wildlife movement and disturb tortoise habitat.</p>	<p>add high value resources to those already being managed by BLM.</p> <p>-The impacts of utility and transportation corridors would be the same as described in Alt A, except the Black Canyon Corridor would be widened 1 mile to the west. No impacts are expected within the life of the plan.</p>	<p>have similar impacts as described for Alt A, except the Black Canyon Corridor would be widened 2 miles to the west.</p>	<p>impacting sensitive resources.</p> <p>Impacts from acquiring private or state lands would be similar to those in Alt B.</p>	<p>private or state lands would be similar to those in Alt B.</p>
4.11.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	<p>-Plans to maintain or improve watershed conditions, soil cover, and water flows would maintain or improve riparian vegetation quality, species diversity, and water quality in select drainages.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.11.4 From Biological Resource Management	<p>-In the AFNM, proposed landscape improvements would improve riparian habitats.</p> <p>-Stocking native fish would increase their overall viability.</p> <p>-Fence modifications would improve pronghorn movement.</p>	<p>-Implementation of the Land Health Standards would make progress toward achieving desired plant communities.</p> <p>-Habitat needs of special status species would be a high priority.</p> <p>-Reintroduction, transplanting, and</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to Alt B, except:</p> <p>-In the AFNM, management of the WHA for pronghorn would avoid or mitigate impacts to pronghorn and emphasize management of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>-Prescribed burns would</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to Alt B except:</p> <p>-In the AFNM, impacts of the Pronghorn WHA would be similar to Alt C, except fences would be removed, greatly reducing pronghorn habitat fragmentation.</p> <p>-Impacts of management</p>	<p>- Impacts similar to Alt B except:</p> <p>-In the AFNM, impacts to pronghorn would be similar to Alt C, except seasonal use restrictions on SRPs would reduce disturbance to pronghorn.</p> <p>-Impacts of management for WHAs would be</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, protection measures on specific stream reaches would improve wildlife habitat.</p> <p>-Acquisition of water rights could reduce competition for water and ensure legal availability and maintenance of flows.</p> <p>-Use of native species for restoration would reestablish native plant communities and improve wildlife habitat.</p> <p>-Protection of significant cliffs for nesting raptors would improve nesting conditions.</p> <p>-Protection of the bighorn lambing areas in the Harquahala Mountains would increase forage and reproductive success in sheep populations.</p>	<p>supplemental stocking of wildlife would contribute to conservation and recovery of T&E species.</p> <p>-Desert tortoise management standards would protect tortoise populations and habitat.</p> <p>-DFC objectives would protect and conserve priority habitats and species.</p> <p>-Wildlife water availability would ensure access.</p> <p>-Distribution and abundance of some species would be enhanced.</p> <p>-Actions to protect springs and seeps would prevent overexploitation.</p> <p>-Prohibiting domestic sheep and goat grazing near desert bighorn sheep habitat will reduce the likelihood of disease transmission.</p> <p>-Exotic species management would emphasize the restoration and maintenance of native species.</p>	<p>improve pronghorn forage and reduce invasive species.</p> <p>-The management of Belmont-Big Horn Mountains and the Date Creek Mountains WHAs would improve species distribution, maintain genetic diversity and ensure bighorn sheep are given priority consideration in future road improvements.</p> <p>-The Upper Agua Fria River Basin WHA would reduce wildlife-vehicle conflicts and improve pronghorn and mule deer movement.</p> <p>-The designation of the WHAs would add additional protection to desert tortoise habitat and 14.7 miles of riparian habitat by emphasizing wildlife habitat management.</p>	<p>for the Date Creek WHA would be similar to those described in Alt C, except that it would further reduce habitat fragmentation and loss of tortoise habitat.</p> <p>-Impacts of management for the Upper Agua Fria River Basin WHA would be similar to those described for Alt C; except they would be applied to a larger area and removal of fences would facilitate big game movement.</p> <p>-The designation of the WHAs would add additional protection to fewer habitats than in Alt C as well as 5 miles of riparian habitat by emphasizing wildlife habitat management.</p>	<p>similar to those described for Alt C.</p> <p>-The designation of the WHAs would add additional protection to desert tortoise habitat, similar to Alt C as well as 14.7 miles of riparian habitat by emphasizing wildlife habitat management.</p>
4.11.5 From Cultural Resource Management	-Management actions for cultural resources that prohibit surface disturbance near known	-In the AFNM, development of High public use at five sites could degrade biological	-In the AFNM, impacts of one High public use areas would be similar to those described for Alt B, but to	-In the AFNM, impacts from developing one Moderate public use sites described would be	-In the AFNM, impacts of High public use at two sites and Moderate public use at six sites would be

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	archaeological sites would protect vegetation and wildlife habitat in those areas.	resources. -Development of four Moderate public use areas would have fewer impacts. -No impact is expected from Low public use sites.--In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from public use would depend on site location, size, and surrounding habitat. -In desert tortoise habitat, the decision to accept no net loss of habitat would reduce impacts from site development.	a lesser degree. -Impacts of developing eight Moderate public use sites would be similar to those described in Alt B, but on more sites. -Overall, impacts are expected to be lower than in Alt B. -Impacts in Bradshaw-Harquahala are expected to be similar to Alt B, but in fewer locations.	similar to those described for Alt B, but at fewer sites. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts of public use development would be similar to those described in Alt B, but in fewer locations than Alt C.	similar to those described for Alt B. -Within the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts of public use development would be similar to those described for Alt B.
4.11.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.11.7 From Recreation Management	-In the AFNM, recreation uses would be allowed if they are consistent with the proclamation. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, current levels of recreation management would inadequately protect biological resources. -Informal concentrated recreational use areas would continue to develop and grow causing increasing levels of habitat loss and	-In the AFNM, Front Country and Passage zones could lead to some additional disturbances to wildlife habitats. -Campgrounds could disturb pronghorn movement and fawning behavior. -Designation of 12,700 acres of Back Country, would result in less ground disturbance to vegetation and wildlife habitat. -In the Bradshaw-	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except impacts of visitor use in Front Country would affect 42,000 acres and 700 acres of Passage RMZ. -The Badger Springs campground could potentially affect pronghorn behavior and fawning success on Black Mesa. -Impacts from Back Country would be similar to Alt B, but the zone	-In the AFNM, impacts to biological resources would be similar to Alt B, except impacts in Front Country would affect only 1,530 acres and 990 acres of Passage Zone. -The Back Country would be expanded to include 68,380 acres. -Impacts from allocating a Passage zone would be similar to Alt B except that the zone would consist of 990 acres. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala,	-In the AFNM, Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B, except impacts of visitor use in Front Country would affect 11,900 acres and 1,350 acres of Passage RMZ. -Since Back Country would include 57,650 acres, the impacts to wildlife described in Alt B would be over a much larger area. -Within the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from staging areas and route

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>disturbance.</p> <p>-The location and use of these areas would continue to be unplanned and may conflict with sensitive biological resources, priority species, or priority habitats.</p> <p>-Motorized and non-motorized cross-country users can cause trailing and destruction of vegetation.</p>	<p>Harquahala, seasonally restricting motorized events in Category I and II desert tortoise habitat would reduce impacts to desert tortoises.</p> <p>-Limiting designation of rock crawling sites would protect resources.</p> <p>-In the Table Mesa, Hieroglyphic Mountains, and San Domingo SRMAs, development of OHV staging areas would destroy the vegetation and habitat in those sites.</p> <p>-Impacts from cross-country travel would be similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>would increase to 28,200 acres.</p> <p>-Impacts from allocating a Passage zone would be similar to Alt B, except that the zone would occupy just 700 acres.</p> <p>-Impacts of staging areas and route designation would be less than Alt B.</p> <p>-Impacts from cross-country travel would be similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>impacts from OHV staging areas and route designations would be reduced from Alt C.</p> <p>-Shifting use in the Hieroglyphics SRMA from motorized to non-motorized would reduce habitat fragmentation as well as disturbance and displacement of wildlife.</p> <p>-Impacts from cross-country travel would be similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>designations would be similar to those described for Alt C.</p> <p>-Impacts from cross-country travel would be similar to Alt A.</p>
4.11.8 From Visual Resource Management	<p>-Assigning VRM Class I or II could limit the design and location of some wildlife management developments. This could adversely affect wildlife populations. There are 96,820 acres of Class I.</p>	<p>-Impacts to would be similar to those under Alt A, except that the area in VRM Class I would be 96,820 acres and VRM Class II would be allocated to 486,800 acres.</p>	<p>-Impacts to would be similar to those under Alt B, except that the area in VRM Class I would increase to 109,570 acres and the area in VRM Class II would increase to 502,610 acres.</p>	<p>-Impacts to would be similar to those under Alt B, except that the area in VRM Class I would decrease to 298,310 acres and the area in VRM Class II would decrease to 340,880 acres.</p>	<p>-Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt B, except that the area in VRM Class I would increase to 116,132 acres and the area in VRM Class II would increase to 454,868 acres.</p>
4.11.9 From Rangeland Management	<p>-Implementing the Land Health Standards would reduce soil erosion, restore functional conditions of riparian habitats, and reduce the presence of invasive</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Applying the Special Ephemeral rule could result in the increase of native grass production, shrub and tree cover, and habitat complexity.</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to Alt B, except:</p> <p>-Impacts of closing riparian areas to grazing would occur quicker and could be more pronounced.</p>	<p>-The affects of removing all livestock from federal lands in both planning areas would be similar to those described for riparian and upland areas under Alt C. However,</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt B.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Implementing would prioritize the habitat needs of special status species where wildlife and other land use conflict. -Implementing changes in grazing practices would increase vegetation density and cover. -Fence modifications would improve big game movement. -Development of water facilities for grazing may improve water availability for some species, while being mortally dangerous to others. -Congregation of livestock in and around water developments can result in some habitat loss. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Retirement of allotments could increase plant diversity and habitat complexity. -In the AFNM, limiting riparian areas to winter use would increase the diversity and abundance of plant species and the complexity of the wildlife habitat. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, implementing riparian management would have similar impacts to riparian habitats but more slowly and less consistently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Seasonal grazing closure in the Harquahala Mountains ONA ACEC during bighorn lambing season would increase forage abundance and availability to bighorn sheep during the critical lambing season, improving their health and potentially improving lamb fitness and survival. -Prohibiting the development of facilities that would increase livestock use in Browns Canyon and the Inner Basin would eliminate concentrated livestock use from sensitive riparian and upland habitat areas. 	<p>Alt D would affect a much larger area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eliminating all range improvements that serve no purpose in the absence of livestock grazing would remove many fences and corrals that hinder natural movement of pronghorn, mule deer, and bighorn sheep. 	
4.11.10 From Minerals Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, minerals actions would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and impacts to biological resources would be mitigated and avoided to the extent allowable by regulation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts within the AFNM would be similar to Alt A. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, closing areas to mineral extraction would protect habitat from disturbance and protect the wildlife that depend on those areas. -The riparian area in Tule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts within the AFNM would be similar to Alt A. -Impacts of closing areas to mineral extraction would be similar to those described in Alt B. -Opening reconvened lands to mining could degrade desert tortoise habitats and habitats for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts within the AFNM would be similar to Alt A. -Impacts of closing areas to mineral would be similar to those described in Alt B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts within the AFNM would be similar to Alt A. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts to reconveyed lands would be similar to those described for Alt C. -Impacts in Tule Creek

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	-Some residual loss of desert tortoise habitat is likely.	Creek would especially benefit. -Opening reconveyed lands to mining could degrade riparian and areas and habitats for priority species.	priority species, but in this alternative, riparian habitats would be protected.		would be similar to Alt B. Impacts in other areas would be similar to Alt A.
4.11.11 From Fire Management	-In the AFNM, use of prescribed fire affects pronghorn habitats and helps control invasive species and restores the natural fire cycle. -Full suppression of natural fire starts could interrupt the natural fire cycle required for natural succession, allowing establishment of invasive species, and a buildup of fuel loading. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, full suppression of fires in fire adapted communities would have the same impact. Full suppression of fires in Sonoran desertscrub habitat would decrease mortality to species not adapted to fire.	-The impacts of prescribed fire use in fire adapted plant communities would be the same as Alt A. -Treatments would reduce the population size of invasive species in fire-adapted environments, reducing competition between invasive species and native vegetation. -Allowing natural starts to burn when conditions are suitable would allow natural fire cycles to return, creating natural mosaics of vegetation age classes and successional stages, improving wildlife habitat and helping to control invasive species. -Impacts of full suppression would be similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.11.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	-No impacts are expected in the AFNM. -In Harquahala HA, continued degradation of	Impacts similar to Alt A.	-Impacts in the AFNM and the Lake Pleasant area are the similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>sensitive habitats and increased competition with wildlife for scarce resources.</p> <p>-In Lake Pleasant HMA, Managing for AML would minimize competition with wildlife and livestock.</p>		<p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, eliminating the burro population in the Harquahala HA would help sensitive habitats recover and reduce competition for forage, water, or other habitat.</p>		
4.11.13 From Management of Travel Management	<p>-In the AFNM, biological resources would benefit from prohibiting cross-country OHV use, which would prevent the destruction of vegetation and priority wildlife habitats.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, prohibiting cross-country OHV use would provide some protection for sensitive desert tortoise habitat.</p> <p>-Use of routes that degrade the value of sensitive riparian and tortoise habitat would likely continue and increase.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, Designating 134 miles of road as open and closing 37 miles would reduce habitat fragmentation and human disturbance to priority habitats, including riparian and pronghorn habitats.</p> <p>-Closed roads would reclaim and restore habitat.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, designating vehicle routes and closing undesignated routes and cross-country travel would benefit biological resources by reducing (1) habitat fragmentation, (2) vegetation destruction, and (3) human disturbance of wildlife.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt B, except that 123 miles of roads would remain open, providing less habitat fragmentation.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt B, except that 48 miles of roads would remain open, fragmenting even less habitat than under Alt C.</p>	<p>-Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt B, except that 52 miles of roads would be closed. Impacts would be more than in Alt C, but less than Alt D.</p>
4.11.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected.	-Allocations to wilderness characteristics would recognize wildlife populations and habitat as	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except that allocating 107,843 acres to maintain wilderness characteristics	Impacts similar to Alt C, except 140,235 acres would be allocated to maintain wilderness	Impacts similar to Alt C, except 88,179 acres would be allocated to maintain wilderness

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<p>important aspects of naturalness and actively manage them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Allocating 56,040 acres in the Harquahala Management Unit, would reduce disturbances to priority wildlife habitats. -Closing lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics to mineral material disposal would reduce ground disturbance and impacts to vegetation and wildlife habitat. 	<p>in 3 management units would further reduce disturbances to priority wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>characteristics.</p>	<p>characteristics and these areas would not be closed to mineral material disposal making them subject to impacts associated with this activity.</p>
4.12 Impacts on Cultural Resources					
4.12.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Management of WSR non-impairment would continue to protect cultural resources. -Management of designated Wilderness would preserve cultural resources in current condition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts are similar to Alt A, except ACEC designation for Perry Mesa and Larry Canyon would be removed which would have little effect. -Increased use from Back Country byways could increase vandalism, accelerated erosion at roadside sites, and create a need for more maintenance to preserve historic features off of Constellation Road. -Designating Tule Creek would limit surface disturbances that could damage archaeological 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Proposed ACEC designations would include restrictions on transportation routes, rights-of-way, livestock grazing, and minerals actions. Such restrictions could help protect cultural resources by limiting public access and ground-disturbing activities. -Impacts of Back Country Byways would be similar to Alt B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No back country byways are proposed; therefore, no impacts to cultural resources are expected. -ACEC designations would have similar impacts to Alt C. -Designating more ACECs would further restrict and uses, thereby better protecting cultural resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts are similar to Alt B except ACEC protection would be more like Alt C, extending to 89,970 acres. -Black Mesa would be recommended for recognition in the National Register of Historic Places. -No back country byways are proposed; therefore, no impacts to cultural resources are expected.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		features.			
4.12.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<p>-Land acquisitions would acquire valuable cultural resources and consolidate important areas. This would increase protection of many sites and assure their availability for future scientific or public uses.</p> <p>-Installation of utilities within the Black Canyon Corridor could reduce the physical integrity and visual setting of the AFNM's natural and cultural landscape.</p> <p>-Disposal of lands in the Upper Agua Fria River Basin could remove significant cultural resources from Federal protection.</p>	<p>-Acquisitions impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Narrowing the Black Canyon Corridor and restrictions on utility development should help maintain integrity of cultural and natural landscapes.</p> <p>-Acquiring or disposing of lands in Bradshaw-Harquahala might add or remove significant cultural resources from federal protection. Impacts would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>-Widening the Black Canyon Corridor could put more sites at risk of disturbance. Installation of above-ground facilities would detract from the visual setting. Establishing corridors protects sites outside of corridors.</p>	<p>-Acquisitions impacts similar to Alt A</p> <p>-Eliminating the Black Canyon utility corridor would reduce the likelihood that cultural resources would be affected by ground disturbance or visual intrusions from future utility development.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, disposal of 600 acres would be unlikely to affect significant cultural resources. Disposal of 49,100 acres could transfer significant cultural resources out of federal protection.</p> <p>-Widening the Black Canyon Corridor two miles west would have similar impacts to Alt B, but would allow additional flexibility.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, eliminating the Black Canyon utility corridor would have impacts similar Alt C.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, acquiring state and federal lands would likely increase the level of protection for cultural resources on those lands, much as would Alt C.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt C.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, Impacts are expected to be similar to those described in Alt B except only 38,755 acres are available for disposal and the Black Canyon Utility corridor has been adjusted to exclude known sensitive cultural resources.</p> <p>-Project related impacts would be mitigated.</p>
4.12.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	Actions to improve soil and vegetation stability would help protect cultural resources from eroding.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.12.4 From Biological Resource Management	-In the AFNM, modification of existing	-Actions designed to protect wildlife habitats	Limiting routes in pronghorn corridors could	Impacts similar to Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>fences would have no affect, but new fences could disturb cultural resources and degrade the visual setting.</p> <p>-Restricting public access to sensitive wildlife habitats would have the spin off benefit of also reducing disturbance and vandalism to cultural sites.</p>	<p>generally also protect cultural resources. Building wildlife management facilities, such as water developments, could disturb cultural resources. Specific surveys and mitigation would be needed that is specific to any proposal.</p> <p>-Travel limitations could restrict access to cultural sites for research or cultural heritage tourism.</p>	<p>protect sites but limit opportunities for research, monitoring, and interpretation.</p> <p>-In the AFNM, fence modifications would have impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, limiting routes in sensitive habitats could restrict access that leads to damage.</p>		
4.12.5 From Cultural Resource Management	<p>-In the AFNM, restrictions to surface disturbance would help protect cultural resources, but may limit research opportunities.</p> <p>-Protective actions would minimize disturbance to cultural resources. Mitigation devised under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act would help ensure protection of National Historic Register eligible sites.</p>	<p>-Proactive management helps protect sites from disturbance. Inventories and consultation with tribes would help identify sites and needs for future uses or protective measures that may be important.</p> <p>-Implementation of measures could stop, limit, or repair damage from vandalism, erosion and other disturbances, or could improve success in prosecution.</p> <p>-Scientific research methods might disturb sites.</p> <p>-Development of sites for public use could improve understanding, reducing</p>	<p>-Impacts to cultural resources would be similar to Alt B, except:</p> <p>-In the AFNM, one site would be developed for High public use and eight sites would be allocated to a less intensive Moderate.</p> <p>-Impacts of public use development would be similar to Alt B, but in fewer areas and less intensive for the Moderate developed sites.</p> <p>-Overall there is less potential for damage to cultural resources and reduced opportunity for public education and enjoyment of cultural</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, no sites would be developed to High public use and one site would be developed to Moderate public use.</p> <p>-This alternative would subject the fewest sites to potential damage, but also develop the fewest sites for public education and enjoyment.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, sites would be allocated to public use in two SCRMA's.</p> <p>-This alternative subjects the fewest sites to potential damage from visitation, but also provides the least opportunities for public education, recreation, and</p>	<p>-Impacts to cultural resources would be similar to Alt B, except:</p> <p>-Two sites would be allocated to High public use development and six sites would be allocated to Moderate.</p> <p>-Impacts would be similar to Alt B, but slightly less.</p> <p>-At least 60,000 acres in the AFNM would be excluded from public use allocations. In these remote areas, visitors could encounter and observe archaeological sites under conditions of solitude in pristine settings.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, sites in six</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<p>behaviors that put cultural sites at risk. Attracting people to particular sites can cause disturbance.</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Tourism can provide an economic benefit to nearby communities.</p> <p>-Development of four sites to High public use within the AFNM would potentially result in increased disturbance, but would provide the greatest opportunity for interpretation, public education and enjoyment.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, sites would have the largest potential for damage as well as having the greatest opportunity for interpretation, public education and enjoyment.</p>	<p>sites than in Alt B.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, sites in four cultural priority areas would be developed for public use, reducing the potential for damage, but also reducing the opportunities for public education and enjoyment of cultural sites.</p> <p>-Alt C entails a moderate potential for damage to sites from public use, as well as a moderate potential benefit in public education and the recreational opportunities and economic returns of cultural heritage tourism.</p>	<p>economic return from cultural heritage tourism.</p>	<p>cultural priority areas would be developed for public use, reducing the potential for damage to cultural sites from Alt B, but also reducing the opportunities for public education and enjoyment of cultural sites.</p>
4.12.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.12.7 From Recreation Management	<p>-In the AFNM, limiting motorized vehicle use would help protect sites.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, continued protection and interpretation of the Harquahala Peak</p>	<p>-Prohibiting geocaches on sites would reduce vandalism and disturbance.</p> <p>-Restricting camping and campfires near sites could reduce damage.</p> <p>-For SRPs, limiting group</p>	<p>-This alternative would allocate a smaller proportion of the AFNM to the Front Country RMZ than Alt B with an expected reduction in levels of recreational facilities and visitation.</p>	<p>-This alternative would create the lowest level of visitation and the least risk of damage to cultural resources. Access restrictions would limit the regular monitoring of sites in remote areas,</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, the relatively large area allocated to the Back Country zone, along with a number of route closures, would contribute to protecting cultural resources, while</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>Observatory would enhance opportunities for public education and cultural heritage tourism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The potential for damage could continue as public awareness and subsequent casual use increases. -Cross-country non-motorized recreation use can cause trailing which can degrade cultural features. These impacts are relatively minor. 	<p>size would help preserve integrity of sites and reduce potential disturbance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Public outreach and education programs could make the public more aware of cultural values and may discourage damaging behaviors. -Vehicle route designations can reduce damage. Routes that increase the risk of damaging particular sites can be closed. -This alternative would allow the highest amount of visitation and access by motorized vehicles and would have the greatest potential for site disturbance along with the greatest opportunity for interpretation and education. -Non-motorized recreation impacts similar to Alt A. 	<p>Impacts to archaeological sites are expected to be less extensive in areas allocated to the Back Country zone. Site visitation and educational opportunities from interpretive development of archaeological sites would also decline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, reductions in travel routes are expected to contribute to lower levels of damage. -Opportunities for cultural heritage tourism partnerships would slightly decrease. -Non-motorized recreation impacts similar to Alt A. 	<p>leaving some sites vulnerable to vandalism. Reduced access would reduce opportunities for interpretation and public education, as well as reduced opportunities for scientific research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, more emphasis on non-motorized recreation, issuance of fewer SRPs, and more miles of closed routes would reduce the potential of damage. Opportunities for public education, community partnerships, and revenues from cultural heritage tourism would be reduced. -Non-motorized recreation impacts similar to Alt A. 	<p>still allowing for unobtrusive interpretive uses and access for scientific research and monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, there would be an intermediate level of recreational facilities and route closures. Impacts would likely be similar to Alt C. Recreational activities would continue to threaten cultural resources but community partnerships would be developed. This would enhance the long-term effectiveness of public education, stewardship, and cultural resource protection by enlisting citizens as partners in these efforts. -Non-motorized recreation impacts similar to Alt A.
4.12.8 From Visual Resource Management	A lack of VRM Class objectives throughout the planning area could lead to a steady degradation of visual landscapes that contribute to prehistoric and historic sites.	Establishing VRM classes through RMP decisions, along with actions that minimize or mitigate visual intrusions, would protect the integrity of cultural resources.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.12.9 From Rangeland Management	<p>Livestock grazing can cause physical damage to sites from rubbing or walking on them.</p> <p>-Sites could be damaged by soil erosion resulting from the loss of stabilizing vegetation or the trampling of streambanks. Damage is expected to be greatest at sites where livestock tend to concentrate.</p> <p>-Installing and maintaining livestock management facilities could damage the physical or visual integrity of cultural sites.</p> <p>-Implementing the Land Health Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health would reduce soil erosion impacts to cultural sites.</p>	<p>Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A, except that grazing riparian areas in winter only would reduce impacts.</p> <p>-Grazing in the Front Country may result in conflict between livestock and visitors to sites developed for public use.</p> <p>-Projects for installing and maintaining livestock management would avoid or mitigate impacts to physical or visual integrity.</p>	<p>In both planning areas reductions in upland grazing and the removal of livestock from riparian habitats would reduce damage to cultural resources in nearby areas. Other impacts similar to Alt B.</p>	<p>Removing grazing from public lands would eliminate livestock impacts to cultural resources and enhance primitive experiences for visitors.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt B.</p>
4.12.10 From Minerals Management	<p>Surface disturbance from mining can disturb or destroy cultural sites.</p> <p>-Two active mining claims occur within the AFNM that may continue to be mined for casual use.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, archeological surveys are conducted to evaluate if cultural</p>	<p>In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A, except more areas would be closed to, or contain restrictions to mining, increasing protection of cultural resources.</p>	<p>In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B, except more areas would be closed to, or contain restrictions to mining, increasing protection of cultural resources.</p>	<p>In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt C, except even more areas would be closed to, or contain restrictions to mining, further increasing protection of cultural resources.</p>	<p>In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B, except mining closures in Tule Creek ACEC and in riparian areas within the reconveyed lands would be closed to mineral materials disposal,</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	resources might be affected by proposed mining. However, casual use mining does not require a mining plan and impacts to cultural resources may occur.				protecting cultural sites in these areas.
4.12.11 From Fire Management	Fires (wild or prescribed) can damage cultural sites, especially those with flammable components. Fires could temporarily affect visual settings. Methods to fight fire or prepare a site for prescribed burning can disturb cultural sites and cause surface disturbances. Prescribed fire planning includes input from an archeologist to avoid or minimize potential damage. Wildfires that may threaten cultural sites have archeologist input on tactics to minimize the potential for resource damage.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except archeological surveys would help locate sensitive resources that may require special attention. MIST would be used to reduce potential damage.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.12.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.12.13 From Management of Travel Management	-Continued restrictions that limit the use of motorized vehicles to designated routes in the AFNM would help	-Selected routes that lead directly to sites that have been damaged or are threatened by vandalism would be closed.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except Alt C would allocate fewer transportation routes. -More limited public	-Alt D would close the largest number of transportation routes in both planning areas. In the AFNM, only limited	-Impacts from Travel Management would be similar to Alt C for The AFNM. The number of route closures would

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	protect cultural resources. -Continued use of existing roads leading to large archaeological sites might increase the potential for vandalism and damage.	-Limiting vehicle traffic on fragile sites would help protect the surface and could deter illegal digging and collecting activities. -Alt B would allow for a more extensive network of transportation routes, which could increase the potential for damage. A more extensive network would facilitate access to a larger number of sites, increasing vulnerability to vandalism and theft. Conversely, increased access would also allow for more interpretation, which could enhance understanding and stewardship of cultural resources.	access would be expected to reduce the impacts to archaeological sites from vehicle and visitor traffic in both planning areas.	motorized use would be allowed in the extensive Back Country RMZ. While this would reduce the levels of damage, fewer areas would be available for site visitation and cultural heritage tourism projects. -Restricted access would also limit the regular monitoring of archaeological sites in remote areas. -Restrictions on access for permitted scientific studies would limit the scientific use of sites and the gathering of information useful for research and resource management.	contribute to protecting cultural resources, while still allowing for unobtrusive interpretive uses and access for scientific research and monitoring. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, there would be an intermediate level of route closures. Impacts to cultural resources would likely be similar to those described for Alt C.
4.12.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected.	Management of wilderness characteristics would preserve the visual integrity and natural settings of archaeological sites and cultural landscapes.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.13 Impacts on Paleontological Resources					
4.13.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	Impacts expected to be minimal. Where resources are discovered, management for reduced public use would	Impacts similar to Alt A except in the Bradshaw-Harquahala, fencing Tule Creek ACEC would prevent damage and	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	diminish potential impacts.	special designations would protect more areas than Alt A.			
4.13.2 From Lands and Realty Management	Impacts minimal.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.13.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	Management to improve soil conditions in the AFNM could preserve potential sites. No impacts are expected in the Bradshaw-Harquahala.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.13.4 From Biological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.13.5 From Cultural Resource Management	Actions to protect cultural resources may preserve potential paleontological sites.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.13.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.13.7 From Recreation Management	Impacts are expected to be inadvertent and minimal. Damage may occur from concentrated recreation use.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except reduction of routes may help preserve potential sites.	Impacts similar to Alt B, but more routes would be closed and more area allocated to Back Country RMZ.	Impacts similar to Alt C, except more routes would be closed and more area allocated to Back Country RMZ.	Impacts similar to Alt B, except more routes would be closed and more area allocated to Back Country RMZ.
4.13.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.13.9 From Rangeland Management	Continued grazing may reduce vegetation and increase erosion.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Elimination of grazing could help preserve potential sites.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.13.10 From Minerals	No impacts are expected.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
Management	Should sites be found, potential damage would be mitigated.				
4.13.11 From Fire Management	Prescribed burning equipment may affect potential sites.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.13.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.13.13 From Management of Travel Management	No impacts are expected in the AFNM. Unrestricted vehicle use in B-H may damage sites.	OHV use in the AFNM could damage potential sites. Restricted vehicle use in B-H may preserve sites.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.13.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected.	Management may preserve sites by restricting uses.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.14 Impacts on Recreation					
4.14.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	-Recreation opportunities in WSR corridors and wilderness areas would be retained. -Growing numbers of non-motorized users could impair solitude and cause trailing and campsite use impacts in wilderness areas.	-Bloody Basin Road back country byway could increase traffic and interaction among visitors. -Primitive recreational experiences WSR corridor could be diminished. -Interpretive elements of byway would increase visitor awareness, appreciation, and enjoyment. -Constellation Mine Road byway impacts similar to Bloody Basin Road	-Impacts of byways similar to Alt B. -ACEC designation would have little impact in the AFNM. -Tule Creek ACEC would have impacts similar to Alt B. -ACECs in the Bradshaw-Harquahala would improve opportunities for primitive recreation experiences. -Impacts to wilderness areas would be similar to Alt B.	-No impacts from byways. -Impacts from ACECs similar Alt C but cover more area. -Impacts to wilderness areas due to group size and permit restrictions would be similar to Alt B.	-No impacts from byways. -Tule Creek ACEC would have impacts similar to Alt B. - Impacts from ACECs similar Alt C. -Opportunities for non-motorized recreation maintained in wilderness areas. -Impacts to wilderness areas due to group size and permit restrictions would be similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Conflicts between byway users and large OHV groups could diminish scenic drive experience. -Tule Creek ACEC would reduce opportunities for vehicular recreation. -Eliminating grazing would retain a more natural setting and reduce conflicts with livestock. -Interpretive elements would increase appreciation of the natural and cultural resources. -In wilderness areas, establishing criteria to manage larger groups would protect wilderness values. 			
4.14.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Disposal of lands would reduce or eliminate recreation opportunities in those areas. OHV use in Skull Valley and Table Mesa would relocate elsewhere. -In the Upper Agua Fria River Basin, some recreation connectivity between local communities and the Prescott National Forest would be lost. -Corridors are not expected to impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Acquiring non-Federal lands that enhance AFNM's values would improve recreation opportunities by improving access. -Lands in the Table Mesa area would be retained and recreation on those lands could continue. -Acquiring lands could enhance opportunities for recreation by increasing connectivity of public lands. 	Impacts similar to Alt A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt C. No lands would be disposed, and no impacts are expected. Impacts from corridors would be similar to Alt A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B. -No impacts are expected to result from disposing of lands because parcels are small, isolated, or generally an urban area. -Because recreation on these parcels is generally minimal, relocating the activities to other BLM-managed lands is not expected to have great impacts. -Impacts from other lands actions would be similar

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	recreation until future projects are proposed. Impacts of utility proposals would be analyzed at the time of application.				to Alt B.
4.14.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	In the AFNM, maintaining water quality would enhance wildlife viewing opportunities and water related recreation. Managing air quality could result in restrictions to recreation activities that have the potential to exceed standards. Any recreation related facilities would need to be designed to address emissions.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.14.4 From Biological Resource Management	-In the AFNM, fence modifications and development of additional wildlife waters could enhance wildlife viewing opportunities. -Protection of sensitive habitat could reduce motorized recreation opportunities, but improved habitat could improve wildlife viewing opportunities. -Development of wildlife waters and protection of	Impacts in the AFNM would be similar to Alt A. -Designation of Harquahala Mountains Wildlife Habitat Area (WHA) would Protect sensitive wildlife habitat but route closures would diminish opportunities for motorized recreation. -Management for desert tortoise could limit development of new motorized vehicle routes. -Seasonal limitations on	-Limitation of routes in pronghorn movement corridors could reduce connectivity of motorized routes within the AFNM. -Prohibiting recreational sites in pronghorn corridors could preclude facilities that enhance the recreation experience of some users. -Impacts of habitat enhancement projects similar to Alt B. -Management of WHA	- AFNM impacts similar to Alt C. -Removal of all fences would maintain route connectivity and enhance the natural appearance of the landscape. -Wildlife viewing would be enhanced. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B. -Impacts from WHA management similar to Alt C.	-AFNM impacts similar to Alt C. -Prohibiting new fences in specified WHA would help maintain the current connectivity of the route network. -Impacts from desert tortoise management similar to Alt B. -Impacts from WHA management similar to Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>big horn sheep habitat would improve hunting and wildlife viewing opportunities.</p> <p>-Motor vehicle restrictions in desert tortoise, Arizona night lizard, and Sonoran mountain king snake habitats could reduce motorized recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>motorized special events and the number of events could limit future expansion of those events.</p> <p>-Ensuring connectivity of wildlife habitats could reduce motorized recreation by closing routes that cross sensitive areas or movement corridors.</p> <p>-Wildlife viewing would be enhanced habitat enhancement projects.</p>	<p>and wildlife corridor could affect diminish recreational opportunities while enhancing wildlife viewing.</p> <p>-Impacts from desert tortoise management similar to Alt B.</p>	<p>-Impacts from desert tortoise management similar to Alt B.</p>	
4.14.5 From Cultural Resource Management	<p>-More permits could lead to allocation and protection problems if larger numbers of tours and activities visit the same sites.</p> <p>-Allocation to scientific use or preservation would limit certain sites for commercial or general recreation use.</p>	<p>-Route closures on the AFNM could reduce motorized recreation opportunities.</p> <p>-Conflicts among users could reduce, and natural opportunities be enhanced.</p> <p>-Developing education and interpretive programs would lead to a better appreciation of cultural resources.</p> <p>-Improving routes and trails could open sites to a wider variety of users, but could limit access for some users.</p> <p>-Developing five sites for High public use and four sites for Moderate</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except that one site would be allocated to High public use and eight sites would be allocated to Moderate public use.</p> <p>-Impacts would be similar to Alt B, although this would not provide the educational and interpretive opportunities provided by Alt B.</p> <p>-Restricting SRPs to educational tours could reduce recreational and educational opportunities for casual users.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, no sites would be developed to High public use and one would be developed to Moderate use.</p> <p>-Education and awareness afforded by developed sites would be least under this alternative.</p> <p>-Self-discovery opportunities would be greatest.</p> <p>-User conflicts could increase.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would be similar as described for Alt B, except sites in two cultural priority areas would be developed for</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B except that two sites would be developed for High public use and six sites for Moderate public use.</p> <p>- closing of routes as a protective measure would impact recreational.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala developing sites for public use in each cultural priority area would increase awareness and recreational opportunities for experiencing cultural resources.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		public use in the AFNM would increase access and education programs on 16,000 acres. -Development of public use sites in eight cultural priority areas would increase awareness and opportunities within Bradshaw-Harquahala.		public use. -Educational and interpreted recreational opportunities would be less than in Alt C. -Opportunities for self-discovery would increase, but conflicts between users increases.	
4.14.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.14.7 From Recreation Management	-Increasing recreation could diminish the experience of some users and alter the setting for many activities. -Could result in inappropriate use in sensitive areas, overcrowding and user conflicts. -Dispersed camping expected to proliferate. -Conflicts between users and resource disturbance are expected to escalate. -Closures of some OHV routes or activity areas could limit opportunities. -In Bradshaw Harquahala, cross-country could disrupt other recreational settings. -Settings would shift over	-Back Country RMZ would benefit non-motorized activities. -Front Country RMZ would concentrate more intensive uses. -In the AFNM, restrictions on dispersed camping would reduce impacts. -The two developed campgrounds would increase vehicle based camping opportunities. -Some popular shooting areas would be closed for safety reasons. Shooters would be displaced to other areas. -Connecting trails for non-motorized activities would enhance some opportunities and reduce	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to those to Alt B, except: Front Country would be 42,000 acres and Back Country 28,200 acres. -Camping in Front Country allowed only at designated camp sites. -Impacts of developed campground similar as described in Alt B, but in only one place. -Campfires allowed at campsites with some limitations. -Impacts of recreational target shooting similar to Alt B, except the Front Country zone would be closed. -Management actions in the Bradshaw-Harquahala	-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt C, except: The Front Country zone reduced to 1,530 acres and the Back Country zone 68,380 acres. -Impacts of dispersed camping similar to Alt C, except restricted to designated sites. -Designated routes include campsites. -Campfires allowed at dispersed sites, but wood for campfires must be brought in from outside the AFNM. -Closure of the AFNM to recreational target shooting would displace all non-hunting shooters to locations outside the AFNM.	-In the AFNM, dispersed camping impacts similar to Alt B. -Impacts from vehicles of dispersed camping are expected to be similar to Alt D. -Recreational target shooting impacts similar to Alt D. -Non-motorized trail connections would have impacts similar to Alt B. -Black Canyon Trail would become a trail of regional significance for mountain bikers, equestrians, and hikers. -Management actions applied to the entire Bradshaw-Harquahala would have impacts similar to Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>time to more motorized settings.</p> <p>-Increased demand for large recreation events requiring SRPs would continue.</p> <p>-With no limits on the number of motorized competitive races the number of permits could increase.</p>	<p>conflicts.</p> <p>-The North Black Canyon Trail SRMA would enhance non-motorized opportunities.</p> <p>-On the AFNM, 35 miles of route would be closed to reduce resource conflicts and 5 miles of new route construction would be built to improve route connectivity and looping opportunities.</p> <p>-Cross-country travel would be prohibited for game retrieval, may diminish hunting opportunities.</p> <p>-Management of 149,760 acres of BLM land in SRMAs would maintain opportunities and reduce conflicts.</p> <p>-Developed facilities would enhance recreation experience for many users.</p> <p>-Increasing SRP permits to 12 on the AFNM could increase opportunities for structured tour groups, while increasing conflicts between commercial tours and casual users sites.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from</p>	<p>would reduce impacts on resources; maintain recreation opportunities and settings and increase.</p> <p>-Staging and trail areas would enhance recreation experiences</p> <p>-In the AFNM, impacts of SRPs would be similar to Alt B, except the maximum number to be authorized across the AFNM would be six.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from SRP management similar to Alt A, except: a maximum of six races per year. Races not allowed in the Table Mesa SRMA.</p> <p>-Annual limits for races may result in races being relocated but conflicts minimized.</p>	<p>-56,240 acres of SRMAs and RMZs allocated for intensive recreation management.</p> <p>-Area available for intensive motorized use smaller than all other alternatives.</p> <p>-Many users and activities would be displaced to other areas. -Conflicts between casual users and larger group activities would intensify and conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation could increase.</p> <p>-Prohibiting SRPs in the AFNM may reduce ability of some users to experience the resources.</p> <p>-It could also eliminate conflicts between casual visitors and large groups, especially at popular locations.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts of SRPs would be similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-Race limits lower than current.</p> <p>-No races allowed in the Hieroglyphic Mountains SRMA would impact motorized racing because</p>	<p>-384,510 acres would be allocated to SRMAs and RMZs in this alternative.</p> <p>-8motorized races would be allowed annually.</p> <p>-The Yarnell SRMA impacts similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-Access to the North Black Canyon Trail RMZ would enhance non-motorized recreation experiences</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts are similar to Alt C except: number of race events could be increased to 4 per year in the Vulture Mountains RMZ.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<p>SRPs would be similar to those described in Alt A except: the number of motorized competitive races would be limited to 14 per year and spread to minimize user conflicts and allow OHV opportunities.</p> <p>-The Yarnell SRMA would preserve hang gliding takeoff and landing areas.</p> <p>-Restricting competitive, commercial, and organized group events could limit the opportunities for new events.</p> <p>-VRM standards and recreation settings could limit existing events and prevent new events.</p>		<p>remaining area is less diverse and farther.</p> <p>-Racing opportunities would be lost and the demand would not be met.</p>	
4.14.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	<p>-In the AFNM, managing 12,700 acres as VRM Class II and 57,900 acres as Class III would maintain appearance of Back Country and allow Front Country to accommodate recreation activities.</p> <p>-Elsewhere, VRM Class II in areas allocated to maintain wilderness</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except VRM Class III reduced to 42,000 acres and VRM Class II increased to 28,200 acres.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B, except 107,843 acres allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics and</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except VRM Class III reduced to 1,530 acres and VRM Class II increased to 68,380 acres.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, 102,664 acres allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics and 98,500 acres of ONA ACEC managed for VRM</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except VRM Class III on 11,900 acres, and VRM Class II on 57,650 acres.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B, except 67,279 acres allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics managed as VRM Class II.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<p>characteristics would retain appearance of naturalness.</p> <p>-Improvements would need to be designed to meet VRM standards and may require design modifications to do so.</p>	<p>allocated to VRM Class II.</p> <p>-Managing Sheep Mountain ONA ACEC as VRM Class I would enhance the visual setting of the area.</p>	Class I.	
4.14.9 From Rangeland Management	<p>-Conflicts between recreation users and livestock grazing increase. -Limited access across private lands would reduce recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, grazing limitations would degrade the recreational experience during use periods.</p> <p>-Primitive recreation experience enhanced during non-use months.</p> <p>-Additional fencing may limit access.</p> <p>-Improved conditions would enhance settings and improve wildlife viewing opportunities.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to those described for the AFNM above.</p> <p>-Improved vegetation conditions would improve the recreation setting for non-motorized users.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, removal of livestock from riparian areas would eliminate conflicts with cattle and enhance the recreational experience in those areas.</p> <p>-Other grazing related impacts similar to Alt B.</p>	<p>-Conflicts with livestock would be eliminated.</p> <p>-Recreation experiences improve as recreation settings become free of livestock inconveniences.</p> <p>-Access could be lost if ranchers sell private property.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.14.10 From Minerals Management	<p>-In the AFNM, no impacts.</p> <p>-Mining in popular recreation areas would degrade the experience.</p> <p>-Most impacts would</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, no impacts.</p> <p>-Closing lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics and ACECs to mineral</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, no impacts.</p> <p>-Impacts similar to Alt B, except closing lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, no impacts.</p> <p>-Impacts similar to Alt B, except closing lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, no impacts.</p> <p>-Impacts similar to Alt B, 172,80 acres closed to mineral material disposal.</p> <p>-Primitive recreation</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	result from developing saleable minerals.	material disposal would improve recreation opportunities and settings on 56,680 acres. -There would be no impacts from leasable minerals management -Few impacts from locatable minerals.	and ACECs to mineral material disposal would improve recreation opportunities and settings on 163,220 acres. -Visual settings maintained due to objectives.	and ACECs to mineral material disposal would improve recreation opportunities and settings on 284,280 acres. -Recreation opportunities in undisturbed natural settings over the largest area under any of the alternatives.	opportunities in undisturbed natural settings.
4.14.11 From Fire Management	-Fires displace recreation users from burned areas until recovery. -Improved vegetation conditions could improve recreational experiences and wildlife viewing opportunities.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, except natural fire starts could increase disruptions to recreation through area closures.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.14.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.14.13 From Management of Travel Management	-Motorized use in AFNM unchanged. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, Mechanized use would increase. -Conflicts between various users would occur. -Vehicle routes would remain open, and motorized recreation opportunities would not be affected. -Recreation settings shift to more motorized.	-In the AFNM, 134 miles of routes open. -Route system would enhance opportunities for motorized recreation. -Closing 37 miles of routes could limit opportunities for motorized recreation and displace some users. -Limiting vehicles to inventoried routes would eliminate cross-country OHV travel. -Some hunter access	-In the AFNM, route designation impacts similar to Alt B, except 123 miles of routes remain open and 48 miles of existing routes would be closed. -The impacts of route designation and developing route networks in the Bradshaw-Harquahala similar to Alt B.	-In the AFNM, 48 miles of routes would be open and 123 miles closed. -Opportunities for motorized recreation would be limited, and loop trails would not be developed. -Opportunities for motorized recreation would diminish in some areas. -Opportunities for non-motorized recreation would be enhanced	-In the AFNM impacts of route designations would be similar to Alt C, except 94 miles of route would be designated as open and 52 miles of route would be closed. -Impacts on opportunities for recreation in the Bradshaw-Harquahala Planning Area would be similar to Alt C. -The Black Canyon Trail

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<p>could be limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Development of new routes could be precluded. -Developing connected route networks would provide expanded opportunities and reduce conflicts. -The North Black Canyon Trail SRMA would enhance non-motorized recreation opportunities. 		<p>throughout the AFNM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -There would be more opportunity to experience solitude and natural landscape settings. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from route designations on recreational opportunities would be similar to Alternative B. 	<p>from Carefree Highway to north of Highway 69 would become a major trail of regional significance for mountain bikers, equestrians, and hikers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Opportunities for intensive motorized recreation is provided in various RMZs. -The North Black Canyon Trail SRMA would enhance non-motorized recreation opportunities.
4.14.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, opportunities for primitive and non-motorized recreation would decline due to increasing motorized recreation and land use authorizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, 56,040 acres of land would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. -Designation of these areas would limit motorized access to little-used routes. -Motorized recreation would be displaced. -Crowded motorized routes would reduce the quality of dispersed recreational experiences. -Non-motorized users would benefit from a more natural setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B except 107,843 acres would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics -More displacement of motorized recreation than Alt B. -More non-motorized recreational opportunities than Alt B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts are similar to Alts B and C with the exception, 140,235 acres would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics including 37,571 acres in the Agua Fria National Monument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B and C except, 88,179 acres would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. -More non-motorized recreational opportunities than Alt B, but less than Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.15 Impacts on Visual Resources					
4.15.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Present conditions would be maintained. BLM would evaluate future projects for visual impacts. -The two ACECs in the AFNM have no impact on visual resources. -The Agua Fria River WSR guidance would benefit visual resources. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala Planning Area, 5 wilderness areas would be managed by VRM Class I standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, WSR corridors maintain the natural views. -Back Country Byway designation on the Bloody Basin Road would have low impacts. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, retaining the Harquahala Mtn Summit Road would not affect existing scenic quality. -The wilderness areas would remain under VRM Class I. -Tule Creek ACEC would improve conditions and restrictions would steadily improve visual resource. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, WSR impacts similar to Alt B. -ACECs requiring fencing could degrade visual resources. -ACEC required route closures could improve visual character. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B, except: 7 ACECs could slightly degrade visual resources with fencing, but improve visual resources by prohibiting mining, closing roads, prohibiting construction of facilities. -Wilderness impacts similar to Alt B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, WSR impacts similar to Alt B. -Impacts from ACECs similar to Alt C, but over a larger area. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would be similar to those described in Alt B except: impacts from 8 ACECs would be similar to Alt C, except over a larger area. -Wilderness impacts similar to Alt B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, WSR impacts similar to Alt B. except no by-way impacts. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt C.
4.15.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, land acquisitions, rights-of-way and utilities would be evaluated for visual impacts on a case-by-case basis. -New utility proposals could impact the visual character of the landscape. -Impacts would be along the western edge of the AFNM where existing facilities exist. -In the Bradshaw- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In both planning areas, acquired lands would be subject to Visual Resource Management. -Land disposal could impair visual resources by eliminating VRM standards. -Designating utility corridors could increase potential for development. -Narrow corridors allow placement in disturbed areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts from land tenure changes, corridors and authorizations would be similar to Alt B, except: -Eliminating the existing utility corridor in the AFNM would eliminate potential impacts of future utilities. -Expansion of the corridor to the west could extend facilities into sight of Sunset Point Scenic Overlook, but would allow room for route that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts similar to Alt B, except: -Impacts in AFNM from utility corridors would be similar to those under Alt C. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, no lands identified for disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts in AFNM from utility corridors would be similar to those under Alt B. - In the Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts from utility corridors would be similar to a combination of Alt B and C. - Expanding the Black Canyon Utility Corridor allows for future development with flexibility to adjust facilities to minimize

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>Harquahala, no impacts are expected from land acquisition.</p> <p>-Disposal actions would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>-Future actions on disposal lands would not conform to VRM standards.</p> <p>-Various authorizations would degrade visual qualities.</p>	<p>-Wide corridors allow route selection to minimize impacts.</p> <p>-All utilities and telecom projects are evaluated on a case-by-case basis and mitigated to minimize impacts and conform to VRM class.</p> <p>-The Wickenburg Bypass corridor would be inconsistent with VRM objectives.</p>	<p>minimizes visibility.</p>		<p>visual impacts.</p> <p>-All other lands impacts similar to Alt B.</p>
4.15.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	<p>-Project designs minimizing or mitigating air quality impacts would maintain visual landscape.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A.</p>
4.15.4 From Biological Resource Management	<p>-Negligible impacts are expected.</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to Alt A, except:</p> <p>-Wildlife project design to VRM Class I and II standard would reduce visual impacts.</p> <p>-WHA management prescriptions could improve visual landscapes.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt B, except WHAs in more areas.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt C, except some WHAs are managed in ACECs.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt C.</p>
4.15.5 From Cultural Resource Management	<p>No impacts are expected.</p>	<p>-Implementing protective measures could impair visual resources.</p> <p>-Closing routes and</p>	<p>-Impacts in both areas would be similar to those described in Alt B.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B except no sites would be allocated to High public use.</p>	<p>-Impacts in AFNM would be would be similar to Alt C.</p> <p>-Impacts in the Bradshaw-Harquahala</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<p>restricting grazing could increase vegetation cover, improving visual resources.</p> <p>-Commercial and group tours could degrade visual resources.</p> <p>-In the AFNM high public use areas could add visitor facilities, signs and improve routes impacting visual.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, public use sites would have similar impacts to those described in the AFNM.</p> <p>-Public use sites would be developed in all eight SCRMA's.</p>		- In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B.	Planning Area would be similar to Alt B.
4.15.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.15.7 From Recreation Management	<p>-In both areas, visual resources impacts would occur from installing signs and target shooting.</p> <p>- Large public land area OHV activity would continue to affect visual resources with dust.</p> <p>-As visitation increases</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, Front Country maintaining or enhancing visitor travel could impact visual resources with facilities.</p> <p>-In the Back Country zone no impacts are expected.</p> <p>-In the Passage zone</p>	<p>- In the AFNM impacts would be similar to those discussed for Alt B except Front Country and Passage impacts are reduced from Alt B.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM impacts would be similar to those discussed for Alt B except Front Country impacts are reduced and Passage impacts are increased from Alt B.</p> <p>- In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts</p>	<p>-In the AFNM impacts would be similar to those discussed for Alt B except Front Country impacts are reduced and Passage impacts are increased from Alt B.</p> <p>- In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	visual qualities could be further degraded by landscape damage and increasing dust.	some visitor related development could occur, would maintain visual character. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala Visual resources could be affected by the development of recreational and visitor facilities. -Motorized events could alter the visual landscape by reducing local visual clarity.		similar to Alt B.	similar to Alt B.
4.15.8 From Visual Resource Management	-The visual landscape is expected to gradually decline. -VRM application inconsistent.	-In the AFNM, 57,900 acres would be allocated to VRM Class III, 12,700 allocated to VRM Class II and visual landscapes would be protected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, VRM management consistent. -Some visual intrusions but expected to be minimal.	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except: 42,000 acres managed as class III and 28,200 acres managed as VRM Class II. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B, except more area included in VRM Class II. -Preserves natural landscape over larger areas than Alt B.	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except: 1,530 acres managed as Class III and 69,380 acre managed as class II. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt C, except more area included in VRM Class I. -Preserves natural landscape over larger areas than Alt C.	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt B, except: 11,900 acres managed as Class III and 57,650 acre managed as class II. - In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt C.
4.15.9 From Rangeland Management	-Construction of livestock facilities could contribute to decline in visual quality.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, except: -Construction of features to restrict access to riparian areas would impair while improve vegetative from actions	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except the improvements to riparian vegetation would be faster.	-Visual impacts from some range facilities would be removed. -Improved vegetation conditions would improve visual landscapes. -Additional livestock	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		would improve views.		facilities on non-Federal lands or private land development could degrade visual landscapes.	
4.15.10 From Minerals Management	<p>-In the AFNM, mineral development on existing claims would have minimal impacts on visual resource.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, mining would alter the visual landscape adding surface disturbance, facilities, and routes.</p> <p>-Localized degradation of air quality and visual clarity could occur from mining.</p> <p>-The five Wilderness areas continue to be closed to mineral development.</p> <p>-Visual impacts from the different types of mining would be eliminated on the following lands (including Wilderness acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 167,720 acres closed to saleable minerals ▪ 171,680 acres closed to locatable minerals ▪ 171,680 acres closed to leasable minerals 	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, minerals management could affect visual resources over most of the planning area. Mining impacts would be minimized by compliance with VRM standards.</p> <p>-Alt B would protect the visual landscape more than would Alt A.</p> <p>-In addition, mining would be prohibited from some lands as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 224,400 acres closed to saleable minerals ▪ 101,000 acres closed to locatable minerals ▪ 101,000 acres closed to leasable mineral 	<p>-In both areas, impacts similar to Alt B, except that visual impacts from the different types of mining would be eliminated on the following lands (including Wilderness acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 330,940 acres closed to saleable minerals ▪ 188,450 acres closed to locatable minerals ▪ 188,190 acres closed to leasable minerals 	<p>-In both areas, impacts similar to Alt B, except that visual impacts from the different types of mining would be eliminated on the following lands (including Wilderness acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 452,000 acres closed to saleable minerals ▪ 457,664 acres closed to locatable minerals ▪ 464,734 acres closed to leasable minerals 	<p>-In both areas, impacts similar to Alt B, except that visual impacts from the different types of mining would be eliminated on the following lands (including Wilderness acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 167,720 acres closed to saleable minerals ▪ 171,940 acres closed to locatable minerals ▪ 171,680 acres closed to leasable minerals
4.15.11 From Fire	-Prescribed burning	-Impacts similar to Alt A	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
Management	would reduce visual quality in the short term but improve vegetation health and visual quality in the long term. -Wildfires would have a similar affect, but in non fire adapted communities visual impacts could last for decades.	except some natural start fires may be allowed to burn in the AFNM, increasing slightly the potential visual impacts.			
4.15.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	Removal of burros in the Harquahala Herd Area could improve vegetation cover and visual resources.	Impacts similar to Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt C.
4.15.13 From Management of Travel Management	-In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, new roads and routes authorized or pioneered could eventually create visual disturbances in the planning area.	-In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, a wide range of impacts are anticipated from management of travel, travel management. -Small transportation projects would be mitigated and consistent to the appropriate VRM classes.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	-In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, less adverse impacts are anticipated. Impacts would be greatly reduced than those considered under Alt B and C. -As described in Alt B, there could be visual impacts from major county, state and federal highway projects. -Overall, allocated VRM classes would maintain or enhance the appearance of public lands.	-In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would be similar to those under Alt B and projects would be installed mostly consistent with VRM objectives.
4.15.14 From Management of	No impacts.	-Visual and scenic resource conditions	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
Wilderness Characteristics		would be maintained and protected in areas allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics. -Light pollution could be less and dark skies more effectively maintained.			
4.16 Impacts on Rangeland Management					
4.16.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	-Exclusion of grazing in Larry Canyon ACEC has a negligible effect on rangeland management. -If WSR corridors are designated, winter use only livestock use in riparian segments would be implemented. -Vegetation health and density would improve, and with it forage conditions in the riparian areas would improve. -During the period the riparian is closed, the altered livestock distribution could cause increased disturbance in areas livestock congregate. -Slight potential of vehicle-livestock impacts along the Harquahala Summit Scenic Road Back Country Byway.	-Designation of the Bloody Basin Road and Constellation Mine Road as back country byways would increase traffic in the area, therefore increasing animal-vehicle collisions. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, Tue Creek ACEC would exclude grazing from fenced areas, improving health of riparian vegetation and negligibly decrease AUMs for the grazing allotment.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except: -Exclusion of livestock from 810 acres of riparian ACEC in the AFNM would have a negligible affect on livestock grazing. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, reduced surface disturbance from non-grazing activities restricted by ACEC designation on 55,710 acres would improve forage conditions and reduce potential for vehicle-animal collisions. -Back country byway impacts similar to Alt B.	-Management of the 13,070 acres of ACEC in the AFNM would improve range conditions by reducing vehicle traffic, damage to riparian vegetation, disturbance by recreational users, and potential vectoring of noxious and invasive species. -Designation of 8 ACEC in the Bradshaw-Harquahala would have similar impacts to Alt C, but over a larger area (192,800 acres).	-In the AFNM, there are no impacts from Special Area Designations. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts from ACECs would be similar to Alt C, except the ACEC acreage would cover 89,970 acres.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.16.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, maintenance or construction of utilities in corridors may disturb vegetation and disrupt grazing operations. -Acquiring privately owned and state-held lands could consolidate management, and increase AUMs. -Land disposal of 54,370 acres would reduce available grazing lands. -AUMs may be reduced or whole allotments may be closed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, narrowing utility corridor would restrict impacts to vegetation from new utility. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt A, except: Lands available for disposal would be 58,400 acres. Authorized AUMs might need to be adjusted. Total acreage would be less than 6% of grazing land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eliminating the Black Canyon corridor would eliminate development impacts. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt A. -Impacts of the land tenure adjustment of 49,100 acres similar to Alt B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts to rangeland vegetation would be similar to that described in Alt C. -Impacts to grazing and livestock would end with the cessation of grazing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM impacts to rangeland vegetation and grazing would be similar to Alt B. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would be similar to Alt C, except that 38,755 acres would be offered for disposal (4% of available grazing land). -Utility impacts similar to Alt A.
4.16.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Livestock authorizations could be modified to meet standards. -Reduced livestock numbers would improve range conditions. 	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.16.4 From Biological Resource Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, the use of prescribed fires could improve vegetation quantity and quality but disrupt pasture rotations. -Limits on mechanical vegetation treatment could assist invasive species. -Fence modifications could movement of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts on the AFNM similar to Alt A. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, prohibiting construction of range improvements in Browns Canyon could limit opportunities to improve livestock distribution in the Aguila allotment. -Potential restrictions to 	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>livestock across pastures and allotments creating additional work for permittees.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, mitigation and closure of waters could result in poor livestock distribution and added operation costs.</p> <p>-Sheep restrictions would adversely impact operators.</p> <p>-Bighorn lambing restrictions would impact livestock distribution and use patterns.</p>	<p>vehicle routes could limit access to range facilities and increase maintenance costs.</p> <p>-Prohibiting domestic sheep and goat grazing within 9 miles of occupied desert bighorn sheep habitat would affect 1 grazing allotment where sheep are currently an authorized class of livestock.</p>			
4.16.5 From Cultural Resource Management	-Site protection measures to exclude livestock from sites through fencing may slightly reduce available forage.	-For both planning areas, High public use development would damage vegetation in the area of the site construction. If the protected areas contain livestock waters, alternate sources would need to be found or developed. -Moderate public use area impacts to vegetation would be minimal, and Low public use impacts would even be smaller.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.16.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.16.7 From Recreation Management	<p>-Current OHV management has lead to proliferation of vehicle routes, disturbance to vegetation, vehicle-animal encounters, and vandalism of range improvements and private property.</p> <p>-SRPs have the potential to have similar effects, but may be slightly lower due to restrictions.</p>	<p>-Recreation allocations on the AFNM are would increase visitation, bring increased vehicle numbers, increasing animal-vehicle encounters, and vectoring of invasive weeds.</p> <p>-Limiting vehicles to designated routes would reduce vehicle related impacts.</p> <p>-Other recreation impacts in the Bradshaw-Harquahala would include target shooting being restrictions on 27,570 acres would decrease risk of animal stress and mortality.</p> <p>-Campground/staging areas could require adjustment to authorized livestock numbers.</p> <p>-New trails established for pedestrian, non-motorized, and motorized use could increase animal stress and potential mortality from collisions with vehicles.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt B, except:</p> <p>-In the AFNM, RMZs would reduce people-livestock encounters and associated visitor impacts.</p> <p>-Reductions in route miles may make some areas difficult to access, increasing operating costs of grazing permits.</p> <p>-In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, target shooting restrictions could further reduce potential conflicts with livestock.</p> <p>-Reduced SRPs issued to motorized race events could reduce the risk of disturbance to livestock and mortality from collisions with vehicles.</p>	<p>Impacts to rangeland resources and remaining facilities similar to Alt C, except that the elimination of grazing would remove impacts to livestock.</p>	<p>In the AFNM, impacts from allocations for RMZs similar to Alt C. For both planning areas, confining vehicles to designated routes would have impacts are similar to Alt C.</p> <p>Activities authorized through Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) are expected to have impacts similar to those in Alt B.</p>
4.16.8 From Visual Resource Management	<p>Impacts from VRM management could include increased costs, project relocation or possible denial.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A.</p>	<p>No impacts are expected.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.16.9 From Rangeland Management	<p>-Implementation of the Land Health Standards and Guidelines for Grazing Administration could reduce livestock numbers, rest or close pastures, or convert some pastures or allotments to ephemeral use.</p> <p>-These standards would also improve and maintain range conditions.</p> <p>Riparian areas would improve health and density of vegetation. Livestock distributions may be disrupted in some areas, and loss of water sources in summer may require development of range improvements to replace the lost water.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt A	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A, except:</p> <p>-Prohibiting grazing in riparian areas in the AFNM would close 25,989 acres to livestock. Prohibiting grazing in Bradshaw-Harquahala would potentially close 249,400 acres to livestock.</p> <p>-For both planning areas, the potential loss in availability to livestock grazing from riparian closure would be greater than for closing upland areas. The loss of water sources in some instances could result in no grazing on public lands. Riparian vegetation and vegetation cover would increase more rapidly than in Alt A.</p>	<p>-Closing all allotments to grazing would eliminate 13,492 AUMs in the AFNM and 69,568 AUMs in the Bradshaw-Harquahala. If ranchers cannot find alternative forage for their livestock, holders of all 104 permits and leases would go out of business. Cost of removal of unnecessary range improvements would be born by the BLM, as well as costs of maintaining facilities used for other purposes.</p> <p>-Vegetation conditions would improve until environmental stability is reached.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.16.10 From Minerals Management	<p>-The AFNM is closed to new mineral entry.</p> <p>-Impacts in the Bradshaw-Harquahala are expected to be negligible.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.16.11 From Fire Management	<p>-Short term impacts from removal of forage and closure of pastures before and after burning.</p> <p>-Fire treatments would improve vegetation</p>	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	quality and quantity.				
4.16.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	-No impacts in the AFNM. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, maintaining the Lake Pleasant HMA has negligible impact. -Removing all burros from Harquahala HA would increase vegetation, improve riparian, and reduce competition for water with livestock.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.16.13 From Management of Travel Management	Vehicle limitations in Perry Mesa ACEC have reduced the potential for upland vegetation damage by unauthorized cross-country OHV travel. -Damage to roadside vegetation has increased due to unauthorized OHV travel around poorly maintained segments of roadway. Decreased OHV travel would reduce the potential for animal stress. --The OHV travel restriction has also decreased the potential for animal-vehicle collisions.	Limiting vehicular travel in these same areas would reduce damage to upland and riparian vegetation, stress to animals, risk of animal-vehicle collisions, and potential vectoring of noxious weeds.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	No impacts.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.16.14 From Management of	No impacts are expected.	For both planning areas, small impacts are	Impacts similar to Alt B.	No impacts.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
Wilderness Characteristics		expected by preventing the construction of new range improvements. This may have an adverse impact on improving livestock distribution through the prohibition of development of new livestock waters.			
4.17 Impacts on Minerals and Energy Resources					
4.17.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	Mining closed in designated areas, including wilderness and the AFNM prevents any potential resources in these areas from being developed. Potential is low for leasable minerals, moderate for salable minerals, and varies for locatable minerals. Current needs and future demands of public users would be affected.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except Tule Creek ACEC in Bradshaw-Harquahala would be closed to mining. This is expected to have negligible impact. This could result in a loss of economic opportunity or prohibit future development or expansion.	Impacts similar to Alt A in the AFNM. Impacts in Bradshaw-Harquahala would be similar to Alt B, except more areas would be closed to mining including Sheep Mountain RNA ACEC. Material disposal in Vulture Mountains Raptor Area ACEC and Black Butte ONA ACEC would prevent the sale of sand, gravel and decorative rock.	Impacts similar to Alt C, except more acreage would be specially designated. Mineral development would also be closed in Baldy Mountain ONA ACEC, Harquahala Mountains ONA ACEC, and Vulture Mountains ACEC. Any potential leasing and sales would not occur in the Belmont-Big Horn Mountains ACEC.	Acreage of closures are similar to Alt A, but Desired Future Conditions for the ACECs makes the impacts more like Alt C.
4.17.2 From Lands and Realty Management	No impacts are expected in the AFNM. -Acquisition of non-Federal mineral estate in two RCAs would increase potentially developable mineral resources. -Closure of reconveyed	No impacts are expected in the AFNM. -Rights-of-way, leases, and patents establish superior rights to future mineral development, but may also cause access restrictions. However,	Impacts similar to Alt B, except opening small tracts and reconveyed lands for high potential areas only would limit future development opportunities. This would potentially reduce conflict	Impacts similar to Alt B, except that keeping all small tract and reconveyed lands closed to mineral development would be the same as Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B, except small tract lands would remain closed. Reconveyed lands would be opened, but riparian areas would remain closed to mineral material sales. Impacts to mining

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	lands in the Black Canyon corridor precludes opportunities for mineral development. -Small tract lands closed to location could cause conflicts with surface owners. -Utility developments could restrict access and interfere with mineral removal. -Impacts are addressed when specific proposals are developed.	rights-of-way for roads, highways, and powerlines could improve access and infrastructure. -Land ownership adjustments may dispose of or acquire valuable mineral resources. -Opening reconveyed lands to mineral development might provide further opportunities. -Opening small tracts to locatable mineral development could increase opportunities but potentially create conflict with surface owners.	with surface owners.		development are expected to be minimal.
4.17.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	No impacts in AFNM. Actions to protect soil, air, and water resources generally increase mine productions costs, occasionally rendering operations economically unfeasible.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.17.4 From Biological Resource Management	No impacts in the AFNM. Tortoise habitat restrictions decrease opportunities for developing mineral resources. -Stipulations and mitigation for wildlife	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	increase operating costs and permitting timeframes, and may potentially constrain mining actions. -Mineral development is restricted in habitat for T&E species and discovery of a T&E species may interrupt operations.				
4.17.5 From Cultural Resource Management	Cultural survey and mitigation for found cultural resources create delays in approval of mining operations and increase cost of mineral development.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.17.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	Discovery of paleontological resources could increase the costs of mineral extraction.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.17.7 From Recreation Management	No impacts in the AFNM. Allocations such as SRMAs might limit potential surface disturbances and where development can occur. Compliance with management prescriptions could increase costs.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.17.8 From Visual Resource Management	VRM managed to Class III, except wilderness is Class I. Class III is not	-Impacts of VRM Class III and IV would be similar to current	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	expected to affect minerals and energy management.	standards, though Class IV would allow additional flexibility. -VRM Class I and II would increase mining costs. -Some discretionary mining and related infrastructure may be excluded.			
4.17.9 From Rangeland Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.17.10 From Minerals Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.17.11 From Fire Management	Wildfires may affect access to mineral resources during fire operations. Management can protect mine developments from wildfires.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.17.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.17.13 From Land Health Standards	Land Health Standards would raise reclamation standards and costs, and result in a greater delay in bond release.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.17.14 From Management of Travel Management	-No impacts are expected.	-Authorization would be required to drive off road to access mining claims or conduct exploration. -Fewer access roads would inhibit access for	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		prospecting. -Improved road conditions leading to improved access would facilitate operating existing and potential mines.			
4.17.15 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected.	-Lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics would be closed to mineral material disposal. -Closing these areas would prevent the exploitation of potential resources.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B except that in addition to closing lands allocated for management of wilderness characteristics to mineral material disposal, mineral and geothermal leasing would also be prohibited.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.18 Impacts on Fire and Fuel Resources					
4.18.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	-In areas with limits on motorized vehicles, the potential for human-caused wildfire ignitions could be reduced. -Travel restrictions would not affect management. Areas of limited development with fewer improvements and structures would affect suppression. -Wilderness areas could limit suppression and access. Motorized equipment may be used in emergency circumstances, affecting fire suppression strategies	Designation of Bloody Basin Road and Constellation Mine Road as Back Country Byways could increase the risk of human caused fires.	-Vehicular travel could be further limited in this alternative, decreasing risk of human-caused ignition. -Prohibiting grazing in the Harquahala Mountains ACEC could increase fine fuels on the surface, resulting in easier ignition and a more continuous fuel bed.	Impacts similar to Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	and options for fuel treatment.” The use of motorized equipment to fight wildfire in emergency circumstances in wilderness can be authorized				
4.18.2 From Lands and Realty Management	<p>Continued use of existing utility rights-of-way could increase opportunities for human caused ignition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improvements and structures require additional fire protection, introduce hazards to aircraft and ground resources, and restrict fire operations, thereby increasing overall costs. -Utility maintenance impacts minimal. Utility construction could benefit suppression in the short term and encourage weed invasions in the long term. -Disposing of 54,370 acres can consolidate federal lands, making fire operations more efficient and less expensive. -Conversion of disposed acres to development would increase human populations and change ignition potential, fire 	Impacts similar to Alt A, except disposal increases to 58,400 acres.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except disposal decreases to 49,100 acres.	Impacts similar to Alt A. However, impacts related to land disposal are eliminated as no acres are available for disposal.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except potential disposal acres are 38,755.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	behavior, and risk decisions.				
4.18.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	-Meeting air quality standards limits the amount of prescribed burning. An approved prescribed burn plan defines measures that would be taken to reduce impacts. -Implementing prescribed fire in fire-adapted environments and fuel treatments in other high-risk locations would improve watershed conditions, increase soil cover, and promote proper water flows.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.18.4 From Biological Resource Management	Management of sensitive species limits prescribed fire, fire treatment, and fire suppression operations. The allocation of WHAs may decrease the occurrence of human-caused fires and overall suppression costs.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except further restrictions could reduce visitor use and decrease the opportunity for human-caused ignitions.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.18.5 From Cultural Resource Management	The use of MIST minimizes the impacts on cultural resources and the landscape, although unintentional damage could occur.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except increased public visitation from development of public use cultural sites may increase the risk of	Impacts similar to Alt B, except the number of sites developed for public use would be less and 276,527 acres are allocated to SCRMA's.	Impacts similar to Alt C, except the number of sites developed for public use would be less than in Alt C and 125,292 acres are allocated to SCRMA's.	Impacts similar to Alt B, except the number of sites developed for public use would be less (but more than for Alt C).

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>For fire suppression, consideration for cultural resources can result in larger fires and higher costs.</p> <p>Mitigation measures during prescribed burning would increase costs and time associated with planning projects, and excludes some areas from prescribed burns.</p>	<p>human caused fires. In addition, increased numbers and types of facilities could lead to changes in suppression decisions and commitments of suppression resources</p> <p>In Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts would increase due to allocation of 316,103 acres SCRMA's and developing sites for interpretation.</p>			
4.18.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.18.7 From Recreation Management	<p>As recreation use increases so would fire frequency.</p> <p>Target shooting increases the potential for ignitions as shooting is a common cause of wildfire in some areas.</p>	<p>Continued dispersed camping would increase the risk of human-caused ignitions.</p> <p>In both planning areas, increased visitor use could increase the risk of human-caused fires and change suppression decisions, prioritization of resources, and resulting costs.</p>	Impacts similar to Alt B, except the restriction of vehicle use in SRMA's could decrease the potential of human-caused ignition.	Impacts similar to Alt B, except more routes would be closed than in Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.18.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.18.9 From Rangeland Management	Livestock grazing can reduce the loading of fine	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>fuels, reducing the frequency and size of wild fires.</p> <p>Grazing can also convert ecological types resulting in lower frequencies but higher intensities.</p> <p>Conversion to fire dependent annual grass communities greatly increases fire risk in these areas and may result in the eventual loss of native desert vegetation.</p> <p>Improvements for managing livestock present potential hazards to fire fighters and fire operations.</p> <p>Suppression actions often depend on water from range improvements.</p> <p>In areas planned for fire treatment, livestock use can remove enough forage to preclude prescribed burning.</p>				
4.18.10 From Minerals Management	-Mineral development in the Bradshaw-Harquahala could increase human-caused fire ignitions.	Impacts similar to Alt A.			

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Development associated with mining also increases the risk and complexity of wildland fire suppression operations. -No impacts are expected in the AFNM. 				
4.18.11 From Fire Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Full suppression of all wildfires helps to keep some fires small, reducing harm to resources. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala 14,000 acres have been selected for prescribed fire treatments for hazardous fuel accumulations and reduce the threat of large catastrophic wildfires. -Prescribed fire operations would also be limited and costs increased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts similar to Alt A, except wildland fire could be allowed if defined prescriptive conditions are being met, especially in the AFNM's tobosa grasslands. -Wildland fire use would be beneficial in both planning areas except in the Sonoran Desert vegetation communities. 	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.18.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.18.13 From Management of Travel Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Restricting vehicles to existing roads and trails would reduce the potential for accidental human-caused ignitions. -Initially, no major impacts are expected, but as increases in vehicle travel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts to fire would be similar to those described for Alt A. -Restricting vehicles to designated roads would reduce potential human-caused ignitions. 	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	on designated routes continue, the potential for human-caused fire would also increase.				
4.18.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected.	For both planning areas, management of wilderness characteristics may impact fire suppression by preventing the construction of new firelines using heavy equipment. Management response would offset the impacts from the potential loss of heavy equipment.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.19 Impacts on Wild Horses and Burros					
4.19.1 From Management of Special Area Designations	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.19.2 From Lands and Realty Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.19.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.19.4 From Biological Resource Management	Development of springs and seeps to improve ecological function could improve forage conditions and reliable water supplies. However, fencing those areas would reduce availability of forage and water.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except for the Harquahala Mountain WHA allocation which would have no effect on the burros.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.19.5 From Cultural Resource Management	Fencing cultural sites could reduce available range and forage for burros. The impact is expected to be negligible.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except development of sites for public use could result in the increased congregation of visitors. This could increase the risk of injury to both visitors and burros and may reduce the quantity and quality of habitat.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.19.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.19.7 From Recreation Management	Increasing OHV use can increase vehicle-burro conflicts and burro-human encounters, increasing the risk of injury to both people and burros. Increased vegetation disturbance from recreation uses could slightly reduce available forage.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except Areas allocated to non-motorized settings could help minimize impacts to vegetation from motorized recreation, increasing available forage.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.19.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.19.9 From Rangeland Management	-Implementing Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines for Grazing Management could improve habitat conditions. -Maintaining existing grazing practices could result in more water	-Impacts similar to Alt A, except construction of fences or other barriers to restrict riparian grazing could also restrict burros. -This could limit available forage and water, decrease available range size and increase	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Eliminating grazing would eliminate forage and water competition between burros and livestock. Removal of unneeded grazing improvements could decrease water sources, but may also allow burros	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	sources, but competition for these sources and forage would continue.	competition.		to expand their range.	
4.19.10 From Minerals Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.19.11 From Fire Management	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.19.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	-Management of the Lake Pleasant HMA would potentially enhance genetic viability of the herd. The social structure of the herd may be disrupted by removal of burros. -All burros from the Harquahala HA are to be removed.	-Impacts to the Lake Pleasant HMA would be similar to Alt A. -The Harquahala HA would not become an HMA, and removal of nuisance burros and burros damaging sensitive habitats could result in elimination of the herd.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.19.13 From Management of Travel Management	Increasing OHV use could increase the possibility of vehicle-burro conflicts and cause a loss of habitat. The amount of available forage could be slightly reduced. The incidence of burro-human encounters could increase, intensifying the risk of injury to people and burros.	-Designated motorized routes could decrease the amount of available habitat and increase the risk of bodily injury to burros. Increasing levels of use by visitors on designated non-motorized trails would further fragment burro habitat. Burros could be harassed by visitors. -Areas allocated to non-motorized settings could minimize impacts to vegetation from motorized recreation, and	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		increase available forage.			
4.19.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected.	-Lands with wilderness characteristics would have minimal impacts on the number or location of wild burros. -Harassment would be less since most areas with wilderness characteristics have few trails and overall lower levels of visitation. Increases in primitive recreation in burro areas could increase harassment and movement of burros away from visitors. This would be significant only if the visitors occupy critical burro watering areas during periods of heat stress.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.20 Travel Management					
4.20.1 From Special Area Designations	-The AFNM ACECs would have no impacts on access. -WSR non-impairment guidelines could restrict use of some routes. -Five designated wilderness areas (96,820 acres) in Bradshaw-Harquahala would remain closed to motorized vehicle use.	-WSR impacts on the AFNM similar to Alt A. -Bloody Basin Road Back Country Byway could improve access if designated. -Wilderness impacts similar to Alt A. -Constellation Mine Road Back Country Byway could improve access if designated but could	-Impacts in the AFNM similar to Alt B except the 4 additional ACECs would close ½ mile of route. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts would be similar to Alt B except additional ACECs would be designated. -Development of new routes in these ACECs	-In the AFNM, no impacts from Back Country Byway and Riparian ACEC impacts would be similar to WSR management. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts would be similar to Alt C except additional ACECs would be designated. -The modeled route	- In the AFNM, no impacts from Back Country Byway and ACECs as none are designated WSR impacts similar to Alt A. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts would be similar to Alt D except fewer ACECs would be designated. -The modeled route

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	-Access to the Harquahala Mountain Backcountry Byway would continue and associated management would benefit users.	increase conflicts with local residents. -Tule Creek ACEC would have no impact on access as the fenced area is currently closed to motorized vehicles.	would be impacted. -The impacts of ACECs on existing routes would be determined through the route evaluation and designation process.	system could close 723 miles of routes which would significantly impact travel and access. -Nominating the Black Canyon Trail as National Recreation Trail could improve access in the area.	system could close 211 miles of routes which would significantly impact travel and access. -Impacts of Black Canyon Trail similar to Alt D.
4.20.2 From Lands and Realty	Authorizations would expand the travel network. Development of state and private lands could lead to the disruption or loss of public access.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.20.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	Actions to protect or mitigating damage to soil, water and air resources could diminish the motorized route network.	Impacts similar to Alt A, except BLM would take direct action to reduce impacts on soil, water and air resources. -BLM would designate routes, reduce dust, re-route or close problem routes, apply buffer zones, SRMA prescriptions, and improve existing routes to reduce impacts.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.20.4 From Biological Resources Management	No impacts are expected.	-Transportation routes and public access could be reduced to resolve conflicts in WHAs and tortoise habitat through the route evaluation/designation	-In the AFNM, route closures for riparian protection 3.54 miles. -Pronghorn management a factor in route restrictions. -Impacts similar to Alt B,	-In AFNM impacts similar to Alt C. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt C except 18,020 acres in WHAs.	- In AFNM impacts similar to Alt C. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt C except 179,640 acres in WHAs.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		<p>process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -WHA 64,220 acres. -New routes could be restricted. -Vehicle use on routes that remain open could increase. -Route connectivity secondary to wildlife habitat in WHAs. 	<p>except 156,120 acres WHAs in Bradshaw-Harquahala and 39,330 acres in the AFNM.</p>		
4.20.5 From Cultural Resources Management	-A few specific vehicle travel routes could be closed to protect cultural sites or mitigate damage, but this would have little overall impact.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, some routes would be closed for cultural site protection. -Route connectivity could be diminished and the quality of vehicle-based recreation pursuits would decline. - In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts could include some restrictions to protect sites. 	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.20.6 From Paleontological Resource Management	No impacts on expected.	No impacts on expected.	No impacts on expected.	No impacts on expected.	No impacts on expected.
4.20.7 From Recreation Resource Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, no impacts are expected. Most routes remain open. -SRP route use would mostly be displaced. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, 2,240 miles of vehicle routes would remain open. In some areas, route mileage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A, shooting restrictions may reduce or displace use. -37 miles of existing routes would be closed. -134 miles remain open. -5 miles of new routes. -Users of these routes would be displaced to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except: -48 miles closed. -123 miles remain open. -6 miles of new routes. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt B, except: based on route model -382 miles closed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except: -123 miles closed. -48 miles remain open. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt B, except: based on route model -723 miles closed -1,645 miles remain open 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except: -52 miles closed. -94 miles remain open. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt B, except: based on route model -211 miles closed. -2,028 miles remain open

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	would increase over the long-term.	<p>other areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Recreational opportunities for motorized users would be enhanced by creating loop trails. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, based on route model, 169 miles of existing routes would be closed. -14 miles of new routes -Total distance of open routes would be 2,086 miles. -Overall effect would be to maintain existing settings and opportunities. -Limiting vehicles to inventoried routes before completing the route designation process would eliminate cross-country OHV travel and prevent development of new routes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -1,889 miles remain open -26 miles of new routes -Traditional users could be displaced and recreation opportunities diminished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -62 miles of new routes -Traditional users could be displaced and recreation opportunities diminished. -Route networks would be disconnected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -39 miles of new routes. -Non-motorized routes would be expanded. -Once completed, the Black Canyon Trail from the Carefree Highway to north of Highway 69 would become a major trail. -Managing the North Black Canyon Trail RMZ would enhance the non-motorized recreation. -Impacts of limiting vehicles to inventoried routes before completion of the route designation process would be similar to Alt B.
4.20.8 From Visual Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Designation of VRM I and II classes could affect route construction or cause re-alignment of existing routes. Class I designation would allow few motorized routes. Non-motorized routes would be easier to install. -Installation of new travel routes within Class III 	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		and IV VRM class areas enable development of access.			
4.20.9 From Rangeland Management	-Impacts would be minimal. -New developments could increase access. -Vandalism to livestock facilities from visitors could potentially lead to closure of routes.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	The elimination of grazing could lead to route deterioration.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.20.10 From Minerals Management	-No impacts in AFNM. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala new actions may increase public access if routes are made available for public use. -New mining routes could displace traditional trail users. -Closure of mining could eventually contribute to the loss of public access when routes are reclaimed. -Existing routes may be closed if active mining operations pose a threat to public health or safety.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.20.11 From Fire Management	Some routes could be closed on a temporary basis due to fire suppression or controlled burns.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.20.12 From Wild Horse	No impact is expected.	No impact is expected.	No impact is expected.	No impact is expected.	No impact is expected.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
and Burro Management					
4.20.13 From Management of Travel Management	<p>-The AFNM is closed to cross-country motorized travel, but existing routes are open. No impacts are likely to occur.</p> <p>-In Bradshaw-Harquahala, 2,240 miles of vehicle routes would remain open, and access would not be affected.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt A, -37 miles of existing routes would be closed. -134 miles remain open. -5 miles of new routes. -Users of these routes would be displaced to other areas. -Recreational opportunities for motorized users would be enhanced by creating loop trails. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, based on route model, 169 miles of existing routes would be closed. -14 miles of new routes -Total distance of open routes would be 2,086 miles. -Overall effect would be to maintain existing settings and opportunities. -Limiting vehicles to inventoried routes before completing the route designation process would eliminate cross-country OHV travel and prevent development of new routes.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except: -48 miles closed. -123 miles remain open. -6 miles of new routes. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt B, except: based on route model -382 miles closed -1,889 miles remain open -26 miles of new routes -Traditional users could be displaced and recreation opportunities diminished.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except: -123 miles closed. -48 miles remain open. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt B, except: based on route model -723 miles closed -1,645 miles remain open -62 miles of new routes -Traditional users could be displaced and recreation opportunities diminished. -Route networks would be disconnected.</p>	<p>-In the AFNM, impacts similar to Alt B, except: -52 miles closed. -94 miles remain open. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala impacts similar to Alt B, except: based on route model -211 miles closed. -2,028 miles remain open -39 miles of new routes. -Non-motorized routes would be expanded. -Once completed, the Black Canyon Trail from the Carefree Highway to north of Highway 69 would become a major trail. -Managing the North Black Canyon Trail RMZ would enhance the non-motorized recreation. -Impacts of limiting vehicles to inventoried routes before completion of the route designation process would be similar to Alt B.</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
4.20.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts are expected.	-In the AFNM no impacts. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala maintenance of wilderness character would be a consideration in the route evaluation and designation process. -New routes would be limited or precluded on 56,040 acres in areas managed for wilderness character.	-In both areas, impacts similar to Alt B, except 107,843 acres are allocated for wilderness character in the Bradshaw-Harquahala area.	- In both areas, impacts similar to Alts B and C, except 102,664 acres are allocated for wilderness character in the Bradshaw-Harquahala area and 37,571 acres within the Agua Fria National Monument.	-In the AFNM, 20,900 acres allocated for wilderness character. -New route construction precluded in this area but designated routes would be open. -In the Bradshaw-Harquahala, impacts similar to Alt B except 68,970 acres allocated for wilderness character.
4.21 Impacts on Wilderness Characteristics					
4.21.1 From Special Area Designations	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	Impacts similar to Alt A except ACEC and WSR management would conserve wilderness characteristics.	Impacts similar to Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt C.
4.21.2 From Lands and Realty	No impacts are expected.	-Rights-of-ways, utility lines and communication sites could impact natural conditions and solitude.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.21.3 From Management of Soil, Air, and Water Resources	No impacts are expected.	Management actions to maintain or enhance water, soil, and air quality would help maintain wilderness characteristics.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.21.4 From Biological Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	Habitat improvements could impact natural conditions and solitude.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.
4.21.5 From Cultural Resource Management	No impacts are expected.	-Route closures to protect cultural sites could benefit wilderness	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
		characteristics by reducing public access and increasing solitude. -Development of sites for public use would allow concentrations of users in certain areas, while limiting development would preserve the natural setting of places with wilderness characteristics.			
4.21.6 From Paleontological Resources	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.21.7 From Recreation Resource Management	Increasing intensity of recreation could result in a loss of solitude. -Increasing numbers of non-motorized users could impair solitude opportunities and contribute to trailing and campsite use impacts. - Increased number of SRPs could lead to increased numbers of users and conflicts, deteriorating opportunities to experience solitude and wilderness characteristics.	-Designating RMZs could benefit wilderness characteristics through management of more intensive recreation uses. -Opportunities for solitude would be maintained in the Back Country RMZ. -Reduction in lands available for competitive OHV events would maintain opportunities to experience more natural settings.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, except that a larger Back Country RMZ, and fewer SRPs would offer more solitude opportunities and maintain more wilderness characteristics.	-Impacts similar to Alt C, except for more Back Country RMZ acreage, and fewer SRPs.	-Impacts similar to Alt B, although restrictions on SRPs would more closely resemble Alt C.
4.21.8 From Visual Resource Management	The application of VRM Class III standards may eventually lead to some intrusions in to the visual	-Management of lands to VRM Class II would retain the current physical setting of 96,150 acres	Impacts similar to Alt B, except 486,800 acres would be managed to VRM Class II, 284,720	Impacts similar to Alt B, except 502,610 acres would be managed to VRM Class II, 260,020	Impacts similar to Alt B, except 340,880 acres would be managed to VRM Class II, 220,790

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	landscape in or around lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics.	and enhance primitive recreational experiences and opportunities for solitude. -Design criteria would maintain the area with little to no visual impacts and would retain naturalness.	acres to VRM Class III, and 98,660 to VRM Class IV.	acres to VRM Class III, and 94,800 to VRM Class IV.	acres to VRM Class III, and 107,020 to VRM Class IV.
4.21.9 From Rangeland Management	Impacts would be minimal. Site specific water projects, fencing, or vegetation projects may impact small areas but impacts would be consistent with the management of wilderness characteristics.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	No expected impacts.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.21.10 From Minerals Management	-No impacts are expected in the AFNM. -In Bradshaw-Harquahala, wilderness characteristics could be impaired, decline or be foregone within areas not afforded protection of their wilderness characteristics.	Closing the allocation to maintain wilderness characteristics to mineral material disposal would reduce the potential for ground disturbance and maintain primitive open space.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B, except wilderness characteristics would also be closed to mineral and geothermal leasing and mineral entry. This would further maintain primitive open space.	Impacts similar to Alt A.
4.21.11 From Fire Management	No impacts are expected	No impacts are expected	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.21.12 From Wild Horse and Burro Management	No impacts are expected	No impacts are expected	No impacts are expected	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.21.13 From Management of Travel	-No impacts are expected in the AFNM.	Adverse impacts on wilderness characteristics	Impacts similar to Alt B, except adverse impacts	Impacts similar to Alt B, except adverse impacts on	Impacts similar to Alt C.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
Management	-In Bradshaw-Harquahala road and route development, access rights-of-way and other developments requiring roads could adversely affect wilderness characteristics.	would be of a lesser scale than described under Alt A.	would be of a lesser degree than described under Alt A or B.	wilderness characteristics would be considerably less than described under Alt A, B or C.	
4.21.14 From Management of Wilderness Characteristics	-In the AFNM, primitive or semi-primitive non-motorized settings would likely be maintained due to the management guidelines set forth in the AFNM Proclamation. -Wilderness characteristics could be impaired, decline or be foregone within Bradshaw-Harquahala in areas not afforded protection of their wilderness characteristics.	-In the AFNM, impacts would be similar to Alt A. Allocation of wilderness characteristics would allow individuals to recreate in a more natural and remote setting. -Wilderness characteristics would be maintained in areas with management for WSR suitable segments, and ACECs. In more accessible unprotected areas wilderness character could be impaired.	More acres of wilderness characteristics would be maintained than under Alt B as additional lands are allocated. Loss of wilderness characteristics would be minimal under Alt C.	Impacts similar to Alt C, except fewer acres would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. This alternative would designate some of the areas described under Alt B and C as ONA ACECs.	Non-motorized, primitive recreation users would benefit more than under Alt B, but less than under Alt C and D.
4.22 Impacts on Social and Economic Conditions					
4.22.1 Planning Area Growth and Development					
Recreation Related Impacts	-Designation of the AFNM would likely result in increased visitor use. Activities that might be less available in the AFNM might place greater demands on surrounding lands. -Use of land in the	Impacts would be similar to Alt A, but development of recreation facilities would be encouraged to improve recreational experiences, resulting in increase visitation and use. -Protection of biological	-Primitive recreation would be favored in the AFNM. The number of commercial and guide/outfitter permits would be about half of those than under Alt B. Public access to cultural resources would also be	-The emphasis on non-motorized recreation would reduce visitation more than any other alternative by closing the most vehicle routes. No motorized competitive races would be authorized.	-Primitive recreation would be favored in the AFNM, but overall access would be greater than Alt D. Total visitation and related expenditures are expected to be less than Alt A, B, or C.. -Access in Bradshaw-

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>planning areas would continue to increase as the population increases. Visitation is expected to increase 55% by 2025.</p> <p>-Growth and a continuation of current access would yield economic benefit to local communities that provide services compatible with recreation.</p> <p>-Access for OHV users and equestrians would continue to benefit the economy.</p> <p>In the long term, as recreation continues to increase, resource conditions could deteriorate thereby increasing the need for more management.</p>	<p>and cultural resources would enhance the quality of experiences and increase visitation.</p> <p>-2,220 miles of routes would be designated. The allocation of nine SRMAs and eight SCRMA would increase visitor use.</p> <p>-One WHA and two areas proposed for lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics would attract visitors seeking more primitive experiences.</p> <p>-Designation of Bloody Basin and Constellation Mine Roads as Back Country Byways could increase visitation.</p> <p>-Overall, recreation demand would increase more than in the other alternatives resulting in increased overall spending by recreationists in nearby communities.</p> <p>-The long term impacts of recreational use would be the same as Alt A.</p>	<p>more limited.</p> <p>-Public access in Bradshaw-Harquahala would also be more restrictive than Alt A or B. Biological and cultural resources would be more protected. Visitation and visitor spending would be reduced. Economic benefits to local communities would be less for this Alt than for Alt A or B but greater than Alt D.</p> <p>-Designation of Bloody Basin Road and Constellation Mine Road would have impacts as similar to Alt B.</p> <p>-2,012 miles of routes would be designated. SCRMA would be reduced to four, lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics would increase, and 11 ACECs would be designated, which would likely reduce visitation, although some communities would continue to benefit from providing services to recreationists.</p> <p>-The long term impacts of</p>	<p>-Public access to cultural resources would be more limited than any other alternative. Visitation and OHV use would decline, resulting in somewhat lower visitor spending.</p> <p>-If this loss is offset by increased non-motorized recreation, the difference between the impacts of Alt D and the other alternatives would not be so great.</p> <p>-1,639 miles of routes would be designated and use of trails would be limited. SCRMA would be reduced to two, the number of areas allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics would increase to six, and eight ACECs would be designated. Visitation and related spending would likely decline, although some communities would continue to benefit.</p> <p>-The overall economic impacts from motorized recreation would be slightly less than Alt C due to fewer available routes and concentrated use areas.</p>	<p>Harquahala would be more limited than Alt B, but less than C.</p> <p>-Designated vehicle routes (2,122 miles) are expected accommodate use at current levels.</p> <p>-OHV impacts would continue similar to those described in Alt A and B.</p> <p>-Increased opportunities for non-motorized recreation may increase overall visitation, but this is unlikely to greatly increase spending.</p> <p>-Allocating SRMA to more intensive recreation could attract more users. Use is expected to increase along with user satisfaction. Overall, the economic benefits of recreation are expected to be lower than under Alt A, B, and C, but greater than under Alt D.</p> <p>-Six SCRMA would contain sites allocated to public use, which would have impacts similar to Alt B. The increase in areas allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics and designation of 4 ACECs would provide non-</p>

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
			recreational use would be the same as Alt A.		motorized opportunities. -Bloody Basin Road and Constellation Mine Road would not be considered as back country byways thus impacts would be the same as Alt A. -The long term impacts of recreational use would be similar to Alt A, except that management actions should result in sustainable conditions.
Ranching, Agriculture, and Livestock Production-Related Impacts	-Increases in population and urbanization have resulted in loss of agricultural land and increased conflicts with farm and ranch operations. -Livestock production on BLM land contributes to the local economy. Prohibiting grazing in the Larry Canyon ACEC has minimal impact on production and the economic impacts would not change.	-Impacts are expected to be the similar to Alt A except that grazing in riparian areas would be limited to winter. Grazing would likely decline but would not measurably differ from current livestock management. Should allocating eight SCRMA result in restricting grazing, livestock production may decrease.	-Impacts are expected to be the similar to Alt B except livestock grazing is prohibit in riparian areas, which would reduce the number of allotments to 43. This may eliminate or reduce some allotments to the point that ranches would no longer be viable. -Impacts on the regional economy would be minimal.	-Closing BLM-managed lands to grazing would significantly affect holders of grazing leases, local economies, and reduce livestock production in the state.	-Impacts would be the similar to Alt B, except six SCRMA would be allocated which might result in fencing some areas from grazing use.
Minerals-Related Impacts					
Locatable Minerals	-The AFNM is closed to all forms of mineral entry. -Bradshaw-Harquahala would generally be left open to mineral location and development. Should	-Impacts similar to Alt A, except Alt B would be the most encouraging to mineral development. -Tule Creek ACEC would be closed to mineral	-Impacts similar to Alt A, except for the closure of 3 ACECs and riparian areas. This could result in some economic limitations.	-This alternative would tend to more or less eliminate mining via attrition over the duration of the plan. It would also reduce mining-related	Impacts similar to Alt B, except fewer acres would be allocated to VRM Classes II and IV, and more acres would be allocated to VRM Class

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>prices reach a high enough level to begin exploration or reopen mines, there would be a positive economic impact in mining employment and earnings.</p> <p>-Recreational prospecting for gold has resulted in the formation of numerous prospecting clubs that hold mining claims. Businesses have begun to cater to their needs and support their social structure. Current access would allow continued use by these groups, and the possibility of expansion to new areas.</p>	<p>location and development.</p> <p>-VRM standards may increase costs of mining by requiring rehabilitation standards. Increased rehabilitation may result in economic benefits if local labor and/or material are used.</p>	<p>-Casual use miners and prospecting clubs could continue with their activities, except route closures may make it difficult or expensive to maintain access to claims.</p> <p>-Impacts from VRM would increase compared to Alt B, but be less than those under Alt D.</p>	<p>additions to the local and regional economies, thereby limiting economic opportunity more than the other alternatives.</p> <p>-Impacts similar to Alt C, but more acreage would be closed to mining, and more areas would be classified as VRM I and II.</p>	<p>III. Re-conveyed lands, mainly in the Black Canyon area between Black Canyon City and Bumblebee, would be closed to mineral location and development along with Tule Creek ACEC.</p>
Saleable Minerals	<p>Continued sale of mineral materials would contribute to local economies. BLM would continue to issue free use permits to the state and to local communities as the need arises. The result would be the continued availability of materials. Impact of mineral material sales is expected to be slight.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A, except Tule Creek ACEC and two areas allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics would be closed to mineral material sales. This would somewhat reduce the opportunity to extract those commodities, but the impact is expected to be negligible.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt A, except ACECs and areas allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics would be closed to mineral material sales. These areas would be larger than in Alt A or B.</p>	<p>Impacts similar to Alt C, except more acres would be closed to mineral material sales. In the short term, demand is expected to be met by non-Federal and federal production. But future demand may not be met. Increased costs of importing building material would increase building costs in all parts of the economy.</p>	<p>-Impacts similar to Alt A, except Tule Creek ACEC and riparian areas would be closed to mineral material disposal. Impacts are expected to be minimal.</p> <p>-VRM standards might affect mineral material and decorative rock mining.</p>
Leasable Minerals	No known viable sources	Impacts similar to Alt A,	Impacts similar to Alt A	Impacts similar to Alt A	Impacts similar to Alt B.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	<p>of leasable minerals exist within the planning area. No measurable economic impacts are expected except in areas that might be explored north of the planning area but within the Phoenix District boundary.</p>	<p>except Tule Creek ACEC would be closed to mineral leasing which would have a negligible impact.</p>	<p>except mineral leasing would be prohibited in four ACECs and on scattered lands outside the planning area.</p>	<p>except mineral leasing would be prohibited in a number of ACECs and lands allocated to maintain wilderness characteristics.</p>	
<p>Lands and Corridors-Related Impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Disposal of 54,370 acres of BLM land would contribute not be a significant growth inducing action. -Development of disposed land would increase resource demands on remaining BLM land and could contribute to the loss of small, rural communities by increasing traffic and the need for more urban services. However, growth could also contribute to local economies. -Maintaining current utility corridors would meet future demand. - Jobs related with future utility development could contribute to local economies. -Utility developments can have profound impacts on regional economic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A, except 58,400 acres would be available for disposal. -The 58,400 acres would mainly affect the communities of Dewey, Humboldt, Mayer, and Goodyear for future potential development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -This alternative considers two options for land disposal. Under Option 1, 600 acres would be available, and impacts would be similar to Alt D. In Option 2, 49,100 acres would be available for disposal and impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A. -Impacts of the multi-use utility and transportation corridor that includes the Interstate 17 right-of-way would be similar to Alt A, except the corridor would be narrowed to move it out of the AFNM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No BLM land would be available for disposal. This would have no measurable impacts on potential growth or availability of land for development. Retaining all BLM land may contribute to maintaining rural lifestyles in some parts of the planning area. -Reduction in the level of corridors would support continued growth but may somewhat constrain siting of potential utilities in the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Impacts are expected to be similar to Alt A, except 38,755 acres would be available for disposal. This would mainly affect the communities of Buckeye, Goodyear, Wickenburg, and the greater Phoenix area. -Impacts of utility and transportation corridors would also be similar to Alt A.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	sustainability but is often controversial to local communities.				
4.23 Environmental Justice					
Impacts to Minority and Low Income Populations	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.	No impacts are expected.
4.24 Cumulative Impacts					
Population Growth and Development	-Potential effects of growth include the loss of ranching/related western lifestyle, and change in social leadership resulting from increases in urban values. -Growth would result in economic changes. 54,370 acres of BLM land would be available for disposal by sale or exchange, but this is not expected to be a significant growth-inducing action and so there would be no measurable cumulative impact. However, growth would continue to impact resources on BLM land.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, but 58,400 acres would be available for disposal.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, but 49,100 acres would be available for disposal.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, even though BLM would make no land available for disposal.	-Impacts similar to Alt A, but 38,755 acres would be available for disposal. -The Black Canyon Utility Corridor under this alternative improves long term economic condition of central Arizona by accommodating more types of utilities.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	-The reconstruction and widening of I-17 would facilitate growth of local communities as well as the State as a whole.				
Recreation and Visitation	<p>-Impacts would include intensified use in certain areas, especially for motorized activities, as recreation increases and growth and development occur. General plans for the counties and communities include provisions for open space, which is likely to further concentrated motorized activities on BLM land.</p> <p>-Increased visitation is expected to result in increased local spending for recreational goods and services.</p> <p>-The reconstruction and widening of I-17 could enhance or restrict access for recreation and likely have a negative visual impact on the surrounding areas.</p>	Impacts are expected to increase over those in Alt A since visitation is expected to increase the most in this alternative. The trend toward non-motorized recreation in urban areas would be similar to Alt A.	Impacts are expected to decrease as compared Alt A and B as this alternative favors primitive recreation and visitation would likely decline. The beneficial economic effects of recreation and visitation would be lower than under Alt A and B, but greater than under Alt D.	Impacts are expected to decrease more than under Alt C, as this alternative would devote the most area to non-motorized recreation and close more areas to vehicular access. Visitation is expected to be the lowest and so cumulative affects would be least.	Primitive recreation would be favored in the AFNM and access would also be somewhat reduced in Bradshaw-Harquahala. Visitation and related expenditures are expected to be less than Alt A and B, but more than C or D.
Air Quality	Cumulative air quality impacts have been addressed by air quality non-attainment plans and maintenance plans prepared by MAG and	Impacts similar to Alt A, except the miles of trails open to recreation would decrease by 3%. Air quality impacts on the region would be minimal.	Impacts similar to Alt A, even though miles of trails open to recreation would decrease by 4%.	Impacts similar to Alt A, although OHV emissions and particulates in rural areas would possibly be less, given more restrictions on areas open	Impacts similar to Alt A, although miles of trails open to recreation would decline.

Resource	Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Alternative)
	ADEQ. -It is possible that increased OHV use would cause increased fugitive dust impacts immediately near the roads and trails. But future OHV emissions would probably decline and contribute a proportionately smaller fraction of emissions.			to OHV use and competitive events.	
Soils	Cumulative effects are generally limited to a site. Management practices have led to some detrimental conditions. Development may compact and displace soil and remove vegetation. Soil productivity in these areas is lost for all practical purposes.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts are expected to be the least of all Alternatives given that recreation and mining would be more restricted and grazing would be prohibited.	Impacts are expected to be less than Alts A or B, but more than C or D given that motorized recreation would be more restricted and fewer acres would be available for disposal and eventual development.
Water Resources	Many watercourses in central Arizona have been degraded by increased sediment load due to urbanization, livestock grazing, and recreation as well as leachate from mining. Under this Alt, these activities would continue.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts similar to Alt A.	Impacts are expected to be less than those under other alternatives, given that recreation and mining would be more restricted and grazing would be prohibited.	Impacts are expected to be less than Alts A or B, but more than C and or D given that motorized recreation would be more restricted and fewer acres would be available for disposal and eventual development.
Wild Horse and Burro Management	No noticeable cumulative affects are expected.	Impacts similar to Alt A, even though the Harquahala HA would not be a managed herd.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.	Impacts similar to Alt B.