

**United States
Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Tucson Field Office**

Decision Record

**Ironwood Forest National Monument Travel Management Plan
Environmental Assessment NEPA # DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0033-EA**

Decision

I have reviewed the project plan and the Environmental Assessment (EA) and have made a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the project, *Ironwood Forest National Monument Travel Management Plan*. The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Ironwood Forest National Monument RMP ROD (2013). Based on that review and all information available to me, it is my decision to select the Proposed Action to undertake a strategic program (Travel Management Plan), as described in the EA, to implement the transportation and travel management decisions in the IFNM RMP and the route designations established concurrently with the IFNM RMP ROD, to support allowable uses and protect Monument objects. I approve the proposed action alternative with all the best management practices and the mitigation measures described in the EA.

Rationale for Decision

Currently, the Monument's road network is in need of strategic and long-term maintenance. Travel route designations were established concurrent with the IFNM RMP; however the RMP did not identify the travel management plan components (a sign plan, road maintenance standards and guidelines, a strategy for rehabilitation of decommissioned routes, etc.) needed to support this designated route network. The TMP includes best management practices, projects, and site-specific on-the-ground actions to achieve the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions.

Alternatives Considered

The BLM considered two alternatives: the No Action and the Proposed Action. Since the proposed action incorporates design features and resource damage mitigation measures, two alternatives is sufficient.

Public Involvement

Several public stakeholder meetings and individual interviews were conducted in June - August 2013 to gather input for developing the implementation plan. Holders of existing authorizations (grazing leases, ROWs, communication sites, Special Recreation Permits), representatives of the Tohono O'odham Nation, US Border Patrol (Tucson and Casa Grande Sectors), BLM Gila District law enforcement rangers, Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), United States

Air Force, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Pima County, and recreational users provided information on their access needs. The input included information on the condition of routes and on the specific type and frequency of access needed.

Appeal Opportunity

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4. Your notice of appeal must be filed in this office, located at 21605 North 7th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, 85027, within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition (request) pursuant to regulation 43 CFR Part 4.21(b) for a stay (suspension) of the effectiveness of this decision during that time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice to appeal. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the notice of appeal and the petition for a stay must also be submitted to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

Standards for Obtaining a Stay

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits,
3. The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted,
4. Whether the public interest favors a granting the stay.

/s/
Viola E. Hillman
Field Manager
Tucson Field Office

9/12/14
Date