

Chapter 2

ALTERNATIVES

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 describes in detail five alternatives, including the *Proposed Action*. These alternatives have been developed to resolve the issues that were identified in Chapter 1. The main purpose of this chapter is to identify the various combinations of public land uses and resource management practices that respond to the five major planning issues. All the alternatives will be described in relation to long-term impacts, except where impacts are noted as short-term. The short term would cover the five years after the filing of the final RMP, and the long term would cover the 25 years following the implementation of an action. The alternatives are the *Proposed Action*, *No Action*, *Resource Production*, *Resource Protection*, and *Environmental Protection*.

THE PROPOSED PLAN

The proposed plan was selected by a team composed of the District Manager, Area Manager and Resource Specialists. It was reviewed by the State Director. It was selected based on (1) issues raised throughout the planning process, (2) public input received during the 90-day comment period and at meetings, and (3) the environmental analysis developed on the previously formulated alternatives in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

The Proposed Action of this chapter describes the proposed management and objectives by issue, the recommendations or actions required to obtain those objectives and the rationale for selecting a particular alternative level.

The *Proposed Action* of this chapter describes the proposed management and objectives by issue, the recommendations or actions required to obtain those objectives and the rationale for selecting a particular alternative level.

HOW THE PROPOSED PLAN WILL BE IMPLEMENTED AND MONITORED

A record of decision will be issued following publication of this final environmental impact statement on the proposed resource management plan (RMP). The record of decision will include the final RMP which will describe the decisions on all land use issues, except for the wilderness issue. Wilderness recommendations will be reported in the

final wilderness EIS for the Lower Gila South. The record of decision will also contain implementation criteria and a monitoring plan.

The implementation criteria will guide the order in which projects are implemented. Those criteria will be tied to the budget process and will be applied annually to determine the projects that will be accomplished first, second, etc. The monitoring plan will outline monitoring programs for evaluating the effectiveness of plan proposals such as forage allocations and wildlife improvements. Monitoring will determine whether assumptions were correctly applied and impacts correctly predicted. Monitoring will also help to establish long-term use and condition trends for the planning area and will provide valuable information for future planning.

The record of decision will be the approval authority for implementing the land use allocations and other actions contained in the final RMP.

ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION

Both the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) regulations and the BLM resource management planning regulations require the formulation of alternatives. Each alternative represents a complete and reasonable plan to guide future management of public lands and resources. One alternative must represent no action, which means a continuation of present levels of resource use. The other alternatives must provide a range of choices from resource protection to resource production.

The basic goal in formulating alternatives is to identify combinations of public land uses and resource management practices that respond to the issues.

Alternatives to resolve the five issues were formed around five general themes: proposed action, no action, full multiple use consideration (resource production), resource protection, and environmental protection (this is the no livestock grazing alternative with all 12 WSAs recommended for designation).

Issues dictated the way in which alternatives were formulated. Those lands, resources, and programs not affected by the resolution of any issue will be managed in the future essentially as they are at present. Future changes will be permitted based on a case-by-case analysis and in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

2 - DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

General Guidance

Areas containing special and/or significant resource values will be evaluated to determine if special management practices are needed. Through these evaluations it may be necessary to restrict certain uses or designate Special Management areas.

Rangeland Management

Allotment Categorization. All grazing allotments in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area have been assigned to two of the three management categories outlined in BLM's current grazing management policy. See Appendix 12 for a detailed definition of the grazing allotment categories. Except for the *Environmental Protection* alternative, all allotments and grazing leases would be categorized as follows for all alternatives. Categorization for the 22 allotments designated perennial-ephemeral would place 12 allotments in the Maintain category and 10 allotments in the Custodial category. The remaining 18 ephemeral allotments and eight Section 15 perennial-ephemeral grazing leases would be placed in the Custodial category (see Table 2-1). The Maintain category allotments generally would be managed to maintain current satisfactory resource conditions, and Custodial category allotments would be managed to prevent resource deterioration.

Categorization for any or all allotments may change when objectives are met or new conflicts are identified as a result of monitoring studies.

Rangeland Developments. Proposed developments would be approved or authorized by one of two methods under all the alternatives: (1) range improvement permits or (2) cooperative agreements. A range improvement permit authorizes a privately owned project (a corral, fence, well) that aids in the handling of livestock and is paid for by the permittee. All developments on public land must meet the same environmental and engineering standards as those constructed by BLM (Appendix 13). For a cooperative agreement, BLM may fund all or part of the development and the title remains with the United States. Cooperative agreements specify maintenance responsibility and division of cost and labor between BLM and the permittee. Developments constructed primarily to benefit resources other than livestock would be maintained by BLM or non-livestock cooperators through agreement. Under BLM policy, permittees maintain structural developments such as fences, wells, troughs, springs, reservoirs, pipelines, and cattleguards installed primarily to benefit livestock grazing. BLM maintains nonstructural developments not assigned to permittees.

TABLE 2-1
PERENNIAL-EPHEMERAL ALLOTMENT CATEGORIZATION
Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District, Arizona

<u>Maintain Category</u>	
Beloat	Hazen
Bighorn	Ranegrass Plain
Cameron	Sentinel
Childs	South Vekol
Crowder-Weisser	Table Top
Eagle Tail	Vekol
<u>Custodial Category</u>	
Clem	A Lazy T**
Conley	Amavisca**
Coyote Flat	Arnold**
Gable-Ming	Artex**
Gila Bend Indians	Dendora Valley**
Hansen	Gable Peterson**
Kirian	Gila River Community**
Lower Vekol	Gillespie**
Ward	Hazen Sheppard**
Why	Jagow Kreager**
Amavisca*	Layton**
Bagwell*	Mariani**
Bagwell*	Mumme**
Arizona Title & Trust*	Painted Rock**
C. Hill & J. Palmer*	Palomas**
Jojoba Plantation Prod. Inc.*	Powers Butte**
K.K. Skousen (Caliente Farms)*	Sevey**
White Wing Ranch Co.*	Stout**

* Sec. 15 grazing leases outside grazing boundary.

** Ephemeral allotments.

SOURCE: Phoenix District grazing records

Rangeland Monitoring Program. BLM's monitoring program provides information critical to managing and refining the grazing program and provides a basis for making needed adjustments. A rangeland monitoring plan was prepared in June 1981 and outlines the studies to be conducted for each allotment. Detailed monitoring plans have also been developed for each allotment and are described in allotment files at the Lower Gila Resource Area Office.

On selected perennial-ephemeral allotments, monitoring studies would include (1) actual yearly livestock use, (2) forage utilization, (3) trend in rangeland condition, and (4) precipitation. Monitoring studies on allotments classified as ephemeral would consist of photopoints at selected key areas. BLM would also design studies to ensure that wildlife requirements in riparian areas were being met. Special emphasis would be placed on monitoring riparian habitat along the Gila River (Fred J. Weiler Green Belt), as well as the habitats of federal- and state-listed species which include Sonoran pronghorn, desert bighorn sheep and desert tortoise.

Grazing Administration. BLM would supervise livestock grazing throughout the year under all alternatives except the *Environmental Protection* alternative where all livestock would be removed from the public land. Should livestock trespass be discovered, BLM would have the unauthorized livestock removed and require the operators responsible for the trespass to pay for the forage consumed and damages incurred.

MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

Twenty-two grazing allotments and eight grazing leases are classified as perennial-ephemeral and are allowed to graze a base herd on a yearlong basis. Livestock operators on perennial-ephemeral allotments would be offered 10-year permits that state the number and kind of livestock and the period of use for each allotment. Flexibility in livestock numbers could be allowed for years of high or low forage production, availability of water, early or late rangeland readiness, and variations in ranching operations. Flexibility would be allowed as long as actual use did not exceed the initial livestock preference. Additional livestock use would be authorized by issuing a supplemental grazing permit when such use would not conflict with management objectives and the perennial vegetation would not be damaged. Temporary permits for ephemeral grazing would generally be issued for at least 30 days, and only if the overall rangeland condition were fair or better. Grazing authorizations for ephemeral forage on perennial-ephemeral allotments would be issued to qualified applicants only if such forage were assured.

The remaining 18 allotments are designated as ephemeral allotments and are managed in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule (See Appendix 2A, 33 FR 238, 12/7/68). In general, these allotments are grazed three years intermittently out of 10 years. Grazing use by livestock is based on 50% of the available and potential ephemeral forage crop. During dry years when little ephemeral forage is present, grazing is not authorized on ephemeral allotments. When wet years occur and it is determined by an authorized officer that enough forage is available for both wildlife and livestock, grazing may be authorized on a case-by-case basis and would be subject to management requirements.

Protected Plants

Before construction or soil-disturbing activities are allowed, BLM conducts site evaluations for protected plants. If possible, projects are located to avoid impacts to large numbers of protected plants or their habitats. Where significant impacts to protected plants are possible, plants are salvaged and transplanted or the project is abandoned. BLM notifies the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture 30 days in advance of actions that would affect plants protected under the Arizona Native Plant law (Arizona, State of, 1981).

Wilderness Resources

All 12 wilderness study areas will continue to be managed in compliance with BLM's *Interim Management Policy* (BLM, (revised) July 12, 1983) until wilderness suitability recommendations are reviewed and acted on by Congress. Areas being studied for wilderness will be managed to meet the nonimpairment standard. In cases

where valid mining rights occur, areas would be managed to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of the land.

Public land within areas added by Congress to the National Wilderness Preservation System would be managed in compliance with BLM's *Wilderness Management Policy* and the *Wilderness Act of 1964*. Site-specific wilderness management plans would be developed for such areas within two years after designation by Congress.

WSAs reviewed by Congress but not added to the National Wilderness Preservation System would be managed in accordance with applicable guidance provided by the approved Lower Gila South RMP.

Copies of BLM's *Interim Management Policy*, *Wilderness Management Policy*, and the *Wilderness Act of 1964* are available to the public at the Phoenix District Office.

Land Tenure

Lower Gila Resource Area processes a variety of land actions in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area—rights-of-way, communication sites, easements, permits, and unauthorized occupancy. All land cases would continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Communication site plans will be developed on all existing sites and will be prepared prior to any new site approval or development.

A. The main methods of disposal will be through sales (FLPMA, Section 203) or exchanges (FLPMA, Section 206) or both. Other forms of disposal such as Recreation and Public Purpose (R&PP) would also be appropriate forms of disposal.

B. In addition to the above disposal criteria, all public lands within the RMP/EIS area (with the exception of public lands that are withdrawn, classified, under wilderness study, or designated as wilderness) will be available for disposal to accommodate the following actions:

1. State exchanges - these exchanges will allow the BLM to acquire lands that will help support wildlife, wilderness, recreation values on the public lands. It will also reduce costs and improve public land management and allow the State and BLM to develop a better land ownership pattern.
2. State in-lieu selections - these selections need to occur in order for the U.S. to pay its land debt to the State of Arizona.
3. Special legislation that calls for the disposition of public lands - these programs are Congressionally mandated and usually have short time-frames in which to accomplish the work.

In all three types of actions it must be determined that the action is in the public's interest. This will be done through the required site-specific Environmental Assessment/Land Report.

All lands not identified for disposal will be retained unless needed to accommodate the above mentioned actions.

2 – DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

C. Lands to be acquired by BLM primarily through exchanges should:

1. facilitate access to public lands and resources,
2. maintain or enhance public uses and values,
3. facilitate implementation of other aspects of the Lower Gila South RMP, and
4. provide for a more manageable land ownership pattern.

Cultural Resources

BLM is mandated by Congress to play a stewardship role in the preservation of cultural values on public land. BLM would continue to manage cultural resources for their cultural values. Certain significant sites or areas may be protected and preserved for future use as funds become available.

The following measures apply to all actions in the RMP/EIS area involving ground disturbance or transfer of title. Before proposals involving surface disturbance or transfer of title are approved, site-specific cultural resource evaluations will be completed within areas which have not been previously evaluated for cultural remains. A Class I literature review, as well as a Class III intensive field inventory or an adequate Class II sample survey will be conducted as appropriate (BLM Manual 8111).

BLM in consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has developed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which permits an adequate Class II cultural inventory on BLM lands proposed for exchange with the state, instead of an intensive Class III inventory. If any historic or archaeological properties are found, their eligibility for inclusion in the *National Register of Historic Places* will be determined in consultation with the SHPO (36 CFR 1204). Whenever feasible BLM will avoid impacts to cultural resources by redesigning or relocating the project. If impacts are unavoidable, BLM will consult with the SHPO to develop mitigating measures to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts to cultural resources. BLM will consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as appropriate in accordance with 36 CFR 800. In addition, BLM will consult with appropriate Native American groups which have aboriginal or historic ties to lands within project areas concerning known areas of traditional cultural and/or religious significance. Impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated before project construction begins. If buried cultural remains are found during construction, the construction will stop and BLM will be notified. BLM Manual 8141 (Arizona Supplement) provides details on agency-specific guidelines for both long-term and interim physical and administrative protection of cultural resources. These measures will ensure compliance with the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966* and the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*.

Fire Management

The Phoenix District has developed a fire plan that is designed to manage fires as they occur in all areas of the district. The plan identifies areas suitable for prescribed burns, modified suppression areas, intensive control areas, and rehabilitation measures. Objectives are to maintain desired plant communities, recycle nutrients, and prepare seed beds.

Minerals

Private industry is encouraged to explore and develop federal minerals to satisfy national and local needs. This policy provides for economically and environmentally sound exploration, extraction, and reclamation practices. Public lands are open and available for mineral exploration and development unless withdrawn or administratively restricted. Mineral development may occur along with other resource uses.

Locatable Minerals. Exploration and development in the RMP/EIS area would continue to be administered in accordance with existing surface and mineral management regulations (43 CFR 3809 and CFR 3802).

Saleable Minerals. Demand for saleable minerals would be met by sales or free-use permits on a case-by-case basis.

Leasable Minerals. Leasable minerals would be managed under the leasing regulations.

Recreation Program

Although recreation in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area was not identified as a major issue, the impacts to recreation use will be analyzed in this document as they relate to the wilderness issue.

The recreation program will continue to participate in environmental assessments and resource activity plans in order to address and mitigate impacts on recreation resources. Visual resource management, management of off-road vehicle (ORV) use, and other recreation resource management will continue as recreation programs. Public lands in the planning area have not been designated as open, limited, or closed to ORVs.

Off-Road Vehicle Use. Limitations on or closure of public lands to motorized off-road vehicle use will be established for specific roads, trails, or areas where problems are identified. The following criteria would be considered before restricting or closing any area to ORV use.

- the need to promote user enjoyment and minimize use conflicts;
- the need to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resource values;

- the need to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant degradation of wildlife habitats; and
- the need to promote user safety.

Wilderness areas established by Congress in the Lower Gila South area would be closed to motorized vehicle use.

The Lower Gila Resource Area's recreation program will continue to prepare environmental assessments and ORV races will be permitted as appropriate.

Visual Resource Management. Visual resources will continue to be evaluated as a part of activity and project planning and areas not presently designated according to BLM Visual Resource Management Classification will be designated in the future. These evaluations would consider the significance of a proposed project and the visual sensitivity of the affected area. Stipulations are to be attached as appropriate to assure compatibility of projects with management objectives for visual resources.

Visual resources were not identified as an issue in the Lower Gila South EIS/RMP, therefore, visual resource management (VRM) classes for all public lands in the area have not been established. On BLM-administered lands in Arizona where classes have not been established, the lands will be managed as VRM Class III. All wilderness study areas are managed as VRM Class II and designated wilderness areas as VRM Class I.

VRM classes, their objectives, and required management practices are as follows.

- Class I Class I provides primarily for natural ecological changes only. It is applied to primitive areas, some natural areas, and similar situations where management activities are to be restricted.
- Class II Changes in any of the basic elements (form, line, color, or texture) caused by a management activity should not be evident in the characteristic landscape.
- Class III Changes in the basic elements caused by a management activity may be evident in the characteristic landscape, but the changes should remain subordinate to the visual strength of the existing character.
- Class IV Changes may subordinate the original composition and character but must reflect what could be a natural occurrence within the characteristic landscape.
- Class V Change is needed. This class applies to areas where the naturalistic character has been disturbed to a point where rehabilitation is needed to bring it back into character with the surrounding countryside. This class would apply to areas identified in the scenery evaluation in which the quality class has been reduced because of unacceptable intrusions. It

should be considered an interim short-term classification until one of the other objectives can be reached through rehabilitation or enhancement. The desired visual quality objective should be identified.

Wildlife Program

BLM's wildlife program in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area was not identified as a major issue. Wildlife objectives will continue to be analyzed in environmental assessments or resource activity plans to ensure the consideration of wildlife needs and values and to mitigate any adverse impacts to wildlife habitat. BLM would continue to place wildlife escape ramps in water troughs and construct or maintain new wildlife waters in coordination with state and other federal agencies and according to the following specifications.

1. New livestock waters to be located within two miles from crucial tortoise habitat and/or crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat will be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to determine potential impacts. Significant impacts will be mitigated with appropriate stipulations on site relocation.
2. Before installing facilities, BLM will conduct a site evaluation for state-protected animals and will develop mitigation to protect these species and their habitats. Such mitigation might include project relocation, redesign, or abandonment.
3. BLM will initiate formal Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on all actions that may affect federal listed threatened and endangered species or its critical habitat as required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended.
4. During construction of rangeland developments, vehicles will use existing roads and trails wherever possible for access to sites. Where feasible or where no roads exist, vehicles will travel cross-country to avoid the need for road building. Where new roads must be built, roadbeds will be no wider than needed for reliable access; BLM specifications will also be used to reduce erosion and gullying.
5. During construction of all rangeland developments, surface resources will be disturbed as little as possible. After construction, disturbed surfaces will be restored to a natural condition as far as is practicable.
6. Fences proposed in big game habitat will be designed to reduce adverse impacts to big game movement. Specifications in BLM Manual 1737 and in local BLM directives will be used. BLM will consult with the Arizona Game and Fish Department on the design and location of new fences.

2 – DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

7. Where existing fences in big game habitat do not meet BLM specifications, they will be modified according to BLM Manual 1737 when they are scheduled for replacement or major maintenance.
8. As a general practice, new roads will not be bladed for use in fence construction. Vehicles will travel overland, or fences will be built by hand.
9. All livestock waters will provide safe, usable water for wildlife. As funding and opportunities permit, existing facilities will be modified for safe wildlife use. The following standards apply to design and modification of livestock waters.
 - The above-ground height of livestock troughs and tanks will not exceed 20 inches. BLM will install wildlife escape ladders in each facility and provide ramps for small bird and mammal access. Storage tanks will have either a metal or floating vinyl cover to reduce evaporation and prevent wildlife from drowning.
 - Ground-level wildlife water developments will be established on livestock waters where feasible. An enclosure of three to seven acres containing the water source, storage, and related riparian habitat will be built to exclude livestock. Where terrain permits, livestock water will be provided at least 0.25 miles outside of the fenced enclosure.
 - Developed spring storage and adjacent riparian habitat will be fenced to exclude livestock.
 - Where practical, water troughs and tanks will be kept full year-round to provide a continuous water supply for wildlife.
10. Domestic sheep grazing would not be allowed on allotments containing bighorn sheep habitats to avoid transmittal of diseases.
11. BLM will initiate a cooperative Habitat Management Plan with Arizona Game and Fish Department to address critical wildlife habitat needs in the Lower Gila South Planning Area.

Woodcutting Permits

The Lower Gila Resource Area would continue to issue woodcutting permits on a case-by-case basis.

PROPOSED ACTION

The *Proposed Action* provides for a balanced level of production while protecting important resource values. The goal of this alternative is to meet statutory requirements and policy commitments and to resolve the issues in Chapter 1 in a manner that is cost efficient, is based on sound management and biological principles,

prevents any significant impairment of the land's productivity, and protects the wilderness values on 190,391 acres.

Rangeland Management Issue

Level of Grazing Management. The *Proposed Action's* grazing management objectives would be to maintain ecological rangeland condition currently in good to excellent condition and to improve those areas in poor to fair condition. BLM would not initially adjust livestock numbers on the 22 perennial-ephemeral allotments and eight perennial-ephemeral grazing leases. Authorized grazing use on the perennial-ephemeral allotments would remain at 60,524 AUMs on 1,592,278 acres. In addition, supplemental permits could be issued if sufficient ephemeral forage were known to exist and there were no conflicts with other resources. The remaining 18 allotments are designated as ephemeral allotments and do not have grazing preferences (AUMs) attached to them (Appendix 2). The 18 ephemeral allotments (416,954 acres) would continue to be administered in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule (*Federal Register*, Vol. 33, No. 238, December 7, 1968) (See Appendix 2 and 2A).

Rangeland Developments. Objectives for new rangeland developments would be to improve livestock distribution and the trend in rangeland condition. Improvement and maintenance of the rangeland would be accomplished through the construction of new rangeland developments (see Table 2-2) and through livestock adjustments if needed. Environmental assessments for specific developments would be prepared and approved before implementation to assure that all resources are adequately considered. The following rangeland developments would be constructed to implement the *Proposed Action*: 47 miles of fence, 10 reservoirs, and seven wells. Total cost of construction of these rangeland developments would amount to approximately \$371,345. Procedures for authorizing and maintaining rangeland developments are discussed in this chapter under Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives.

Rangeland Monitoring. The Lower Gila Monitoring Plan (on file at the Lower Gila Resource Area Office) would provide guidance for all allotments to be monitored in the RMP/EIS area. Needed adjustments in livestock numbers would be based on the results of up to five years of rangeland monitoring data. Upward adjustments would only be authorized if five years of monitoring showed a sustained yield of forage production and only if other resources were considered. If monitoring shows that a reduction is needed, the adjustment would be implemented over a five-year period through a signed agreement or by a decision (see Management Guidance Common to all Alternatives—Rangeland Monitoring Section). Monitoring will be more intensive on Maintain allotments and allotments indicating high browse use, as well as crucial Sonoran

TABLE 2-2
 PROPOSED RANGELAND DEVELOPMENTS
 Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District, Arizona

PROPOSED ACTION					
Allotment		Category	Reservoirs	Wells (Equipped)	Fence (Miles)
Number	Name				
3007	Beloat	Maintain	--	1	15
3009	Bighorn	Maintain	--	1	7
3013	Cameron	Maintain	--	--	5
3016	Childs	Maintain	1	--	--
3017	Clem	Custodial	--	--	--
3018	Conley	Custodial	2	--	--
3020	Coyote Flat	Custodial	--	--	--
3022	Crowder-Weisser	Maintain	2	1	--
3028	Eagle Tail	Maintain	1	1	7
3032	Gable-Ming	Custodial	--	--	--
3035	Gila Bend Indians	Custodial	--	--	--
3039	Hansen	Custodial	--	--	--
3042	Hazen	Maintain	--	1	--
3046	Kirian	Maintain	1	--	--
3047	Ranegras Plain	Maintain	--	--	--
3053	Lower Vekol	Custodial	--	--	--
3076	Sentinel	Maintain	--	1	--
3080	South Vekol	Maintain	1	--	13
3083	Table Top	Maintain	--	1	--
3085	Vekol	Maintain	1	--	--
3086	Ward	Custodial	1	--	--
3091	Why	Custodial	--	--	--
TOTALS			10	7	47

RESOURCE PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE					
Allotment		Category	Reservoirs	Wells (Equipped)	Fence (Miles)
Number	Name				
3007	Beloat	Maintain	--	1	15
3009	Bighorn	Maintain	--	1	7
3013	Cameron	Maintain	--	1	5
3016	Childs	Maintain	--	--	--
3017	Clem	Custodial	--	--	--
3018	Conley	Custodial	2	--	--
3020	Coyote Flat	Custodial	--	--	--
3022	Crowder-Weisser	Maintain	2	1	--
3028	Eagle Tail	Maintain	2	2	12
3032	Gable-Ming	Custodial	1	--	--
3035	Gila Bend Indians	Custodial	--	--	--
3039	Hansen	Custodial	1	--	--
3042	Hazen	Maintain	1	1	5
3046	Kirian	Maintain	1	--	--
3047	Ranegras Plain	Maintain	--	--	10
3053	Lower Vekol	Custodial	--	--	--
3076	Sentinel	Maintain	--	1	--
3080	South Vekol	Maintain	1	1	13
3083	Table Top	Maintain	--	1	--
3085	Vekol	Maintain	1	--	--
3086	Ward	Custodial	--	--	--
3091	Why	Custodial	--	--	--
TOTALS			12	10	67

SOURCE: Phoenix District grazing files

2 – DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

pronghorn, desert tortoise and bighorn sheep habitat and less intensive on Custodial allotments.

At a minimum, the monitoring studies would include actual yearly livestock use, forage utilization, trend in rangeland condition, and precipitation data. Actual livestock use figures supplied by the operators would be the foundation for grazing management adjustments. Rangeland specialists would evaluate condition and trend studies every three to five years to determine if conditions were improving, declining, or stable. Trend would be measured using plant frequency and cover data, and this data would be correlated to rangeland condition and compared with previous years' figures. BLM would also design studies to ensure that wildlife habitat management objectives were being met. Special emphasis would be placed on monitoring approximately 63,000 acres of riparian habitat along the Gila River (Green Belt).

Implementation. BLM would begin thorough consultation with livestock operators, affected landowners, and federal, state, and local agencies after completion of the final RMP/EIS.

After the filing of the final RMP/EIS, BLM would prepare a burro capture plan in consultation with appropriate government agencies and interest groups. All burros would be removed from the Painted Rock Reservoir area. Details for the burro capture program would be outlined in a herd management area plan (HMAP).

Normally a five-year monitoring period is required before any adjustments in livestock numbers are implemented. However, if two or three years of monitoring data, solely or in combination with the rangeland inventory data, indicate a change is necessary, adjustments would be implemented through a decision or by an agreement issued by the Lower Gila Resource Area Manager.

Wilderness Issue

The *Proposed Action* analyzes as wilderness portions of the New Water Mountains, Eagletail Mountains, Woolsey Peak, and Table Top Mountains WSAs (totaling 190,391 acres). Should these areas be designated wilderness, they would be managed to preserve their naturalness, solitude, and primitive recreation opportunities in accordance with BLM's Wilderness Management Policy and the Wilderness Act of 1964. A wilderness management plan would be developed and implemented for each area following wilderness designation by Congress.

Eight entire WSAs and portions of the four remaining WSAs would not be designated wilderness. The lands not designated (431,540 acres) would be released from the wilderness review process. After release by Congress, these lands would be managed according to provisions in the approved Lower Gila South RMP and would return to other multiple use management (see Glossary). Suitable and nonsuitable acreage for each WSA and the surface and

mineral rights recommended for acquisition through land exchange are described in Table 2-3.

Acquisition through land exchange of 2,643 acres of surface and mineral lands and 561 acres of nonfederal mineral rights within the Eagletail Mountains WSA would facilitate wilderness management and enhance wilderness and related values. Acquisition of nonfederal mineral estate would allow BLM-administered surface lands above such parcels to be incorporated into the proposed wilderness.

Land Tenure Issue

Disposal (Exchange or Sale). Approximately 73,123 acres of public land within the RMP/EIS area have been proposed for disposal. Most of these lands are isolated parcels that are difficult and uneconomical to manage. Additionally, some of these parcels are well suited for community expansion, agricultural development, and management by the Arizona State Land Department. These characteristics meet the disposal criteria described in Section 203 and 206 of *Federal Land Policy and Management Act* (FLPMA).

Lands recommended for disposal would be retained if significant resource values were found. These determinations would be made during the development of the environmental assessment and land report that is required on every disposal action.

These lands would be made available through state and private exchanges and sales (including recreation and public purpose patents and state selections). Land exchanges would be the preferred method of disposal.

Appendix 3 shows the legal description of those lands that are proposed for disposal. Table 2-4 shows a summary of recommended disposal lands by alternative.

Acquisition. Approximately 36,845 acres of nonpublic lands have been identified for acquisition. Acquisition of these lands would benefit wildlife, botanical, wilderness, and multiple use values. Appendices 4 through 8 list the benefiting resource programs and the legal descriptions of the lands to be acquired. Table 2-5 shows a summary of acres recommended for acquisition by alternative and the benefiting resource or program.

Split Mineral Estate. The split mineral estate problem must be resolved by a statewide program. In the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area there are approximately 23,645 acres of federal minerals that underlie either state or private lands and approximately 112,160 acres of federal surface estate where the underlying minerals are owned by either state or private interests. This situation causes confusion and creates problems with the individual or agency owning or managing the surface estate. Therefore, it is recommended that BLM acquire approximately 112,160 acres of state and private mineral estate and dispose of approximately 23,645 acres of federal minerals that underlie state or privately owned surface estates. The mineral estate

TABLE 2-3
WSA RECOMMENDATIONS BY ALTERNATIVE
Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District, Arizona

WSA	Public Land Acres		Recommended Land Acquisition*	
	Suitable Acres	Nonsuitable Acres	Surface and Mineral Ownership	Mineral Estate Only
PROPOSED ACTION				
New Water Mountains	24,200	16,400	0	0
Little Horn Mountains West	0	13,800	0	0
Little Horn Mountains	0	91,930	0	0
Eagletail Mountains	70,791	48,909	2,643	561
East Clanton Hills	0	36,600	0	0
Face Mountain	0	27,575	0	0
Signal Mountain	0	20,920	0	0
Woolsey Peak	61,000	12,930	0	0
North Maricopa Mountains	0	75,483	0	0
South Maricopa Mountains	0	72,004	0	0
Butterfield Stage Memorial	0	9,566	0	0
Table Top Mountains	34,400	5,423	0	0
TOTALS	190,391	431,540	2,643	561
NO WILDERNESS/NO ACTION				
New Water Mountains	0	40,600	0	0
Little Horn Mountains West	0	13,800	0	0
Little Horn Mountains	0	91,930	0	0
Eagletail Mountains	0	119,700	0	0
East Clanton Hills	0	36,600	0	0
Face Mountain	0	27,575	0	0
Signal Mountain	0	20,920	0	0
Woolsey Peak	0	73,930	0	0
North Maricopa Mountains	0	75,483	0	0
South Maricopa Mountains	0	72,004	0	0
Butterfield Stage Memorial	0	9,566	0	0
Table Top Mountains	0	39,823	0	0
TOTALS	0	621,931	0	0
ENHANCED WILDERNESS ALTERNATIVE				
New Water Mountains	24,200	16,255	0	0
Little Horn Mountains West	0	13,800	0	0
Little Horn Mountains	50,460	41,470	440	520
Eagletail Mountains	90,261	29,439	2,643	1,601
East Clanton Hills	0	36,600	0	0
Face Mountain	26,390	1,185	0	0
Signal Mountain	0	20,920	0	0
Woolsey Peak	61,000	12,930	0	0
North Maricopa Mountains	39,840	35,643	0	0
South Maricopa Mountains	0	72,004	0	0
Butterfield Stage Memorial	0	9,566	0	0
Table Top Mountains	34,400	5,423	0	0
TOTALS	326,551	295,380	3,083	2,121
ALL WILDERNESS ALTERNATIVE				
New Water Mountains	40,600	0	0	225
Little Horn Mountains West	13,800	0	(40)	1,140
Little Horn Mountains	91,930	0	1,360	1,500
Eagletail Mountains	119,700	0	4,836	2,635
East Clanton Hills	36,600	0	0	40
Face Mountain	27,575	0	0	0
Signal Mountain	20,920	0	0	1,280
Woolsey Peak	73,930	0	0	0
North Maricopa Mountains	75,483	0	(160)	4,830
South Maricopa Mountains	72,004	0	0	684
Butterfield Stage Memorial	9,566	0	0	0
Table Top Mountains	39,823	0	0	1,855
TOTALS	621,931	0	6,396	14,189

* All parcels recommended for acquisition through exchange are State of Arizona lands, except parcels in parentheses that are privately owned.

SOURCE: Phoenix District Office files

2 - DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

to be acquired is shown in Appendix 9, and the mineral estate to be disposed of is shown in Appendix 10.

Utility Corridor Issue

Over the past 10 years there has been an increase in major utility systems within the RMP/EIS area. This increase is largely because of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS) that lies in the northeastern portion of the area. Because ownership of the PVNGS is divided among Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas utility companies, there is a need for transmission systems to accommodate the out-of-state owners. Other interstate systems include two interstate highways and oil and gas lines. Along with the interstate systems there are also various intrastate systems that affect the RMP/EIS area.

In order to accommodate the existing systems and provide for the orderly development of future systems, the *Proposed Action* would designate 10 corridors (each one-mile-wide) (see Map 1-2). This would provide space for construction of future utility projects and allow for multiple occupancy by compatible users. Section 503 of FLPMA authorizes the formal designation of utility corridors.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The *No Action* alternative is the current management direction, assuming no changes in policy or funding, and it provides a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives. Currently, the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area lacks formal management direction established through approved land use plans.

Rangeland Management Issue

Level of Grazing Management. Under the *No Action* alternative, yearlong grazing would continue on 1,592,278 acres of public lands on 22 perennial-ephemeral allotments and eight perennial-ephemeral custodial leases. Livestock numbers would continue to be authorized on the perennial-ephemeral allotments and leases up to the present active preference of 60,524 animal unit months (AUMs). The remaining 18 ephemeral allotments involving 416,954 acres of public land would continue to be managed in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule. These allotments do not produce enough perennial forage on a sustained yield basis to issue yearlong grazing permits. On the perennial-ephemeral allotments, supplemental permits could be issued for ephemeral forage if the forage were known to exist and ephemeral grazing did not conflict with other resources.

Rangeland Developments. BLM would not construct new rangeland developments and would not maintain existing developments. Operator-built developments would

be authorized by either cooperative agreements or range improvement permits on a case-by-case basis as needed to facilitate livestock management.

Implementation. Since existing grazing management would continue, a specific implementation of this alternative would not be required. BLM would develop a wild burro capture plan to remove all existing burros from the Painted Rock Reservoir Herd Management Area.

Wilderness Issue

No designated BLM wilderness areas currently exist in the RMP/EIS area. Under the *No Action* alternative none of the 12 WSAs would be analyzed for designation as wilderness. All 621,931 acres (Table 2-3) would be managed under multiple use management principles with no wilderness restrictions. Subsequent management actions would be guided by laws, regulations, BLM policy, and the approved Lower Gila South RMP. This alternative represents the *No Wilderness* alternative required by BLM Wilderness Study Policy.

Land Tenure Issue

Disposal (Exchange or Sale). No lands would be proposed or offered for disposal. This in effect would require the retention of all public lands in the RMP/EIS area and no change of ownership pattern would occur (see Table 2-4).

TABLE 2-4
SURFACE ACREAGE SUITABLE FOR DISPOSAL BY ALTERNATIVE
Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District, Arizona

Proposed Action	No Action	Resource Production	Resource Protection	Environmental Protection
73,123	0	73,123	73,123	73,123

SOURCE: Phoenix District maps and files

Acquisition. Lands would not be acquired under this alternative. There would be no change in ownership pattern, and no areas would be acquired for resource enhancement (see Table 2-5).

TABLE 2-5
ACREAGE SUITABLE FOR ACQUISITION BY ALTERNATIVE
Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District, Arizona

Benefiting Resource or Program	Proposed Action	No Action	Resource Production	Resource Protection	Environmental Protection
Wilderness	2,643	0	0	3,083	6,396
Wildlife	11,120	0	2,200	16,340	17,840
Botanical	2,440	0	0	2,440	2,440
Multiple Use	20,642	0	20,642	20,642	20,642

SOURCE: Phoenix District files

Split Mineral Estate. There would be no changes proposed in the mineral ownership pattern in the RMP/EIS area.

Utility Corridor Issue

This alternative would not propose designation of utility corridors for powerline and pipeline construction. Rights-of-way applications would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

RESOURCE PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE

This alternative emphasizes increased production and development of resources that would contribute to the economy of the region. Environmental values would be protected to the extent required by laws, regulations, and policies. The issues would be resolved in a manner that would place highest priority on livestock forage utilization, leaving all areas open to mineral development and oil and gas leasing.

Rangeland Issue

Level of Management. Grazing management objectives for this alternative would be the same as the *Proposed Action*. As a result of this alternative, areas currently underutilized would become available for livestock grazing by the construction of new rangeland developments.

BLM would initially authorize 54,315 AUMs (a 10 percent reduction from the current authorized preference of 60,524 AUMs) on the 30 perennial-ephemeral allotments and leases, based on the 1980-1981 rangeland inventory survey (see Appendix 11). Allotment management plans (AMPs) would be developed on eight allotments (see Table 2-6) where potential exists for improving livestock distribution and trends in rangeland condition on approximately 531,400 acres of public land. The 18 ephemeral allotments would not change current grazing management and would continue to be managed in accordance with the Special Ephemeral Rule published in the December 1968 *Federal Register*.

TABLE 2-6
PROPOSED ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLANS (AMPs)
UNDER RESOURCE PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE
Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District, Arizona

Allotment Number	Allotment Name	Allotment Number	Allotment Name
3007	Beloat	3046	Kirian
3009	Bighorn	3076	Sentinel
3013	Cameron	3080	South Vekol
3016	Clem	3083	Table Top

SOURCE: Phoenix District files

Rangeland Developments. As in the *Proposed Action*, management objectives under the *Resource Production* alternative would be to improve livestock distribution and trend in rangeland condition through the proper placement and construction of new rangeland developments. Developments proposed in this alternative would also accommodate increased numbers of livestock, if monitoring data indicated that increases were justified. Implementation of the *Resource Production* alternative would entail the following rangeland development: 67 miles of fence, 12 reservoirs, and 10 wells (Table 2-2). Total cost of construction of these rangeland developments would amount to 23,045. Procedures for authorizing and maintaining rangeland developments would be the same as those listed in the *Proposed Action*.

Rangeland Monitoring. Detailed monitoring plans would be developed for each allotment scheduled for an allotment management plan (AMP). These plans would assess the effectiveness of the rangeland developments and grazing treatments. At a minimum, monitoring data for the perennial-ephemeral allotments would include actual use, forage utilization, trend in rangeland conditions, and precipitation data. Ephemeral allotments would be monitored through photo-points (photographs taken every other year at the same location). BLM would coordinate monitoring plans with allottees, other interested parties (universities), and other state and federal agencies.

Implementation. Implementing this alternative would require up to five years of monitoring before actual adjustments in livestock numbers would be made. Total AMPs developed under this alternative would depend on livestock operator cooperation and funds provided for rangeland developments. Priorities for AMPs would be based on (1) potential for improvement (livestock distribution and improved utilization of the range), (2) impacts on existing operations, (3) other resource requirements, and (4) economic return on investment. BLM would develop a burro capture program as in the *Proposed Action* to remove all existing wild burros from the Painted Rock Reservoir Herd Area.

Wilderness Issue

None of the 12 WSAs, involving 621,931 acres, would be analyzed for designation as wilderness under the *Resource Production* alternative (Table 2-3). This alternative is identical to the *No Action* alternative.

Land Tenure Issue

Disposal (Exchange or Sale). This alternative recommends disposing of the same lands that were identified under the *Proposed Action*. See Appendix 3 and Table 2-4.

2 – DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Acquisition. Approximately 22,842 acres of nonpublic lands would be identified for acquisition, which would benefit wildlife and multiple use values. Appendices 4 and 5 list the benefiting resource program and the legal description of the lands to be acquired. Also see Table 2-5 for a summary of lands to be acquired.

Split Mineral Estate. Same as the *Proposed Action*.

Utility Corridor Issue

Same as the *Proposed Action*.

RESOURCE PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE

The *Resource Protection* alternative emphasizes protection and enhancement of natural resources (cultural, botanical, wildlife, and wilderness) while implementing a lower level of livestock grazing. Mineral and energy exploration would be allowed only to the extent that it is compatible with resource protection. The objectives of this alternative are to facilitate the improvement and recovery of wildlife habitat on 16 allotments (Arnold, Powers Butte, Table Top, South Vekol, Vekol, Kirian, Lower Vekol, Bighorn, Conley, Coyote Flat, Why, Cameron, Childs, Hazen, Beloit, and Eagle Tail) where wildlife and livestock compete for browse (false mesquite, jojoba, and range ratany). Special emphasis would also be placed on the acquisition of prime mesquite and saltcedar habitat along the Gila River (Green Belt).

Rangeland Management Issue

Level of Grazing Management. This alternative proposes a 47 percent reduction in authorized livestock use over five years (from 60,524 AUMs to 31,914 AUMs) on 22 perennial-ephemeral allotments (see Appendix 11). Grazing management of the 18 ephemeral allotments and eight perennial-ephemeral grazing leases would be the same as the *Proposed Action*.

The level of livestock use in this alternative may be adjusted in the future to reflect new resource information gathered by monitoring or other studies. Allotments with the greatest potential for wildlife habitat improvement would have the first priority for livestock adjustments.

Rangeland Developments. No new rangeland developments would be proposed under this alternative, except for resource protection purposes. Construction of rangeland developments would be allowed only when other natural values—watershed, wildlife, wilderness—also benefit. Before specific developments are approved, environmental assessments would be prepared to assure that all resources were adequately considered. All rangeland developments used to facilitate livestock would be maintained by livestock operators.

Rangeland Monitoring. BLM specialists would place a higher number of monitoring plots on the 16 allotments displaying competition for forage between livestock and wildlife than on allotments with no conflicts. The remaining allotments would be monitored as described in the *Proposed Action*. Intensity of the monitoring studies would vary depending on the level of conflicts or controversy in resource use. If monitoring data show that adjustments in livestock use are needed, changes in permanent livestock use would be implemented over a period not to exceed five years.

Implementation. Under the *Resource Protection* alternative, reduction in livestock use levels would be phased in over a five-year period. More immediate wildlife habitat improvement and increases in wildlife populations would occur than under the *Proposed Action*. BLM would not develop AMPs under this alternative but could prepare habitat management plans (HMPs) in cooperation with the Arizona Game and Fish Department to provide for faster recovery and protection of wildlife habitat. HMPs would be implemented first on allotments with the greatest potential for improvement of aquatic and terrestrial wildlife habitat, watershed, and/or vegetation.

Wilderness Issue

The *Resource Protection* alternative would analyze for designation portions of the New Water Mountains, Little Horn Mountains, Eagletail Mountains, Face Mountain, Woolsey Peak, North Maricopa Mountains, and Table Top Mountains WSAs (326,551 acres). As wilderness, these areas would be managed for preservation of their natural character, solitude, and primitive recreation opportunities in accordance with BLM's Wilderness Management Policy and the Wilderness Act of 1964. A wilderness management plan would be developed and implemented for each area following wilderness designation by Congress.

Five entire WSAs and portions of the seven WSAs, totaling 295,380 acres, would not be designated wilderness. After release from wilderness review by Congress, these lands would be managed for their multiple use resource values according to the decisions reached in the approved Lower Gila South RMP. WSA suitable and nonsuitable acreage and recommended land acquisition for each area are described in Table 2-3.

Acquisition through land exchange of 3,083 acres of surface and mineral estate and 2,121 acres of nonfederal mineral rights within or adjacent to the WSAs would facilitate wilderness management and enhance wilderness and related values under this alternative. Acquisition of nonfederal minerals would allow BLM-administered surface lands to be incorporated into the proposed wilderness areas.

Land Tenure Issue

Disposal (Exchange or Sale). This alternative would dispose of the same lands that were identified under the *Proposed Action*. See Appendix 3 and Table 2-4.

Acquisition. Approximately 42,505 acres of nonpublic lands would be identified for acquisition, which would benefit wildlife, botanical, wilderness, and other multiple use values. Appendices 4 through 8 list the benefiting resource program and the legal description of the lands to be acquired. Also see Table 2-5 for a summary of lands to be acquired.

Split Mineral Estate. Same as the *Proposed Action*.

Utility Corridor Issue

Same as the *Proposed Action*.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would eliminate livestock grazing in the RMP/EIS area and analyzes the impacts of removing livestock from public lands. All other issues would be resolved the same as in the *Resource Protection* alternative. This alternative was developed to show the impacts of removing livestock from public rangelands and to provide managers with a full range of options to study.

Rangeland Management Issue

Level of Management. BLM would cancel all grazing permits on the 30 perennial-ephemeral allotments and grazing leases. All forage would be reserved for wildlife and other benefiting resources. Livestock grazing would be phased out over a five-year period after the filing of the final RMP. No ephemeral grazing licenses would be issued for the 18 ephemeral allotments.

Rangeland Developments. BLM would build or maintain rangeland developments only to benefit wildlife, watershed, and other benefiting resources. Livestock operators with investments on public lands would be entitled to project salvage rights. To prevent cattle from straying onto public lands, 700 miles of fence, 200 cattle-guards, and 150 gates would be required.

Monitoring. BLM would monitor wildlife habitat conditions, watershed conditions, and periodically inspect public lands to detect livestock trespass.

Implementation. Livestock grazing would be phased out over a five-year period after grazing decisions became final. A burro capture plan would be developed to remove all wild burros from the Painted Rock Reservoir Herd Area.

Wilderness Issue

The *Environmental Protection* alternative would analyze for designation as wilderness all 12 WSAs, totaling 621,931 acres. This alternative would preserve wilderness values in all WSAs. A wilderness management plan would be developed and implemented for each area following wilderness designation by Congress. This alternative represents the *All Wilderness* alternative required by BLM's *Wilderness Study Policy*. Suitable acreage and recommended land acquisition for each WSA are shown in Table 2-3.

Acquisition through land exchange of 6,396 acres of surface and mineral lands and 14,189 acres of mineral rights within or adjacent to the WSAs would facilitate wilderness management and enhance wilderness and related values. Acquisition of nonfederal minerals would allow the BLM-administered surface lands to be incorporated into the proposed wilderness areas.

Land Tenure Issue

Disposal (Exchange or Sale). This alternative would dispose of the same lands that were identified under the *Proposed Action*. See Appendix 3 and Table 2-4.

Acquisition. Approximately 47,198 acres of nonpublic lands would be identified for acquisition, which would benefit wildlife, botanical, wilderness, and other multiple use values. Appendices 4 through 8 list the benefiting resource program and the legal description of the lands to be acquired. Also see Table 2-5 for a summary of lands to be acquired.

Split Mineral Estate. Same as the *Proposed Action*.

Utility Corridor Issue

Same as the *Proposed Action*.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The analysis of the environmental consequences of the *Proposed Action* and alternatives reveals that none of the alternatives would measurably impact geology, topography, soils, water resources, protected plants, visual resources, air quality, climate, wild burros, social conditions, or fire management. Impacts would occur to rangeland management, vegetation, wilderness, land uses, minerals and energy, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, recreation, and economic conditions. Table 2-7 summarizes impacts by alternative. For a more detailed analysis of impacts, see Chapter 4.

2 - DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

TABLE 2-7
 IMPACT SUMMARY TABLE BY ALTERNATIVE
 Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District, Arizona

Resources Impacted	Proposed Action	No Action	Resource Production	Resource Protection	Environmental Protection
<u>Rangeland Management</u>					
Allocated AUMs	60,524	60,524	54,315	31,914	0
Change From Authorized Grazing	0	0	-10%	-47%	-100%
Distribution of Livestock Grazing	Improve	No Improvement	Improve	Improve	No Impact
Livestock Operators	No Impact	No Impact	Beneficial	Adverse	Adverse
Allotments Overlapped by WSA	11	0	0	19	33
Allotment Management Plans	0	0	8	0	0
<u>Vegetation</u>					
Acres Acquired (Botanical T&E)	2,440	0	0	2,440	2,440
Rangeland Condition & Trend	Slight Improvement	Static	Improve	Improve	Improve
<u>Wilderness</u>					
WSAs Recommended	4	0	0	7	12
WSA Acres Recommended	190,391	0	0	326,551	621,931
WSAs Not Recommended	8	12	12	5	0
WSA Acres Not Recommended	431,540	621,931	621,931	295,380	0
Acres to be Acquired	2,643	0	0	3,083	6,396
<u>Land Uses</u>					
Acres Recommended for Disposal	73,123	0	73,123	73,123	73,123
Acres Recommended for Acquisition	36,845	0	22,842	42,505	47,198
Split Mineral Estate Acquisition	112,160	0	112,160	112,160	122,160
Split Mineral Estate Disposal	23,645	0	23,645	23,645	23,645
<u>Utility Corridors</u>					
Number of Corridors Proposed	10	0	10	10	10
WSA Boundary-Corridor Conflicts	0	0	0	1	5
<u>Wildlife</u>					
Acres Protected by Wilderness Design.					
Desert Bighorn Sheep	147,090	0	0	241,170	373,850
Desert Tortoise	10,520	0	0	17,570	46,770
Acres Acquired	11,120	0	2,200	16,340	17,840
<u>Mineral and Energy Resources</u>					
Acres Closed to Mineral Entry	189,750	0	0	324,350	607,557
Acres Closed to Mineral Leasing	189,750	0	0	324,350	607,557
Acres of Oil & Gas Leasing Affected	189,750	0	0	324,350	607,557
Mining Claims Affected Within WSAs	199	0	0	666	3,152
<u>Cultural Resources</u>					
Acres Protected by Wilderness Design.	103,818	0	0	145,513	218,560
<u>Recreation</u>					
Acres Closed to ORVs	190,391	0	0	326,551	621,931
<u>Economic Conditions</u>					
Net Revenue (Long Term \$)					
Small Ranch	3,743	3,743	3,040	2,512	0
Medium Ranch	12,424	11,588	13,112	6,037	0
Large Ranch	36,251	34,863	36,427	13,419	0
20-Year Net Revenue (Present Value \$)					
Small Ranch	37,094	37,094	30,126	25,440	0
Medium Ranch	117,890	114,839	113,403	59,908	0
Large Ranch	350,612	345,498	323,661	135,899	0
Ranch Values (Long Term \$)					
Small Ranch	72,000	72,000	61,500	57,000	0
Medium Ranch	255,000	241,500	273,000	127,500	0
Large Ranch	909,000	894,000	925,000	445,500	0

SOURCE: Phoenix District files