

## CHAPTER 2.0 ALTERNATIVES

---

### 2.1 OVERVIEW OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has developed four alternative management strategies for managing public lands within the Ironwood Forest National Monument (IFNM). Alternative A is a “No Action Alternative”; that is, it proposes no new plan. Under this alternative, management of public land within the IFNM would continue under existing planning documents, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 7320 (Proclamation) and additionally guided by BLM’s Interim Management Policy for BLM National Monuments and National Conservation Areas (Instruction Memorandum 2002-008). Alternatives B, C, and D (the “action alternatives”) would each affect more change in management—each includes proactive responses to existing conditions and circumstances, which in many cases may have changed since the existing planning documents now in force were written. Establishment of the IFNM is, of course, the best example of this. Each alternative has a different emphasis, or theme, of management that reflects a different response to the Federal mandate to balance use and conservation of resources on public lands. All four alternatives protect objects of the monument and comply with the Proclamation and with all other applicable laws, regulations, and policies. However, Alternative B focuses on protecting monument objects through preservation by restricting public uses and access, while Alternative C focuses on allowing for public uses and access to the extent that monument objects can be protected with limited mitigation requirements. Alternative D provides for the greatest amount of accessibility and is less restrictive than Alternative C. Uses of land and resources that are not permitted by the Proclamation have been excluded from consideration under any of the alternatives.

**Alternative A (No Action)** – Alternative A would continue management of public land within the IFNM according to the management prescriptions of the 1989 Phoenix Resource Management Plan (RMP) and the Eastern Arizona Grazing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as amended by the Arizona Statewide Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire, Fuels, and Air Quality Management (USDI, BLM 2003a) and the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (USDI, BLM 1997). Alternative A also would include modifications to management mandated by the Proclamation, including protection of the objects of the monument. A description of this strategy outlines the current management guidance and the allowable uses as determined by the existing planning documents, as modified by the Proclamation. The Interim Management Policy for BLM National Monument and National Conservation Areas also would provide additional guidance until a new RMP takes effect. In other words, the No Action Alternative is current policy and would continue to be in effect until another RMP is approved (USDI, BLM 2002a).

**Alternative B** – The management theme of Alternative B is preservation—it is the most restrictive strategy, designed to protect the IFNM’s resources by imposing the most limits to use of the monument’s resources. This alternative places more restrictions on motorized and mechanized travel throughout the IFNM and favors dispersed, non-motorized recreational activities over motorized recreational activities. The types of allowable uses and the intensity of those uses are restricted to provide the strongest, reasonable protection for objects of historic, scientific, and aesthetic interest within the IFNM. Livestock grazing would be prohibited on public land upon expiration of existing leases. While developing this alternative, BLM sought to determine the minimum amount of allowable uses of monument resources to provide maximum protection to monument objects, while continuing to manage the area under the guiding principle of multiple use of public lands.

**Alternative C** – Alternative C is BLM’s proposed plan except for utility corridors. The proposed plan for utility corridors is Alternative B. Alternative C incorporates elements from each of the other alternatives and ensures the long-term conservation of public land and resources within the IFNM, continues some compatible uses that have traditionally taken place on the land within the monument, such as grazing and

recreation, and allows for appropriate levels of access for the enjoyment, appreciation, and study of the objects of the monument. In sensitive resource areas, Alternative C would provide a higher level of resource protection and less public use; however, greater opportunities for public use would be allowed outside those areas. More routes would be designated as open for motorized and mechanized travel (although fewer miles would be designated for motorized and mechanized use as compared with Alternative D). Areas of public land within the West Silver Bell Mountains and the Roskrige Mountains would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Cultural resource sites would be open to scientific and public uses, and livestock grazing would be allowed perennially on nine allotments if they are meeting public land health standards and following guidelines for grazing administration; two allotments would remain ephemeral. The management goals and objective associated with Alternative C would protect the monument objects on a broad scale; that is, the geologic features, vegetative populations, sensitive wildlife populations, scenic vistas, and other objects described in the Proclamation would be retained even if some localized and negligible losses occurred. Management actions associated with Alternative C would include resource monitoring to ensure protection of the monument objects as a whole and the ability to adapt management if resource impacts are identified.

**Alternative D** – The management theme of Alternative D is access—it emphasizes the maintenance of existing public access to IFNM lands and resources. It identifies areas that are most appropriate to accommodate various uses—especially those identified as desirable during public scoping—and emphasizes those uses, particularly with respect to transportation and recreation. This alternative would include the most miles of roads designated for motorized and mechanized use and allow for establishment of more recreational sites (e.g., campsites); the entire monument would be available for grazing. When developing this alternative, BLM sought to define a maximum amount of allowable uses of IFNM resources that would still provide adequate protection of the monument’s objects and conform to the guiding principle of sustained yield of renewable resources on public land, as set forth by the Proclamation and the Federal Lands Policy Management Act (FLPMA). That is, how many types of uses could be allowed (e.g., recreation and grazing) and how intense could those uses be (e.g., open versus restricted access, and year-round versus seasonal) without violating resource protection requirements, goals, and objectives. While the greater public accessibility provided by Alternative D may result in more localized impacts to the objects of the monument than Alternatives B and C, on the scale of the monument as a whole, the objects would be protected through the identified management goals and objectives. These objectives include the application of adaptive management concepts that would provide for changes in management should monitoring identify unacceptable resource impacts.

## **2.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL**

This section briefly describes management actions that were recommended by the public through the scoping process or the preliminary draft alternatives workshop but were not incorporated in any of the alternatives carried forward for detailed analysis in this EIS. These are presented below, along with the rationale for excluding them from further detailed consideration.

### **2.2.1 Wilderness**

BLM received suggestions from a citizen group that the new RMP establish new wilderness study areas (WSAs) within the IFNM. BLM has the authority under FLPMA Section 201 to inventory public land resources and other values, including characteristics associated with the concept of wilderness identified as naturalness, solitude, and primitive, unconfined recreation. The BLM Land Use Planning Handbook provides guidance on considering wilderness characteristics in the land-use planning process and directs BLM to identify decisions to protect or preserve wilderness characteristics. However, BLM has no authority to establish new WSAs or to report such areas to Congress. BLM can, however, protect areas in their natural state using a wide range of designations that offer the same protections. Therefore, in response to this citizen group request and as a general management concern, BLM has considered

management prescriptions in specific areas to protect wilderness characteristics, but has not included the establishment of new WSAs as part of any alternative.

### **2.2.2 Livestock Grazing**

BLM received comments recommending the elimination of livestock grazing from the IFNM. BLM considered but eliminated an alternative that would immediately remove livestock grazing from the IFNM because it was determined to be unreasonable in terms of costs to BLM and IFNM lessees, manageability, enforcement, and various other issues. BLM opted to consider a more feasible approach to the elimination of livestock grazing on the IFNM through the removal of livestock grazing as existing leases expire (as part of Alternative B). Therefore, BLM has not considered an alternative that would immediately remove livestock grazing from the IFNM, but has instead considered removal of livestock grazing from the IFNM as existing leases expire (as part of Alternative B).

### **2.2.3 Route Designations**

BLM received a map proposing a route network within the IFNM from a coalition of citizen groups. This specific network was not considered as an alternative because it did not consider access to private inholdings or State Trust land, where BLM could be required to provide access. BLM also received a suggestion to designate all routes in the IFNM as closed to motorized traffic. This alternative was not considered because it would not allow BLM to meet the management goals and objectives established for the IFNM. Instead, BLM developed a minimum route network that could be established to effectively manage the IFNM, which is included under Alternative B.

### **2.2.4 Visitor Facilities**

Some members of the public requested the construction of visitor facilities throughout the monument, thereby allowing a greater level of access to restrooms, drinking water, and other essentials. This suggestion was not considered as an alternative because the IFNM is a unit within BLM's National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS), and is managed, in part, to maintain the character of the existing setting. Part of the overarching strategy and vision for NLCS units is for BLM to work with local communities with regard to amenities and visitor facilities, which would be located in communities adjacent to BLM lands. As such, BLM has not included construction or installation of any significant visitor use facilities in the plan (refer to the entries listed under Visitor Services in Table 2-14). The proposed recreation management zones (RMZs) indicate the character of the IFNM that will be preserved in order to achieve the targeted recreational benefits/outcomes. Generally, visitors will be expected to be self-sufficient, and no facilities will be provided. However, minimal facilities could be installed in the future if needed to protect public health and safety, and resources, particularly in the Roaded Natural RMZ where the greatest amount of visitation is expected to occur.

## **2.3 MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES**

The alternative selected by the BLM for management of the IFNM must heed and be in accordance with all relevant laws, regulations, and policies of other government entities with jurisdiction over the IFNM. This management, common to all alternatives, is described below.

### **2.3.1 Presidential Proclamation**

Presidential Proclamation 7320 (see Appendix A for full text) recognizes all valid rights in existence at the time of the monument designation (June 9, 2000). The Proclamation did not revoke any existing withdrawal, reservation, or appropriation of public lands or interests in lands. However, it did establish the national monument as the dominant reservation (use of public land). The Proclamation also notes that

the jurisdiction of the State of Arizona with respect to fish and wildlife management and the rights of American Indian tribes are neither enlarged nor diminished by the monument designation.

All alternatives presented in the IFNM RMP/EIS are consistent with the guidance in the Proclamation, including provisions regarding mineral and geothermal leasing, land use authorizations, off-road motorized and mechanized vehicle use, transportation management and grazing.

### **2.3.2 Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health**

Land health standards are the goals for the desired condition of the biological and physical components and characteristics of rangelands, and apply to all resources and resource uses. Standards are measurable and attainable and comply with various Federal and State statutes, policies, and directives applicable to BLM rangelands. The Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (USDI, BLM 1997) establish three land health standards as indicators for rangeland health on public lands, as described below. The guidelines for grazing administration, which also are common to all alternatives, are presented in Appendix C.

#### **2.3.2.1 Land Health Standard 1: Upland Sites**

Upland soils exhibit infiltration, permeability, and erosion rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate and landform (ecological site).

Soil conditions support proper functioning of hydrologic, energy, and nutrient cycles. Many factors interact to maintain stable soils and healthy soil conditions, including appropriate amounts of vegetative cover, litter, and soil porosity and organic matter. Under proper functioning conditions, rates of soil loss and infiltration are consistent with the potential of the site.

Ground cover in the form of plants, litter or rock is present in pattern, kind, and amount sufficient to prevent accelerated erosion for the ecological site; or ground cover is increasing as determined by monitoring over an established period of time.

Signs of accelerated erosion are minimal or diminishing for the ecological site as determined by monitoring over an established period of time, as indicated by such factors as ground cover (including litter, live vegetation [amount and type, such as trees, shrubs, grasses], and rock) and signs of erosion (including flow pattern, gullies, rills, plant pedestaling).

#### **2.3.2.2 Land Health Standard 2: Riparian-Wetland Sites**

Riparian-wetland areas are in properly functioning condition.

Stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate for proper functioning condition for existing climate, landform, and channel reach characteristics. Riparian-wetland areas are functioning properly when adequate vegetation, landform, or large woody debris is present to dissipate stream energy associated with high water flows, as indicated by such factors as gradient, width/depth ratio, channel roughness and sinuosity of the stream channel, bank stabilization, reduced erosion, captured sediment, groundwater recharge, and dissipation of energy by vegetation.

Riparian-wetland functioning condition assessments are based on examination of hydrologic, vegetative, soil and erosion-deposition factors. BLM has developed a standard checklist to address these factors and make functional assessments. Riparian-wetland areas are functioning properly as indicated by the results of the application of the appropriate checklist (USDI, BLM 1997).

The two exemptions to Standard 2 include (1) dirt tanks, wells, and other water facilities constructed or placed at a location for the purpose of providing water for livestock and/or wildlife and which have not been determined through local planning efforts to provide for riparian or wetland habitat; and, (2) water impoundments permitted for construction, mining, or other similar activities.

### **2.3.2.3 Land Health Standard 3: Desired Resource Conditions**

Productive and diverse upland and riparian-wetland plant communities of native species exist and are maintained.

Upland and riparian-wetland plant communities meet desired plant community objectives.

Plant community objectives are determined with consideration for all multiple uses.

Objectives also address native species, and the requirements of the Taylor Grazing Act, FLPMA, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, and appropriate laws, regulations, and policies.

Desired plant community objectives will be developed to assure that soil conditions and ecosystem function described in Standards 1 and 2 are met. They detail a site-specific plant community, which when obtained, will assure rangeland health, State water quality standards, and habitat for endangered, threatened, and sensitive species. Thus, desired plant community objectives will be used as an indicator of ecosystem function and rangeland health, as indicated by composition, structure, and distribution.

The exception to Standard 3 includes ecological sites or stream reaches on which a change in existing vegetation is physically, biologically, or economically impractical.

### **2.3.3 BLM Policy**

BLM has policy guidance already established under various instruction memorandums and information bulletins from both the Washington and Arizona State offices. For example, one such policy is that “no domestic sheep or goat grazing should be allowed within buffer strips less than 9 miles surrounding desert bighorn habitat, except where topographic features or other barriers prevent physical contact (IM WO-98-140).” There are numerous policies that apply to the IFNM, and all cannot be described here in detail. For more information on BLM policies applicable to land use planning, refer to BLM Handbook H-1601-1, Land Use Planning Handbook (2005) and the information bulletins and instruction memorandums available on BLM websites for the Washington and Arizona offices (<http://www.blm.gov/nhp/efoia/wo/woerr.html> and <http://www.blm.gov/nhp/efoia/az/>, respectively).

### **2.3.4 Administrative Actions**

Administrative actions are the day-to-day activities required to serve the public and to provide optimum management of the IFNM’s resources. These actions are allowable by regulation and do not require authorization within an RMP, and generally do not require site-specific analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). For example, in day-to-day management of the IFNM, BLM is responsible for law enforcement activities that need not be authorized under the plan. Additionally, BLM may authorize or restrict access in certain areas in emergency situations (with publication of a notice in the Federal Register) or coordinate with other agencies and organizations, such as Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), for specific activities that may not require site-specific NEPA documentation efforts. Other examples of administrative actions include, but are not limited to, mapping, surveying, inventory, monitoring, and research studies. These and other administrative actions will be conducted in the IFNM, sometimes in partnership with other landowners or agencies or entities. The degree to which these actions are carried out depends upon BLM policies, available personnel, funding

levels and further environmental analysis and decision-making, as appropriate. Administrative uses and actions are listed in Appendix D.

### **2.3.5 Monitoring and Adaptive Management**

Monitoring is the repeated measurement of activities and conditions over time, with the implied purpose of using these measurements to adjust management, if needed, in order to achieve or maintain established objectives. The primary objective of monitoring in the IFNM is to detect change in the condition of monument objects as identified in Table 1-2, and to use this information to ensure continued protection of monument objects and to meet other resource objectives as identified in this plan. Two levels of monitoring will be used to meet this objective: implementation monitoring and effectiveness monitoring.

**Implementation Monitoring in the IFNM** – Implementation monitoring of land use planning decisions is used in order to determine whether management actions have been implemented and what management actions are pending implementation. (For example, the proposed plan states that specific actions, such as installation of barriers, will be taken to promote compliance with travel route designations. Implementation monitoring would determine if this actually occurs.) The BLM planning regulations (43 CFR Part 1610.4-9) call for monitoring RMPs on a continual basis and establishing intervals and standards based upon the sensitivity of the resource to the decisions involved. Implementation monitoring will be completed at least annually, and tracked in a log or report that is then made available to the public. Results of this evaluation will be used to develop annual budgets. BLM will also conduct a more intensive evaluation of the approved plan every five years to determine where management changes may be necessary and if the plan is in need of a major revision. These evaluations may occur more frequently based on changes in BLM policy or related plans that could affect the IFNM.

**Effectiveness Monitoring in the IFNM** – Effectiveness monitoring requires the collection of necessary data/information, and determines whether on-the-ground actions being taken are indeed achieving the desired goals and objectives of land use planning decisions. (For example, data would be collected in order to ensure that range conditions on IFNM are meeting the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration.) Monitoring is an integral part of all actions and programs, used not only to measure the effectiveness of actions implemented, but also to record any impacts to resources. Taken as a whole, the management actions proposed in this plan are anticipated to protect and/or enhance monument objects, as described in detail in Chapter 4. BLM's monitoring program for the IFNM will measure any change in the condition of objects, after which BLM, working with its monitoring partners, will make determinations as to whether or not BLM's actions are indeed furthering protection of monument objects. If monitoring shows that objects are going to be or are being impacted at an unacceptable level, mitigation is initiated to reverse the situation. This may include a reduction in, or elimination of, the action or situation causing the impact. As a result, although there may be some short-term disturbance to resources, the flexible and responsive management approaches under all alternatives would protect monument objects and other resources and resource uses.

### **Monitoring Process, Timeline and Public Input**

Many activities and events are currently monitored in the IFNM in order to evaluate and determine whether desired outcomes are being achieved: grazing utilization and vegetation trends are measured to support decisions on land health evaluations; off-highway vehicle (OHV) events are monitored to determine whether permit stipulations are followed and needed site rehabilitation occurs; and specific recreational activities and sites, such as shooting and shooting sites, are monitored to determine the associated impacts to resources. This plan proposes additional monitoring needs that are focused on monument objects, as well as land restoration activities, recreation, travel management, and several other resources and uses. See Table 1-2 for a general description of monument object indicators and protection thresholds to be used to determine if monument objects are being protected. See also Appendix D for

monitoring methods related to these objects and other resources and uses. Specific protocols and strategies to apply to these methods, including the identification of baselines and indicators that will be used to measure progress, appropriate monitoring time intervals, and protection thresholds, or triggers for action, will be included in a more detailed monitoring framework as part of the IFNM Approved Plan.

Within 90 days of the publication of the Approved Plan, BLM will develop an implementation strategy that will guide implementation of the actions approved in the plan. With the implementation plan in place, BLM will be prepared to initiate public input into developing a monitoring plan based on the framework included in the IFNM Approved Plan. Input from the public will include but not be limited to developing object and resource-specific monitoring designs, refining indicators, establishing limits of acceptable change, and developing monitoring and evaluation schedules. Initiation of public input into the monitoring plan will occur within six months of the publication of the IFNM Approved Plan. Monitoring activities on the IFNM will be ongoing thereafter. Public input in designing monitoring and evaluation plans and in conducting monitoring activities is critical to a successful and effective monitoring strategy. BLM will work with other agencies, as well as ranchers, organizations, volunteers and visitors to the IFNM to gather information that will aid monitoring efforts and allow BLM to more effectively execute adaptive management within the IFNM.

### **Adaptive Management**

The implementation and effectiveness monitoring processes described above are at the heart of the adaptive management approach to be undertaken on the IFNM. Adaptive management is an integrated method for addressing uncertainty in natural resource management, and requires a robust monitoring program to succeed. It is a structured process for learning by doing, examining strategies for meeting measurable goals and objectives, and then, if necessary, adjusting future management actions according to what is learned. Adaptive management is also a preplanned process. It recognizes that changes in the resource base, management information, and/or other conditions are inevitable over time and that a preplanned process must be in place to measure these changes and develop appropriate responses to maintain or improve the program's effectiveness. An adaptive management program is essential for resources with information gaps and biological uncertainty involving a potentially significant risk to the resource. Under an adaptive management approach, the management actions in IFNM RMP can be refined continuously in response to changing conditions and varied effectiveness of plan implementation to ensure that only the most effective components of the plan are retained while less effective measures are dropped or replaced. Through adaptive management, decisions, actions, and results are carefully documented and communicated to others so that the knowledge gained through experience is passed on. The adaptive management "feedback loop" allows information obtained through the monitoring and evaluation of management actions to provide information on necessary changes that could further improve management. The adaptive management feedback loop can be portrayed as:

Action → Monitoring → Evaluation → Adjustment → Action

Ultimately, the goal of this adaptive management process is to move toward desired future conditions. Tracking the progress of actions and measuring changes resulting from these activities will be critical in either determining success in protecting monument objects or the need for a different management approach.

## 2.4 FORMAT OF THE ALTERNATIVES

RMPs are broad-scale land management plans that establish desired outcomes (goals and objectives) for resource management, and identify the measures deemed likely to achieve those outcomes. The following presentation of the alternatives identifies the goals and objectives for each resource and resource use, and the measures, including management actions, allowable uses, and land use allocations, that would achieve those goals and objectives. Once an alternative is selected, the broad, plan-level decisions included in that alternative—the management actions, allowable uses, and land use allocations—will become the RMP and provide the framework for subsequent, site-specific management decisions and actions. These site-specific management decisions and actions are known as implementation-level decisions, and typically occur following adoption of the RMP, but in some cases they are identified through this RMP process. For example, decisions about designating routes as motorized or non-motorized, which are implementation-level decisions, are part of the alternatives presented in this document. Prior to being initiated, all implementation actions are subject to the appropriate level of analysis based on the NEPA process. The implementation-level actions presented in the tables below are analyzed as part of each alternative. Through this process, BLM will determine the most appropriate method of implementation that achieves the goals of the project and is consistent with the Proclamation and other management goals and objectives for the IFNM.

As described above, four management alternatives have been developed for the IFNM. Goals and objectives, proposed allowable uses and management actions, and implementation-level actions are identified in each of the four alternatives described in tables 2-1 through 2-17 below. Each alternative addresses the management of the following 17 resources or resource uses:

- Air quality
- Geology and caves resources
- Soil and water resources
- Vegetation
- Wildlife and wildlife habitat
- Special status species
- Fire ecology and management
- Cultural resources
- Paleontological resources
- Scenic and visual resources
- Wilderness characteristics
- Energy and mineral resources
- Livestock grazing
- Recreation
- Lands and realty
- Travel management
- Special designations

As shown in the tables, the action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) generally share the same goals and objectives (desired outcomes), which were identified through the planning and scoping process for this plan; the goals and objectives for the No Action Alternative are different because they are directly derived from the current land use plans (when goals and objectives are identified in those plans). The goals and objectives are followed by different sets of management actions, allowable uses, and use allocations for each alternative—these identify areas and acreages where certain land uses would be prohibited, restricted, or allowed, as well as proactive management measures. In cases where the existing management plans do not have a comparable management action, allowable use, or use allocation, the no-action alternative (Alternative A) states “No existing decisions specifically address this action.” Some implementation-level decisions have been included within the alternatives, and are analyzed as part of each alternative. The administrative actions that BLM is authorized to take outside of direction from a land use plan are listed in Appendix D.

**Table 2-1. Resource Management Alternatives for AIR QUALITY**

Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives			
NO ACTION	ACTION ALTERNATIVES		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No land use plan-level (LUP-level) goals for air quality are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Reduce fugitive dust production and manage uses to maintain Federal and State air quality standards.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for air quality are presented in the existing planning document; however, law requires compliance with Federal and State air quality standards.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Implement measures to reduce fugitive-dust within the monument, especially as they pertain to unpaved roads and other disturbed areas to less than 50 tons of PM<sub>10</sub> dust per year.</p>		
Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations			
Alternative A (No Action)	Action Alternative B	Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)	Action Alternative D
<p>1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>1. Control fugitive-dust emissions from unpaved roads and disturbed areas (e.g., parking pull-offs) regularly accessed by the public for various purposes (e.g., recreation) by using appropriate control methods, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• posting signs or creating obstacles to speed (e.g. speed bumps)</li> <li>• applying dust suppressants or gravel</li> <li>• implementing road-use restrictions</li> </ul>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-2. Management Alternatives for GEOLOGY AND CAVES**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for geologic resources are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Manage geologic features to protect natural characteristics and processes and for public enjoyment (as opposed to mining or mineral potential).</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for geologic resources are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Unique or unusual geologic and cave resources are managed to protect their visual, wildlife habitat, or other values in accordance with the proclamation.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
1. No existing decisions specifically address this action	1. If geologic resources are discovered that warrant special management, identify appropriate management actions, allowable uses, and allocations for the resource or site.	1. Same as Alternative B.	1. Same as Alternative B.
2. No existing decisions specifically address this action. The Monument proclamation warns unauthorized persons not to remove any feature of the Monument.	2. Prohibit collection of geologic resources; however, when officially authorized by permit allow collection and removal of geological resources for legitimate scientific research or educational uses.	2. Same as Alternative B.	2. Same as Alternative B.
<b>Implementation-Level Decisions</b>			
1. No implementation-level decisions are established for geologic resources.	1. Provide adequate access to geologic sites and/or features for viewing and enjoyment where public access does not conflict with other resource goals or uses.	1. Same as Alternative B.	1. Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-3. Resource Management Alternatives for SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES**

Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives			
NO ACTION	ACTION ALTERNATIVES		
<p><b>Goal:</b></p> <p>1. Land Health Standards (in Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration – see Section 2.3.2 of this Chapter) define desired outcomes for soil and water resources.</p> <p>2. Ensure that all waters on public land meet or exceed Federal and State water quality standards.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Conserve sensitive soils, desert pavement and biological soil crusts.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Manage land uses to protect the water supply needs of the biota and other natural resources.</p> <p><b>Goal 3:</b> Manage watersheds to maintain healthy conditions and restore degraded areas.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b></p> <p>Management activities would maintain or promote ground cover that would provide for infiltration, permeability, soil moisture storage, and soil stability appropriate for the ecological sites within management units. The ground cover should maintain soil organisms and plants and animals to support the hydrologic and nutrient cycles, and energy flow.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Manage land uses such that erosion and sedimentation rates are appropriate to natural conditions, and so that areas returning to natural conditions, or areas under active restoration meet, or are making progress towards meeting, Land Health Standards within five years.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Conserve areas of biological soil crusts and desert pavement with minimum disturbance so that stability of soil crusts and desert pavement is maintained.</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> Limit fugitive-dust pollution by reducing disturbance to soils.</p>		
Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations			
Alternative A (No Action)	Action Alternative B	Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)	Action Alternative D
<p>1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>1. Minimize surface disturbance during construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of facilities (including structures for recreation, livestock grazing, transportation, or any other structure within the IFNM). Develop mitigation plans and restore surfaces and stabilize soils in accordance with resource management and/or restoration objectives.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>

Soil and Water (continued)

2. Maintain and improve soil cover and productivity through erosion-prevention measures and land treatments, and incorporate salinity control measures into erosion-prevention strategies and rehabilitation treatments.	2. Same as Alternative A.	2. Same as Alternative A.	2. Same as Alternative A.
3. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	3. In areas of sensitive or fragile soils, prohibit new ground-disturbing activities. Mitigate existing ground-disturbing activities.	3. In areas of sensitive or fragile soils, allow new and continuing ground-disturbing activities with mitigation.	3. Same as Alternative C.
4. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	4. Prohibit surface-water diversions and groundwater pumping that removes water from within the monument boundary to outside its boundary, or adversely affects the monument's values.	4. Same as Alternative B.	4. Same as Alternative B.
5. Designate the 16,699-acre Agua Blanca Ranch Multiple Resource Management Area.	5. Discontinue the Agua Blanca Ranch Multiple Resource Management Area.	5. Same as Alternative B.	5. Same as Alternative B.
6. Designate the 47,976-acre Cocoraque Butte-Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area.	6. Discontinue the Cocoraque Butte-Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area.	6. Same as Alternative B.	6. Same as Alternative B.
<b>Implementation-Level Decisions</b>			
1. Develop an activity plan for the Agua Blanco Ranch Multiple Resource Management Area and manage to improve watershed condition to satisfactory, increase soil cover, and reduce sediment.	1. Do not develop an activity plan for the Agua Blanca Multiple Resource Management Area.	1. Same as Alternative B.	1. Same as Alternative B.
2. Implement an activity plan for the Cocoraque Butte-Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area, and manage to improve watershed condition to satisfactory, increase soil cover, reduce sediment yield, improve ecological site condition to good, and promote the recovery of an endangered plant.	2. Do not implement the activity plan for Cocoraque Butte-Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area.	2. Same as Alternative B.	2. Same as Alternative B.

Soil and Water (continued)

3. No implementation decisions specifically address this action.	3. Maintain or remove existing flood- and erosion-control structures, based on an analysis of their functionality.	3. Same as Alternative B.	3. Same as Alternative B.
--	--	---------------------------	---------------------------

**Table 2-4. Resource Management Alternatives for VEGETATION**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Assure adequate vegetative cover with an approximate mix of natural plant species that meet acceptable range health standards based on current ecological conditions.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Each vegetation community is maintained within its natural range of variation in plant composition, structure, and function.</p> <p><b>Goal 3:</b> Follow Land Health Standards to achieve desired outcomes for vegetation resources.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Assure adequate vegetative cover with an approximate mix of natural plant species that meet acceptable range health standards based on current ecological conditions.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Manage to protect, enhance and restore as appropriate vegetation communities to maintain their natural range of variation in plant composition, structure, and function. Communities within the monument include (1) paloverde–cacti-mixed scrub; (2) jojoba chaparral; (3) creosotebush–white bursage; (4) curly mesquite grass-scrub; and xeroriparian.</p> <p><b>Goal 3:</b> Manage grazing, off-highway vehicles, and other uses to prevent the introduction and spread of noxious weeds and invasive species into and within the IFNM.</p> <p><b>Goal 4:</b> Manage allowable and authorized uses of the monument to minimize potential impacts on vegetation.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for vegetation are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Limit the impact of invasive species and noxious weeds on natural resources and processes by reducing the distribution and abundance of these species. Reduce known infestations by 10% annually.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Priority habitats, vegetation assemblages, and species will be managed to maintain the vegetative community complex while recognizing valid existing rights and appropriate catastrophic wildfire dangers.</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> Manage collection and/or salvage of desert vegetation for personal and commercial uses (including firewood) in accordance with monument objectives and the State of Arizona Native Plant Law, while taking into consideration potential traditional and/or cultural uses.</p> <p><b>Objective 4:</b> Manage activities on the monument to maintain the following priority species and habitats: (1) dense or large ironwoods (<i>Olneya tesota</i>); (2) cholla forest; (3) cactus dunes; (4) creosote rings; (5) xeroriparian vegetation; (6) curly mesquite grassland; (7) jojoba chaparral; (8) the Ragged Top vegetation assemblage; and (9) Nichol Turk’s head cactus; and special status species (discussed further in Table 2-6, Special Status Species). Ensure no net loss of high priority species and habitats throughout the IFNM.</p> <p><b>Objective 5:</b> Restore the diversity and distribution of existing natural plant communities in disturbed areas to their ecological site potential, with conditions moving toward ecological site potential within 5 to 10 years.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<p>1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>1. Minimize surface disturbance that results in loss of existing vegetation cover. Restrict surface-disturbing activities to methods that allow for re-sprouting of tree and shrub species unless permanent construction is required.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>

Vegetation (continued)

<p>2. No existing decisions specifically address this action. The Monument proclamation warns unauthorized persons not to remove any feature of the Monument.</p>	<p>2. Removal and/or use of living or dead and down native plant material is prohibited, with the following exceptions, when specifically authorized: (1) non-commercial Native American traditional use/collection, (2) seed collection and transplant for revegetation projects within the IFNM, (3) collection for scientific purposes as authorized with a BLM Special Use Permit, (4) administrative vegetation treatment to ensure adequate side and overhead clearance along designated routes, (5) consumption by wildlife, and (6) consumption by livestock (until grazing leases expire).</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B, except (6) consumption by livestock.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative C, with the addition of: (7) collection of dead and down wood for firewood use while camping within the IFNM (except where BLM has determined through inventory and monitoring that firewood collection negatively impacts objects of the monument).</p>
<p>3. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>3. Pursue an integrated weed management approach to prevent the introduction of and control invasive species and noxious weeds using methods including mechanical, chemical, and biological treatments. Use biological control methods to control invasive plant species if appropriate safety measures are applied, and in coordination with appropriate Federal, State, County, municipal and tribal agencies.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>4. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>4. Assign priority to the control of invasive species and noxious weeds that have a substantial and apparent impact on native plant communities and wildlife. When infestations are identified, they would be evaluated for their potential threat. Prioritize treatment of species that are identified as aggressive invasive species or are considered noxious weeds, and are located within priority vegetative habitats. Schedule other species for action in coordination with partners.</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative B.</p>

<p>5. Develop an activity plan for the Cocoraque Butte-Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area and manage to improve watershed condition to satisfactory, increase soil cover, reduce sediment yield, improve ecological site condition to good, promote the recovery of an endangered plant, and enhance water quality and stream flow.</p>	<p>5. Restore disturbed areas based on a restoration plan to be developed within two years following RMP approval. Include the following elements in the restoration plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identification of disturbed areas</li> <li>• inventory and description of the history of areas to be restored</li> <li>• objectives and success criteria for the restoration efforts at each site</li> <li>• restoration strategies to be implemented at each site</li> <li>• duration and severity of restricted uses after restoration activities are implemented</li> <li>• monitoring protocol to be used to assess restoration efforts against the objectives and success criteria</li> <li>• adaptive management strategies to address situations where success criteria are not met</li> <li>• priorities for restoration</li> </ul>	<p>5. Same as Alternative B, but restore disturbed areas based on a restoration plan to be developed within five years.</p>	<p>5. Restore areas on a case-by-case basis.</p>
<p>6. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>6. Emphasize passive restoration by natural processes to return sites to their desired resource conditions and hydrological functions; use active reclamation practices to stabilize and reclaim sites that are likely to be successfully reclaimed using active management methods due to their ecological characteristics, and that are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• severely damaged, rapidly deteriorating, or rapidly expanding</li> <li>• placing adjacent resources at risk</li> <li>• prone to invasion by nonnative species</li> <li>• heavily disturbed, such as mining sites</li> <li>• capable of improving habitat for special status species</li> <li>• a management priority and require accelerated restoration to meet a selected management</li> </ul>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>

	<p>objective, such as obliterating a route to effectively implement a route closure or restoring an important habitat function</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identified as having high visual resource values that are being affected</li> <li>• located in priority vegetative habitats</li> </ul>		
7. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	7. Use a variety of vegetation reclamation methods, as appropriate, to restore and promote a natural range of native plant associations. Methods may include mechanical, chemical, and biological treatments.	7. Same as Alternative B.	7. Same as Alternative B.
8. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	8. Use native plants for all restoration projects.	8. Same as Alternative B.	8. Use native plants as the first priority for all restoration projects. Non-intrusive, non-native plants may be used in limited, emergency situations where they may be necessary to protect the resources or when taking no action would further degrade the resources. Allow use to the extent that it complies with the vegetation objectives and other management goals and objectives. In these situations, use of short-lived species in combination with native species would be preferred to facilitate the establishment of native species.
9. Fencing is evaluated and installed on a case-by-case basis.	9. Fence along designated routes, as necessary, to prevent damage to sensitive and unique vegetation and minimize the spread of invasive species and noxious weeds. Fencing would be designed and installed consistent with the procedures and configurations described in BLM Manual H-1741, Fencing.	9. Same as Alternative B.	9. Same as Alternative B.
10. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	10. Avoid projects or activities that could disturb priority species or habitats. Require mitigation when avoidance is not possible.	10. Same as Alternative B.	10. Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-5. Resource Management Alternatives for WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE HABITAT**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for wildlife and wildlife habitat are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Sustain ecological conditions within the IFNM that continue to support the wildlife populations and achieve Arizona Game and Fish Department wildlife management goals.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Conserve, enhance, and, where appropriate, restore native wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p> <p><b>Goal 3:</b> Maintain or enhance wildlife corridors between blocks of habitat.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for wildlife and wildlife habitat are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Manage wildlife habitat in cooperation with adjacent land owners to minimize degradation, loss, and fragmentation throughout the monument.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Manage and/or conserve areas identified as important for the viability of priority species and bighorn sheep populations, including, but not limited to lambing areas and movement corridors. Within 10 years, enhance habitat conditions in movement corridors so they are conducive to wildlife movement.</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> Manage for wildlife water availability to sustain optimal wildlife population sizes as determined by AGFD. Minimize adverse impacts of current and potential waters on all wildlife species.</p> <p><b>Objective 5:</b> Manage access and transportation, and implement use restrictions to protect wildlife habitat values, decrease human-wildlife conflicts, and reduce and/or minimize fragmentation of habitat.</p> <p><b>Objective 6:</b> Manage allowable activities and uses to protect the following priority species: game species, bighorn sheep, mule deer, javelina, burrowing owls, migratory birds, and special status species (special status species as of the date of this document are listed in Chapter 3) to sustain healthy populations.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	1. Priority habitats for wildlife are bighorn sheep habitat (as allocated for the Wildlife Habitat Management Area [WHA] below), xeroriparian habitat, and desert tortoise habitat categories I and II (desert tortoise are discussed further in Table 2-6, Special Status Species).	1. Same as Alternative B.	1. Same as Alternative B.
2. Silver Bell Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Area includes 56,800 acres (of Federal, State Trust, and private land, of which approximately 41,470 acres are BLM managed surface estate within the IFNM), including areas outside the IFNM boundary (refer to Map 2-1; areas outside the IFNM boundary are not shown).	2. Discontinue the 41,470 acres Silver Bell Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Area. Instead, approximately 29,820 acres are allocated for the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA (as shown on Map 2-2) to protect habitat, lambing areas, and movement corridors. The WHA would be managed in conjunction with appropriate agencies.	2. Same as Alternative B.	2. Same as Alternative B.

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat (continued)

<p>3. For the Silver Bell Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Area: develop an activity plan; prohibit surface occupancy for oil/gas development on 800 acres of Ragged Top; limit motorized vehicles to existing roads and trails, except close 800 acres on Ragged Top; acquire land.</p>	<p>3. For the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA: In coordination with AGFD, implement closures to human entry from January 1 through April 30, as needed, based on information and monitoring data gathered on lambing areas within the WHA, as identified by available information and monitoring data. Lambing areas are closed to sheep and goats year-round. (NOTE: Adaptive management techniques would be used as lambing areas change over time).</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>4. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>4. As appropriate, BLM would coordinate the evaluation and implementation of proposals to enhance wildlife populations through partnerships with the AGFD and other agencies as necessary to determine what levels of wildlife introductions or habitat enhancements are appropriate for each desired plant community.</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>5. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>5. Dogs are prohibited on public land within the monument.</p>	<p>5. Dogs must be leashed when on public land within the monument, except when being used for hunting or when being used for livestock operations.</p>	<p>5. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>6. Modify existing waters (within the Cocoraque and Agua Dulce Ranches) as necessary to make the sources safer for use by wildlife.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• escape ramps would be placed in troughs to prevent animal drowning</li> <li>• floating platforms would be placed in open top storage tanks to prevent bird drowning.</li> </ul>	<p>6. Evaluate and implement, as appropriate, proposals for wildlife waters including selecting sites and installing new waters; modifying, replacing, and/or repairing existing waters; and removing nonfunctioning waters. Coordinate with AGFD for this action. Any new or modified waters would be designed consistent with current standards for wildlife and public safety.</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat (continued)

<p>7. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>7. Remove fences, roads, and facilities that are no longer necessary for transportation, wildlife management, monument administration, or other purposes in their present locations.</p>	<p>7. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>7. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>8. If necessary, the BLM would modify those portions of existing fence lines found to be restricting deer or desert bighorn sheep travel. Fence lines creating hazards to wildlife because of maintenance needs would be repaired by the operator (within the Cocoraque and Agua Dulce Ranches).</p>	<p>8. Construct or modify fences as necessary to maintain safe, unrestricted travel by wildlife. Fencing would be designed and installed consistent with the procedures and configurations described in BLM Manual H-1741, Fencing.</p>	<p>8. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>8. Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-6. Resource Management Alternatives for SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES**

Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives			
NO ACTION	ACTION ALTERNATIVES		
<p><b>Goal:</b></p> <p>No LUP-level goals for special status species are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Conserve special status species (including Federally listed species, Arizona’s Wildlife of Special Concern, Priority Vulnerable Species in Pima County, BLM Sensitive Species, Arizona Department of Agriculture); where necessary, enhance or restore their habitats.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b></p> <p>Conservation of Federal threatened or endangered, proposed, candidate, and other special status species is promoted by the maintenance or restoration of their habitats.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Manage land uses to sustain adequate habitat for special status species.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Restore large disturbed areas (&gt; 1 acre) within priority special status species habitats within 10 years, including roads and other habitat alterations.</p>		
Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations			
Alternative A (No Action)	Action Alternative B	Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)	Action Alternative D
<p>1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>1. Priority special status species habitats include: (1) 2,240 acres of Nichol Turk’s head cactus habitat; (2) 58,810 acres of desert tortoise habitat categories I and II; and (3) lesser long-nosed bat foraging habitat (the IFNM in its entirety).</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>2. Manage approximately 3,342 acres as the Waterman Mountains Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) for the Nichol Turk’s head cactus (Map 2-3). NOTE: This includes both Federal and non-Federal land; approximately 2,240 acres are administered by BLM.</p>	<p>2. Manage approximately 2,240 acres of Nichol Turk’s head cactus habitat on BLM-administered public land as the Waterman Mountains Vegetation Habitat Management Area (VHA) for the protection of this species (Map 2-4).</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B (except refer to Map 2-5).</p>

Special Status Species (continued)

<p>3. Within the Waterman Mountains ACEC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit land use authorizations except along existing roads.</li> <li>• Acquire approximately 1,140 acres (of non-Federal land).</li> <li>• Continue implementing 1986 HMP.</li> </ul>	<p>3. Within Waterman Mountains VHA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit land use authorizations except along routes designated for motorized use.</li> <li>• Acquire non-Federal land, which upon acquisition would be managed as part of the VHA.</li> <li>• Revise and implement the 1986 HMP.</li> <li>• Prohibit camping (on BLM-administered land) in the VHA.</li> </ul>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow camping within the VHA. (Refer to Table 2-14, Recreation for more information regarding camping.)</li> </ul>	<p>3. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>4. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>4. Approximately 6,780 acres are allocated as the Ragged Top VHA as shown on Map 2-4.</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>4. Allocate 6,500 acres as the Ragged Top VHA as shown on Map 2-5.</p>
<p>5. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>5. Within Ragged Top VHA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acquire non-Federal land, which upon acquisition would be managed as part of the VHA.</li> <li>• Prohibit camping (on BLM-administered land) in the VHA.</li> </ul>	<p>5. Same as Alternative B, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow camping within the VHA. (Refer to Table 2-14, Recreation for more information regarding camping.)</li> </ul>	<p>5. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>6. No existing decisions specifically address this action. However, as a matter of policy, BLM would follow the efforts described in Alternative B.</p>	<p>6. Implement the applicable conservation measures found in the Lesser Long-nosed Bat Recovery Plan (USFWS 1994), including measures to protect columnar cacti and agaves. Refer to Appendix E.</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>7. No existing decisions specifically address this action. However, as a matter of policy, BLM would follow the efforts described in Alternative B.</p>	<p>7. Implement measures to conserve desert tortoise habitat, as prescribed in Desert Tortoise Habitat Management on the Public Lands: A Rangeland Plan (USDI, BLM 1988). Refer to Appendix E.</p>	<p>7. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>7. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>8. Minimize livestock impacts on listed or candidate plants by providing water sources away from existing populations. Move or replace livestock waters that are found to be causing habitat deterioration near rare plants.</p>	<p>8. No relocation or additional livestock water sources would be provided (BLM would not invest in range improvements because grazing leases would begin to expire in 2009).</p>	<p>8. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>8. Same as Alternative A.</p>

Special Status Species (continued)

<p>9. Implement the Nichol Turk’s head cactus recovery plan to increase soil cover, reduce sediment yield, improve ecological site condition to good, and promote the recovery of the endangered plant.</p>	<p>9. Implement the Nichol Turk’s head cactus recovery plan to increase soil cover, reduce sediment yield, and improve ecological site conditions.</p>	<p>9. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>9. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>10. Implement conservation measures (refer to Appendix E) during fire suppression operations to reduce the effects of fire management actions on threatened and endangered species.</p>	<p>10. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>10. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>10. Same as Alternative A.</p>

**Table 2-7. Resource Management Alternatives for FIRE ECOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Fuels in the wildland-urban interface are maintained at levels to provide for public and firefighter safety.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Each vegetation community is maintained within its natural range of variation in plant composition, structure, and function, and fuel loads are maintained below levels that are considered to be hazardous.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Maintain fuels in the wildland-urban interface at levels to provide for public and firefighter safety.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Maintain each vegetation community within its natural range of variation in plant composition, structure, and function, and maintain fuel loads below levels that are considered to be hazardous.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for fire management are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> All fuels treatment actions will prioritize public and firefighter safety.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Maintain characteristics of Fire Regime Condition Class 1 (vegetation composition, structure, and fuels are similar to those of the historical regime and do not pre-dispose the system to risk of loss of key ecosystem components; wildland fires are characteristic of the historical fire regime behavior, severity, and patterns; disturbance agents, native species habitats, and hydrologic functions are within the historical range of variability; smoke production potential is low in volume).</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> Suppress wildfire in the shortest practical time using minimum impact suppression tactics, while minimizing suppression costs.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<p>1. IFNM is allocated to Non-Wildland Fire Use (areas not suitable for wildland fire use for resource benefit). This allocation requires mitigation and suppression to prevent direct threats to life or property. It includes areas where fire never played a large role, historically, in the development and maintenance of the ecosystem, and some areas where fire return intervals were very long. It also includes areas (including some wildland urban interface [WUI] areas) where an unplanned ignition could have negative effects to the ecosystem unless some form of mitigation takes place.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>

Fire Ecology (continued)

2. Maintain full suppression in all areas in accordance with applicable conservation measures (refer to Appendix E).	2. Same as Alternative A.	2. Same as Alternative A.	2. Same as Alternative A.
3. Implement programs to reduce unwanted ignitions, and emphasize prevention, detection, and rapid suppression response techniques.	3. Same as Alternative A.	3. Same as Alternative A.	3. Same as Alternative A.
4. Where fuel loading is high, use biological, mechanical or chemical treatments to maintain non-hazardous levels of fuels, reduce the hazardous effects of unplanned wildland fires, and meet resource objectives. Use of prescribed fire is prohibited.	4. Same as Alternative A.	4. Same as Alternative A.	4. Same as Alternative A.
5. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	5. A Resource Advisor would be present on all fires within the IFNM.	5. Same as Alternative B.	5. Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-8. Resource Management Alternatives for CULTURAL RESOURCES**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal</b> No LUP-level goals for cultural resources are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Recognize the potential public and scientific uses of the cultural resources on monument lands, and manage those resources so that their values are not diminished, but rather are maintained and enhanced.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> The objective of cultural resources management in the RMP area is to protect the information potential or the public use values of properties or to manage them, where applicable, for conservation.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Allocate cultural resources to one of five use categories: (1) scientific use, (2) conservation for future use, (3) traditional use, (4) public use, (5) experimental use, or classify as discharged from management, according to the BLM Cultural Resource Manual 8110.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Protect the variety of cultural resources on monument lands to preserve their integrity and historic and prehistoric context.</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> On sites not allocated for scientific or public use, cultural resources are undisturbed, with any changes only attributable to natural causes.</p> <p><b>Objective 4:</b> Research activities in the monument yield additional and new information regarding cultural resources and improve management and protection.</p> <p><b>Objective 6:</b> Educational activities enhance public understanding and appreciation of cultural resources, and further protection of cultural resources.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	1. Sites would be allocated and re-allocated according to the BLM Cultural Resource Manual 8100 using the criteria pertinent to the specified use listed below and in response to changing resource conditions, public use, research opportunities, and other reasons.	1. Same as Alternative B.	1. Same as Alternative B.
<i>Scientific Use</i>	<i>Scientific Use</i>	<i>Scientific Use</i>	<i>Scientific Use</i>
2. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	2. Sites that are most important for the scientific or historical information they contain are allocated to scientific use. Sites are allocated to this category based on the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>significance and uniqueness of site</li> </ul>	2. Same as Alternative B, in addition the Santa Ana de Cuiquiburitac site (640 acres) is allocated to scientific use.	2. Same as Alternative C.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• potential to contribute toward scientific understanding</li> <li>• capability of currently available scientific methods to achieve research goals</li> <li>• appropriate research proposal that will further scientific understanding or resource management</li> <li>• existing threats to site, including vandalism, erosion, or other types of disturbance.</li> </ul> <p>The following general sites classes may be allocated to scientific use.</p> <p>Classes of prehistoric sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• village sites, camp sites, agricultural sites, rock shelters or cave sites</li> <li>• lithic scatters, artifact scatters</li> <li>• groundstone manufacturing sites</li> <li>• rock features and alignments</li> <li>• food and other resource processing sites, roasting pits</li> <li>• hunting blinds and ambush sites</li> <li>• trail sites</li> <li>• tinaja and spring sites</li> <li>• petroglyph sites, pictograph sites</li> <li>• intaglio sites</li> </ul> <p>Classes of historic sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ranches, homesteads, and associated features and components</li> <li>• livestock raising related sites, agricultural features</li> <li>• mines and prospecting sites</li> <li>• settlements and camps</li> <li>• roads, trails, and driveways, railroads and associated features, stage stops and stations</li> <li>• public works sites, military camps and sites</li> </ul>		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rock features and walls</li> <li>• facilities used in commerce</li> <li>• wells and water developments, water control features</li> <li>• artifact scatters</li> <li>• historic aboriginal sites</li> <li>• historic rock art</li> <li>• trash dumps</li> </ul>		
3. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	3. Allow scientific and historical studies, which do not involve any ground-disturbing activities, by permitted qualified researchers at selected sites allocated to scientific use. Assign the highest priority for study to sites that are threatened with damage from human activities or natural processes, areas of scientific interest, sites eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and areas where research may inform management actions or otherwise benefit IFNM management and resources. Use historic contexts and research designs to provide guidance for scientific studies.	3. Allow scientific and historical studies, including excavation if warranted, by permitted qualified researchers at selected sites allocated to scientific use. Assign the highest priority for study to sites that are threatened with damage from human activities or natural processes, areas of scientific interest, sites eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and areas where research may inform management actions or otherwise benefit IFNM management and resources. Use historic contexts and research designs to provide guidance for scientific studies.	3. Same as Alternative C.
<i>Public Use</i>	<i>Public Use</i>	<i>Public Use</i>	<i>Public Use</i>
4. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	4. Sites managed for public use would be protected and developed as interpretive exhibits in place, or for related educational and recreational uses. No sites are allocated for public use at this time.	4. Sites managed for public use would be protected and developed as interpretive exhibits in place, or for related educational and recreational uses. Sites allocated to public use include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Segments of the Historic Sasco Railroad located on public land</li> <li>b. Historic sites associated with Silver Bell Mine on public land</li> <li>c. Historic ranching sites</li> <li>d. Certain agricultural use areas within the existing Avra Valley</li> </ul> Other sites may be allocated to public use based on the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the ability of the site to support public use while protecting monument objects</li> </ul>	4. Same as Alternative C.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• presence of aboveground features, such as structures or rock art, landscape characteristics, or other features that are of interest to the public and are amenable to interpretive development</li> <li>• the condition of the site and the feasibility of treating or stabilizing selected areas to withstand visitation</li> <li>• accessibility to travel routes;</li> <li>• visitor safety</li> <li>• compatibility of other land uses and site values, such as traditional use by Native Americans</li> <li>• feasibility of regular inspections by BLM staff and volunteers</li> <li>• partnership opportunities for interpretive and educational projects</li> <li>• unique site(s) and/or interpretive opportunity not available in the surrounding area</li> </ul>	
<p>5. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>5. No group tours of cultural sites would be allowed because no sites would be allocated to public use.</p>	<p>5. Restrict visitor access, group tours, and group size as needed to prevent any damage from visitor use. Require commercial tour operators to receive Arizona Site Steward training and provide appropriate educational information on archaeological site etiquette and resource conservation to their customers if cultural sites are included on tours. Require tour operators to report vandalism or damage to sites.</p>	<p>5. Same as Alternative C.</p>

<i>Traditional Use</i>	<i>Traditional Use</i>	<i>Traditional Use</i>	<i>Traditional Use</i>
6. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	6. Allocate sites to traditional use that are important in maintaining the identity, heritage or well being of American Indian tribes or other cultural groups. Sites allocated for traditional use are managed in ways that recognize the importance ascribed to them and seek to accommodate their continuing traditional use.	6. Same as Alternative B.	6. Same as Alternative B.
7. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	7. Allocate sites to traditional use based on consultation with affiliated Indian tribes and consideration of other public uses.	7. Same as Alternative B.	7. Same as Alternative B.
8. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	8. Continue to consult with American Indian tribes to identify places of traditional importance and associated access needs. Develop measures for managing and protecting places that might be identified by tribes during the life of the plan. Honor tribal requests to protect the confidentiality of sensitive information, to the extent permitted by law.	8. Same as Alternative B.	8. Same as Alternative B.
<i>Conservation for Future Use</i>	<i>Conservation for Future Use</i>	<i>Conservation for Future Use</i>	<i>Conservation for Future Use</i>
9. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	9. Allocate sites to the conservation for future use category that are of singular historic importance, architectural interest or cultural importance. Their unusual significance makes them unsuitable for scientific or historical study that would result in their physical alteration. Allocate the Santa Ana de Cuiquiburitac site (640 acres) to Conservation for Future Use.	9. Allocate sites to the conservation for future use category that are of singular historic importance, architectural interest or cultural importance. Their unusual significance makes them unsuitable for scientific or historical study that would result in their physical alteration. No sites are allocated for conservation for future use at this time.	9. Same as Alternative C.
10. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	10. Sites would be conserved for the future until specified provisions were met such as the discovery of new information about the site, the development of new scientific techniques capable of fully realizing	10. Same as Alternative B.	10. Same as Alternative B.

Cultural Resources (continued)

	the research potential of the site, or damage to the site's integrity from vandalism or natural processes.		
<i>Experimental Use</i>	<i>Experimental Use</i>	<i>Experimental Use</i>	<i>Experimental Use</i>
11. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	11. Sites best suited for controlled experimental studies that would improve management of other sites would be allocated to the experimental use category.	11. Same as Alternative B.	11. Same as Alternative B.
12. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	12. Sites in this category would be considered for studies such as testing and measuring the rate of natural or human-caused deterioration, testing the effectiveness of certain protection measures, and testing the effects of fire. Studies would develop new research or interpretation methods or would generate similar kinds of practical management information. Experimental study would not be applied to cultural properties with strong research potential, traditional cultural importance, or good public use potential if it would significantly diminish those values. Justifications would be made in terms of weighing the benefits of specific information to be gained versus the loss of cultural attributes or data that may occur during the experiment or study.	12. Same as Alternative B.	12. Same as Alternative B.
<i>Cultural Resource Management Areas</i>	<i>Cultural Resource Management Areas</i>	<i>Cultural Resource Management Areas</i>	<i>Cultural Resource Management Areas</i>
13. Designate the 2,720-acre Avra Valley as a Cultural Resource Management Area.	13. Discontinue the designation of the Avra Valley as a Cultural Resource Management Area.	13. Same as Alternative B.	13. Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-9. Resource Management Alternatives for PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal</b> No LUP-level goals for paleontology are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Protect paleontological resources.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for paleontology are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Manage paleontological resources for their scientific, educational and recreational values.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<p>1. The collection of any objects, including... paleontological resources... should not be permitted, except where intended for legitimate scientific uses for which documentation is provided to the satisfaction of the responsible management official.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>
<p>2. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>2. Require field surveys for paleontological resources prior to any ground-disturbing activities on IFNM lands and mitigate according to BLM guidelines.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-10. Resource Management Alternatives for SCENIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives	
NO ACTION	ACTION ALTERNATIVES
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for scenic and visual resources are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Preserve the monument’s natural scenic and visual values, and where appropriate, rehabilitate disturbed areas that impact important views.</p>
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for scenic and visual resources are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Maintain or enhance opportunities to view those landscapes of the monument that may be valued for scenic, cultural, biological, recreation, or other reasons. Preserve the visual quality of those landscapes visible from important viewing areas or key observation points, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• specific scenic road corridors</li> <li>• recreational sites and areas (perhaps as characterized by Recreational Management Zones [RMZs])</li> <li>• designated motorized and non-motorized trails</li> <li>• cultural and historic areas</li> <li>• residences in and near the monument</li> <li>• other sites/areas with identified place-based values</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Prioritize disturbed areas for rehabilitation based on the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of visual contrast with the surrounding area</li> <li>• Distance the area is visible</li> <li>• Proximity to high recreation and/or visitor use areas or scenic routes and overlooks</li> <li>• High scenic quality</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> Apply best management practices and visual design guidelines to minimize visual contrast of proposed projects to achieve Visual Resource Management (VRM) objectives to the greatest extent possible.</p> <p><b>Objective 4:</b> Manage the transportation system to provide a variety of sightseeing opportunities.</p>

<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<i>VRM Classes</i>	<i>VRM Classes</i>	<i>VRM Classes</i>	<i>VRM Classes</i>
1. Manage all public land as VRM Class III areas (Map 2-6).	1. Consistent with visual resources values and other resources and resource use allocations, manage visual resources on IFNM lands according to the following VRM class allocations: Class I: 36,990 acres Class II: 88,120 acres Class III: 3,290 acres  The VRM Classes for this alternative are shown on Map 2-7.	1. Consistent with visual resources values and other resources and resource use allocations, manage visual resources on IFNM lands according to the following VRM class allocations: Class II: 124,900 acres Class III: 3,420 acres Class IV: 80 acres  The VRM Classes for this alternative are shown on Map 2-8.	1. Consistent with visual resources values and other resources and resource use allocations, manage visual resources on IFNM lands according to the following VRM class allocations: Class II: 122,580 acres Class III: 4,220 acres Class IV: 1,600 acres  The VRM Classes for this alternative are shown on Map 2-9.
2. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	2. Rehabilitate existing disturbed areas, as feasible, that attract attention to achieve visual contrast level consistent with designated VRM class.	2. Same as Alternative B.	2. Same as Alternative B.
3. No implementation decisions specifically address this action.	3. Manage activities that result in fugitive-dust (e.g., road route system) to protect visual quality in the monument (see also alternatives for air quality and transportation).	3. Same as Alternative B.	3. Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-11. Resource Management Alternatives for LANDS MANAGED TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for areas with wilderness characteristics are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Protect wilderness characteristics where they provide for the greatest opportunities for a combination of naturalness, opportunities for solitude, and/or opportunities for unconfined recreation.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Allow land uses and authorizations compatible with wilderness characteristics and consistent with resource management objectives.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for areas with wilderness characteristics are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Manage lands identified for protecting wilderness characteristics to preserve the following qualities:</p> <p><i>Naturalness:</i> Lands and resources exhibit a high degree of naturalness when affected by the forces of nature and where the imprint of human activity is substantially unnoticeable. Naturalness attributes may include the presence or absence of roads and trails, fences and other improvements; the nature and extent of landscape modification; the presence of native vegetation communities; and the connectivity of habitats. Wildlife populations and habitats are recognized as important aspects of the naturalness and will be managed actively.</p> <p><i>Solitude:</i> Visitors may have outstanding opportunities for solitude when the sights, sounds, and evidence of other people are rare or infrequent, where visitors can be isolated, alone or secluded from others.</p> <p><i>Primitive and Unconfined Recreation:</i> Visitors may have outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined types of recreation where the use of the area is through non-motorized, non-mechanical means off designated routes and as specifically excepted, and where no or minimal developed recreation facilities are encountered.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<p>1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>1. Manage 36,990 acres of IFNM to protect wilderness characteristics, as shown on Map 2-10.</p>	<p>1. Manage 9,510 acres of IFNM to protect wilderness characteristics, as shown on Map 2-11.</p>	<p>1. No areas would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics.</p>
<p>2. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>2. Visual changes from allowable uses and management activities to the characteristic landscape on lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics (36,990 acres, as shown on Map 2-7) must be very low and preserve existing character consistent with VRM Class I objectives.</p>	<p>2. Visual changes from allowable uses and management activities to the characteristic landscape on lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics (9,510 acres, as shown on Map 2-8) must be low and retain existing character consistent with VRM Class II objectives.</p>	<p>2. No management actions apply under this alternative.</p>

Wilderness Characteristics (continued)

<p>3. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>3. Recreation setting conditions (particularly solitude, remoteness, facilities, encounters among visitors, evidence of use, and accessibility) in areas managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be in accordance with the Primitive RMZ objectives (as defined in Table 2-14).</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>3. No management actions apply under this alternative.</p>
---	--	----------------------------------	---

**Table 2-12. Resource Management Alternatives for ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for energy and minerals resources are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Manage mining on the monument where valid existing rights occur.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for energy and minerals resources are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Prevent unnecessary and undue degradation from mining activity on grandfathered mining claims that have established valid existing rights.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<p>1. Mining activities and mineral extraction for energy production within the IFNM would continue to be administered on a case-by-case basis for valid mining claims. (New mining claims, mineral leases and sales are prohibited in the IFNM; refer to Appendix A).</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative A.</p>
<p>2. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>2. Reclaim abandoned mines having the greatest and immediate risk to human health or convert to another use protective of other resources.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<b>Implementation-Level Decisions</b>			
<p>1. No implementation decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>1. Mitigate potential physical and chemical hazards related to mines in the monument and preserve wildlife habitat values where identified.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-13. Resource Management Alternatives for LIVESTOCK GRAZING**

Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives			
NO ACTION	ACTION ALTERNATIVES		
<p><b>Goal:</b> Provide forage on a sustained yield basis for livestock consistent with meeting Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health. Healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems would be maintained or improved to meet Land Health Standards and produce a wide range of public values such as wildlife habitat, livestock forage, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Manage and monitor livestock grazing, in areas open for this use, consistent with the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (see Section 2.3.2 of this Chapter), and with protection of monument objects.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Manage grazing and range resources toward best possible ecological conditions for the local area given past uses and current potential.</p> <p><b>Goal 3:</b> Acknowledge the cultural, historical and economic values of ranching through interpretive efforts.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> Livestock use and associated management practices would be conducted in a manner consistent with multiple use needs and objectives to ensure that the health of rangeland resources is preserved or improved so that they are productive for all rangeland values. Where needed, public rangeland ecosystems would be improved to meet objectives.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Manage grazing and range resources to limit the amount of ephemeral forage used by livestock to no more than 30% of annual production.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Manage grazing to maintain the integrity of monument objects over time, such that noticeable impacts are measurable only in small and localized areas.</p>		
Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations			
Alternative A (No Action)	Action Alternative B	Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)	Action Alternative D
<p>1. All public lands within 11 allotments (approximately 128,400 acres) are available for livestock grazing.</p>	<p>1. All public lands within 11 allotments (only the portion within the IFNM, which includes approximately 128,400 acres) are unavailable for grazing to maximize the preservation of monument objects. Allotments would be unavailable for grazing only upon expiration of existing leases.</p>	<p>1. All public lands within 11 allotments (approximately 128,400 acres) are available for grazing.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative C.</p>

Livestock Grazing (continued)

<p>2. Classify nine of 11 allotments as perennial/ephemeral and classify 2 as ephemeral (refer to Appendix F for classification criteria).</p>	<p>2. No management actions apply under this element for Alternative B.</p>	<p>2. Classify Agua Blanca, Agua Dulce, Blanco Wash, Claflin, Cocoraque, King, Old Sasco, Sawtooth Mountains, and Silver Bell allotments as perennial (refer to Appendix F for classification criteria). Morning Star and Tejon Pass allotments continue to be classified ephemeral.</p> <p>If the resource conditions within an allotment change due to implementation of management decisions or other factors, an allotment may be recategorized based on those conditions.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>3. Following cancellation of a grazing lease, reallocate forage available for livestock use on a sustained yield basis within the associated allotment to a new grazing use applicant.</p>	<p>3. No management actions apply under this element for Alternative B.</p>	<p>3. Following cancellation or voluntary relinquishment of a grazing lease, BLM would determine if conditions within the associated allotment(s) are satisfactory based on applicable management objectives. If BLM determines that livestock grazing is preventing or hindering progress towards the achievement of applicable management objectives, BLM may decide to discontinue livestock grazing use on the allotment(s) if this action would help promote attainment of these objectives. Even if BLM initially decides to discontinue livestock use on some or all of an allotment, it may later decide to resume livestock use if it determines, based on its subsequent evaluation of ecological conditions and other pertinent factors, that it is appropriate to do so.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative C.</p>

Livestock Grazing (continued)

<p>4. Allow only those new range improvements for livestock in (Desert Tortoise) Category I and II Habitat Areas that would not create conflicts with tortoise populations. Mitigation for such conflicts is permissible to make the net effect of the improvements positive or neutral to desert tortoise populations. Conflicting existing improvements should be eliminated as opportunities arise.</p>	<p>4. No new range improvements for managing livestock grazing would be authorized.</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative A, with the following addition: Where range improvements are necessary and/or permitted, access and activities would be located and implemented to minimize additional disturbance to resources.</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>5. Provide additional (stock) water sources in the Twin Tanks and Cocoraque Pastures. Construct all additional waters to accommodate deer, javelina, and quail.</p>	<p>5. No management actions apply under this element for Alternative B.</p>	<p>5. Provide additional (stock) water sources in the Twin Tanks and Cocoraque Pastures. All stock waters would be constructed to accommodate all wildlife species that might benefit from them. Current stock waters would be evaluated, and modified as necessary, to provide the maximum benefit and minimum adverse impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>5. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>6. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>6. No management actions apply under this element for Alternative B.</p>	<p>6. As necessary, increase the number and variety of wildlife and livestock exclosures to represent various ecosystems, and monitor these regularly. Exclosures would meet standard design configurations from manual H-1741-1.</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>7. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>7. No management actions apply under this element for Alternative B.</p>	<p>7. Maintain yearlong water sources in all pastures for livestock to ensure safe availability of water to wildlife. Minimize livestock impacts on priority plant species and habitats by providing water sources away from existing populations. Move or replace livestock waters that are found to be causing habitat deterioration near rare plants.</p>	<p>7. Same as Alternative C.</p>

<p>8. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>8. No management actions apply under this element for Alternative B.</p>	<p>8. Use of motorized vehicles by authorized users (livestock grazing, wildlife management activities, rights-of-way and special use permits) is subject to the OHV use and travel route designations, unless specifically authorized on a case-by-case basis. Administrative access to fence lines, corrals, wells, and water infrastructure for inspection and maintenance would be granted, as necessary. See Table 2-16 Travel Management for more information.</p>	<p>8. Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p><b>Implementation-Level Decisions</b></p>			

**Table 2-14. Resource Management Alternatives for RECREATION**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>	
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for recreation are presented in the existing land use plans; however, recreation resources would be managed under an extensive recreation management area (ERMA) strategy, without specific objectives for recreation use, access to recreation opportunities, quality of experience, or quality of setting. Recreation use would be subject to regulations dictated primarily by resource protection objectives for the various monument values (watershed, cultural, VHA, VMA).</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Manage monument lands to produce a variety of quality recreation experiences in largely natural settings, while protecting natural and cultural resources, and promoting safety and harmony among users.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Manage recreation resources and visitor services to facilitate production and protection of appropriate recreation opportunities, activities, experiences and benefits that are that could be derived from the monument, and that are important to individuals and the communities affected.</p> <p><b>Goal 3:</b> Make visitor information available to the public to aid in visitor use, and foster compliance with use restrictions, management objectives, and appreciation for resources.</p> <p><b>Goal 4:</b> Coordinate visitor information, signing, and management with the Arizona State Lands Department, AGFD, counties, private land owners, and other interests to achieve desired recreation outcomes.</p>
<p><b>Objectives:</b> No LUP-level objectives for recreation are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Intensively manage the IFNM with an undeveloped recreation-tourism market strategy to sustain its distinctive undeveloped setting character, and produce targeted recreation opportunities, experiences and benefits.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Identify Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) based on resource capability and accessibility, and prescribe the required settings to produce targeted recreation opportunities, experiences and benefits representing the range of opportunities currently available.</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> When recreation use conflicts arise, promote communication, collaboration, and coordination among users to address them.</p>

<b>Recreation Management Zone Objectives</b>	
<p>No decisions from existing land use plan apply.</p>	<p><b>Roaded Natural RMZ Objectives:</b></p> <p><i>Recreation Niche:</i>                      Scenic Sonoran Desert touring on improved roads for viewing the natural landscape, with wayside stops for interpretation of the monument’s natural and cultural history, and access to dispersed recreation opportunities.</p> <p><i>Recreation Management Objective:</i>                      This zone provides opportunities for visitors to engage in scenic road tours in a variety of modes of travel, and in interpretive programs available, with at least 75 percent of visitors realizing the targeted outcomes and/or benefits within the life of the RMP.</p> <p><i>Primary Activities:</i>                      Driving passenger car and a variety of other motorized recreational vehicles for viewing scenery and points of interest. Stopping at wayside interpretive sites and overlooks to view scenery or wildlife. Driving to and staging for access to more remote and primitive settings.</p> <p><i>Experiences:</i>                      Enjoying the natural Sonoran desert landscape and climate with family or friends; learning about the monument’s natural and cultural history; taking low risks.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i>                      Enhanced sensitivity, awareness and appreciation of the monument’s natural and cultural resources. High sense of personal responsibility for protecting monument objects.</p> <p><b>Recreation Setting Character required to produce recreation management outcomes:</b></p> <p><i>Remoteness:</i>                      Areas are readily accessible with low sense of remoteness due to their location along collector or local improved and maintained roads that are accessible by passenger and recreational vehicles.</p> <p><i>Naturalness:</i>                      Largely natural with a few developments in the foreground view, as needed for allowable IFNM land uses (range improvements, recreation sites, parking areas, signs, etc.)</p> <p><i>Facilities:</i>                      Stabilized, improved and maintained roads and trails, parking turnouts, traffic control, interpretive signs/exhibits, trailheads to side trails. Minimal improvements provided for visitor convenience, and public health and safety.</p> <p><i>Contacts:</i>                      Daily average no more than 50 parties passing along the road, and no more than 25 other parties at activity areas.</p> <p><i>Group size:</i>                      Parties of 50 persons or more with special permit only, 100 persons maximum.</p> <p><i>Evidence of use:</i>                      Maintained roads, parking turnouts, trailheads or staging areas, signs (portal, directional, informational, other), fence crossings without gates, stabilized or improved activity areas, intersections with side roads, or more primitive roads.</p> <p><i>Accessibility:</i>                      Motorized vehicles and non-motorized vehicles licensed and insured to operate on a public road under Arizona law (ARS Title 28). Design vehicle is passenger car and recreational vehicle. Recreation sites and/or activity areas barrier free for persons with mobility impairments.</p>

	<p><i>Management Controls:</i>          Vehicle use and recreation activity areas limited to designated sites. Rules of conduct for developed sites implemented. Regulatory signs, other visitor control devices installed.</p> <p><i>Visitor Services:</i>          Regular visitor contact patrols by official personnel, with frequency depending on time of year. Regular law enforcement patrols. Regular clean-ups and trash collection. Self service on-site visitor information at recreation activity areas, special purpose sites, and access points to more remote settings.</p>
<p>No decisions from existing land use plan apply.</p>	<p><b>Semi-Primitive Motorized RMZ Objectives:</b></p> <p><i>Recreation Niche:</i>          Scenic Sonoran Desert touring on semi-primitive routes for viewing the natural and cultural landscape by a variety of off-highway vehicles, and access to dispersed recreation opportunities and more remote settings.</p> <p><i>Recreation Management Objective:</i>          This zone provides opportunities for visitors to engage in semi-primitive road touring on off-highway motorized vehicles (4WD, ATV, and trail motorcycle, or any other), with at least 75 percent of sampled visitors realizing the targeted outcomes and/or benefits within the life of the RMP.</p> <p><i>Primary Activities:</i>          Driving off-highway vehicles (4WD, ATVs, and trail motorcycles). Vehicle based semi-primitive camping and/or picnicking, hunting, viewing scenery and wildlife, access to more remote settings.</p> <p><i>Experiences:</i>          Enjoying self-directed desert adventure, exploring, taking moderate risks.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i>          Self-reliance for survival and comfort. Improved or practicing outdoor recreation ethics and skills. Enhanced sensitivity, awareness, and appreciation of the monument’s natural and cultural resources. Greater sense of personal responsibility for protecting monument objects.</p> <p><b>Recreation Setting Character Required to produce recreation management outcomes:</b></p> <p><i>Remoteness:</i>          Areas where physical access may require special equipment providing for a moderate sense of remoteness. Areas are located along resource access roads accessible to off-highway vehicles (high clearance, 4WD, ATV, trail-bike) and at least ½ mile away from maintained collector roads and/or county roads.</p> <p><i>Naturalness:</i>          Natural landscape with some modifications, consistent with VRM objectives.</p> <p><i>Facilities:</i>          Stabilized, minimally maintained single lane roads, trails. Rustic parking turnouts, traffic control, signs and trailheads. No visitor conveniences at recreation areas. Minimal public health and safety hazard mitigation.</p> <p><i>Contacts:</i>          Daily average, no more than 15 other parties passing along the road, and no more than 10 other parties at activity areas.</p> <p><i>Group size:</i>          Parties of 50 persons or more with special permit only, 100 persons maximum.</p> <p><i>Evidence of use:</i>          Single lane, semi-primitive roads, rustic parking turnouts, well worn and lightly worn and activity areas, signs.</p>

	<p><i>Accessibility:</i>                  Motorized vehicles and non-motorized vehicles limited to routes designated for that use. Typical design vehicle is full size high clearance utility vehicle, with trailer combination vehicles for special purposes. Some recreation sites and/or activity areas barrier free for persons with mobility impairments.</p> <p><i>Management Controls:</i>                  Regulatory signs and other visitor control devices installed. Regular law enforcement patrols.</p> <p><i>Visitor Services:</i>                  Periodic patrols by BLM visitor services personnel, with frequency depending on time of year, on at least a bi-weekly basis during high use season. On-site visitor information at recreation activity areas, access points and special purpose sites, and access points to more remote settings.</p>
<p>No decisions from existing land use plan apply.</p>	<p><b>Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized RMZ Objectives:</b></p> <p><i>Recreation Niche:</i>                  Scenic Sonoran Desert touring for viewing the natural and cultural landscape by a variety of non-motorized travel.</p> <p><i>Recreation Management Objective:</i>                  This zone provides opportunities for visitors to engage in non-motorized touring (hiking, equestrian, mountain bike), with at least 75 percent of sampled visitors realizing the targeted outcomes and/or benefits within the life of the RMP.</p> <p><i>Primary Activities:</i>                  Hiking, horseback riding, mountain biking, riding livestock pulled wagons to view scenery, access semi-primitive camping and picnicking, hunting, viewing landscape or wildlife, access more remote settings.</p> <p><i>Experiences:</i>                  Enjoying self-directed desert adventure, exploring, taking moderately high risks.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i>                  Self-reliance for survival and comfort. Improved or practicing outdoor recreation ethics and skills. Enhanced sensitivity, awareness, and appreciation of the monument’s natural and cultural resources. Greater sense of personal responsibility for protecting monument objects.</p> <p><b>Recreation Setting Character required to produce recreation management outcomes:</b></p> <p><i>Remoteness:</i>                  Areas located along routes limited to non-motorized travel that are at least ½ mile away from resource access roads.</p> <p><i>Naturalness:</i>                  Natural landscape with some modifications, consistent with VRM objectives.</p> <p><i>Facilities:</i>                  Stabilized designated trails. Rustic parking turnouts, traffic control, signs and trailheads. No visitor conveniences at recreation activity areas. Minimal public health and safety hazard mitigation.</p> <p><i>Contacts:</i>                  Daily average, no more than 15 other parties encountered along travel routes, and no more than 10 other parties at activity areas.</p> <p><i>Group size:</i>                  Parties of 25 persons or more with special permit only, 50 persons maximum.</p> <p><i>Evidence of use:</i></p>

	<p>Single-track trails, converted use roadways, unimproved activity areas, minimal signs.</p> <p><i>Accessibility:</i> Only by non-motorized travel, including non-motorized mechanized vehicles, on single track trails or converted single lane roadways. Typical design vehicles are equestrian and mountain bike, with full size utility vehicle for special administrative purposes. Some routes and recreation sites and/or activity areas with some barriers for persons with mobility impairments, requiring assistance, special equipment or exceptional ability.</p> <p><i>Management Controls:</i> No restrictions on hiking and equestrian use, or dispersed camping and picnicking and other dispersed recreation activities, except as needed to mitigate potential impacts to fragile, sensitive resources. Mechanized vehicles (including mountain bikes) restricted to routes designated for that purpose. Regulatory signs and other visitor control devices installed at access points. Minimal law enforcement presence; regular patrols at access points.</p> <p><i>Visitor Services:</i> Periodic patrols by BLM visitor services personnel with frequency depending on time of year; monthly basis or as needed for follow-up. On-site visitor information at access points and special purpose sites along travel route.</p>
<p>No decisions from existing land use plan apply.</p>	<p><b>Ragged Top Wildlife Viewing RMZ Objectives:</b></p> <p><i>Recreation Niche:</i> Viewing and learning about a variety of desert wildlife in their natural habitat, in the most diverse and rugged Sonoran Desert mountain setting found in the IFNM.</p> <p><i>Recreation Management Objective:</i> This zone provides opportunities for visitors to engage in wildlife viewing and nature study in a naturally appearing landscape with at least 75 percent of sampled visitors realizing the targeted outcomes and/or benefits within the life of the RMP.</p> <p><i>Primary Activities:</i> Hiking, horseback riding, roadside or trailside stopping to view wildlife and the natural landscape, rough trekking and mountain climbing.</p> <p><i>Experiences:</i> Learning about the Sonoran Desert ecology and wildlife. Enjoying the natural desert landscape. Enjoying self-directed desert adventure, exploring, taking moderately high risks.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Enhanced awareness and appreciation of the monument’s wildlife and natural habitat resources. Increased self-reliance for survival and comfort. Greater sense of personal responsibility for protecting monument objects. Improved or practicing outdoor recreation ethics and skills.</p> <p><b>Recreation Setting Character required to produce recreation management outcomes:</b></p> <p><i>Remoteness:</i> Areas where access is by way of walking or riding along trails, and by driving vehicle only along perimeter of area.</p> <p><i>Naturalness:</i> Natural landscape with few modifications, consistent with VRM objectives.</p> <p><i>Facilities:</i> No facilities within the area’s interior, except gates at fences and interpretive signs. Rustic parking turnouts, trailheads, traffic control, interpretive signs, informational and other signs on the area’s perimeter access points, or</p>

	<p>along the trails.</p> <p><i>Contacts:</i> Daily average, no more than 15 other parties encountered along travel routes, and no more than 10 other parties at activity areas.</p> <p><i>Group size:</i> Parties of 25 persons or more with special permit only, 50 persons maximum.</p> <p><i>Evidence of use:</i> Paths and unimproved single-track trails, converted use roadways, parking turnouts and signs.</p> <p><i>Accessibility:</i> Foot, horse and mountain bike travel on designated trails. Passenger car access to area's perimeter. Interior not accessible due to natural barriers for persons with mobility impairments. Perimeter accessible to persons with mobility impairments.</p> <p><i>Management Controls:</i> Seasonal restrictions on hiking, equestrian use camping, and picnicking may apply as needed to mitigate potential impacts to fragile, sensitive resources. Regulatory signs and other visitor control devices installed at access points. Infrequent law enforcement presence; regular patrols at access points.</p> <p><i>Visitor Services:</i> Regular patrols by BLM visitor services personnel with frequency depending on time of year. Weekly presence during high use season. On-site visitor information and interpretive sites at access points and special sites along travel routes.</p>		
<p>No decisions from existing land use plan apply.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="594 743 1470 1448"> <p><b>Primitive RMZ Objectives:</b></p> <p><i>Recreation Niche:</i> Hiking and riding excursions into the most remote, rugged and naturally appearing Sonoran Desert landscape found in the monument.</p> <p><i>Recreation Management Objective:</i> This zone provides opportunities for visitors to engage in primitive recreation activities with a sense of remoteness and solitude, in a naturally appearing landscape with at least 75 percent of sampled visitors realizing the targeted outcomes and/or benefits within the life of the RMP.</p> <p><i>Primary Activities:</i> Hiking, horseback riding, trailside semi-primitive camping and/or picnicking, hunting, viewing scenery and wildlife.</p> <p><i>Experiences:</i> Enjoying self-directed desert adventure, exploring, opportunities for taking high risks.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Self-reliance for survival and comfort. Improved or practicing outdoor recreation ethics and skills. Enhanced sensitivity, awareness, and appreciation of the monument's natural and cultural resources. Greater sense of personal responsibility for protecting monument objects.</p> <p><b>Recreation Setting Character required to produce recreation management outcomes:</b></p> <p><i>Remoteness:</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="1470 743 1919 1448"> <p>No decisions apply under Alternative D.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><b>Primitive RMZ Objectives:</b></p> <p><i>Recreation Niche:</i> Hiking and riding excursions into the most remote, rugged and naturally appearing Sonoran Desert landscape found in the monument.</p> <p><i>Recreation Management Objective:</i> This zone provides opportunities for visitors to engage in primitive recreation activities with a sense of remoteness and solitude, in a naturally appearing landscape with at least 75 percent of sampled visitors realizing the targeted outcomes and/or benefits within the life of the RMP.</p> <p><i>Primary Activities:</i> Hiking, horseback riding, trailside semi-primitive camping and/or picnicking, hunting, viewing scenery and wildlife.</p> <p><i>Experiences:</i> Enjoying self-directed desert adventure, exploring, opportunities for taking high risks.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Self-reliance for survival and comfort. Improved or practicing outdoor recreation ethics and skills. Enhanced sensitivity, awareness, and appreciation of the monument's natural and cultural resources. Greater sense of personal responsibility for protecting monument objects.</p> <p><b>Recreation Setting Character required to produce recreation management outcomes:</b></p> <p><i>Remoteness:</i></p>	<p>No decisions apply under Alternative D.</p>
<p><b>Primitive RMZ Objectives:</b></p> <p><i>Recreation Niche:</i> Hiking and riding excursions into the most remote, rugged and naturally appearing Sonoran Desert landscape found in the monument.</p> <p><i>Recreation Management Objective:</i> This zone provides opportunities for visitors to engage in primitive recreation activities with a sense of remoteness and solitude, in a naturally appearing landscape with at least 75 percent of sampled visitors realizing the targeted outcomes and/or benefits within the life of the RMP.</p> <p><i>Primary Activities:</i> Hiking, horseback riding, trailside semi-primitive camping and/or picnicking, hunting, viewing scenery and wildlife.</p> <p><i>Experiences:</i> Enjoying self-directed desert adventure, exploring, opportunities for taking high risks.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Self-reliance for survival and comfort. Improved or practicing outdoor recreation ethics and skills. Enhanced sensitivity, awareness, and appreciation of the monument's natural and cultural resources. Greater sense of personal responsibility for protecting monument objects.</p> <p><b>Recreation Setting Character required to produce recreation management outcomes:</b></p> <p><i>Remoteness:</i></p>	<p>No decisions apply under Alternative D.</p>		

	<p>Areas where access is by way of walking, horseback riding, and cross-country or non-motorized trail travel. Areas are located at least ½ mile away from local and resource access roads.</p> <p><i>Naturalness:</i> Natural landscape with few modifications, consistent with VRM objectives.</p> <p><i>Facilities:</i> No facilities within the area’s interior, except gates on fences. Rustic parking turnouts, traffic control, signs and trailheads on boundary along perimeter.</p> <p><i>Contacts:</i> Daily average, no more than 1 other party encountered along travel routes, and no more than 1 other parties at activity areas.</p> <p><i>Group size:</i> Parties of 10 persons or more with special permit only, 25 persons maximum.</p> <p><i>Evidence of use:</i> Paths and unimproved single-track trails, converted use roadways.</p> <p><i>Accessibility:</i> Foot and horse cross country travel, no non-motorized mechanized vehicles. Not accessible due to natural barriers for persons with mobility impairments without extraordinary measures or risks.</p> <p><i>Management Controls:</i> Seasonal restrictions on hiking, equestrian use dispersed camping and picnicking and other dispersed recreation activities may apply, as needed to mitigate potential impacts to fragile, sensitive resources. Regulatory signs and other visitor control devices installed at access points. Minimal law enforcement presence; regular law enforcement presence at access points.</p> <p><i>Visitor Services:</i> Periodic patrols by BLM visitor services personnel with frequency depending on time of year. Presence limited to case-by-case condition surveys or follow up activities. On-site visitor information at access points and special purpose sites along travel route.</p>	
--	--	--

<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
1. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	1. Allocate the entire IFNM (approximately 128,400 acres) as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). The SRMA is managed with a strategy targeting the local undeveloped recreation-tourism market. This market demands a variety of distinctive kinds of dispersed recreation opportunities produced by settings in open spaces with an undeveloped character, and a high degree of self-reliance. As non-Federal land in-holdings are acquired, they would be added to this allocation.	1. Same as Alternative B.	1. Same as Alternative B.
<b><i>Recreation Management Zones (RMZs)</i></b>	<b><i>Recreation Management Zones (RMZs)</i></b>	<b><i>Recreation Management Zones (RMZs)</i></b>	<b><i>Recreation Management Zones (RMZs)</i></b>
2. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	2. Allocate monument land to RMZs as follows (acreages are approximate): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roded Natural = 17,610 acres</li> <li>• Semi-Primitive Motorized = 14,540 acres</li> <li>• Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized = 60,000 acres</li> <li>• Ragged Top Wildlife Viewing = 6,780 acres</li> <li>• Primitive = 29,420 acres</li> </ul> The RMZs for this alternative are shown on Map 2-12.	2. Allocate monument land to RMZs as follows (acreages are approximate): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roded Natural = 18,380 acres</li> <li>• Semi-Primitive Motorized = 36,230 acres</li> <li>• Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized = 57,450 acres</li> <li>• Ragged Top Wildlife Viewing = 6,780 acres</li> <li>• Primitive 9,510 acres</li> </ul> The RMZs for this alternative are shown on Map 2-13.	2. Allocate monument land to RMZs as follows (acreages are approximate): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roded Natural = 19,060 acres</li> <li>• Semi-Primitive Motorized = 59,020 acres</li> <li>• Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized = 43,770 acres</li> <li>• Ragged Top Wildlife Viewing = 6,500 acres</li> <li>• Primitive = 0 acres</li> </ul> The RMZs for this alternative are shown on Map 2-14.

<p><b><i>Resources</i></b></p> <p>3. No existing decisions specifically address this action; however, recreation resources are under basic custodial management throughout the IFNM. Recreation uses, activities and settings may change over time as needed to achieve other resource management objectives.</p>	<p><b><i>Resources</i></b></p> <p>3. Implement recreation actions as necessary that sustain specific setting characteristics and achieve targeted outcomes for each RMZ.</p>	<p><b><i>Resources</i></b></p> <p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p><b><i>Resources</i></b></p> <p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><b><i>Signing and Facilities</i></b></p> <p>4. No existing decisions specifically address this action; however, BLM would provide on-site signing, where needed, for visitor information, regulatory, or interpretation; provide portal information facilities at monument access points (such as informational kiosks); and develop materials and designs to blend in with the natural landscape.</p>	<p><b><i>Signing and Facilities</i></b></p> <p>4. For all RMZs, provide on-site signing, where needed, for visitor information, regulatory, or interpretation purposes in accordance with RMZ setting prescriptions; provide portal information facilities at monument access points (such as informational kiosks); maintain facilities to levels appropriate to the RMZ; and, develop materials and designs to blend in with the natural landscape.</p>	<p><b><i>Signing and Facilities</i></b></p> <p>4. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p><b><i>Signing and Facilities</i></b></p> <p>4. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><b><i>Marketing</i></b></p> <p>5. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p><b><i>Marketing</i></b></p> <p>5. For all RMZs, concentrate marketing strategies on delivering visitor information and other services once visitors arrive in the local area. Publicity is not attempting to position the monument as a major destination for a large volume of tourism or recreational use. Coordinate marketing efforts among the various providers.</p>	<p><b><i>Marketing</i></b></p> <p>5. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p><b><i>Marketing</i></b></p> <p>5. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><b><i>Interpretation/Education</i></b></p> <p>6. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p><b><i>Interpretation/Education</i></b></p> <p>6. Provide interpretive exhibits, signs or programs on-site at suitable locations in all RMZs. On-site programs may include BLM sponsored field trips or events, commercial interpretive or educational field trips or events, etc. Participate in off site interpretive or educational events with monument related themes.</p>	<p><b><i>Interpretation/Education</i></b></p> <p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p><b><i>Interpretation/Education</i></b></p> <p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>

<b><i>Recreation Monitoring</i></b>	<b><i>Recreation Monitoring</i></b>	<b><i>Recreation Monitoring</i></b>	<b><i>Recreation Monitoring</i></b>
7. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	7. Conduct baseline and follow-up intensive surveys of recreation sites and activity areas. Conduct resource condition, recreation use, and visitor surveys to determine if recreation and RMZ objectives are being achieved, and setting prescriptions are being maintained.	7. Same as Alternative B.	7. Same as Alternative B.
<b><i>Visitor Services</i></b>	<b><i>Visitor Services</i></b>	<b><i>Visitor Services</i></b>	<b><i>Visitor Services</i></b>
8. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	8. The level of visitor services within the IFNM would vary by zone, with the greatest presence of BLM staff within the roaded natural RMZ. Visitor center facilities would be provided offsite in coordination with the local communities.	8. Same as Alternative B.	8. Same as Alternative B.
<b><i>Camping</i></b>	<b><i>Camping</i></b>	<b><i>Camping</i></b>	<b><i>Camping</i></b>
9. No existing decisions specifically address this action; however, collection of dead and down firewood for use in campfires is allowed.	9. Prohibit wood campfires; allow camp stoves and/or charcoal fires only.	9. Allow wood campfires only when firewood is from a non-monument source.	9. Allow campfires using dead, down, and detached wood. Collection of wood for campfires may be restricted if needed as determined through monitoring.
10. No existing decisions specifically address this action; however, dispersed, vehicle-based camping is allowed throughout the monument. (Per State law, camping within ¼ mile of a natural water hole containing water, or a manmade watering facility containing water, in such a place that wildlife or domestic stock would be denied access to the only reasonably available water, is prohibited.)	10. Allow overnight vehicle-based camping (including RVs) at identified sites only. Specific sites identified as open and/or available for camping would be periodically reviewed and modified based on public demand and resource protection needs within the IFNM. Approximately 30 sites potentially would be identified, subject to additional site-specific analysis and monitoring.	10. Same as Alternative B, except approximately 100 sites potentially would be identified, subject to additional site-specific analysis and monitoring.	10. Same as Alternative B, except approximately 150 sites potentially would be identified, subject to additional site-specific analysis and monitoring.
11. Dispersed non-motorized camping is allowed throughout the monument, subject to existing access.	11. Allow overnight, dispersed, non-motorized camping at identified campsites only, unless camping in an area is specifically prohibited for protection of resource values (e.g., signed sensitive closure areas, which could vary over time).	11. Allow overnight, dispersed, non-motorized camping throughout the monument unless camping in an area is specifically prohibited for protection of resource values (e.g., signed sensitive closure areas, which could vary over time).	11. Same as Alternative C.

<p>12. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>12. Large group camping is allowed at identified group sites only. Special permit required for groups larger than prescribed by RMZ. Group size maximum varies depending on RMZ (see RMZ objectives above).</p> <p>Group camping could only occur at two identified large campsites located at Manville Road (within the roaded natural RMZ) and Reservation Road (within the roaded natural RMZ) (Map 2-12).</p>	<p>12. Same as Alternative B, with the following change:</p> <p>Group camping could only occur at three identified large campsites located at Manville Road (within the roaded natural RMZ), Reservation Road (within the roaded natural RMZ), and near the West Silver Bell Mountains (within the semi-primitive motorized RMZ) (Map 2-13).</p>	<p>12. Same as Alternative B, with the following change:</p> <p>Group camping could only occur at four identified large campsites located at Manville Road (within the roaded natural RMZ), Reservation Road (within the roaded natural RMZ), near the West Silver Bell Mountains (within the semi-primitive motorized RMZ), and in the Sawtooth Mountains (within the semi-primitive motorized RMZ). (Map 2-14).</p>
<p><b><i>Use and Discharge of Firearms/Target Shooting</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Use and Discharge of Firearms/Target Shooting</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Use and Discharge of Firearms/Target Shooting</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Use and Discharge of Firearms/Target Shooting</i></b></p>
<p>13. Allow recreational shooting within the monument outside of developed areas in accordance with 43 CFR §8365. (Dispersed recreational shooting is allowed throughout the monument, subject to resource protection regulations; BLM may close areas for public safety.)</p>	<p>13. Prohibit the use and discharge of firearms within the IFNM, except for permitted or authorized hunting activities conducted in accordance with AGFD hunting regulations.</p>	<p>13. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>13. Allow recreational (target) shooting within two designated areas: Avra Hill (approximately 406 acres) and Cerrito Represo (approximately 223 acres). Allow permitted or authorized hunting activities conducted in accordance with AGFD hunting regulations.</p>
<p><b><i>Equestrian Use</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Equestrian Use</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Equestrian Use</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Equestrian Use</i></b></p>
<p>14. Accommodations or staging areas for equestrian use may be considered on a case-by-case basis. No specific staging area improvements identified. Equestrian use cross country and on roads and trails is allowed.</p>	<p>14. Within the roaded natural RMZ, six areas are identified for access and/or staging locations for equestrian uses (Map 2-12) along Manville Road, Avra Valley Road, Reservation Road, Silverbell Road, near the West Silver Bell Mountains, and Aries Drive . Exact location would be subject to additional site-specific planning, design, and NEPA compliance.</p>	<p>14. Provide access and/or staging areas for equestrian uses same as under Alternative B (Map 2-13). Allow equestrian use cross country, on roads, primitive roads, administrative roads, and non-motorized trails, unless specifically prohibited and posted.</p>	<p>14. Same as Alternative C (Map 2-14).</p>

	Prohibit equestrian use cross country. Allow equestrian use on roads, primitive roads, administrative roads, and non-motorized trails, unless specifically prohibited and posted.		
	Refer to Table 2-16 Travel Management for more information regarding equestrian use.	Refer to Table 2-16 Travel Management for more information regarding equestrian use.	Refer to Table 2-16 Travel Management for more information regarding equestrian use.
<b><i>Collection of Objects</i></b>	<b><i>Collection of Objects</i></b>	<b><i>Collection of Objects</i></b>	<b><i>Collection of Objects</i></b>
15. The Monument proclamation warns unauthorized persons not to remove any feature of the Monument. Collection of objects allowed under public land regulations at 43 CFR 8360 (commonly available renewal resources, nonrenewable resources, mineral materials or forest/woodland products) will not be allowed.	15. Prohibit collection of any renewable resources (such as flowers, berries, nuts, seeds, cones and leaves); nonrenewable resources (such as rocks, mineral specimens, fossils and semiprecious gemstones); mineral materials (such as stone, sand and gravel); forest/woodland products (such as firewood, posts, poles), except as specifically authorized to accommodate valid existing rights (such as mining claims), research, scientific, educational, or native American traditional purposes furthering Monument management objectives.	15. Same as Alternative B.	15. Same as Alternative B, except that dead, down and detached wood may be collected for campfire use in the Monument, subject to restrictions deemed necessary through adaptive management.
<b><i>General Recreation</i></b>	<b><i>General Recreation</i></b>	<b><i>General Recreation</i></b>	<b><i>General Recreation</i></b>
16. Retain and acquire additional areas in the Sawtooth Mountains, outside the Silver Bell Resource Conservation Area (RCA), as a Cooperative Recreation Management Area (CRMA) with state or local agencies. Designate the Silver Bell Mountains RCA in part to provide extensive areas of public land for dispersed, unstructured recreation activities.	16. Discontinue the CRMA and RCA allocations.  NOTE: BLM would seek cooperative management of the IFNM through administrative actions (refer to Appendix D).	16. Same as Alternative B.	16. Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-15. Resource Management Alternatives for LANDS AND REALTY**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for lands and realty are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Secure non-Federal land and interests in land to further the natural and cultural resource and public and administrative access goals for the monument.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Manage utility corridors and rights-of-way to avoid or minimize impacts on monument objects.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for lands and realty are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Acquire lands and interest in land from willing sellers to further protection of monument objects and/or achieve management objectives. Priority lands for consideration (1) contain ecologically or administratively important areas (e.g., riparian movement corridors); (2) expand undisturbed blocks of public land; (3) protect existing blocks of habitat; or (4) provide legal access to monument lands.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Construction and maintenance activities for utilities occur in locations that utilize established rights-of-way and corridors (if applicable) so that they do not conflict with the natural and cultural resource goals for the monument.</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> Manage land use authorizations to accommodate use, maintenance, and operation with minimal impacts to monument objects.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B (Proposed Plan for Utility Corridors Only)</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan for all but Utility Corridors)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<i>Land Tenure</i>	<i>Land Tenure</i>	<i>Land Tenure</i>	<i>Land Tenure</i>
<p>1. Retain public lands (surface and subsurface estate) in the Silver Bell RCA.</p>	<p>1. Retain all Federal land (surface and subsurface) except in special instances where land exchanges could be used to further the natural and cultural resource goals of the monument.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>2. Pursue acquisition of all State land in the Silver Bell RCA primarily through exchange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider acquisition of private land in the Silver Bell RCA on a case-by-case basis.</li> <li>• Acquire 1,140 acres of State and private land in the Waterman Mountains ACEC.</li> <li>• Retain 15,188 acres in the Sawtooth Mountains and</li> </ul>	<p>2. Acquire non-Federal land or interests in land within the boundaries of the IFNM from willing sellers by purchase, exchange, or donation, as opportunities arise.</p> <p>Where land cannot be acquired, secure conservation easements.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>

<p>acquire 640 acres of State land, outside the RCAs, as a CRMA with state or local agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acquire up to 2,280 acres of private and State land in the Agua Blanco Ranch Multiple Resource Management Area.</li> <li>• Acquire up to 13,227 acres of private and State land in the Cocoraque Butte-Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area.</li> <li>• Acquire up to 7,630 acres of state and private land in the Silver Bell Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Area.</li> <li>• Acquire three State sections [9, 15, and 16 in T.11S., R.7E.] in crucial bighorn sheep habitat in the West Silver Bell Mountains.</li> </ul>			
<p>3. Acquire through exchange, non-Federal mineral estate underlying Federal surface holdings in the Silver Bell RCA.</p>	<p>3. Acquire through exchange, or other means, non-Federal mineral estate underlying Federal surface holdings throughout the monument.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>4. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>4. Do not acquire surface estate unless mineral estate can be acquired concurrently (or is already Federally owned).</p>	<p>4. Same as Alternative B</p>	<p>4. Do not consider acquisition of mineral estate as a factor in surface estate acquisitions.</p>
<p>5. There is no existing decision for this action; however, there are two existing withdrawals for a total of approximately 300 acres for military uses.</p>	<p>5. Military withdrawals exist on approximately 300 acres; if and when the land is returned to BLM the area would be managed consistent with the management of adjacent public land.</p>	<p>5. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>5. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>6. There is no existing decision for this action; however, there is one existing recreation and public purposes (R&amp;PP) lease for the Tucson Soaring Club/glider park.</p>	<p>6. R&amp;PP leases (existing at the time of monument designation) would be renewed at the discretion of BLM. (NOTE: No new R&amp;PP leases would be granted within the monument per the Proclamation.)</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>6. Same as Alternative B.</p>

<i>Corridors and Rights-of-Way</i>	<i>Corridors and Rights-of-Way</i>	<i>Corridors and Rights-of-Way</i>	<i>Corridors and Rights-of-Way</i>
<p>7. Utility corridors follow existing transmission line and pipeline facilities within the boundaries of the Silver Bell RCA; all corridors would be 1 mile in width (Map 2-15).</p>	<p>7. No utility corridors would be designated as shown on Map 2-16.</p>	<p>7. Designated corridors, shown on Map 2-17, would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor 1: 200-foot wide and the width of the corridor begins from the west edge of the western existing pipeline right-of-way and extends easterly. One additional major right-of-way may be granted, underground only; additional non-major rights-of-way may be granted.</li> <li>• Corridor 2: 400-foot wide and the width of the corridor begins from the western edge of the existing authorized electrical line right-of-way and extends easterly. Additional major right-of-way facilities above or below ground are allowed; additional non-major rights-of-way may be granted.</li> </ul>	<p>7. Designated corridors, shown on Map 2-18, would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor 1: ¼-mile wide, centered on the center line of the existing pipeline right-of-way; additional major rights-of-way may be granted underground only; additional non-major rights-of-way may be granted</li> <li>• Corridor 2: ¼-mile wide, centered on the center line of the existing power line right-of-way; additional major rights-of-way may be granted above or below ground; additional major right-of-way may be granted underground only; additional non-major rights-of-way may be granted</li> <li>• Corridor 3 (two segments, one in the Sawtooth Mountains and one near the West Silver Bell Mountains): ¼-mile wide, centered on the center line of existing power line rights-of-way; additional non-major rights-of-way may be granted</li> </ul>
<p>8. Rights-of-way would be issued to promote the maximum use of existing right-of-way routes, including joint use whenever possible.</p>	<p>8. No new rights-of-way would be authorized within the monument, except where required by law.</p>	<p>8. All rights-of-way for access and utilities, including for inholdings, would be considered and issued on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the goals of the monument, including renewal of rights-of-way established prior to monument designation.</p>	<p>8. Same as Alternative C.</p>

<i>Avoidance and Exclusion Areas</i>	<i>Avoidance and Exclusion Areas</i>	<i>Avoidance and Exclusion Areas</i>	<i>Avoidance and Exclusion Areas</i>
9. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	9. The entire monument is an exclusion area; however, valid pre-existing authorizations (i.e., rights-of-way) would be recognized. Existing rights-of-way may be renewed in accordance with 43 CFR 2800.	9. The entire monument, with the exception of the designated corridors, is an avoidance area; however, valid pre-existing authorizations (i.e., rights-of-way) would be recognized. Existing rights-of-way may be renewed in accordance with 43 CFR 2800.	9. Same as Alternative C.
10. Designate the 160 acre Pan Quemado communication site at T.13.S., R.9.E., sections 1, 2, 11, and 12, inside the Silver Bell RCA.	10. The Pan Quemado communication site is located on 2 acres and includes one facility with one tower; the Confidence Peak communication site is located on 3 acres and includes one multi-user right-of-way with one facility. No additional facilities such as towers and buildings would be allowed.	10. Same as Alternative B.	10. The Pan Quemado communication site is located on 2 acres and includes one facility; the Confidence Peak communication site is located on 3 acres and could include up to two facilities.
11. Require the implementation of mitigation measures to ensure that maintenance of established rights-of-way does not conflict with the natural and cultural resource goals for the monument.	<p>11. As part of the land use authorization process, construction and maintenance activities would include protective measures to minimize the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• spread of noxious weeds</li> <li>• soil erosion</li> <li>• air quality degradation</li> <li>• water quality degradation (e.g., limited disturbance in washes)</li> <li>• vegetation disturbance and/or removal</li> <li>• extensive or loud noise from heavy equipment</li> <li>• impacts on wildlife (i.e., wildlife-friendly design)</li> <li>• disturbance of cultural resources</li> <li>• visual intrusions</li> </ul> <p>A reclamation plan would be required on a site-specific basis. In addition, communication site plans would be updated as necessary.</p>	11. Same as Alternative B.	11. Same as Alternative B.

Lands and Realty (continued)

<p>12. Land use authorizations for permits and easements would be considered on a case-by-case basis, and must be compatible with the natural and cultural resource goals for the monument.</p>	<p>12. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>12. Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>12. Same as Alternative A.</p>
<p>13. On land retained or acquired, communication facility development would be limited to designated sites.</p>	<p>13. Upon acquisition of land, designate that land as exclusion area for rights-of-way.</p>	<p>13. Upon acquisition of land, designate that land as avoidance area for rights-of-way, unless that land is within designated corridors.</p>	<p>13. Same as Alternative C.</p>

**Table 2-16. Resource Management Alternatives for TRAVEL MANAGEMENT**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for transportation and public access are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Provide a comprehensive transportation system for the monument that is protective of monument objects. <b>Goal 2:</b> Provide adequate, legal, and safe access for allowable public use and administrative purposes while protecting monument objects.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for transportation and public access are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Improve on-the-ground travel management operations and maintenance programs to protect monument objects, and to manage visitor access, safety, and recreation opportunities and experiences. <b>Objective 2:</b> Give priority to establishing, improving, or maintaining designated routes or access points to protect monument objects and accommodate allowable uses. <b>Objective 3:</b> Secure legal and safe access, appropriate for achieving and maintaining monument management objectives, for both motorized and non-motorized entry into the monument. Provide and maintain connectivity of the IFNM transportation system with the surrounding public highway system (interstate, Federal, State and county roads).</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<i>OHV Area Designations</i>	<i>OHV Area Designations</i>	<i>OHV Area Designations</i>	<i>OHV Area Designations</i>
<p>1. Monument lands are designated as open, limited, or closed in accordance with definitions and criteria in 43 CFR 8340. Limit vehicular travel on public land to existing roads and trails with the exception of areas that are specifically identified as closed or where travel would be limited to designated roads and trails. Close the 20-acre Santa Ana de Cuiquiburitac Special Management Area and 800 acres surrounding Ragged Top to motorized vehicles. Limit motorized vehicles to existing roads and trails: within (a) 39,170 acres of Federal land within the Silver Bell Bighorn Sheep Management Area; (b) 2,720-acre Avra Valley Cultural Resource Management Area; (c) 14,419 acres of Federal land in Agua Blanco Ranch Multiple Resource Management Area; (c) and</p>	<p>1. Monument lands are designated as open, limited, or closed in accordance with definitions and criteria in 43 CFR 8340. Area designations to manage motorized vehicle use would be as follows: <b>Open:</b> 0 acres. <b>Limited to designated routes:</b> 90,360 acres. <b>Closed:</b> 38,040 acres, including:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 37,060 acres to protect wilderness characteristics and wildlife habitat</li> <li>• 340 acres to protect cultural resources at Cocoraque Butte</li> <li>• 640 acres to protect other cultural resources</li> </ul>                     These area designations are shown on Map 2-20.</p>	<p>1. Monument lands are designated as open, limited, or closed in accordance with definitions and criteria in 43 CFR 8340. Area designations to manage motorized vehicle use would be as follows: <b>Open:</b> 0 acres. <b>Limited to designated routes:</b> 117,520 acres. <b>Closed:</b> 10,880 acres, including:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9,900 acres to protect wildlife habitat</li> <li>• 340 acres to protect cultural resources at Cocoraque Butte</li> <li>• 640 acres to protect other cultural resources</li> </ul>                     These area designations are shown on Map 2-21.</p>	<p>1. Monument lands are designated as open, limited, or closed in accordance with definitions and criteria in 43 CFR 8340. Area designations to manage motorized vehicle use would be as follows: <b>Open:</b> 0 acres. <b>Limited to designated routes:</b> 128,400 acres. <b>Closed:</b> 0 acres. These area designations are shown on Map 2-22. As non-Federal lands are acquired, lands would be designated for OHV use consistent with the maps presented in the RMP.</p>

<p>(e) within 34,749 acres of Federal land in Cocoraque Butte – Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area.</p> <p>Limit motorized vehicles to allocated roads and trails within 1,960 acres of Federal land in the Waterman Mountains ACEC.</p> <p>Area designations to manage motorized vehicle use are as follows (acreages are approximate):</p> <p><b>Open:</b> 0 acres  <b>Limited to existing routes:</b> 127,580 acres  <b>Closed:</b> 820 acres</p> <p>These area designations are shown on Map 2-19.</p>	<p>As non-Federal lands are acquired, lands would be designated for OHV use consistent with the maps presented in the RMP.</p>	<p>As non-Federal lands are acquired, lands would be designated for OHV use consistent with the maps presented in the RMP.</p>	
<p><b><i>Public Access Locations</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Public Access Locations</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Public Access Locations</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Public Access Locations</i></b></p>
<p>2. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>2. Public access is subject to route designations, travel restrictions, and acquisition of legal access. Public access onto IFNM from non-IFNM lands or from routes without public legal access is subject to easement acquisition, or acquisition of the non-Monument land inholding.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>2. Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><b><i>Development of New Routes and Rehabilitation of Closed Routes</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Development of New Routes and Rehabilitation of Closed Routes</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Development of New Routes and Rehabilitation of Closed Routes</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Development of New Routes and Rehabilitation of Closed Routes</i></b></p>
<p>3. No existing decisions specifically address this action.</p>	<p>3. Develop new routes only when a new segment is needed to provide legal public access to monument lands or provide access to a non-Federal land inholding or other locations specified in a land use authorization or if needed for administrative use or to meet a specific management objective. Construction of new routes would be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>3. Same as Alternative B.</p>

Travel Management (continued)

4. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	4. Rehabilitate or restore identified routes using the most appropriate method based on ecological site conditions.	4. Same as Alternative B.	4. Same as Alternative B.
<b><i>Recreational Access</i></b>	<b><i>Recreational Access</i></b>	<b><i>Recreational Access</i></b>	<b><i>Recreational Access</i></b>
5. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	5. Allow motorized, mechanized, and recreational livestock access into the IFNM from areas of urban interface only via public or community access points to be designated through the travel management planning process. Types of access (i.e., motorized or non-motorized) would depend on the Recreation Management Zone (RMZ). New access would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	5. Same as Alternative B.	5. Same as Alternative B.
6. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	6. Provide minimum improvements for, and maintain monument access staging areas or facilities, to accommodate multi-mode access to monument lands consistent with RMZ objectives.	6. Same as Alternative B.	6. Same as Alternative B.
7. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	7. Take measures or install appropriate barriers to promote compliance with travel route use designations and restrictions consistent with RMZ objectives.	7. Same as Alternative B.	7. Same as Alternative B.
8. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	8. Provide signing along travel routes for directional, informational, regulatory purposes consistent with RMZ objectives.	8. Same as Alternative B.	8. Same as Alternative B.

<i>Equestrian Use</i>	<i>Equestrian Use</i>	<i>Equestrian Use</i>	<i>Equestrian Use</i>
9. No existing decisions specifically address this action.	9. Prohibit cross-country equestrian use and allow for equestrian uses on routes designated motorized or non-motorized. No new equestrian trails would be constructed. Equestrian uses may be restricted where BLM has determined through inventory and monitoring that such use is adversely impacting monument objects. Allow equestrian use to retrieve lawfully taken game in all areas of the IFNM.	9. Allow equestrian uses on routes designated as motorized or non-motorized; cross-country equestrian travel is allowed in all areas of the monument open to public use. New trails for equestrian uses would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Equestrian uses may be restricted where BLM has determined through inventory and monitoring that such use is adversely impacting monument objects.	9. Same as Alternative C.
<i>Non-Motorized, Mechanized Use</i>	<i>Non-Motorized, Mechanized Use</i>	<i>Non-Motorized, Mechanized Use</i>	<i>Non-Motorized, Mechanized Use</i>
10. Use of non-motorized wheeled game carriers to retrieve lawfully taken game is allowed in all areas of the monument.	10. Same as Alternative A.	10. Same as Alternative A.	10. Same as Alternative A.
<b>Implementation-Level Decisions</b>			
<i>Motorized and Non-Motorized Use Route Designations</i>	<i>Motorized and Non-Motorized Use Route Designations</i>	<i>Motorized and Non-Motorized Use Route Designations</i>	<i>Motorized and Non-Motorized Use Route Designations</i>
1. Limit motorized vehicle use in the IFNM to existing roads and trails (Map 2-19).	1. Travel route designations: Designate 63 miles of existing travel routes for motorized access/use. Allow motorized use by all types of vehicles on these routes.  Designate 266 miles for non-motorized use. Allow non-motorized use and non-motorized mechanized use on these routes except in areas where restricted. (Mechanized use of trails would be prohibited.) Motorized use for administrative access is allowed on a case-by-case basis provided route is not subject to improvements  17 miles of existing routes would be obliterated and/or revegetated.	1. Travel route designations: Designate 124 miles of existing travel routes for motorized access/use.  Designate 205 miles for non-motorized use. Allow non-motorized use and non-motorized mechanized use on these routes except in areas where restricted. (Mechanized use of trails would be prohibited.) Motorized use for administrative access is allowed on a case-by-case basis provided route is not subject to improvements.  17 miles of existing routes would be obliterated and/or revegetated.	1. Travel route designations: Designate 226 miles of existing travel routes for motorized access/use.  Designate 116 miles for non-motorized use. Allow non-motorized use and non-motorized mechanized use on these routes except in areas where restricted. (Mechanized use of trails would be prohibited.) Motorized use for administrative access is allowed on a case-by-case basis provided route is not subject to improvements.  4 miles of existing routes would be obliterated and/or revegetated.

	<p>Motorized use would be required to keep within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside, allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping or parking, unless otherwise posted.</p> <p>Travel on all designated routes is subject to route-specific designations for type of use, functional class, maintenance level and route standard (refer to Appendix G for more information).</p> <p>Route designations are shown on Map 2-20.</p> <p>NOTE: mileage shown above is for BLM land only.</p>	<p>Motorized use would be required to keep within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside, allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping or parking, unless otherwise posted.</p> <p>Travel on all designated routes is subject to route-specific designations for type of use, functional class, maintenance level and route standard (refer to Appendix G for more information).</p> <p>Route designations are shown on Map 2-21 (also see Appendix G Maps G-1 through G-4 for enlarged maps).</p> <p>NOTE: mileage shown above is for BLM land only.</p>	<p>Motorized use would be required to keep within the designated route with reasonable use of the shoulder and immediate roadside, allowing for vehicle passage, emergency stopping or parking, unless otherwise posted.</p> <p>Travel on all designated routes is subject to route-specific designations for type of use, functional class, maintenance level and route standard (refer to Appendix G for more information).</p> <p>Route designations are shown on Map 2-22.</p> <p>NOTE: mileage shown above is for BLM land only.</p>
--	---	--	---

**Table 2-17. Resource Management Alternatives for SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS**

<b>Desired Outcomes: Management Goals and Objectives</b>			
<b>NO ACTION</b>	<b>Goals COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> No LUP-level goals for special area designations are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Manage special designations, as applicable, to protect resources for which they are established.</p>		
<p><b>Objective:</b> No LUP-level objectives for special area designations are presented in the existing land use plan.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> No LUP-level objectives for special designations have been developed.</p>		
<b>Decisions for Management Actions, Allowable Uses, and Use Allocations</b>			
<b>Alternative A (No Action)</b>	<b>Action Alternative B</b>	<b>Action Alternative C (Proposed Plan)</b>	<b>Action Alternative D</b>
<p>1. Designate ACEC to Protect the habitat, provide optimum habitat for naturally occurring populations of Nichol Turk’s head cactus on approximately 2,240 acres of BLM-administered public land, and assist in the recovery of this subspecies. (Refer to Appendix H for additional information.)</p>	<p>1. Remove the ACEC designation.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>1. Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table**

Table 2-18 provides a summary of the impacts on the human and natural environment in terms of environmental, social, and economic consequences that are projected to occur from implementing the proposed alternatives presented in Tables 2-1 through 2-17. These environmental consequences are described in detail in Chapter 4.

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Air Quality</b>	<p>Vehicle travel on existing routes in the 26,630 acres of PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area and recreation-al use could result in the release of particulate matter (dust) and emissions of other pollutants in localized areas from surface disturbance. Surface disturbance in the 8,240 acres of utility corridors, development of rights-of-ways, fuel treatments and livestock grazing could increase exposure of soils where vegetation is removed resulting in release of particulate matter in localized areas, generally through wind erosion. Closing 820 acres to motorized use and limiting vehicles to existing routes through-out the remainder of the IFNM would limit vehicle-generated emissions (including dust) to areas near existing routes.</p>	<p>Vehicle travel on designated routes in the 10,630 acres of the PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area that is managed as Rooded Natural or Semi-Primitive Motorized could result in localized degradation of air quality from vehicle emissions, including fugitive dust.</p> <p>Prohibiting surface disturbance on the 11,340 acres with fragile or sensitive soils, managing 38,040 acres closed to vehicle travel, and managing 29,420 acres a Primitive RMZ could reduce wind erosion and decrease fugitive dust compared to Alternative A.</p> <p>A lack of utility corridors and allocating the IFNM as an exclusion area for rights-of-way would limit opportunities for surface-disturbing activities that could generate fugitive dust within the IFNM, but more of those activities could occur outside the IFNM potentially resulting in increased particulate matter emissions in localized areas.</p>	<p>Vehicle travel in the 17,750 acres of the PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area managed as Rooded Natural or Semi-Primitive Motorized could result in localized degradation of air quality from emissions, including fugitive dust.</p> <p>Allowing surface disturbance but requiring mitigation on the 11,340 acres with fragile or sensitive soils, managing 10,880 acres closed to vehicle travel, and managing 9,510 acres a Primitive RMZ could reduce wind erosion and decrease fugitive dust compared to Alternative A, but increase erosion and dust compared to Alternative B.</p> <p>Managing 241 acres as utility corridors and allocating the IFNM as an avoidance area for rights-of-way could limit surface-disturbing activities within the IFNM, but more surface-disturbing activities could occur outside the IFNM potentially resulting in increased emissions of particulate matter in localized areas.”</p>	<p>Vehicle travel in the 21,560 acres of the PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area managed as Rooded Natural or Semi-Primitive Motorized could result in localized degradation of air quality from emissions, including fugitive dust.</p> <p>Allowing surface disturbance but requiring mitigation on the 11,340 acres with fragile or sensitive soils, and managing 10,880 acres closed to vehicle travel, could reduce wind erosion and decrease fugitive dust compared to Alternative A, but increase erosion and dust compared to Alternative B.</p> <p>Managing 2,660 acres as utility corridors and allocating the IFNM as an avoidance area for rights-of-ways could reduce surface-disturbing activities. This could reduce wind erosion and decrease fugitive dust within the IFNM compared to Alternative A, though localized increases in fugitive dust could occur in the Sawtooth Mountains because of the new corridor within that area.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p><b>Geology and Caves</b></p>	<p>Designating 128,400 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class III objectives and allocating 8,240 acres of utility corridors could result in surface-disturbing activities that would generate localized erosion. This could result in the loss of geologic resources or values in localized areas. Closing 820 acres to vehicle travel would eliminate the potential for vehicle travel to cause erosion or disturbance to geologic resources in localized areas.</p> <p>The disturbance to geological objects of the monument (rugged mountains, including Ragged Top and the Silver Bell Mountains) resulting from management actions would be undetectable or measurable only in localized areas; this would be consistent with “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 125,110 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class I or Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, and adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion could limit surface-disturbing activities and localized erosion. This could help protect geologic resources or values. Closing 38,040 acres to vehicle travel and managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics also could reduce surface disturbance and protect geologic resources and values to a greater extent than Alternative A.</p> <p>The disturbance to geological objects of the monument (rugged mountains, including Ragged Top and the Silver Bell Mountains) resulting from management actions would be undetectable or measurable only in localized areas; this would be consistent with “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 124,900 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, and adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion could limit surface-disturbing activities and localized erosion. This could help protect geologic resources or values. Closing 10,880 acres to vehicle travel and managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics also could reduce surface disturbance and maintain geologic resources and values to a greater extent than Alternative A, but to a lesser extent than Alternative B.</p> <p>Allocating 241 acres as utility corridors could result in surface disturbance, localized erosion, and the loss of geologic resources and values.</p> <p>The disturbance to geological objects of the monument (rugged mountains, including Ragged Top and the Silver Bell Mountains) resulting from management actions would be undetectable or measurable only in localized areas; this would be consistent with “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 122,580 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, and adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion could limit surface-disturbing activities and localized erosion. This could help protect geologic resources or values. Managing vehicle travel on 128,400 acres as limited to designated routes also could reduce surface disturbance and maintain geologic resources and values to a greater extent than Alternative A, but to a lesser extent than Alternatives B or C.</p> <p>Allocating 2,660 acres as utility corridors could result in surface disturbance, localized erosion, and the loss of geologic resources and values.</p> <p>The disturbance to geological objects of the monument (rugged mountains, including Ragged Top and the Silver Bell Mountains) resulting from management actions would be undetectable or measurable only in localized areas; this would be consistent with “protection of the monument objects.”</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Soil and Water Resources</b>	<p>Designating 128,400 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class III objectives and allocating 8,240 acres as utility corridors could result in surface-disturbing activities causing the loss of soil resources or degradation of water quality.</p> <p>Closing 820 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicle travel to exiting routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce surface disturbance and erosion in localized areas.</p> <p>Allocating 8,230 acres for utility corridors could result in surface disturbance and erosion in localized areas causing a loss of soil resources or degradation of water quality in localized areas.</p>	<p>Designating 125,110 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class I or Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities throughout a majority of the IFNM, which would protect soil and water resources more than Alternative A.</p> <p>Closing 38,040 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicle travel to designated routes in the remainder of the IFNM could limit surface disturbance and erosion in localized areas.</p> <p>Prohibit the granting of rights-of-way or easements for the construction of surface water diversions or conveyances which remove surface water from the monument or adversely affect the monument's values, subject to valid existing rights, unless such conveyances further the protective purposes of the monument. Prohibit the pumping of groundwater from monument lands that removes water from the monument boundary or adversely affects monument values.</p>	<p>Designating 124,900 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities throughout a majority of the IFNM, which would protect soil and water resources more than Alternative A, but less than Alternative B.</p> <p>Closing 10,880 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicle travel to existing routes in the remainder of the IFNM could limit surface disturbance and erosion in localized areas.</p> <p>Allocating 241 acres as utility corridors could result in surface disturbance and erosion in localized areas causing the loss of soil resources or degradation of water quality in localized areas.</p>	<p>Designating 122,580 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, and adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion could reduce surface-disturbing activities, which would protect soil and water resources more than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B or C.</p> <p>Allocating 2,660 acres as utility corridors could result in surface disturbance and localized erosion causing the loss of soil resources or degradation of water quality in localized areas.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p><b>Vegetation</b></p>	<p>Designating 128,400 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class III objectives and allocating 8,240 acres as utility corridors could result in surface-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal. This could alter vegetation community structure and/or diversity and provide opportunities for noxious weed and invasive species establishment.</p> <p>Allowing dispersed recreational target shooting could result in damage to vegetation resources.</p> <p>Closing 820 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to existing routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce disturbance to vegetation.</p> <p>Managing 3,340 acres, including 2,240 acres of Nichol Turk’s head cactus could help retain existing vegetation resources by restricting surface-disturbing activities.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to vegetative objects of the monument would not reduce the viability or result in the loss of a population of these species or the natural range of variation in vegetative communities, but would require the implementation of mitigation measures to comply with the Proclamation. With mitigation, impacts on those objects would be reduced to the extent that they would be measurable only in small localized areas, and vegetative communities would be conserved for future generations, and would provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 125,110 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class I or Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities compared to Alternative A. This could help protect vegetation and reduce opportunities for noxious weed and invasive species establishment compared to Alternative A.</p> <p>Closing 38,040 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to designated routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce surface disturbance and protect vegetation resource conditions.</p> <p>Managing 9,020 acres on the Waterman and Ragged Top VHAs could help maintain existing vegetation resources by restricting surface-disturbing activities.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to vegetative objects of the monument would be undetectable or measurable only in localized areas and would not reduce the viability or result in the loss of a population of these species, a vegetative community, or the natural range of variation in vegetation communities. The localized nature of impacts on vegetative objects of the monument would provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 124,900 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities compared to Alternative A, but to a lesser extent than Alternative B. This could help protect vegetation and reduce opportunities for noxious weed and invasive species establishment compared to Alternative A, but less than Alternative B.</p> <p>Closing 10,880 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to designated routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce surface disturbance, including vegetation trampling or removal, in localized areas.</p> <p>Allocating 241 acres as utility corridors could result in disturbance to vegetation in localized areas.</p> <p>Managing 9,020 acres as the Waterman and Ragged Top VHAs could retain existing vegetation resources. However, allowing camping in these areas could result in localized surface disturbance.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to vegetative objects of the monument would be greater than those under Alternative B, but would provide for “protection of monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 122,580 acres the IFNM as to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, and adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion could reduce surface-disturbing activities and localized erosion. This could help protect vegetation and reduce opportunities for noxious weed and invasive species establishment compared to Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B or C.</p> <p>Managing 2,660 acres as utility corridors and allowing recreational shooting in site-specific areas could result in disturbance to vegetation in localized areas.</p> <p>Managing 5,740 acres as the Waterman and Ragged Top VHAs could retain existing vegetation resources by restricting surface-disturbing activities. However, this would be 3,280 acres less than Alternatives B and C.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to vegetative objects of the monument would be greater than those under Alternatives B or C, but would provide for “protection of monument objects.”</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p><b>Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat</b></p>	<p>Designating 128,400 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class III objectives and allocating 8,240 acres as utility corridors would provide opportunities for surface-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal. This could reduce the quantity and/or quality of wildlife habitat from present conditions in localized areas.</p> <p>Closing 820 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to existing routes in the remainder of the IFNM could limit surface disturbance and maintain existing wildlife habitat conditions in these areas. In addition, managing 41,470 acres as the Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Area would limit or prohibit surface disturbance, and maintain or continue to improve wildlife habitat conditions.</p> <p>Allocating 8,240 acres for utility corridors could increase surface disturbance and localized erosion, which could degrade the quantity and/or quality of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, as objects of the monument, would not change the types, or relative distributions of wildlife habitats within the IFNM, but would require the implementation of mitigation measures to comply with the Proclamation. With mitigation, impacts on those objects would be reduced to the extent that they would be measurable only in small localized areas, and would provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 125,110 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class I or Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities compared to Alternative A. This could help maintain wildlife habitat and reduce disruptions to wildlife populations.</p> <p>Closing 38,040 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to designated routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce surface disturbance resulting in greater protection of existing wildlife habitat conditions compared to Alternative A. In addition, allocating 29,820 acres as the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA and 2,240 acres as the Waterman Mountains VHA would limit or prohibit surface disturbance, and maintain or improve wildlife habitat conditions in this area.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, as objects of the monument, would be undetectable or measurable only in localized areas and would not change the types, or relative distributions, of wildlife habitats within the IFNM. The localized nature of impacts on vegetative objects of the monument would provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 124,900 acres the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities compared to Alternative A, but less than Alternative B. This could help maintain wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Closing 10,880 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to designated routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce surface disturbance resulting in greater protection of existing wildlife habitat conditions and reduce disruption to wildlife populations compared to Alternatives A or B.</p> <p>Allocating 241 acres as a utility corridor could result in surface disturbance and localized erosion, which could degrade the quantity and/or quality of wildlife habitat. In addition, allocating 29,820 acres as the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA and 2,240 acres as the Waterman Mountains VHA would limit or prohibit surface disturbance, and maintain or improve wildlife habitat conditions in this area.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat objects of the monument would be greater than those under Alternative B, but would provide for “protection of monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 122,580 acres the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion could reduce surface-disturbing activities compared to Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B or C. This could help maintain wildlife habitat and reduce disruption to wildlife populations.</p> <p>Allocating 2,660 acres as a utility corridor could result in surface disturbance and localized erosion, which could degrade the quantity and/or quality of wildlife habitat. In addition, allocating 29,820 acres as the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA and 2,240 acres as a VHA would limit or prohibit surface disturbance, and maintain or improve wildlife habitat conditions in this area.</p> <p>Damage to vegetation associated with recreational shooting in designated areas could result in habitat degradation and the disturbance associated with frequent human presence and firearm noise could disturb wildlife in the vicinity of the designated shooting areas.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, as objects of the monument, would be similar to Alternative A and require the implementation of mitigation measures to comply with the Proclamation and provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Special Status Species</b>	<p>Designating 128,400 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class III objectives and allocating 8,240 acres as utility corridors would provide opportunities for surface-disturbing activities and vegetation removal. This could reduce the quantity and or quality of special status species habitat, depending on the area of disturbance.</p> <p>Closing 820 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to existing routes in the remainder of the IFNM could limit surface disturbance and protect existing special status species habitat conditions. Managing 2,240 acres of public land as the Waterman Mountains ACEC would help protect special status species habitat.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to special status species objects of the monument (including Nichol Turk’s head cactus, lesser long-nosed bat, and Sonoran desert tortoise) resulting from management actions would range from undetectable to measurable at a broad scale (i.e., disturbance in mile-wide utility corridors). The anticipated impacts would not result in the loss of a population of the special status species. BLM’s implementation of management actions for vegetation, including control of invasives, would mitigate the potential for broad-scale impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts on special status species and limit impacts to small and localized areas to provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 125,110 acres of the IFNM to meet VRM Class I or Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities. This could help protect special status species habitat and reduce disruptions to special status species habitat and populations compared to Alternative A.</p> <p>Closing 38,040 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to designated routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce surface disturbance and protect special status species habitat to a greater extent than Alternative A. In addition, managing approximately 2,240 acres of Nichol Turk’s head cactus habitat as a VHA in the Waterman Mountains and 6,780 acres as a VHA at Ragged Top also could help protect special status species habitat.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to special status species objects of the monument (including Nichol Turk’s head cactus, lesser long-nosed bat, and Sonoran desert tortoise) resulting from management actions would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale and would not cause the loss of special status species from the monument. BLM may implement mitigation measures to provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>Designating 124,900 acres the IFNM as to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion, and managing 9,540 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could reduce surface-disturbing activities. This could help protect special status species habitat and reduce disruption to special status species populations.</p> <p>Closing 10,880 acres to vehicle travel and limiting vehicles to designated routes in the remainder of the IFNM could reduce surface disturbance and protect special status species habitat to a greater extent than Alternative A, but less than Alternative B.</p> <p>Allocating 241 acres as utility corridors could result in surface disturbance and localized erosion. This could reduce the quantity and/or quality of special status species habitat.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to special status species objects of the monument (including Nichol Turk’s head cactus, lesser long-nosed bat, and Sonoran desert tortoise) resulting from management actions would be similar to those under Alternative B.</p>	<p>Designating 122,580 acres the IFNM to meet VRM Class II objectives, minimizing the loss of vegetation, and adopting mitigation plans that minimize erosion could reduce surface-disturbing activities and localized erosion. This could help protect special status species habitat and reduce disruption to special status species populations.</p> <p>Managing 2,660 acres as utility corridors could result in surface disturbance and localized erosion. This could reduce the quantity and or quality of special status species habitat.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to special status species objects of the monument (including Nichol Turk’s head cactus, lesser long-nosed bat, and Sonoran desert tortoise) resulting from management actions would range from undetectable to measurable at a broad scale (i.e., disturbance in utility corridors). The anticipated impacts would not result in the loss of a population of the special status species. BLM’s implementation of management actions for vegetation, including control of invasives, would mitigate the potential for broad-scale impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts on special status species and limit impacts to small and localized areas to provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Fire Ecology</b>	<p>Managing 41,470 acres as the Silver Bell Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Area and improving ecological site conditions in the Cocoraque Butte–Waterman Mountains Multiple Resource Management Area would limit surface disturbance and reduce opportunities for the establishment of noxious weeds and invasive species in these areas. These decisions would indirectly help retain FRCC I and maintain the current fire regime. The potential for ignitions that originate from motorized vehicles would be reduced on approximately 820 acres that are closed to motorized vehicles.</p>	<p>Managing 2,240 acres as the Waterman Mountains VHA and 29,820 acres as the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA along with an integrated noxious weed management approach throughout the IFNM, would reduce opportunities for the establishment of noxious weeds and invasive species. These decisions would indirectly help maintain current FRCC I ratings in site-specific areas. The potential for ignitions that originate from motorized vehicles would be reduced on approximately 38,040 acres that would be closed to motorized vehicles.</p> <p>Managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could preclude some types of fire suppression and fuels treatment activities. Managing 60,000 acres as Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized could increase the response time to wildfire ignitions in those areas. In addition, making 11 allotments unavailable for livestock grazing after existing grazing leases expire could increase the amount of fine fuels available for ignition.</p>	<p>Managing 2,240 acres as the Waterman Mountains VHA and 29,820 acres as the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA along with an integrated noxious weed management approach throughout the IFNM, would reduce opportunities for the establishment of noxious weeds and invasive species. These decisions would indirectly help maintain current FRCC I ratings in site-specific areas. The potential for ignitions that originate from motorized vehicles would be reduced on approximately 10,880 acres that would be closed to motorized vehicles.</p> <p>Managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics could preclude some types of fire suppression and fuels treatment activities. Managing 57,450 acres as Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized could increase the response time to wildfire ignitions in those areas. In addition, managing nine allotments as perennial livestock grazing could decrease the amount of fine fuels available for ignition compared to Alternative B.</p>	<p>Managing 2,240 acres as the Waterman Mountains VHA and 29,820 acres as the Desert Bighorn Sheep WHA along with an integrated noxious weed management approach throughout the IFNM, would reduce opportunities for the establishment of noxious weeds and invasive species. These decisions would indirectly help maintain current FRCC I ratings in site-specific areas</p> <p>Managing 43,770 acres as Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized could increase the response time to wildfire ignitions in those areas. In comparison with Alternative B, managing nine allotments as perennial livestock grazing could decrease the amount of fine fuels available for ignition.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	<p>Closing 820 acres to motorized vehicles and allocating the 2,720-acre Avra Valley Cultural Resource Management Area would help protect cultural resources by reducing surface disturbance in these areas. Maintaining the Waterman Mountains ACEC also provides some coincidental protection of cultural resources on approximately 2,240 acres of public lands.</p> <p>Surface-disturbing activities within 8,240 acres managed as utility corridors, from right-of-way construction and use, and resulting from livestock grazing could disturb cultural resources; however, mitigation would be required for impacts to cultural resources.</p> <p>Dispersed recreation and OHV use also would have the potential to disturb cultural resources.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to cultural objects of the monument, including rock art, archaeological sites, archaeological districts, and Mission Santa Ana would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale. BLM would implement mitigation measures to reduce threats or conflicts, providing for the “protection of monument objects.”</p>	<p>Closing 38,040 acres to motorized vehicles and managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics would help protect cultural resources by reducing surface disturbance in these areas.</p> <p>No sites would be allocated to public use, limiting opportunities for public interpretation. For sites allocated to scientific use, ground-disturbing activities for research would not be permitted, potentially limiting the understanding of the resource.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as an exclusion area with no utility corridors designated, and limiting the opportunities for authorization of new rights-of-way, could coincidentally protect cultural resources by reducing surface disturbance compared to Alternative A.</p> <p>Managing 60,000 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation could reduce surface disturbance and subsequent impacts on cultural resources in these areas.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to cultural objects of the monument, including rock art, archaeological sites, archaeological districts, and Mission Santa Ana would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale; less ground-disturbance would be expected under Alternative B compared to other alternatives. BLM would implement mitigation measures to reduce threats or conflicts, providing for the “protection of monument objects.”</p>	<p>Closing 10,880 acres to motorized vehicles and managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics would help protect cultural resources by reducing surface disturbance in these areas.</p> <p>Ground-disturbing activities would be allowed for research at sites allocated to scientific use, by promoting long-term preservation of the informational values to these sites and increase understanding of the cultural history.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as an avoidance area, but allocating 241 acres as utility corridors could cause surface disturbance and the loss of cultural resources in localized areas to a lesser extent than Alternative A, but to a greater extent than Alternative B.</p> <p>Managing 57,450 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation could reduce surface disturbance and subsequent impacts on cultural resources in these areas.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to cultural objects of the monument, including rock art, archaeological sites, archaeological districts, and Mission Santa Ana would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale, but fewer impacts than current management (Alternative A). BLM would implement mitigation measures to reduce threats or conflicts, providing for the “protection of monument objects.”</p>	<p>Managing the IFNM as an avoidance area with 2,660 acres allocated as utility corridors could cause surface disturbance and the loss of cultural resources. Ground-disturbing activities (i.e., excavation) would be allowed for research at sites allocated to scientific use, which would promote long-term preservation of the informational values to these sites and increase understanding of the regional cultural history.</p> <p>Managing 43,770 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation could reduce surface disturbance and subsequent impacts on cultural resources in these areas.</p> <p>Ground-disturbing activities (i.e., excavation) would be allowed for research at sites allocated to scientific use, which would promote long-term preservation of the informational values to these sites and increase understanding of the regional cultural history.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to objects of the monument, including rock art, archaeological sites, archaeological districts, and Mission Santa Ana would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale, with slightly greater potential for impacts compared to Alternatives B and C. BLM would implement mitigation measures to reduce threats or conflicts, providing for the “protection of monument objects.”</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Paleontological Resources</b>	<p>Closing 820 acres to motorized vehicles and allocating 2,720-acre Avra Valley Cultural Resource Management Area would help protect paleontological resources by limiting surface disturbance in these areas.</p> <p>Designating the Waterman Mountains ACEC also provides some coincidental protection of paleontological resources on approximately 2,240 acres of public lands. Surface-disturbing activities within 8,240 acres of utility corridors, from right-of-way construction and use, and resulting from livestock grazing could disturb paleontological resources; however, mitigation would be required for impacts.</p> <p>Dispersed recreation and OHV use would have the potential to disturb paleontological resources.</p>	<p>Closing 38,040 acres to motorized vehicles and managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics would help protect paleontological resources by reducing surface disturbance in these areas.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as an exclusion area with no utility corridors, and limiting the opportunities for authorization of new rights-of-way, could coincidentally protect paleontological resources by reducing surface disturbance.</p> <p>Managing 60,000 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation could reduce surface disturbance and impact to paleontological resources in these areas.</p>	<p>Closing 10,880 acres to motorized vehicles and managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics would help protect paleontological resources by reducing surface disturbance in these areas.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as an avoidance area, but allocating 241 acres as utility corridors could cause surface disturbance and the loss of paleontological resources in localized areas.</p> <p>Managing 57,450 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation could reduce surface disturbance and impact to paleontological resources.</p>	<p>Managing the IFNM as an avoidance area, but allocating 2,660 acres as utility corridors could cause surface disturbance and the loss of paleontological resources in localized areas.</p> <p>Managing 43,770 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation could reduce surface disturbance and impact to paleontological resources.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p><b>Visual Resources</b></p>	<p>VRM Class III designation on 128,400 acres would partially retain visual characteristics of the landscape, allowing a moderate level of change to the characteristic landscape. Mile-wide corridors for utility rights-of-way have highest potential for visual impacts by increasing contrasts. Prohibiting land use authorizations (except along existing roads) within the Waterman Mountains ACEC would limit the potential for new structures and activities that could introduce contrasting elements into the surrounding landscape on approximately 2,240 acres of public land.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to objects of the monument (including visual resources) would range from undetectable to measurable at a broad scale (i.e., continuing management of the IFNM as VRM Class III, which would allow for greater modifications to the landscape). BLM would evaluate specific projects as they are proposed and implement mitigation measures to minimize or reduce human-caused impacts on visual resources and provide for “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>VRM Class I designation would preserve the character of the landscape on about 36,990 acres of the most scenic, natural appearing, and visually sensitive parts of the public lands in the IFNM.</p> <p>VRM Class II designation would retain the existing character of the landscape approximately 88,120 acres of the public lands in the IFNM.</p> <p>Visual contrasts generated from recreational activities would be most noticeable in approximately 17,610 of the public lands in the IFNM in the Roaded Natural zone. Managing the IFNM as a right-of-way exclusion area would help retain visual and scenic resources.</p> <p>The anticipated impacts to objects of the monument (including visual resources) would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale. The visual quality of natural landscapes would be maintained, consistent with the VRM categories, which would provide “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>VRM Class II designation would retain the existing character of the landscape approximately 124,900 acres of the public lands in the IFNM.</p> <p>Visual contrasts generated from recreational activities would be most noticeable in approximately 18,380 acres of the public lands in the IFNM in the Roaded Natural zone.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as a right-of-way avoidance area would help retain visual and scenic resources. Though slightly greater impacts would be anticipated compared to Alternative B, the impacts on objects of the monument (including visual resources) would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale. The visual quality of natural landscapes would be maintained, consistent with the VRM categories, which would provide “protection of the monument objects.”</p>	<p>VRM Class II designation would retain the existing character of the landscape approximately 122,580 acres of the public lands in the IFNM.</p> <p>Visual contrasts generated from recreational activities would be most noticeable in approximately 19,060 acres of the public lands in the IFNM in the Roaded Natural zone, but visual contrast would also be expected within the approximately 629 acres designated for recreational shooting.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as a right-of-way avoidance area would help retain visual and scenic resources. Though slightly greater impacts would be anticipated compared to Alternative C, the impacts on objects of the monument (including visual resources) would range from undetectable to measurable at a local scale. The visual quality of natural landscapes would be maintained, consistent with the VRM categories, which would provide “protection of the monument objects.”</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Wilderness Characteristics</b>	<p>Designating 128,400 acres as VRM Class III would provide for limited protection of lands with wilderness characteristics. Limiting motorized traffic to existing routes and closing 820 acres to OHV use could provide some coincidental protection of lands with wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>Allowing rights-of-way within areas with wilderness characteristics would diminish naturalness in localized areas, as well as opportunities for solitude during construction and maintenance of the facility.</p> <p>Allowing dispersed non-motorized camping throughout the IFNM would promote retention of wilderness characteristics by providing opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.</p>	<p>Designating 125,110 acres as VRM Class I or Class II would help protect areas with wilderness characteristics. Limiting motorized traffic to designated routes and closing 38,040 acres to OHV use could provide some coincidental protection of areas with wilderness characteristics to a greater extent than Alternative A.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as an exclusion area for rights-of-way would retain naturalness, as well as opportunities for solitude.</p> <p>Managing 29,420 acres for Primitive recreation and 60,000 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation use would promote retention of lands with wilderness characteristics by providing opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.</p>	<p>Designating 124,900 acres as a VRM Class II area would help protect areas with wilderness characteristics. Limiting motorized traffic to designated routes and closing 10,880 acres to OHV use could provide some coincidental protection of areas with wilderness characteristics to a greater extent than Alternative A, but less than Alternative B.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as an avoidance area for rights-of-way could help retain naturalness, as well as opportunities for solitude.</p> <p>Managing 9,510 acres for Primitive recreation and 57,450 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation use would promote retention of lands with wilderness characteristics by providing opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.</p>	<p>Designating 122,580 acres as a VRM Class II area would help protect areas with wilderness characteristics. Limiting motorized traffic to designated routes could provide some coincidental protection of areas with wilderness characteristics to a greater extent than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B or C.</p> <p>Managing 43,770 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation use would promote retention of wilderness characteristics by providing opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Livestock Grazing</b>	<p>Designating 128,400 acres as VRM Class III and continuing custodial management of recreation could allow for surface-disturbing activities that reduce forage in site-specific areas. In addition, managing 8,240 acres in nine allotments as utility corridors could result in surface disturbance from construction and development of rights-of-way within the corridors.</p> <p>Closing 820 acres to motorized use and managing approximately 2,240 acres of public land as the Waterman Mountains ACEC could reduce surface-disturbing activities and maintain forage for livestock grazing in these areas.</p>	<p>Making the IFNM unavailable to livestock grazing after leases expire would reduce the number of livestock operators in the IFNM. Designating 3,290 acres as VRM Class III and managing 17,610 acres for Roaded Natural recreation could allow for surface-disturbing activities that reduce forage in site-specific areas.</p> <p>Closing 36,990 acres to motorized use and managing the IFNM as exclusion area for rights-of-way activities could reduce surface-disturbing activities and maintain forage for livestock grazing to a greater extent than Alternative A. Managing 2,240 acres as a VHA and 29,820 acres as a WHA could reduce surface disturbance and help retain forage for livestock grazing.</p>	<p>Designating 3,420 acres as VRM Class III and 80 acres as VRM Class IV, and managing 18,380 acres for Roaded Natural recreation could allow for surface-disturbing activities that reduce forage in site-specific areas.</p> <p>Closing 10,880 acres to motorized use and managing the IFNM as an avoidance area for rights-of-way activities could reduce surface-disturbing activities and maintain forage for livestock grazing to a greater extent than Alternative A, but less than Alternative B.</p> <p>Managing 2,240 acres as a VHA and 29,820 acres as a WHA could reduce surface disturbance and help retain forage for livestock grazing.</p>	<p>Designating 4,220 acres as VRM Class III and 1,600 acres as VRM Class IV, and managing 19,060 acres for Roaded Natural recreation could allow for surface-disturbing activities that reduce forage in site-specific areas.</p> <p>Managing the IFNM as an avoidance area for rights-of-way activities could reduce surface-disturbing activities and maintain forage for livestock grazing to a greater extent than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B or C.</p> <p>Managing 2,240 acres as a VHA and 29,820 acres as a WHA could reduce surface disturbance and help retain forage for livestock grazing.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Recreation</b>	<p>Custodial recreation management could increase the number of vehicle-based campsites in areas near existing routes, providing opportunities for vehicle-based camping. However, this dispersed use could result in increased surface disturbance in localized areas, degrading the natural landscape and diminishing recreational settings over time.</p> <p>Managing 127,580 acres as limited to designated or existing routes would continue to provide opportunities for motorized recreation along approximately 346 miles of road or primitive road. No specific trails would be managed, but non-motorized recreation opportunities would be available along motorized routes</p> <p>Closing 820 acres to OHV use would help maintain the existing recreational settings by preserving natural landscapes; and provide a setting for non-motorized recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Designating 128,400 acres as VRM Class III and continuing the designation of utility corridors on 8,240 acres would allow for activities, including surface disturbance, which could reduce naturalness and degrade recreational settings.</p> <p>Continuing to allow dispersed recreational shooting throughout IFNM would not change the existing recreational opportunity, but would continue to have the potential to conflict with other recreational uses.</p>	<p>Managing 90,360 acres as limited to designated routes would maintain opportunities for motorized recreation along approximately 63 miles of road or primitive road, Closing 38,040 acres to OHV use and managing 60,000 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation would sustain the undeveloped recreational settings, and provide trail touring opportunities on approximately 270 miles of trail.</p> <p>Designating 3,290 acres as VRM Class III would allow surface disturbance, reducing naturalness and degrading some primitive recreational settings in localized areas.</p> <p>Prohibiting recreational target shooting within IFNM would eliminate a currently available recreational opportunity.</p>	<p>Managing 117,520 acres of the IFNM as limited to designated routes would maintain opportunities for motorized recreation along approximately 124 miles of road or primitive road.</p> <p>Closing 10,880 acres to OHV use and managing 57,450 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation would sustain undeveloped settings and provide non-motorized opportunities for touring on 210 miles of trail.</p> <p>Designating 3,420 acres as VRM Class III would allow surface disturbance, reducing naturalness and degrading some primitive recreational settings in localized areas.</p> <p>Prohibiting recreational target shooting within IFNM would eliminate a currently available recreational opportunity.</p>	<p>Managing the IFNM as limited to designated routes would maintain opportunities for motorized recreation along approximately 226 miles of road or primitive road.</p> <p>Managing 43,770 acres for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation would help sustain the undeveloped settings and-provide non-motorized opportunities along 100 miles of trail.</p> <p>Designating 4,220 acres as VRM Class III and 1,600 acres as VRM Class IV would allow surface disturbance, reducing naturalness and degrading recreational settings in localized areas.</p> <p>Providing two specially designated areas for recreational target shooting would provide an ongoing recreational opportunity, but concentrating shooting within approximately 629 acres would change the experience from the dispersed opportunity that currently exists.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p><b>Lands and Realty</b></p>	<p>Land tenure adjustments would focus on acquisition of non-Federal land in the Waterman Mountains, Sawtooth Mountains, Agua Blanca Ranch area, Cocoraque Butte area, Silver Bell Mountains, and three sections of land in the West Silver Bell Mountains. Acquisitions would be driven by opportunities or land availability in these geographic areas.</p> <p>Closing 820 acres to could effectively restrict land use authorizations in these areas as a result of access limitations that would be enforced as part of the OHV closure.</p>	<p>Land tenure adjustments would focus on acquisition of non-Federal land throughout the IFNM, on an opportunistic basis, rather than within specific areas. This would provide greater flexibility for BLM in prioritizing land for acquisition and would account for changing conditions in and around the IFNM. Allocating approximately 128,400 acres as an exclusion area (without any designated utility corridors), would result in the consideration of land use authorizations such as rights-of-way only when required by law.</p> <p>Closing 38,040 acres to OHV travel could effectively restrict land use authorizations in these areas as a result of access limitations that would be enforced as part of the OHV closure.</p>	<p>Land tenure adjustments would focus on acquisition of non-Federal land throughout the IFNM, on an opportunistic basis, rather than within specific areas. This would provide greater flexibility for BLM in prioritizing land for acquisition and would account for changing conditions in and around the IFNM.</p> <p>Allocating the IFNM as an avoidance area (except 241 acres within identified utility corridors) would limit opportunities for rights-of-way to situations where no viable alternatives exist to avoiding placement of facilities within the IFNM. Corridors on 241 acres would provide limited opportunities for major utilities.</p> <p>Closing 10,880 acres to OHV travel could effectively restrict land use authorizations in these areas as a result of access limitations that would be enforced as part of the OHV closure.</p>	<p>Land tenure adjustments would focus on acquisition of non-Federal land throughout the monument, on an opportunistic basis, rather than within specific areas. This would provide greater flexibility for BLM in prioritizing land for acquisition and would account for ongoing changing conditions in and around the monument.</p> <p>Allocating the IFNM as an avoidance area (except areas within identified utility corridors) would limit opportunities for rights-of-way to situations where no viable alternatives exist to avoiding placement of facilities within the IFNM. Corridors on 2,660 acres would provide limited opportunities for major utilities.</p>
<p><b>Travel Management</b></p>	<p>Closing 820 acres to OHV travel and limiting motorized vehicle travel to existing or designated routes on the remaining approximately 127,580 acres would provide an extensive travel network (346 miles) throughout the IFNM, with very few areas where motorized travel would be prohibited.</p>	<p>Closing 38,040 acres to OHV travel and limiting motorized vehicles to designated routes on the remaining approximately 90,360 acres would provide vehicle access on 63 miles of road or primitive road, and non-motorized access on approximately 270 miles of trail throughout the IFNM (plus County-administered routes and routes on State Trust land).</p>	<p>Closing 10,880 acres to OHV travel and limiting motorized vehicles to designated routes on the remaining approximately 117,520 acres would provide vehicle access on 124-miles road or primitive road, and non-motorized access on 210 miles of trail throughout the IFNM (plus County-administered routes and routes on State Trust land).</p>	<p>Limiting motorized vehicle travel to designated routes would provide motor vehicle access on 226 miles of road or primitive road, and non-motorized access on 100 miles of trail throughout the IFNM (plus County-administered routes and routes on State Trust land).</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>Special Designations</b>	The Waterman Mountains ACEC (approximately 2,240 acres of public land) would continue to be designated for the protection of the Nichol Turk’s head cactus.	The 2,240 acres of public land in the Waterman Mountains ACEC designation would not continue because the IFNM designation and management proposed for the IFNM would provide protection of the special status species for which the ACEC was established.	The 2,240 acres of public land in the Waterman Mountains ACEC designation would not continue because the IFNM designation and management proposed for the IFNM would provide protection of the special status species for which the ACEC was established.	The 2,240 acres of public land in the Waterman Mountains ACEC designation would not continue because the IFNM designation and management proposed for the IFNM would provide protection of the special status species for which the ACEC was established.
<b>Public Safety</b>	<p>Allowing vehicle travel on existing or designated routes within 127,580 acres (820 acres would be closed to vehicle travel) would present risks to public safety in the form of vehicle-based accidents.</p> <p>Allowing recreational shooting could present risks of exposure to hazardous materials and injuries in areas of intense recreational use.</p>	<p>Allowing vehicle travel on designated routes within 90,360 acres (38,040 acres would be closed to vehicle travel) would present risks to public safety in the form of vehicle-based accidents.</p> <p>Prohibiting recreational shooting except for permitted hunting would limit risks of exposure to hazardous materials and minimize risks to public safety from shooting activities.</p>	<p>Allowing vehicle travel on existing or designated routes within 117,520 acres (10,880 acres would be closed to vehicle travel) would present risks to public safety in the form of vehicle-based accidents.</p> <p>Prohibiting recreational shooting except for permitted hunting would limit risks of exposure to hazardous materials and minimize risks to public safety from shooting activities.</p>	<p>Allowing vehicle travel on existing or designated routes within 128,400 acres would present risks to public safety in the form of vehicle-based accidents.</p> <p>Designating specific areas for recreational shooting would minimize risks of exposure to hazardous materials and injuries associated with shooting activities in most areas of IFNM, but could intensify the risks in the designated areas due to the concentration of shooting activity.</p>

**Table 2-18: Summary Comparison of Impacts Table (cont.)**

Topic	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p><b>Social and Economic Conditions</b></p>	<p>Grazing would continue to generate economic gains from livestock operations, depending on stocking rates, which could vary. Social values of ranching would continue within the IFNM.</p> <p>Continued custodial management of recreation would result in minor economic impacts (generally from fees for permits); socially, conflicts if use increases among users would continue, and possibly escalate over time.</p> <p>Land use authorizations, such as rights-of-way, would generate economic activity; development within existing or new rights-of-way could influence other development and infrastructure.</p>	<p>After grazing leases expire, there would be a loss of economic activity associated with livestock grazing, as well as a loss of the social value of ranching, within the IFNM.</p> <p>Managing 36,990 acres to protect wilderness characteristics would recognize the social values of these areas; however, opportunities for uses that could generate economic returns could be limited in these areas, but, nonmarket values could increase.</p> <p>Management of recreation would limit social experiences because of the prohibition on having dogs in the IFNM, limiting camping (both vehicle-based and non-vehicle-based) to identified sites, and limiting group camping to two sites, and restrictions on recreational shooting. This would represent a loss of these experiences compared to Alternative A, but may result in fewer user conflicts. Closing VHAs to camping and closing the bighorn sheep lambing areas seasonally could limit valued social experiences (e.g., wildlife viewing) in those areas.</p> <p>Allocating 128,400 acres as exclusion area for rights-of-way and not establishing any corridors for major utilities would preclude opportunities for such facilities, and the associated economic impacts.</p>	<p>Grazing would continue to generate economic gains from livestock operations, depending on stocking rates, which could vary. Social values of ranching would continue.</p> <p>Managing 9,510 acres to protect wilderness characteristics would recognize the social values of these areas; however, opportunities for uses that could generate economic returns could be limited in these areas, but, nonmarket values could increase.</p> <p>Management of recreation would provide for increased social experiences compared to Alternative B, because dogs (on leashes) and non-vehicle-based camping would be allowed in the IFNM, and group camping could occur at three sites, but social impacts would occur from restrictions on recreational shooting. Closing the bighorn sheep lambing areas seasonally could limit valued social experiences (e.g., wildlife viewing) in those areas.</p> <p>Allocating the IFNM as an avoidance area for rights-of-way, except on 241 acres of identified utility corridors would limit, but not preclude, opportunities for such facilities, and the associated economic impacts.</p>	<p>Grazing would continue to generate economic gains from livestock operations, depending on stocking rates, which could vary. Social values of ranching would continue.</p> <p>Management of recreation would provide for increased social experiences compared to Alternative B, because dogs would be allowed in the IFNM (on leashes), non-vehicle-based camping would be allowed throughout the IFNM, group camping could occur at four sites, and recreational shooting would be allowed in designated areas. Closing the bighorn sheep lambing areas seasonal could limit valued social experiences (e.g., wildlife viewing) in those areas.</p> <p>Allocating the IFNM as an avoidance area for rights-of-way, except on 2,660 acres of identified utility corridors would limit, but not preclude, opportunities for such facilities, and the associated economic impacts.</p>