



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

Located in the Robledo Mountains of southern New Mexico lies a major deposit of Paleozoic Era fossilized footprints, plants, and wood dating back approximately 280 million years ago. Approximately 5,280 acres of these fossils located 10 miles northwest of Las Cruces, New Mexico are designated as the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument (PTNM) by the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to provide management guidance for the Federal land within the PTNM. These 5,280 acres are considered the **Planning Area**, while Doña Ana County, where PTNM resides, is considered the **Analysis Area**.

## BACKGROUND

In 1987, a major deposit of Paleozoic Era fossilized footprint megatracks was discovered in the Robledo Mountains by a local Las Cruces, Jerry MacDonald. The area is located in the BLM New Mexico Las Cruces District Office and covered by management outlined in the Mimbres RMP (1993). In 1990, Senator Jeff Bingaman and Congressman Joe Skeen introduced the **Prehistoric Trackways Study Legislation (S. 2684 and H.R. 4945)**. In 1993, the legislation was passed which allowed the BLM to contract with the Smithsonian Institution and the New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science to conduct a study and prepare a report on the significance of the trackways discovery. The report states:

*“ . . . evaluation indicates the Robledo Mountains tracksites are the most scientifically significant Early Permian tracksites known. The diversity, abundance and quality of the tracks in the Robledo Mountains is far greater than at any other known tracksites or aggregation of tracksites. Because of this, the Robledo tracks allow a wide range of scientific problems regarding late Paleozoic tracks to be solved that could not be solved before.”* (Lucas, Hunt, and Hotton III 1994)

Senator Bingaman introduced legislation in 2008 to designate the trackways area as a National Monument *“ . . . in order to conserve, protect, and enhance the unique and nationally important paleontological, scientific, educational, scenic, and recreational resources and values of the public land. . . .”* The Legislation was passed as part of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (the Act or Legislation) and designated 5,280 acres as the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument (PTNM or Monument) administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

## PURPOSE AND NEED

The need for the PTNM Draft RMP/EIS is established by the enabling Legislation which requires that:

*“Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a comprehensive management plan for the long-term protection and management of the Monument... The management plan shall describe the appropriate uses and management of the Monument, consistent with the provisions of the legislation . . . .”*

The existing *Mimbres RMP* (1993) covering the Monument is inadequate to address the mandates of the enabling legislation. The purpose of the Monument RMP is to address resource management and public uses within the Monument as prescribed by Congressional legislation. The EIS will disclose to the public and BLM managers any impacts to the environment that would likely result from implementing the agency's Proposed Action or possible alternatives.

Proposed within Chapter 2 are two different types of decisions. Those decisions are either planning (broad overarching) decisions or implementation (on-the-ground) decisions. The *BLM Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1* describes Planning (land use) Decisions for public land into two categories: desired outcomes (goals and objectives) and allowable (including restricted or prohibited) uses and actions anticipated to achieve desired outcomes. Implementation Decisions are described as BLM's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. To help delineate between the two types of decisions they are outlined differently throughout Chapter 2. The Planning Decisions are highlighted in **Bold Font** and the Implementation Decisions are shown in *Italics*. These font styles and uses are only meant to help the reader decipher between the types of decisions stated within this Chapter.

### Legislative Provisions

- Conserve, protect, and enhance the following resources and values: Paleontological, Scientific, Educational, Scenic, and Recreational.
- Shall only allow uses of the Monument that the Secretary determines would further the purposes for which the Monument has been established.
- Provide for public interpretation of, and education and scientific research on, the paleontological resources of the Monument, with priority given to exhibiting and curating the resources in Doña Ana County, New Mexico.
- Enter into cooperative management agreements or other instruments with interested parties or agencies, as appropriate, to coordinate and collaborate management of the Monument.
- Continue to manage that portion of the Robledo Mountains Wilderness Study Area (WSA) within the Monument according to the *Interim Management Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review*.
- Continue to manage that portion of the Robledo Mountains Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) within the Monument according to the prescribed management in the Mimbres RMP.
- Except as needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles in the Monument shall be allowed only on roads and trails designated for use by motorized vehicles.
- Subject to valid existing rights, close the Monument to entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws. This only refers to the title transfer of land/property (example- cannot sell public land within the Monument); land use authorizations may be authorized in order to facilitate the management of the Monument and to meet the intent of the enabling Legislation.
- Subject to valid existing rights, any Federal land within the Monument and any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States for inclusion in the Monument after the date of

enactment of this Act are withdrawn from -- (1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws; (2) location, entry, and patent under the 1872 mining law as amended; and (3) operation of the mineral leasing laws, geothermal leasing laws, and mineral material disposal laws. Therefore, free-use of petrified wood without a permit is no longer allowed.

- Manage any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States for inclusion in the Monument after the date of enactment of this Act in the same manner and degree as herein described for the rest of the Monument.
- The Secretary may allow grazing to continue in any area of the Monument in which grazing is allowed before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to applicable laws (including regulations).

## ISSUES

The process for developing an RMP begins with identification of planning issues (40 CFR 1502.7 and 43 CFR 1610.4-1) Issues are areas of conflict or controversy between uses and management activities for a given area of public land that must be resolved in the RMP. The agency also addresses other basic environmental and management concerns to provide comprehensive management guidance for all resources within the Monument and to satisfy legal requirements.

The following are issues or areas of concern for the Monument. These were identified by internal scoping by resource specialists and/or raised by the public during scoping.

### Issues Addressed

#### **Paleontological Research and Protection**

1. How will management actions address the legislative mandate of providing for resource protection and research of paleontological resources?
2. How will the management prescriptions address site protection, interpretive development, and public education?

#### **Interpretation and Education**

1. How will the management actions address the legislative mandate of providing for public interpretation of, and education and scientific research on, the paleontological resources of the Monument, with priority given to exhibiting and curating the resources in Doña Ana County?
2. What types of interpretation and education are best suited to protection of the paleontological resources? Onsite? Off-site?

#### **Travel and Access**

1. How can the BLM manage access to the Monument while protecting the paleontological resources of the Monument?

## Recreation

1. How will the RMP address the conflict between motorized use and protection of the Monument objects?
2. How will the RMP address the casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources and the enhancement of recreational resources?
3. How will the BLM manage requests for special recreation permits?
4. How will the management actions address other various recreation opportunities such as camping, shooting, and fossil hunting with providing for protection of Monument resources?
5. What opportunities will be available for visitor services and facilities?

## Management Concerns

### Habitat and Its Users

1. What management actions will protect wildlife and wildlife habitat?
2. How will livestock grazing be addressed within the Monument?
3. How will management of vegetative communities be addressed in the Monument?

### Visual Resources

1. How will the BLM manage threats to scenic quality within the boundaries of the Monument?

### Socio-economics

1. How will the management actions in the RMP impact economic and social opportunities in the community?

## SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

### Alternative A

**Alternative A** or the “No Action Alternative” represents the continuation of existing management, which is defined by the *Mimbres RMP* (1993) and the legislation designating the Monument, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. Two RMP amendments, also affect management of the Decision Area: *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management* (2000) (NM Standards and Guidelines) and the *Resource Management Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management on Public Land in New Mexico and Texas* (2004) (RMPA for Fire and Fuels Management).

### Alternative B

**Alternative B** represents a more restrictive public use approach of the Monument. This approach is more passive in that the human interventions with the resources are minimal and natural processes would continue at the current rate.

- All paleontological resources would be conserved for future scientific research.
- Casual collection of common invertebrate and paleontological resources would not be allowed.
- Livestock grazing would not be allowed within the Monument.

- The Monument would be closed to all mechanized and motorized vehicles - exceptions to off-highway vehicle (OHV) travel restrictions or closures may be authorized for any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicles or any vehicle in official use or expressly authorized in writing by the authorized officer.
- Recreational target shooting would be allowed.
- Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) would not be permitted.
- A majority of the education and interpretation program would be off-site.

### Alternative C

**Alternative C** represents a moderate public use and resource management method of the Monument. This alternative allows for protection of the resources while allowing compatible public uses.

- Paleontological localities deemed suitable for scientific research would be preserved and “reserved” for scientific research only. Localities appropriate for interpretation, educational, and recreational use would be developed for that use.
- Closed to casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources.
- Collecting of common invertebrate would only be allowed while in conjunction with BLM authorized interpretive or educational activities or programs.
- Interpretation and education would be enhanced on-site and off-site including a visitor contact station.
- Facilitated tours and self-guided interpretive activities would be developed.
- Motorized and mechanized travel within the Monument is limited to designated routes and trails with a permit.
- Approximately 5.4 miles of previously designated routes would be closed to motorized and mechanized travel.
- Recreational target shooting would be prohibited
- New routes or trails may be developed by the BLM to enhance visitor experiences and research opportunities.
- Commercial, competitive, and organized group activities would be managed through the SRP process.
- Adjust the allotment management plan to exclude grazing at specific locations such as exclosures around campsites or in areas to protect paleontological resources if determined necessary.

### Alternative D

**Alternative D** represents a maximum use approach to management of the Monument and the widest range of public uses of the resources while still following the constraints of the designating Legislation.

- Paleontological localities deemed suitable for scientific research would be preserved and “reserved” for scientific research only. Localities appropriate for interpretation, educational, and recreational use would be developed for that use.
- Closed to casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources.
- Collecting of common invertebrate would only be allowed while in conjunction with BLM authorized interpretive or educational activities or programs.
- Interpretation and education would be developed for the Monument both on-site and off-site as would a visitor center.
- Facilitated tours and self-guided interpretive activities would be developed along with an interpretive motor tour route.
- Motorized and mechanized travel within the Monument would be limited to designated routes.
- Approximately 4.0 miles of designated routes would be closed.

- New routes and trails may be developed by the BLM to enhance visitor experiences and research opportunities.
- Competitive, commercial, and organized group activities would be managed through the SRP process.
- Current livestock management would continue in the Monument.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table S-1 summarizes the impacts by resource by alternative for the PTNM. These impacts are fully discussed in Chapter 4.

The following resources have been found to have negligible or no impacts from any of the management alternatives proposed:

- American Indian Uses and Traditional Cultural Practices
- Riparian Areas
- Woodland Management
- Floodplains and Wetlands
- Geology
- Minerals
- Hazardous and Solid Wastes
- Prime or Unique Farmlands
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

Actions that are often associated with ongoing program administration are not addressed in this Chapter. These actions would comply with the resource decisions made in this RMP, required National Environmental Policy Act compliance, and appropriate Best Management Practices.

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p>Casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources would continue to be allowed. SRPs would continue to be considered for authorization. Vehicle use has the potential to damage the paleontological resources through crushing and fracturing or staining the specimens with petroleum based fluid. Focus on development of off-site interpretation would create additional protection for the resource by increasing awareness and leaving sites conserved in-situ for future research. Continued management of the Research Natural Area (RNA) would provide redundant management prescriptions that protect the resources on 720 acres within the Monument.</p>	<p>Restriction of casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources reduces the likelihood of loss of scientific-worthy vertebrate fossils. This closure to casual invertebrate and plant paleontological collecting also reduces the educational and recreational opportunities within the Monument. Focus on development of off-site interpretation could create additional protection for the resource by increasing awareness and leaving paleontological sites conserved in-situ for future research. Closure of the Monument to motorized and mechanized travel would eliminate damage to the paleontological resources from this use. SRPs would not be authorized, which would eliminate any group impacts, positive or negative. Reducing overall public access to the PTNM may result in an overall reduction in the opportunity for recreation, education, vandalism, and looting of resources. The removal of the RNA designation removes the redundancy in management prescriptions.</p>	<p>Restriction of casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources reduces the likelihood of loss of scientific-worthy vertebrate fossils. Limited collecting of common invertebrate paleontological resources in conjunction with BLM approved activity would reduce the potential for loss of vertebrate fossils and increase the educational and recreational paleontological opportunities. On-site interpretation and education would increase awareness of the resource but could increase the potential for looting. Development of visitor facilities could increase visitation and thereby result in increased stewardship, vandalism, and looting. Issuance of SRPs could lead to the same impacts as stated in Alternative A. Closing of routes within the Monument where paleontological resources are present would limit destruction of these resources caused by motorized and mechanized vehicles along those routes; however the impacts associated with use would remain along open routes. The removal of the RNA designation removes the redundancy in management prescriptions.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C except, both the beneficial and adverse impacts from on-site interpretation and facilities would be increased due to more development. Impacts from vehicle use would be slightly increased due to 1.4 more miles of designated routes than Alternative C.</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>INTERPRETATION AND EDUCATION</b>			
<p>Scientific research would enhance interpretation and education by discovery of new sites and additional information. Casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources would enhance the educational experience in the Monument. Restriction of development of facilities and trails would limit the interpretive experience on-site.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources would not be allowed and would therefore limit the on-site interpretive experience. Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would limit any surface disturbance in those lands protected for their naturalness (576 acres). This would limit any interpretative trails or signs.</p>	<p>In addition to impacts stated in Alternative A, on-site interpretation, trails and facilities would be developed enhancing the educational opportunities. Casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources would not be allowed. Collecting of common invertebrate paleontological resources while in conjunction with a BLM authorized activity would enhance the educational experience. Additional legal access would be acquired allowing for improved access to the Monument's interpretive sites. Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would limit any surface disturbance in those lands protected for their naturalness (253 acres), which would limit any interpretative trails or signs.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C, except increased benefits to interpretation and education would be possible from the development of a motorized interpretive tour or a visitor center, and development could occur in lands identified for their naturalness.</p>
<b>RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES</b>			
<p>The opportunity for casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources provides an additional recreational opportunity. The lack of on-site interpretative and visitor facilities limits the visitor experience within the Monument and may reduce visitation from some groups. Target practicing within the Monument could cause conflict between users. No planned improvement or maintenance of trails could limit the recreation opportunities available within the Monument, but the existing designated routes would remain open to motorized or mechanized use.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A with respect to facilities and improvements. Casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources, SRPs, and motorized and mechanized vehicles use would not be allowed, thus reducing the number of recreation opportunities available within the Monument.</p>	<p>The opportunity for collecting common invertebrate paleontological resources while in conjunction with a BLM authorized activity would provide an additional recreational opportunity. Development of on-site interpretation and visitor facilities would enhance the visitor experience and may increase visitation from some user groups. Facility development could also impact the natural setting of the Monument. Closure of a portion of the Robledo Mountains Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) trails would impact the more extreme OHV users. Ability to maintain and develop new trails and routes would enhance opportunities for recreational and scientific use.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C except, 1.4 miles more of mechanized and motorized route would remain open providing opportunities to access more extreme routes. A visitor center and a developed campground would be established therefore creating a more developed Monument.</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT</b>			
Continued use of the existing 37.6 miles of designated trails provides an extensive route network with a variety of opportunities for motorized, mechanized, and pedestrian use and travel. Improvement or maintenance of existing routes have not been planned for, which reduces the ease of access for educational and some recreational uses.	Closing the Monument to motorized and mechanized travel would reduce access to most of the Monument for most visitors, but would reduce paleontological resources damage or destruction from this use. Improvement or maintenance of existing routes have not been planned for, which reduces the ease of access for educational and some recreational uses. On the 576 acres of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, construction or improvement of trails and routes would not be allowed.	Limiting motorized and mechanized travel to 32.2 miles of designated routes would still provide an extensive route network with a variety of opportunities for use while protecting known occurrences of paleontological resources. Development of facilities and interpretation may increase the need for additional routes and increased maintenance. This would be allowed within the Monument except within the WSA and the 253 acres identified as Lands with Wilderness Characteristics.	Same as Alternative C, except 33.6 miles of trail would be designated. Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would not be designated, which would then allow for surface disturbing route or trail construction within the lands identified (but not designated) as having wilderness characteristics.
<b>AIR RESOURCES AIR QUALITY</b>			
Vehicle travel on 37.6 miles of designated trails has the potential to emit pollutants and cause dust. Surface disturbance from potential authorized rights-of-way could cause dust emissions. Unplanned wildfire events may also release emissions and reduce visibility.	Closing the Monument to motorized and mechanized use, rights-of-way construction, and SRPs would reduce the potential for emissions and dust compared to Alternative A. Limitations on surface disturbing activities on susceptible soils and within the 576 acres of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would reduce dust emissions compared to Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, except that travel would be limited to 32.2 miles and the Lands with Wilderness Characteristics area would be 253 acres. Protection of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics includes limitations on surface disturbance. Construction of facilities could cause emissions. It is not expected that this will change impacts to air quality from the current condition reflected in Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C, except that travel would be limited to 33.6 miles and no area is protected as Lands with Wilderness Characteristics; which would be off-limits for surface disturbance. It is not expected that this would change impacts to air quality from the current condition reflected in Alternative A.
<b>AIR RESOURCES CLIMATE</b>			
It is not possible to predict with certainty the potential emissions (or sequestration) of greenhouse gases (GHG) associated with each of these four alternatives, their potential impacts on temperature within the Planning Area, or related impacts on resources due to climate change. In general, trails and travel management, livestock grazing, and wildland fires generate GHG emissions that contribute to climate change and, in turn, may impact resources. Related activities such as wildland fire management may result in carbon sequestration and offset increases in GHG emissions.			

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p>Surface disturbing activities such as vehicular travel, research, development of rights-of-way, and vegetation treatments would have the potential to impact cultural resources; however, the BLM would comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for all surface disturbing activities thereby minimizing impacts to cultural resources. Socio-cultural properties also known as Traditional Cultural Properties are those places of traditional cultural significance to American Indians and others. Such properties may exist within the boundaries of the PTNM, but no specific place or resource has yet to be identified during formal consultation.</p>	<p>Closure of the Monument to rights-of way, vehicular travel and other surface disturbing activities would greatly reduce the potential impacts to cultural resources.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>
<b>LANDS AND REALTY</b>			
<p>Lands and Realty decisions would make available 4,491 acres for surface disturbing land use authorizations and 5,280 acres of non-surface disturbing authorizations. Visual Resource Management (VRM) designations for the Monument would impact authorizations (VRM Class I: 789 acres, VRM Class II: 907 acres, VRM Class III: 2,627 acres, VRM Class IV: 932 acres). Commercial renewable energy authorizations would be excluded from the entire Monument. One legal access easement would be sought for the Monument.</p>	<p>Land and Realty decisions would exclude the Monument from all surface disturbing land use authorizations. One legal access easement would be sought for the Monument. The BLM would attempt to obtain 640 acres of non-Federal mineral estate within and adjacent to the Monument, which would eliminate any split estate issues.</p>	<p>Management of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would limit an additional 253 acres from surface disturbing authorizations. Management of visual resources could limit or modify future land use authorizations to comply with VRM classes I (1,042 acres) and II (4,213 acres). Three legal access easements would be sought for the Monument. The BLM would attempt to obtain 640 acres of non-Federal mineral estate within and adjacent to the Monument, which would eliminate any split estate issues.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C except no Lands with Wilderness Characteristics and VRM prescriptions would have impacts on land use authorizations due to VRM Class I acres at 789 acres and VRM Class II at 4,465 acres.</p>
<b>LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<p>Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would be at risk for reduced naturalness as there would be no additional protections.</p>	<p>576 acres of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would be protected by the management prescriptions provided.</p>	<p>253 acres of Lands with Wilderness Characteristics would be protected by the management prescriptions provided and the remaining 323</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except the designation of the Monument as VRM I and II would help retain wilderness characteristics.</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)	ALTERNATIVE D
		acres would be at risk for reduced naturalness from potential surface disturbing activities. Designation of the Monument as VRM I and II would help retain wilderness characteristics.	
<b>LIVESTOCK GRAZING</b>			
Increased visitation could cause increased conflicts with livestock and recreational users. Vegetation treatments could improve forage and reduce competition.	Livestock grazing would be excluded causing need for fencing and adjustment of the Picacho Peak and Altamira allotment management. The estimated cost of a new perimeter fence would be over \$230,000. This decision would reduce the animal unit months (AUMs) by 454 for the areas within the two allotments.	Same as Alternative A, except an additional 253 acres would be excluded from development of range improvements, which may reduce the use of the range. Fences would be constructed around campsites or in areas to protect significant paleontological resources when determined necessary. The amount of available forage would be reduced by approximately 1 AUM for every 12 acres excluded. As routes are constructed or maintained, the chance of potential interaction between livestock and visitors increases.	Same as Alternative A with more anticipated interactions between visitors and livestock as visitor facilities and routes increase.
<b>SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS</b>			
Designation of 37.6 miles of roads and trails open to motorized and mechanized uses supports social values related to public land access and OHV recreation. However, Alternative A also has the lowest levels of non-market economic values and the least support for social values related to preservation of ecological health and wilderness. Social and economic consequences of grazing are the same under Alternatives A, C, and D. Since all alternatives continue to support similar levels of employment and income, none of the decisions are expected to disproportionately or adversely affect environmental justice communities.	Elimination of grazing on the Monument would reduce labor income to ranchers.  Alternative B would support the highest levels of non-market economic values and social values related to protection of natural and cultural resources.  Since all alternatives continue to support similar levels of employment and income, none of the decisions are expected to disproportionately or adversely affect environmental justice communities.	Development of a visitor contact station would cause temporary increase in local employment and labor income during construction phase.  Alternative C balances social values of access and motorized recreation with values related to ecological health and wilderness.  Social and economic consequences of grazing are the same under Alternatives A, C, and D.  Since all alternatives continue to support similar levels of employment and income, none of the decisions are expected to disproportionately or adversely affect environmental justice communities.	Development of a visitor center would cause increase in employment and labor income due to construction, operation, and maintenance of facility.  Social and economic consequences of grazing are the same under Alternatives A, C, and D.  Since all alternatives continue to support similar levels of employment and income, none of the decisions are expected to disproportionately or adversely affect environmental justice communities.

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>SOILS</b>			
Excavations of paleontological resources could cause highly disturbed localized areas, small in scale with little impacts to the watershed as a whole. Casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources would have minor disturbance. Soil disturbance could also be caused from foot traffic associated with recreation and interpretation tours, scientific research, dispersed camping, SRPs, vehicular travel, right-of-way development, and range improvements. Spill of petroleum products could contaminate soils.	Slightly less damage from paleontological resource decisions since casual collecting is restricted. Other surface disturbing restrictions that would be beneficial to soil protection are closure of the Monument to vehicular travel, SRPs, camping, livestock grazing, and surface disturbing land use authorizations.	Same as Alternative A except, the development of visitor facilities would displace and compact soils increasing runoff and erosion rates.	Same as Alternative C with slightly more disturbance from the development of a Visitor Center.
<b>SPECIAL DESIGNATION- AREA OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN</b>			
789 acres would be managed as the Robledo Mountains ACEC	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
<b>SPECIAL DESIGNATION- RESEARCH NATURAL AREA</b>			
The RNA designation would stay as is and the management prescriptions would essentially be duplicated by the Legislation.	The RNA designation would be removed therefore the duplicate management prescriptions would be eliminated. However, management of the resources would continue the protections afforded by the RNA designation	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
<b>SPECIAL DESIGNATION- WILDERNESS STUDY AREA</b>			
789 acres would be managed as the Robledo Mountains WSA.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES</b>			
<p>Vehicular travel and dispersed recreation has the potential to temporarily displace special status species or injure slow moving species. Livestock grazing improvements would benefit special status species by providing water facilities. Vegetation management would improve forage for some species.</p>	<p>Closure to motorized and mechanized travel would reduce potential for injury. Elimination of livestock grazing could reduce forage competition, but would also have adverse impacts by eliminating livestock improvement water sources. Vegetation management would improve forage for some species.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except development of visitor facilities and additional routes could increase the possibility of temporary displacement of special status species or injure slow moving species.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>
<b>VEGETATION</b>			
<p>Special designations would protect 789 acres from surface disturbing activities. Activities associated with use of trails and routes have the potential to remove or damage vegetation and spread noxious weeds. Livestock grazing removes forage from the Monument annually, with 30 to 50 percent utilization of key forage species and has the potential to introduce or spread noxious weeds. Vegetation treatments have the potential to shift species dominating treated areas.</p>	<p>Limitations on surface disturbing activities such as vehicular travel, SRPs, and authorization of rights-of-way, would reduce the potential for damage to vegetation. Elimination of livestock grazing within the Monument would increase the amount of plant biomass to accumulate. In addition to the 789 acres protected by Special Designations, an additional 576 acres would be protected from all surface disturbing activities through protection as Lands with Wilderness Characteristics. Treatment options would be limited for noxious weed control.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except an additional 253 acres would be protected from surface disturbing activities through protection as Lands with Wilderness Characteristics. Additionally, development of new trails, routes, or facilities outside of those 1,042 protected acres would remove vegetative cover.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except additional surface disturbance and vegetation removal is possible from the development of new trails and facilities.</p>
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p>VRM Class I designation would preserve the character of the landscape on approximately 789 acres of the most scenic, natural appearing, and visually sensitive parts of the Monument. VRM Class II designation would retain the existing character of the landscape on approximately 907 acres of the Monument.</p>	<p>VRM Class I designation would preserve the character of the landscape on approximately 1,365 acres of the most scenic, natural appearing, and visually sensitive parts of the Monument. VRM Class II designation would retain the existing character of the landscape of approximately 3,912 acres within the Monument.</p>	<p>VRM Class I designation would preserve the character of the landscape on approximately 1,042 acres of the most scenic, natural appearing, and visually sensitive parts of the public land in the Monument. VRM Class II designation would retain the existing character of the landscape of approximately 4,213 acres within the Monument.</p>	<p>VRM Class I designation would preserve the character of the landscape on approximately 789 acres of the most scenic, natural appearing, and visually sensitive parts of the public land in the Monument. VRM Class II designation would retain the existing character of the landscape of approximately 4,465 acres within the Monument.</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY RESOURCE BY ALTERNATIVE**

<b>ALTERNATIVE A</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVE B</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVE C (PREFERRED)</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVE D</b>
<p>The remaining lands within the Monument would be designated as VRM Class III and IV, which allows more change in the visual character of the land.</p> <p>Development of non-Federal minerals, which 368 acres are within the Monument, has the potential to impact visual resources in the Monument.</p>	<p>Exclosure of livestock from the Monument could cause visual impacts from development of a fence.</p>		
<b>WATER RESOURCES</b>			
<p>Surface disturbing activities have the potential to create nonpoint source pollutants that could be transported to the Rio Grande as well as decreased infiltration, increased runoff, and changes in water flow patterns.</p>	<p>Restrictions in surface disturbing activities would help soil stability and productivity and aid vegetation communities necessary to slow water velocities, hinder erosion, and reduce potential nonpoint source pollution.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A in comparison to surface disturbing potential</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A in comparison to surface disturbing potential.</p>
<b>WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT</b>			
<p>Increased visitation and associated recreation activities could increase potential for man caused wildfires. Vegetation treatments could cause an increase in fuel loading resulting in unwanted fire behavior.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except some recreation activities would be limited including camping and use of motorized vehicles that could reduce potential of man caused wildfires. Reduction in livestock grazing would increase fuels and the likelihood that a wildfire would carry.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except visitation could increase due to increased facilities.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>
<b>WILDLIFE</b>			
<p>Increase in visitation and associated recreation activities could temporarily displace wildlife. Vehicular travel has the potential to injure slow moving wildlife. Water facilities for livestock would benefit local wildlife.</p>	<p>Closure to travel would decrease potential injury and displacement of wildlife. Removal of livestock could increase forage for wildlife, but would remove availability of waters.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except increased displacement could occur around developed interpretation sites and facilities. Water facilities for livestock would benefit local wildlife.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C, except the ability to treat vegetation through prescribed fire could displace, kill or render habitat unsuitable for wildlife but would have long-term benefits to habitat.</p>