




UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ARIZONA STATE OFFICE EVALUATION REPORT TITLE PAGE		Date: September 2017
Title/Subject: Safford District Resource Management Plan (RMP) Evaluation		
Type of Evaluation: Periodic		
Date Conducted: June 2016 through June 2017		
Conducted By: Safford Field Office and Tucson Field Office		
TEAM MEMBERS		
NAME	TITLE	
Amy Markstein	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Gila District Office	
Amy Corathers	Planning and Environmental Specialist Safford Field Office	
Jackie Neckels	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Arizona State Office	
Submitted by: Scott C. Cooke Field Manager Safford Field Office	Signature: 	Date: 9/13/17
Approved by: Scott Feldhausen District Manager Gila District Office	Signature: 	Date: 9/14/17
Approved by: Roxie Trost, Deputy State Director, Renewable Resources and Planning	Signature: 	Date: 9/21/2017

SAFFORD DISTRICT
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Arizona



September 2017

Contents

I. Summary Information.....	1
II. Evaluation	2
III. RMP Implementation.....	19
IV. Consistency with Other Plans of Other Agencies or Tribes	20
V. Plan Conformance	20
VI. Is a Plan Amendment or Revision Necessary.....	20
Attachment A List of Interdisciplinary Team Members.....	A-1
Attachment B Riparian Worksheet.....	B-1
Attachment C Safford District RMP Decision Status	C-1
Attachment D Safford District RMP Decisions	D-1

I. SUMMARY INFORMATION

A. Plan Name and Type: Safford District Resource Management Plan (RMP)

B. Record of Decision (ROD) Date: ROD Partial I – September 1992; Partial II – July 1994

C. Five Year Evaluation Number (I, II, III, IV): II ¹

D. RMP Amendments

Amendment Name	Purpose	Program Area	Decision Date
1. Restoration Design Energy Project (RDEP) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) ROD & RMP Amendment	Identify Renewable Energy Development Areas (REDA) that include disturbed sites and identify a Solar Energy Zone (SEZ) for Arizona.	Renewable Energy	2013
2. Solar Energy Development in Six Southwestern States Programmatic EIS (PEIS)	Facilitate utility-scale solar energy development.	Renewable Energy	2012
3. Section 368 West-wide Energy Corridors EIS	Designate energy transport corridors in response to the Energy Policy Act of 2005.	Lands and Realty	2009
4. Geothermal PEIS	Facilitate geothermal leasing of the federal mineral estate.	Renewable Energy	2008
5. Arizona Statewide Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) for Fire, Fuels, and Air Quality Management	Update the RMP to comply with current fire policy and guidance and fully integrate fire and fuels management and direction found in the latest DOI and BLM resource program guidance for lands administered by BLM.	Wildland Fire Management	2004
6. Statewide LUPA for Implementation of Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration	To allow for full implementation of Arizona Standards and Guidelines developed in accordance with the revised regulations for grazing administration (43 CFR 4100) of public lands in consultation with BLM's Arizona Resource Advisory Council.	Rangeland Management	1997

¹ A 5-year plan evaluation was initiated in 2011 but was discontinued due to an impending RMP revision. However, the Safford District RMP revision did not occur in response to shifting state office priorities.

Amendment Name	Purpose	Program Area	Decision Date
7. Land Tenure Amendment to the Safford District RMP	Identify additional public lands to be considered for disposal, lands for retention, lands desired for acquisition and deletes some lands previously identified for acquisition to facilitate beneficial land exchanges.	Lands and Realty	1994

E. Activity Plans and Decision Dates:

1. Aravaipa Ecosystem Management Plan (2015)
2. Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area Management Plan (1998)
3. Muleshoe Ecosystem Management Plan (1998)
4. Dos Cabezas Mountains Wilderness Management Plan (1995)
5. Peloncillo Mountains Wilderness Management Plan (1995)
6. Hot Well Dunes Recreation Area Project Plan (circa 1991)

II. EVALUATION

A. Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Safford Field Office (SFO) manages 1.4 million acres of deserts, mountains and grasslands in six eastern Arizona counties and another 118,000 acres of rangelands in New Mexico in cooperation with the BLM Las Cruces Field Office. The SFO boundary stretches from the Navajo Nation in the north to the international boundary with Mexico in the south.

At the time of Safford District RMP approval, the SFO was a district office whose boundaries aligned with the boundaries identified in the RMP. Administrative changes have occurred since that time thereby creating the BLM Gila District with two field offices – SFO and Tucson Field Office (TFO).

Management of SFO public lands are currently guided by two land use plans (LUPs) – the Safford District RMP (1992, 1994) and Phoenix RMP (1989). TFO public lands are managed under four RMPs, including the Safford District and Phoenix RMPs. This evaluation addresses the Safford District RMP. This evaluation excludes those rangelands in New Mexico managed cooperatively with the Las Cruces District Office because those lands are managed under the Las Cruces RMP. However, this evaluation includes approximately 188,000 acres located with the TFO boundary. This evaluation also excludes the approximate 57,000-acre San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area (RNCA) within TFO because an RMP is currently being developed for this area. Decisions related to management of the San Pedro RNCA will not be addressed in this evaluation. A similar evaluation process will be completed for the Phoenix RMP that

provides management direction on BLM-managed land in the northern portion of SFO and for BLM-managed land in the TFO not guided by the SFO or other RMPs.

The Safford District RMP incorporates by reference the Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing Environmental Statement (ES)² (1978) and the Eastern Arizona Grazing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (1987).

Special area designations managed in conformance within the Safford District RMP include:

- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)
 - 111 Ranch
 - Bear Springs Badlands
 - Bowie Mountain
 - Desert Grasslands Research Natural Area (RNA)
 - Dos Cabezas Peaks
 - Eagle Creek Bat Cave
 - Guadalupe Canyon
 - Hot Springs Watershed
 - Table Mountain
 - Turkey Creek
 - Willcox Playa and National Natural Landmark
- National Conservation Area (NCA)
 - Gila Box Riparian
 - San Pedro Riparian³
- Wilderness Areas
 - Aravaipa Canyon
 - Fishhooks
 - Dos Cabezas Mountains
 - North Santa Teresa
 - Peloncillo Mountains
 - Redfield Canyon
 - Needle's Eye
- Wilderness Study Area
 - Baker Canyon
- Cooperative Management Area
 - Muleshoe Ranch
- Back Country Byway
 - Black Hills

² This environmental document was officially adopted as an "Environmental Statement" in lieu of "Environmental Impact Statement."

³ The San Pedro Riparian NCA is currently administered by the TFO, and is being addressed within the San Pedro River National Conservation Area RMP currently in development.

- National Register of Historic Places
 - Kearny Encampment Site
- Wild and Scenic River – consideration for more than 30 miles of stream
 - Safford District RMP Partial ROD I:
 - Gila River
 - Aravaipa Creek
 - Bonita Creek
 - Hot Springs Canyon
 - Turkey Creek
 - San Pedro River⁴
 - Swamp Springs Canyon⁵
 - Safford District RMP Partial ROD II:
 - Gila River (Gila Box section)
 - Lower San Francisco River
 - Wild and Scenic Rivers Legislative EIS
 - Gila River Study River⁶

B. Purpose of Evaluation

A periodic evaluation of LUPs and environmental review procedures is required in BLM planning regulations (43 CFR 1610.4-9) to determine the status of ongoing plan monitoring conformance and implementation.

The purpose of a LUP evaluation is to determine whether the LUP decisions and National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) analysis are still valid and whether the plan is being implemented. The LUP is evaluated to:

- Determine if decisions are relevant to current issues.
- Identify any decisions that need to be revised.
- List decisions that need to be dropped from further consideration.
- Determine if decisions are effective in achieving (or making progress toward achieving) desired outcomes.
- Identify areas that require new decisions.
- Determine if the BLM is managing according to the approved RMP. For example, are decisions used when preparing annual work plans and associated budgets? Are all project proposals checked for conformance with plan decisions?
- Identify if the issues in the current LUP have been resolved (or progress is being made towards resolution). If issues were not resolved, identify why e.g., were the issue-specific decisions implemented? If the decisions were implemented, were they effective?

^{4, 5, 6} Stream segment is currently administered by the TFO.

- Are other/additional decisions needed to resolve an issue?
- Determine the level of new planning needed (Amendment versus Revision), and identify anticipated issues and associated data needs for any future planning activity.

This evaluation only provides recommendations for future planning efforts. No decision is tied to this document and no RMP decisions change because of the evaluation.

C. Evaluation Methodology and Scope

The Safford District RMP covers public lands within both the SFO and TFO. Due to the geographic distance between field offices, an evaluation team comprised of resource specialists was established for each field office. Responses provided by specialists were based on professional knowledge and input gathered over time from working with public land users including members of the public, local and state governments, tribes, and authorized permit holders. This evaluation report was compiled by SFO in coordination with TFO.

Safford Field Office

Evaluation questionnaires provided by the BLM Arizona State Office, grouped by resource program, were distributed to the appropriate SFO ID Team resource specialists on July 11, 2016. Subsequent evaluation meetings by program resource were led by Amy Corathers, SFO Planning and Environmental Specialist, with the assistance of Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist, during the period of July 12 – August 4, 2016. The evaluation meeting schedule and attendees is provided in Attachment A.

Additionally, the Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure (“Riparian Worksheet”) was initially drafted by an SFO core team, with subsequent input from TFO. The Arizona State Office Soil, Water and Air program lead reviewed the worksheet and provided concurrence on August 25, 2016. See Attachment B for the approved Riparian Worksheet.

Tucson Field Office

The same evaluation questionnaires used by SFO, were distributed to the appropriate TFO ID Team resource specialists on June 30, 2016. Due to scheduling conflicts and time constraints, resource specialists were not interviewed. However, resource specialists provided written evaluation responses between July 21, 2016, and August 29, 2016. Responses were reviewed by Amy Markstein, Gila District Planning and Environmental Coordinator, and then forwarded to SFO. A list of the participating TFO resource specialists is provided in Attachment A.

D. Background

The Notice of Intent to prepare the Safford District RMP and EIS was published in September 1987, the draft RMP/EIS was published in August 1990, and the final RMP/EIS published August 1991. The RMP analyzed multiple uses and allocations within the planning area including development of minerals, rights-of-ways (ROW), land tenure, recreation opportunities, access, grazing, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and ACECs. The plan was completed in accordance with BLM laws and regulations including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and NEPA, and included public, tribal, and agency involvement. During the preparation of the proposed plan, the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act was passed by Congress

and was signed into law by President George Bush on November 28, 1990. The Safford District RMP was modified during the plan's development to reflect the changes created by the passage of the Wilderness Act, including the designation of the Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area (RNCA).

Due to protests received during the RMP 30-day protest period, two RODs were subsequently issued:

- Partial ROD I, September 1992. Approved portions of the RMP replaced four Management Framework Plans (MFPs) (Geronimo, 1973; Black Hills, 1975; Winkelman, 1981; and San Simon, 1973) for the Safford District. This ROD also provided the basis for managing scattered parcels of Safford District public lands and resources located in Cochise and southwestern Graham Counties not previously covered by MFPs. In addition, the Safford District RMP incorporated the decisions of the San Pedro River Riparian Management Plan (1989), the Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS (1986), and the Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES (1978). This ROD approved the designation of eight ACECs and deferred five others for further consideration.
- Partial ROD II, July 1994. Resolved the protested portions of the Safford District RMP EIS. This partial ROD approved several ACECs – Eagle Creek Bat Cave, Desert Grasslands RNA, and Hot Springs Watershed. Two ACECs previously considered for designation in the RMP (Gila Box RNCA, Coronado Mountain) were not designated.

As provided in Section I (D) of this report, the Safford District RMP has been amended several times.

E. Previous Evaluation and Assessment Summary

The previous 5-year evaluation (2001) correctly noted that Safford District RMP “decisions” were generally broad management objectives that aligned with long-standing BLM policy and procedures. Most decisions at that time were determined to be valid with ongoing implementation. An internal reference document that assigned identifiers to RMP decisions was developed by SFO following RMP implementation. For example, Lands and Realty decisions were identified by a progression of identifiers “LR01, LR02.” It should be noted that since the SFO RMP was approved, planning regulations and policy have been updated. The current Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1 identifies planning level decisions to be considered in RMPs versus implementation level decisions that should be developed in activity level plans. Implementation level decisions in the current RMP should be removed in a future plan revision.

A summary of the 2001 evaluation findings follows:

- Emphasis on planning efforts such as [habitat management plans] HMPs and [allotment management plans] AMPs has changed, but [are] not reflected in any amendments. Field personnel understand the need to move toward single activity plans for each geographic area, but the direction is unclear in the RMP.
- Due to reorganizations and boundary adjustments, SFO manages lands under LUPs that have different histories, management priorities, management techniques, and focus. The Safford RMP contains references to areas that are beyond the current field office boundary. The next RMP revision should address this issue.

- Ecosystem plans suggested:
 - *San Simon*. Current decisions in the land use plan and activity plans are outdated, unrealistic, unnecessary, or are contradictory to other decisions and/or [BLM] policy.
 - *Aravaipa*. There is a need to develop an ecosystem (or watershed) plan for the Aravaipa Creek area; this would incorporate the wilderness plan and other activity plans.
- Resource program area evaluation and recommendations:
 - *Cultural Resources*. A plan revision is recommended for areas that contain cultural resources that were not adequately addressed in the LUPs (e.g., lands in Navajo and Apache counties acquired by SFO in the boundary adjustment.) A plan revision is recommended to establish guidance for addressing Native American Religious Concerns and Native American Pathways and Resources.
 - *Fire Management*. Objectives for Fire Management Zones are outdated. The current fire management plan is not incorporated into the RMP. Need to ensure fire management is tied to vegetation goals and objectives. Fuels management objectives and treatments are not discussed. Hazard fuel reduction goals are not identified. Plan does not address Appropriate Management Response (AMR) and managing fires for resource benefit for (as directed in the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy). Due to other LUP guidance, AMR is not allowed for in the RMP. Wildland Urban Interface issues are not addressed.
 - *Grazing Management*. Need to update Range Program Summary. Need to update maps to reflect current situation. Need to address grazing in Apache, Navajo, and Cochise counties on lands picked up by the Field Office in the last boundary adjustment. Need to address issues related to grazing along the Gila River above the Gila Box. San Simon needs an ecosystem plan to redefine management direction and to reconcile conflicting and/or outdated decisions for this area. See section on San Simon. There is a need to revisit the issue of forage allocation decisions and revise or drop. Consider including ephemeral use criteria. Recommendations for Outstanding Natural Areas need to be revisited, as this designation is no longer valid. These areas have been superseded by Gila Box RNCA, wilderness, grazing retirements and others.
 - *Hazardous Materials Management*. Safford and Phoenix RMP documents lack land use planning level decisions addressing hazardous materials. Future land use planning efforts should incorporate information pertaining to hazardous materials and develop LUP decisions if needed.
 - *Lands and Realty*. Decisions provide purpose and goals to the program, although the plans need to be consolidated and updated to reflect boundary adjustments and current situation. Consideration should be given to including a comprehensive list of special stipulations in future planning documents so they can be used in land use authorizations. This may be valuable for authorizations other than those from the lands and realty program.
 - *Minerals*. Issues to be addressed in future planning efforts include the assessment of mining hazards and related public safety issues. Address the situation where the field office has acquired acreage and revisit RMP decisions based on new

information.

- *Paleontological Resources.* Decisions from the Safford District RMP provide overall management guidance as well as any in the State; review paleontological resources within lands covered by the Phoenix RMP. Consider including an appendix that describes general location and class of resources. Develop a plan decision to preserve Class I areas with ACEC designation.
- *Recreation & Off-highway Vehicles.* Many decisions are valid and have been, or are being implemented. Complete route inventories to provide a baseline for existing roads. There was a perceived need by the staff to designate roads.
- *Riparian.* The Statewide LUPA for Implementation of Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration has given a LUP-level goal for all planning documents to protect riparian habitat. Revise RMP to reflect Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) methodology. See section on San Simon.
- *Watershed (Soil, Water, Air).* Watershed decisions were valid with some needed revision. Need to reconcile terminology and policy between the BLM and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding standards. The EPA's Clean Water Act (CWA) Action Plan (1998) needs to be addressed. The Statewide LUPA for Implementation of Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (1997) is being used for watershed assessment. References to meeting state water quality standards are included in the appropriate guideline under Standard 3, Desired Future Conditions. References to controlling erosion and protecting soil surface are included under Standard 1, Upland Sites. Air quality also needs to be addressed with regards to the fire program.
- *Special Management Areas.* Overall decisions are valid, with some need to revise based on current conditions, including boundary adjustments and other designations. The Muleshoe Ecosystem Management Plan (EMP) (1998) supersedes several decisions regarding the Muleshoe area. The Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers Legislative EIS (LEIS) (1994) found some rivers in the SFO suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System (WSR), while others were found not suitable.
- *Special Status Species.* Special Status Species are addressed through decisions for Vegetation and Wildlife/Fisheries.
- *Transportation.* Plan decisions are valid, although partially implemented (Transportation Plan not complete). Some legal and physical access needs are described in the RMP; consider updating.
- *Vegetation Management, Forest and Woodland Management.* Incorporate the Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration (S&Gs) (1997), biological opinions, and include Desired Plant Community objectives. Address noxious weeds. Need to address personal use fuelwood cutting; few desirable areas outside of riparian, which is closed. Little to no demand in the areas that are open. Need to include language for other vegetation products such as seeds, decorative material, etc. Include decisions addressing salvage.

- *Visual Resources Management*. Need VRM designations for lands in Navajo and Apache counties.
- *Wild and Scenic Rivers*. The Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers LEIS (1994) found some rivers in SFO suitable for inclusion in the WSR system, while others were found not suitable. Overall RMP guidance provides for interim management to protect Outstandingly Remarkable Values.
- *Wilderness*. Guidance lacking in RMP. Consider revising RMP to include recently designated wilderness areas.
- *Wildlife/Fisheries*. Need to revise to reflect changes in State law regarding trapping; incorporate relevant portions of the biological opinions issued by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (jaguar, southwestern willow flycatcher, etc.)

F. Conclusions from Previous Evaluations

The 2001 evaluation correctly noted that due to reorganizations and boundary adjustments, SFO manages lands under land use plans that have different histories, management priorities, management techniques, and focus. The Safford District RMP contains references to areas that are outside of the current field office boundary. The next revision of the RMP should address this issue.

G. Results and Recommendations from Current Evaluation

RMP Decision Status

A review of RMP decisions was conducted to determine the status of each (e.g., decision valid, decision valid but should be modified, drop the decision, or new decision needed.). Decisions excluded from assessment were implementation or administrative decisions. The review revealed the vast majority of the RMP decisions are valid but in need of modification which could be accomplished through a plan revision. The results are provided in Attachment C.

RMP Effectiveness Monitoring of Renewable Resources on BLM Lands

The RMP was developed prior to the bureau's formalized Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring (AIM) principles for determining the status and trend of the terrestrial and aquatic resources relative to the objectives identified in the plan (IM 2016-139). Nevertheless, it is long-standing practice for the SFO to monitor and evaluate renewable resources conditions through the following:

- *Land health assessments*. Long-term monitoring data is collected via an agreement with the University of Arizona. Section 3 (grazing district) allotments are monitored on five-year intervals. Data collected include bare ground, canopy cover, and production percentages to inform Land Health Evaluations (LHE) for processing grazing permit renewals (GPR). Range management staff assess the 17 indicators for rangeland health, often supplemented with Interdisciplinary team long-term monitoring (step point, line intercept). Further, assessments of wildlife and special status species occur with each LHE/GPR.
- *Aquatic monitoring*. The SFO Fishery Biologist conducts fish monitoring on regular basis within the riparian systems of the Gila River, Bonita Creek, Aravaipa Canyon, and Muleshoe Ranch. Data is reported annually to US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

SFO collects monitoring data (e.g., PFC, water quality, water quantity, turbidity, etc.) per the Living Rivers protocol via agreement with Eastern Arizona College funded through Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) partnership funds.

- *T&E terrestrial monitoring.* Per a USFWS biological opinion, the SFO Wildlife Biologist conducts annual monitoring of the Arizona ridge-nosed rattlesnake. On-going monitoring is occurring for the Chihuahua scurfpea, which is currently being petitioned for listing.
- *Salt cedar removal.* Resource staff observations during field visits are conducted, although not part of monitoring schedule.
- *Riparian and associated upland restoration.* Photo point data, on-site qualitative assessments are conducted.
- *Gila Box RNCA Management Plan implementation.* On-site data collection is conducted by resource staff and STEM partnership interns for each mile of the river (several miles each summer). This addresses water quality, vegetation, wildlife, and T&E species. Monitoring protocol fulfill AIM core standards and are coordinated with GIS. Monitoring also occurs during River Ranger patrols.
- *Riparian fence exclosures.* Visual inspections are conducted by resource staff; noted in fisheries biologists' survey field notes.

The following resource programs were not assessed, as they are not present on lands managed under the Safford District RMP:

- *Wild Horses and Burros*
- *Indian Trust Resources*

Based on meetings and written responses to evaluation questionnaires July through August 2016, individual resource program conclusions are as follows:

- *Cultural Resources.* Previous plan evaluation recommendations remain valid. A change to the overall management of cultural resources is not warranted. However, a plan revision could provide some program management benefits. An RMP revision could provide more specific direction (i.e., establish criteria) for avoiding cultural resource conflicts. Existing or future plan decisions related to traditional cultural importance and sacred sites may lack specificity as these resources are not shared publicly by tribes. Tribal consultation for planning and implementation level activities can help minimize potential resource conflicts for these and other known tribal resources. Development of tribe-specific programmatic agreements offer a valuable tool to bridge the lack of RMP specificity and should be considered. Additional Class III inventories are recommended for acquired parcels resulting from the Ray land exchange and for isolated parcels east of SPRNCA that could be considered for acquisition and possible special designation. An update to the Cultural Predictive Model is recommended. Minimization of resource conflicts resulting from off-highway vehicles (OHV) should be developed in a revised RMP. The RMP does not address areas of traditional cultural importance areas including sacred sites. A plan revision should consider management prescriptions or special designation for such areas on BLM-managed lands. Mineral withdrawals identified in the RMP specific to four cultural sites (LR18), although never completed, should be

reassessed in a plan revision.

- *Fire Management and Fuels.* Management actions to achieve fire management goals and objectives do not conflict with the goals and objectives for vegetation or wildlife, although methods can result in short term impacts to these other resources but are ultimately beneficial for species and their habitats. Other resource decisions minimally address fire. Effective fire management would benefit from a RMP revision to include developing and stating desired future conditions with triggers/thresholds amongst the other resources (e.g., key species percentage of vegetation canopy cover, grassland restoration, uplands and watershed measurable objectives). Echoing the 2001 plan evaluation, a plan revision should fully integrate the Arizona Statewide Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) for Fire, Fuels, and Air Quality Management and incorporate the most current fire policies. A plan revision should consider opportunities for biomass utilization goals, such as bio-generation of slash. Wildland urban interface (WUI) issues are not addressed in the Safford District RMP and issues are being achieved by area-specific plans as needed. Utilizing current GIS data, updated regional planning efforts (i.e., Rapid Ecosystem Assessment, watershed management plans), and available monitoring data, should be used to inform new RMP objectives.
- *Grazing Management.* Grazing decisions, including lands available and not available for livestock grazing, were incorporated into the Safford RMP from the Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES and Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS. Allotment selective management categories (Custodial, Maintain and Improve) per IM 2009-018 need to be revisited and subsequently incorporated into the RMP. Currently, selective management categories are not reflective of existing resource conditions in a limited number of cases. The 2001 evaluation noted a need to address grazing issues along the Gila River above the Gila Box. Since then, implementation of measures identified in the Gila Box RNCA Management Plan (1998) has occurred, which included administrative and physical livestock grazing restrictions within the riparian portions of the RNCA. Forage available to livestock (Animal Unit Months) established in the Upper Gila-San Simon grazing ES was incorporated into the RMP. Any authorized changes to AUMs since then are not reflected in the Safford District RMP. Since there has not been a comprehensive assessment of the grazing management program for SFO since 1978, a RMP revision should consider such an effort. This can be supported with monitoring data and geospatial data sets such as NRCS geospatial production layers. An RMP revision may consider management in periods of drought and use adaptive management for grazing forage management.
- *Hazardous Materials.* As noted in the 2001 plan evaluation, the Safford District RMP documents lack land use planning level decisions addressing hazardous materials and abandoned mine lands. Future land use planning efforts should incorporate information pertaining to hazardous materials and develop LUP decisions as needed.
- *Lands and Realty.* As noted in the 2001 plan evaluation, the decisions in the Safford District RMP provide program purpose and goals. Lands identified and mapped for disposal and acquisition per the Land Tenure Amendment (LTA) need to be digitized into GIS. These lands identified for disposal have not been evaluated or surveyed for legal descriptions. Subsequent to the LTA, SFO has identified a number of private in-holdings for acquisition located within or adjacent to Wilderness areas and the Gila Box RNCA.

The Safford District RMP does not address Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) revisionary clause sales. SFO anticipates Graham County to seek R&PP lands not accounted for in the current plan. Withdrawals identified in the plan that have been implemented include the National Guard-Safford and the Fort Huachuca Willcox Playa bombing range. No withdrawals are currently being processed or proposed. The plan is currently silent on guidance of relinquished withdrawals. While the plan does identify avoidance and exclusion areas, general terms and conditions were not developed. The LTA identified proposed utilities corridors but never officially designated them. A plan revision should be very clear on formally designating corridors. Existing ROW corridor locations should be evaluated in light of new renewable energy demands, recent nationwide EISs, and regional EIS documents that allocate renewable energy focus areas.

The Safford District RMP made land tenure decisions for all of the public lands within the current RMP boundary. Land tenure decisions need to be re-evaluated based on new information about resource values present on several key parcels. For example, there are high resource values on lands currently marked for disposal in the Middle Gila River area and around TFO's NCAs, National Monuments, and wilderness areas. These land tenure decisions also need to be re-evaluated based on recent acquisitions and resource goals and objectives outlined in NCA and National Monument specific plans. In SFO, the following ACECs were identified in the RMP for mineral withdrawal, but the withdrawals were not completed: Bowie Mountain, Bear Springs Badlands, Desert Grasslands, Eagle Creek Bat Cave, and Table Mountain. There is a need to transfer ROW data from LR2000 into a geospatial application to inform the RMP and subsequent implementation level decisions.

- *Wind, Solar, and Geothermal Energy.* The demand for energy facilities is addressed by the RDEP EIS, Solar PEIS, Geothermal PEIS, and the Section 368 West-wide Energy Corridors EIS – all of which amended the Safford District RMP. The Wind Energy PEIS did not amend the plan; therefore, proposed wind projects are addressed on a case-by-case basis. The plan addressed USFWS Bald and Golden Eagle Guidelines with respect to renewable energy development via the RDEP EIS and Solar PEIS. The plan identifies three communication sites. Renewable energy development should be considered in a future plan revision.
- *Minerals.* The Safford District RMP identified 11 areas for withdrawal from mineral entry that were never completed. Other withdrawals are to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Although the plan states that mitigation and reclamation measures will be provided to prevent undue or unnecessary degradation of the environment, no further guidance is provided for sustainable development associated with mining. Issues to be addressed in future planning efforts include the assessment of abandoned mine lands hazards and related public safety issues. An inventory of mine waste repositories and abandoned mine waste piles may be helpful in determining land use allocations in a future plan revision. For mineral materials areas of high resource conflicts should be identified and consideration given to excluding those areas from development. The plan provides a hypothetical Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for leasable minerals although the actual potential for oil and gas resources within the planning area has never been identified. This could be revisited in the next planning effort. Two rockhound areas (Black Hills and Round Mountain) should be considered for mining claim withdrawal. A plan revision should also address split estate. The demand

for mineral materials in the upper San Pedro River Valley located within TFO may warrant the designation of community pits.

- **Paleontological Resources.** The Safford District RMP decisions provide broadly stated management guidance for paleontological resources. Protection measures for paleontological resources may conflict with measures for cultural resources, and are addressed case-by-case.
- **Recreation.** Plan designation and validity of Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA) are as follows:
 - Aravaipa Canyon/Turkey Creek area - valid
 - Gila Box/Bonita Creek area – valid
 - Christmas (Gila River below Coolidge dam) - valid
 - Red Knolls/Bear Springs Badlands/Watson Wash areas – partially invalid, as Watson Wash Hot Spring has been decommissioned;
 - Hot Well Dunes – valid
 - Additional lands in the San Pedro RNCA are not included in the existing management plan for the area. The San Pedro RNCA SRMA designation is currently being revisited in the SPRNCA RMP planning effort.

RMP validity of additional general recreation areas identified for project planning:

- Gila Mountain Crest Trail - valid
- Aravaipa – valid (complete)
- Watson Wash Hot Well – invalid (RMP duplication)
- Safford-Morenci Trail – valid
- Red Knolls – valid
- Guadalupe Canyon - valid
- Black Hills Rockhound Area - valid
- Round Mountain Rockhound Area – valid
- Fort Bowie/Helens Dome Trail – valid

The Safford District RMP does not identify recreation opportunity spectrum classes (ROS) or setting characteristics and/or recreation management zones (RMZ). However, a ROS inventory and RMA designations would improve recreation management. More generally, managing public lands within SFO as a SRMA, extended RMA (ERMA), or land not designated as recreation management area for dispersed recreation should be considered. Management objectives for producing specific recreation opportunities is inadequate and the RMP does not place restrictions on recreation use to sustain other resource values. This should be considered in a future plan revision.

Some recreation management plans for SRMAs designated in the RMP either have been developed as a stand-alone plan (Hot Well Dunes) or addressed within ecosystem management plans (Gila Box, Aravaipa – see *Special Area Designations*, page 16). Other areas identified in the RMP for SRMA designation warrant re-evaluation to reflect the current needs of recreation users. As noted in the *Minerals* section (page 12), two rockhound areas should be considered for mining claim withdrawal and may warrant SRMA designation.

Limitations and restrictions on land uses and recreational activities are addressed in the Safford District RMP, specifically within Wilderness, ACECs, and the Gila Box RNCA. The RMP needs to incorporate current travel management guidelines (restrictions)

supported by baseline route inventories.

Changes experienced in recreation management issues since RMP approval include:

- ATV usage being replaced by UTVs that involve wider body/footprint, which are affecting soils and vegetation.
- Increasing parking needs at trailheads.
- Increasing recreation use particularly within:
 - Aravaipa Canyon (Wilderness).
 - Gila Box RNCA. Increased recreation use is driven by public awareness since the area's designation as a NCA. SFO addressed this by increasing the infrastructure available to the recreation users (e.g., campgrounds, trailheads, and day use areas.)

Public land access is a major concern and is not addressed in the RMP. Numerous acres of public lands are inaccessible to the public because of historic land ownership patterns, inadequate entry points, and a failure to remove impediments to tracts of land that should be open for the enjoyment of all. In recent years, hunters, anglers and other outdoor recreationists have raised concerns about access—or a lack thereof—to public lands. Land ownership in SFO is a quilt of federal, state, local, Native American, and private lands. The patchwork of owners can make it difficult for the public to access public lands without trespassing through private lands. Alongside hunting, inadequate access to public lands impacts a range of outdoor recreation activities. According to a General Accountability Office (GAO) study requested by Congress, federal land managers identified a laundry list of recreational activities diminished by inadequate access to public lands, including hunting, hiking, camping, viewing scenery and wildlife, horseback riding, fishing, wilderness area use, and mountain biking, among others. A future plan revision should consider any submittals for the designation of Backcountry Conservation Management areas per Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2017-036.

- *Riparian.* The Safford District RMP directs the BLM (1) to maintain or improve 75% of the acreage of riparian vegetation on public lands within the District in good or excellent condition by 1997 (RP01), and (2) develop a riparian inventory system (RP13). A riparian inventory system has not been implemented, however PFC assessments have been ongoing and conducted on most riparian areas within the RMP boundary, the categorization of “good” or “excellent” need to be re-categorized into PFC categories [i.e., PFC, Functional At-Risk (FAR), and Nonfunctional (NF)]. It is unknown if there are new riparian species to consider subsequent to RMP completion as there has not been any systematic inventory work done in riparian or wetland systems. The RMP provides little direction on management of invasive riparian species and the list of these species has grown quite large since this plan was developed.

There are a number of surface waters with riparian and/or wetland resources associated with public lands within the TFO. Some of these include the San Pedro River (exclusive of the SPRNCA) including possible future acquisitions, Gila River, Mescal Creek, and Mescal Warm Spring, Dripping Springs Mountains, and Mule Mountains. Many have been not been inventoried and characterized.

Opportunities related to improved riparian management do exist – primarily in developing more measurable plan objectives as well as considering stream restoration tools to improve riparian resources. Wetland restoration at Mescal Creek is a tangible

example of a degraded location that would benefit from this approach. A future plan revision should consider new recovery plans for the Chiricahua leopard frog, Huachuca water umbel, and Gila chub.

See *Wildlife/Fisheries and T&E* concerning aquatic species associated with riparian resources.

- *Watershed (Soil, Water, Air)*. Air quality standards and management practices are in accordance with State of Arizona Class II standards, unless designated as non-attainment or redesignated (WS34). Class II standards allow for moderate deterioration of air quality associated with moderate, well-controlled industrial and population growth. Sulfur dioxide nonattainment areas are found near large-scale mining operations in Globe, Mammoth, Hayden-Winkelman, and near the international border area of southern Cochise County. The Safford-Morenci area was designated as an attainment area in 2012. The statewide LUPA for Fire, Fuels, and Air Quality Management addresses activities in special designation areas to some degree but then refers back to the RMP. Since the RMP was approved, some laws such as the Clean Water Act have changed. A plan revision would need to consider the most current laws and regulations when developed.

The RMP very generally discusses water quality, water quantity, and current or foreseeable beneficial uses in the planning area, but specific, measureable objectives were not established. Impaired waters are located within the planning area but are not linked to public land use. Area-wide use restrictions and best management practices addressing water quality are not identified in the RMP – rather, they are addressed through activity-level plans such as the Gila Box RNCA Management Plan. Increasing demands on surface flows and aquifers within the planning area, but not necessarily on public land, needs adequate consideration in a RMP revision (i.e., establishment of thresholds and/or decision trees.) Water rights inventories may be needed for a future plan revision.

In the Safford District planning area, public lands containing soil stability and erosive soil issues are present and dispersed. A number of problem areas whose uses are restricted by low soil productivity, limited water quality, etc., were specifically identified in the RMP – the San Simon area continues to be of particular concern.

In the Safford District RMP, soil survey data is not:

- Described and used to assess the suitability/capability of landscapes to achieve RMP objectives.
- Used to set priorities for restoration/rehabilitation and to guide development of site-specific prescriptions.
- Used to identify erosion hazards or erodible classes throughout the planning area.

Soil survey data is used on project-level activities (e.g., land health evaluation conducted for grazing permit renewals.)

A plan revision may warrant a soil and site stability objective to possibly include assessment of erosion control structures.

- *Climate Trends*. The Safford District RMP does not adequately address resource effects due to changes in climate. A decision was made to initiate studies to determine the effects of “climate change” on vegetation and other resources (VM12) but was never implemented. Opportunities exist to integrate resiliency or mitigation strategies into the

plan via watershed improvements, grassland restorations, erosion control and natural recharge enhancements to protect soil, water and air resources. The Madrean Archipelago Rapid Ecoregional Assessment (REA) may have data (baseline and projections) that could inform a plan revision, although the geographic scope of this particular REA is much smaller than the lands managed under the Safford District RMP. The plan can be informed by the finalization of current BLM Washington Office climate change guidance or policy.

- *Special Area Designations (ACECs, Back Country Byways, Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Historic Trails, National Landmarks, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics).* The Safford District RMP does not set appropriate desired future conditions (DFC) or goals and objectives for Special Area Designations. The plan does not designate monitoring and adaptive management practices, but they are implemented through the establishment of individual management plans:
 - Gila Box RNCA Management Plan
 - Muleshoe EMP
 - Aravaipa EMP area

Since approval of the Safford District RMP, the Aravaipa EMP has been developed. It is an activity level plan that addresses three ACECs.

ACEC. The Safford District RMP calls for the preparation of separate ACEC management plans, but not all have been written. Management prescriptions are adequately protecting the ACEC resources.

Back Country Byway. The RMP designated the Black Hills Back Country Byway a designated interpretive vehicle route. Management prescriptions are adequately protecting the byway.

Nation Scenic and Historic Trails. The Safford-Morenci Trail is eligible for National Park Service designation as a National Recreation Trail. The designation will go into effect upon an RMP amendment to implement this action.

Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR). Public lands along streams identified as potentially suitable for Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR) designation per the Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers LEIS are as follows:

- Gila River and Bonita Creek – addressed in the Gila Box RNCA Management Plan
- Aravaipa Creek – addressed Aravaipa Ecosystem Management Plan
- Middle Gila River (river segment within the Christmas SRMA) – no management plan has been developed.

Since the Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers LEIS was completed, no new information or changes in stream conditions that would affect WSR recommendations have been made. No other streams or tributaries have been identified that should be reviewed for eligibility.

Wilderness. The RMP does not set DFC or clear goals and objectives for designated Wilderness or the Wilderness Study Area (WSA). A plan revision should provide goals, objectives and management actions for both designated Wilderness and the WSA. Additional management guidance is provided by the Wilderness Act of 1964, National Wilderness Policy, and Manual 6330 – Management of Wilderness Study Areas.

Activity level wilderness plans address site-specific actions to more effectively manage these areas. Monitoring and adaptive management practices are established in activity-level plans in conformance with the RMP (e.g., Aravaipa Ecosystem and Gila Box RNCA management plans, Peloncillo Mountains and Dos Cabezas Mountains wilderness plans, and Muleshoe Cooperative Management Plan). Management plans are lacking for the North Santa Teresa and Fishhooks wildernesses. A management plan may also be needed if the Baker Canyon WSA is designated wilderness. Additionally, the acquisition of a 600-acre parcel (ET Ranch) that would provide access to the North Santa Teresa Wilderness is currently under consideration by SFO and, if acquired, consideration of land management prescriptions should be addressed in the plan. A citizen proposal for a wilderness area was submitted for the Mescal Mountains area, which is located within the TFO boundary.

Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC). LWC is not addressed in the RMP. LWC inventory needs to be updated for most of the SFO area. Some inventory has been completed related to the SunZia Southwest and Southline transmission line projects. External groups, such as the Arizona Wilderness Coalition, are actively conducting new citizen inventories in southeastern Arizona. These should be considered during a plan revision.

Significant Cave Resources. In TFO, one small cave feature with petroglyphs is known to exist near Sombrero Butte, and but it may not constitute a significant cave resource. A significant cave resource determination per 43 CFR Part 37 should be addressed in a future plan revision.

- *Special Status Species.* Special status species are addressed through decisions for *Vegetation Management* and *Wildlife/Fisheries and T&E*.
- *Travel and Transportation.* Plan decisions are valid. The development of a District Transportation Plan was identified but not implemented. Implementation-level travel plans have been developed for the Aravaipa ecosystem area and the Gila Box RNCA. The state office has identified nine independent travel management plans (TMP) to be developed by fiscal year 2018 for lands addressed by the Safford District RMP. There is a strong need for updated route inventories primarily within the SFO. This will enable refinement of OHV limited designations to be accommodated through the TMP planning processes. OHV open and closed designations are meeting RMP objectives. The RMP identifies one designated trail, but there are no established Designated Use/Trail Management objectives. The RMP addresses travel as “limited to existing roads and trails” but mapping these existing travel facilities has not occurred. In lieu of clearly stated travel management objectives and prescriptions, they are being defined within area-specific TMPs per the direction of 43 CFR 8340. As previously noted in *Cultural Resources*, minimization of resource conflicts resulting from OHV use should be developed in a revised RMP.
- *Forestry.* Addressed broadly in terms of firewood cutting within *Vegetation Management* below.
- *Vegetation Management.* Since the RMP was approved, newly listed species and habitat have been identified in the planning area. These species should be addressed in a plan revision. The Safford District RMP does not identify DFC for important vegetation communities, or characteristics of healthy vegetation communities. These should be

established in a plan revision. A plan revision should also incorporate land health standards as management common to all alternatives that should be considered by all resource programs. Vegetation management issues are being achieved by area-specific plans as needed. Current GIS data, updated regional planning efforts (i.e., Rapid Ecosystem Assessment, watershed management plans), and available monitoring data, should be used to inform new RMP objectives. The RMP does not adequately provide management direction to address the introduction and spread of noxious and invasive species. Although vegetation treatments such as chemical, fire, and mechanical are covered under the ROD, there is little specific guidance addressing noxious and other invasive species (including riparian). The list of these species has grown quite large since this plan was developed.

SFO references two herbicide programmatic EISs⁷ for guidance. See *Fire Management and Fuels* above regarding biomass utilization.

- *Visual Resources Management (VRM)*. VRM classes were allocated in the current RMP, but visual resource inventories (VRI) were not completed or mapped during development of the plan. The RMP is from the early 1990s and does not completely reflect current resource demand and public sensitivity to visual changes. A VRI within the SFO was conducted in 2011 for the Gila area and in 2014 for the upper San Pedro Basin. This data should be used when considering VRM decisions during a plan revision. The constraints imposed by the VRM classes for protecting visual values while managing development generally works well. Some VRM classes need updating. For example:
 - VRM Class III is currently designated along federal and State highway corridors identified as having scenic routes. VRM Class II may be more appropriate for protecting visual resource values along those routes (SR-177, -77), particularly SR-77 corridor along the Gila River SRMA. The VRM classes for areas adjacent to Wilderness should be evaluated in a plan revision to see if the current transition from a Class I to a Class IV is appropriate. Land abutting the Class I area may qualify for an intermediate VRM class.

VRM is receiving more public and non-governmental organization interest.

- *Wildlife/Fisheries and Threatened & Endangered (T&E)*. Since Safford District RMP approval, new priority species and habitat (including T&E listings) have been identified, and should be reflected in the a plan revision. Some of the T&E listings are addressed in Biological Opinions (BO) on a project-by-project basis and others District-wide. Activity plans have been developed to include T&E components in compliance with the RMP (e.g., Gila Box, Muleshoe, Aravaipa EMP), but activity plans specific to T&E species/habitats have not been developed. USFWS consultation should be considered for the most recently listed species and their associated critical habitats. Implementation of broad-level RMP objectives for special status species has occurred, but are not measurable. Measureable objectives and management prescriptions should be established. Since the RMP was finalized, recovery plans pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act have been completed for the following species: Arizona cliffrose, Beautiful

⁷ Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (2006); Vegetation Treatments Using Aminopyralid, Fluroxypyr, and Rimsulfuron on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (2016).

shiner, Cochise pincushion cactus, desert pupfish, lesser long-nosed bat, ocelot, jaguar, loach minnow, Mexican spotted owl, razorback sucker, Southwestern willow flycatcher, spokedace, yaqui catfish, yaqui chub. A recovery plan for roundtail chub has been drafted but not finalized. Yellow-billed cuckoo and northern Mexican gartersnake have recently been listed although recovery plans have not yet been written.

The Desert Tortoise Rangewide Plan and Arizona Implementation Strategy is being implemented through project-level decisions.

The plan is silent on the golden eagle. A RMP revision would provide a valuable opportunity to integrate migratory bird conservation measures per the USFWS-BLM Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Executive Order (EO) 13186. The identification of specific and measurable objectives for priority habitats should be provided in order to improve wildlife management. A revision to the RMP should also take into consideration species' stressors including drought, climate trends, biological pathogens (e.g. amphibian chytrid fungus, bat white-nose syndrome), increased habitat fragmentation and loss of corridor or genetic connectivity, pharmaceutical contaminants, non-native, invasive species, and ground water diversions.

A plan revision should also consider changes to the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Wildlife 20/20 strategic plan and Arizona's State Wildlife Action Plan: 2012-2022.

Improved GIS data cataloging of existing and incoming data - including other agencies' data - could better portray current conditions, models, and landscape trends to inform wildlife decisions and objectives in a RMP revision.

- *Geospatial data.* SFO geospatial data is current with all national data standards and metadata for related data sets are complete. Metadata is lacking for data layers not yet covered by national data standards. Data layers not yet developed for the current RMP include land use exclusion/avoidance areas, subsurface mineral estate acreages, and potential fossil yield. There is a need to reconcile grazing allotment boundaries (acreages) between the SFO geospatial files, the Range Administration System, and the RMP. Land health reporting monitoring data need to be geospatially converted.
- *Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice.* The RMP does not take into account the topics of socioeconomics and environmental justice. Need to conduct a baseline analysis, and include growth and demographic trends in a RMP revision.

III. RMP IMPLEMENTATION

The land use plan implementation schedule provides the field office a method to identify work to be done to implement RMP planning decisions, and provides a way to prioritize work during the life of the plan. The bureau's initial development of a LUP strategy began in the early 2000s. The intent was to provide BLM with a systematic method for planning and achieving results based on anticipated funding. Policy on the requirements for what the implementation strategy should contain has changed over time. BLM's current policy requires completion of an implementation schedule within a year of approving an RMP, using a three-step process.

In the mid-2000s, BLM AZ attempted development of implementation strategies for existing RMPs that were being implemented. The Gila District developed an initial implementation

framework for their RMPs, including the Safford District RMP. While types of work and priorities were included in the plan, no units of accomplishment were included.

The implementation schedule is supposed to be a living document that is updated by the field office. However, the Gila District implementation schedule has not been finalized or maintained. There currently is not an easy way to track over time all the work that has been accomplished to implement plan decisions in the existing RMP. When a plan revision is undertaken, a new implementation schedule would need to be completed using the bureau's latest guidance.

IV. CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER PLANS OF OTHER AGENCIES OR TRIBES

There are no known inconsistencies between the SFO RMP and plans of other agencies or tribes. However, staff is aware that some agency plans have changed since the RMP was approved (see Section II (G) *Wildlife/Fisheries and T&E*). Plan revisions are in progress for the Coronado and Tonto national forests adjacent to BLM lands. A future plan revision would need to consider local, state, and tribal plans and try to resolve any inconsistencies that may surface.

V. PLAN CONFORMANCE

Actions not considered due to plan conformance issues have not been identified. The RMP has been amended a number of times since approved [see Section I (D)]. This has allowed the offices to deal with emerging issues over the life of the plan.

VI. IS A PLAN AMENDMENT OR REVISION NECESSARY?

A revision of the Safford District RMP is warranted, although a multitude of plan amendments have generally been successful in addressing land management issues as they emerged.

A number of underlying weaknesses with the Safford District RMP that generally affect all resource programs are evident, including:

- Lack of resource data populated geospatially to better inform the planning process (i.e., establish designations and/or resource allocations), develop measurable objective-based decisions, and determine conformance of implementation-level decisions with the RMP.
- Lack of a complete and updated implementation schedule.
- Decisions are primarily broad-based policy conformance statements that lack measureable objectives. While this can allow for considerable flexibility, this can be problematic for maximizing beneficial land management decisions and for measuring RMP effectiveness.

Numerous program policies have been updated since the approval of the Safford District RMP. The RMP either inadequately addresses, or does not address, the following resource programs as grouped by Administration priorities:

- **Making America Great Through Shared Conservation Stewardship, Serving the American Family and Getting America Back to Work**
 - Desired future conditions for resources
 - Climate trends

- Relevant data from the Madrean Archipelago Rapid Ecoregional Assessment (REA)
 - Lands with Wilderness Characteristics
 - Recreation management
 - Access
 - Vegetation management and fuels
 - Land tenure
- **Making America Safe Through Energy Independence**
 - Renewable energy
 - Utility Corridors
- **Making America Safe-Restoring our Sovereignty**
 - US-Mexico border issues

A Safford District RMP revision should consider the appropriate geographic scope, as the administrative boundary has changed since the RMP was approved and implemented.

As previously noted in Section II (G) and documented in Attachment C, the vast majority of the RMP decisions are valid but in need of modification.

Management in SFO believes the vagueness of some of the plan objectives have provided the office the flexibility to continue to accomplish work needed to implement the plan. However, they recognize a plan revision would be helpful for a number of different programs and issues that have arisen over time. Management felt it would be helpful to consider planning decisions in a plan revision for utility corridors, land tenure, lands with wilderness characteristics, recreation management areas and zones, special recreation permits, access, back country conservation areas, renewable energy, vegetation management, weeds, fuels, and border issues.

Management concerns related to starting a plan revision include the scope of the project and balancing that with staff availability, workload, and priorities. SFO has a number of new resource staff members that are not that familiar with BLM and the programs they manage and feel resource training for those individuals is needed before embarking on a plan revision. Managers feel that if a revision is started it must be recognized that other workload will not be accomplished. Consideration should be given to hiring a knowledgeable, dedicated project manager to oversee the plan revision. Management would prefer to see the effort contracted, using staff as support for information needs and review.

When a planning revision effort is undertaken, it would follow BLM's guidance, laws, and regulations. Management would be based on multiple use and sustained yield, unless otherwise specified by law, and would involve other federal agencies, state and local governments, tribes, and interested public.

Attachment A

Safford District RMP 5-Year Evaluation

Safford Field Office ID Team & Interview Schedule

July 12 – 10-11 a.m. (Tuesday)

Riparian Worksheet

Heidi Blasius, Fishery Biologist

Jeffery Conn, Natural Resources Specialist

Amy Corathers, Planning and Environmental Specialist (P&ES)

(Subsequent Gila District/TFO contributions: Amy Markstein, Gila District Planning & Environmental Coordinator; Jeff Simms, Biologist; Ben Lomeli, Hydrologist.)

July 18 – 9-10:30 a.m. (Monday)

Riparian, Fish and Wildlife, T&E

Amy Corathers, Planning and Environmental Specialist (P&ES); Heidi Blasius, Fisheries Biologist; Jeffery Conn, Natural Resources Specialist; Joneen (Jony) Cockman, Lead Natural Resources Specialist; Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist.

Cultural

Dan McGrew, Archaeologist, on Fire Duty; forwarded responses via email.

July 18 – 3-3:30 p.m. (Monday)

Minerals, Paleontology

Larry Thrasher, Geologist

Amy Corathers, P&ES

Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist

July 19 – 10:30 – Noon (Tuesday)

Travel, Recreation, Wilderness, VRM, ACEC

Todd Murdock, Recreation Planner

Amy Corathers, P&ES

Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist

July 19 – 1-2:00 p.m. (Tuesday)

Fire & Fuels

Dan Quintana, Fire Management Specialist

Amy Corathers, P&ES

Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist

July 19 – 2:30 – 3:30 (Tuesday)

AQ, Climate Trends, Water

Amelia Taylor, Assistant Field Manager

Safford District RMP 5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Amy Corathers, P&ES
Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist

July 20 – 10-11:00 a.m. (Wednesday)

Soils, Vegetation, Grazing

Jason Martin, Range Management Specialist
Rebecca Dees, Range Management Specialist
Jony Cockman, Lead Natural Resources Specialist
Amy Corathers, P&ES
Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist

July 20 – 1-2:30 p.m. (Wednesday)

Lands & Realty, Energy

Ron Peru, Realty Specialist
Roberta Lopez, Realty Specialist
Barb Peru, Land Law Examiner
Amy Corathers, P&ES
Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist

August 4 – 10:30-11:30 a.m. (Thursday)

Geospatial Data, New Management Considerations

Sharisse Fisher, GIS Specialist
Amy Corathers P&ES

Tucson Field Office ID Team

Riparian Worksheet

Jeff Simms, Fishery Biologist
Ben Lomeli, Hydrologist
Amy Markstein, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Riparian, Aquatic T&E

Jeff Simms, Fishery Biologist

Lands, Energy

Linda Dunlavey, Realty Specialist

Livestock Grazing

Eric Baker, Range Management Specialist
Karen Simms, Assistant Field Manager

Minerals, Hazardous Materials

Dan Moore, Geologist

Vegetation, Fish & Wildlife, T&E

Marcia Radke, Biologist

Soil, Water, Air Quality

Ben Lomeli, Hydrologist

Visual Resources, Special Area Designations, Wild & Scenic Rivers, National Scenic & Historic Trails, ACECs, Recreation

Francisco Mendoza

Wilderness, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Heather Swanson

Climate Trends

Jeff Simms, Biologist

Linda Dunlavey, Realty Specialist

Eric Baker, Range Management Specialist

Karen Simms, Assistant Field Manager

Dan Moore, Geologist

Francisco Mendoza

Marcia Radke, Biologist

Heather Swanson, Natural Resource Biologist

Amy Markstein, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

ATTACHMENT B

Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure 4.1.07:
Percent of Resource Management Plans making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals

PART 1 – Eligibility			
1.1	Name of Resource Management Plan (RMP)	Safford District RMP	
1.2	Date of Record of Decision (ROD)	September 1992 (Partial ROD I) and July 1994 (Partial ROD II)	
1.3	Date of Evaluation	7/12/16	
1.4	Name of Lead Evaluator	Amy Corathers	
		Yes/No	Text Answer
1.5	Was the RMP, or an RMP Amendment, ROD signed after 2000?	No	Comments: n/a
1.6	Does the RMP contain goals and objectives related to riparian resources?		Comments: n/a
	If Yes, proceed to PART 2		
	If No discuss and summarize in the comment cell why this RMP does not contain riparian goals and objectives.	Yes	
If the response to either question 1.5 or 1.6 is 'No', completing the remainder of this worksheet is optional.			

Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure 4.1.07:

Percent of Resource Management Plans making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals

PART 2 - Stressors and Workload Drivers	
Stressors	
In the space below, list the major stressors that are impacting riparian resources covered by this RMP. Many stressors may be considered during the interdisciplinary team discussion, though this worksheet asks that you record the top 3.	
2.1.1	Surface and Groundwater Withdrawal (agriculture, municipal, livestock operations, mining)
2.1.2	Grazing (surface impact to resources)
2.1.3	Recreation (OHV effects on watershed)
Emerging Stressors and Issues	
In the space below, list emerging or future stressors that are not adequately addressed in this RMP, if applicable.	
2.2.1	Surface and Groundwater Withdrawal & Quality (agriculture, municipal, livestock operations, mining, increasing population/urban interface pressures including increasing recreation use)
2.2.2	Climate Change (e.g., drought, increased fire risk/frequency)
2.2.3	Invasive Species
Activities Impacting Workload	
List 3 activities that are having the most significant impact on this FO priorities (Tip - Think about primary activities and benefiting program e.g. clearances for O&G or for renewable energy projects, or Land Health Assessments for grazing permit renewals, etc.)	
	Activity
2.3.1	Grazing permit renewals (# of allotments in FO)
2.3.2	Right-of-way applications (# Applications:Staff ratio; requires full complement of interdisciplinary staff, not limited to Realty staff)
2.3.3	Recreation Management - Gila Box RNCA, Aravaipa Wilderness, Hot Well Dunes, Special Recreation Permits.

Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure 4.1.07:

Percent of Resource Management Plans making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals

PART 3 - Implementation and Effectiveness of Riparian Actions			
In the space below, list 5 significant riparian actions (e.g. vegetation treatments, on-the-ground activities) that have been implemented since the ROD was signed. Evaluate the effectiveness of these actions (choose yes or no from the drop down box) and list the data sources to validate your conclusion. If no actions have been implemented, skip to Part 3.3.			
	Action Description	Effective	Monitoring/Effectiveness Data Source(s)
3.1.1	Salt Cedar Removal	Yes	Resource staff observations during field visits, although not part of monitoring schedule.
3.1.2	Riparian and Associated Upland Restoration (Guadalupe and Aravaipa Canyons, and Sands Draw, Porter Wash, Howard Well, Posey Well, Cold Spring, Spring Canyon, Martinez Canyon Spring)	Yes	Photo point data, on-site qualitative assessment.
3.1.3	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with City of Safford, AZ, for water pipeline in Bonita Creek.	Yes	Routine site visits by resource staff to ensure minimization of riparian impacts by city maintenance.
3.1.4	Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area Management Plan (livestock (riparian fence enclosures) and off highway vehicle (OHV) exclusion)	Yes	On-site data collection by STEM partnership is conducted for each mile of the river (several miles each summer). This addresses water quality, vegetation, wildlife, and Threatened and Endangered (T&E) species. Monitoring protocol fulfill AIM Core Standards and are coordinated with GIS. Also, monitoring occurs with River Ranger patrols.
3.1.5	Riparian Fence Enclosures	Yes	Visual inspections conducted by resource staff; noted in fisheries biologists' survey field notes.
3.2	Were any of the above actions unsuccessful because of events beyond your control (i.e. fire, flood, etc.)? If Yes, indicate which action(s) and describe. Proceed to PART 4.	Yes	Explanation: Regarding 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 riparian fence enclosures, there is reduced success in some areas due to the displacement of enclosures (1) located in drainages resulting from seasonal flooding, (2) vandalism, or (3) unauthorized recreational motor vehicle. These factors can allow for unauthorized livestock grazing within riparian areas until such time repairs can occur.
3.3	If no riparian actions have been implemented since the ROD was signed, explain why. Proceed to PART 4.		Explanation: n/a

Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure 4.1.07:

Percent of Resource Management Plans making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals

PART 4 – Riparian Planning Decisions and Actions				
Linking Actions to RMP Objectives				
<p>Implementation actions should be undertaken in an effort to move the riparian resource toward meeting condition objectives and associated goals, as described in the RMP. The actions from Part 3 (3.1.1-3.1.5) will auto-fill below. Identify and list which RMP resource area(s), RMP objective(s), and RMP goal(s) each action is tied to.</p> <p>It may also be beneficial to list all other objectives and associated RMP goals related to riparian resources, even if none of the specific actions listed above in 3.1.1-3.1.5 relate. Additional lines are provided to list other objectives. You are encouraged to record RMP objectives and goals relating to varying resources, e.g. riparian, fisheries, recreation, grazing, oil and gas, etc.</p> <p>If an action cannot be tied to one of the objectives or goals defined in the RMP, please explain why in Part 4.2. For example, if there is not an objective and associated goal in the RMP that the action can be tied to, record whether the RMP is deficient in describing appropriate goals and objectives related to riparian resources or if the action should not have been implemented given the goals and objectives defined in the RMP.</p>				
Action Description (Auto-filled from lines 3.1.1-3.1.5 above)	Resource Area	RMP Riparian Objective(s)	RMP Goal	
4.1.1 Salt Cedar Removal	Safford	<p><u>RP19</u> Permit the removal of non-native vegetation for improvement of riparian vegetation.</p> <p><u>RP23</u> Develop a management plan for the Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area.</p> <p><u>RP25</u> During the final stages of AMP implementation, special attention will be given to riparian habitat. Where physically possible riparian habitat will be fenced and managed principally for its wildlife and recreation values.</p>	To maintain or improve 75% of the acreage of riparian vegetation on public lands within the District in good or excellent condition by 1997.	
4.1.2 Riparian and Associated Upland Restoration (Guadalupe and Aravaipa Canyons, and Sands Draw, Porter Wash, Howard Well, Posey Well, Cold Spring, Spring Canyon, Martinez Canyon Spring)	Safford	<p><u>RP15</u> Establish a monitoring plan for selected riparian areas based upon the management priority system. Implement the plan and evaluate monitoring data. Continue to carry out needed changes in riparian area management through activity plans.</p> <p><u>WF09</u> Manage priority wildlife species habitat (vegetation communities) or special features of that habitat (water, riparian vegetation, cliffs, etc.) to maintain or enhance population levels.</p>	To maintain or improve 75% of the acreage of riparian vegetation on public lands within the District in good or excellent condition by 1997.	

Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure 4.1.07:

Percent of Resource Management Plans making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals

PART 4 – Riparian Planning Decisions and Actions				
Linking Actions to RMP Objectives				
<p>Implementation actions should be undertaken in an effort to move the riparian resource toward meeting condition objectives and associated goals, as described in the RMP. The actions from Part 3 (3.1.1-3.1.5) will auto-fill below. Identify and list which RMP resource area(s), RMP objective(s), and RMP goal(s) each action is tied to.</p> <p>It may also be beneficial to list all other objectives and associated RMP goals related to riparian resources, even if none of the specific actions listed above in 3.1.1-3.1.5 relate. Additional lines are provided to list other objectives. You are encouraged to record RMP objectives and goals relating to varying resources, e.g. riparian, fisheries, recreation, grazing, oil and gas, etc.</p> <p>If an action cannot be tied to one of the objectives or goals defined in the RMP, please explain why in Part 4.2. For example, if there is not an objective and associated goal in the RMP that the action can be tied to, record whether the RMP is deficient in describing appropriate goals and objectives related to riparian resources or if the action should not have been implemented given the goals and objectives defined in the RMP.</p>				
Action Description (Auto-filled from lines 3.1.1-3.1.5 above)	Resource Area	RMP Riparian Objective(s)	RMP Goal	
Salt Cedar Removal	Safford	RP19 Permit the removal of non-native vegetation for improvement of riparian vegetation.	To maintain or improve 75% of the acreage of riparian vegetation on public lands within the District in good or excellent condition by 1997.	
		RP23 Develop a management plan for the Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area. RP25 During the final stages of AMP implementation, special attention will be given to riparian habitat. Where physically possible riparian habitat will be fenced and managed principally for its wildlife and recreation values.		
Riparian and Associated Upland Restoration (Guadalupe and Aravaipa Canyons, and Sands Draw, Porter Wash, Howard Well, Posey Well, Cold Spring, Spring Canyon, Martinez Canyon Spring)	Safford	RP15 Establish a monitoring plan for selected riparian areas based upon the management priority system. Implement the plan and evaluate monitoring data. Continue to carry out needed changes in riparian area management through activity plans. WF09 Manage priority wildlife species habitat (vegetation communities) or special features of that habitat (water, riparian vegetation, cliffs, etc.) to maintain or enhance population levels.	To maintain or improve 75% of the acreage of riparian vegetation on public lands within the District in good or excellent condition by 1997.	


Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure 4.1.07:

Percent of Resource Management Plans making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals

4.1.3	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with City of Safford, AZ, for water pipeline in Bonita Creek.	Safford	RP06 Cooperate with and encourage the involvement of interested federal, State and local governments, organizations and private parties to share information, implement management, coordinate activities, and provide education on the value, productivity, and management of riparian areas.	To maintain or improve 75% of the acreage of riparian vegetation on public lands within the District in good or excellent condition by 1997.
4.1.4	Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area Management Plan (livestock (riparian fence exclosures) and off highway vehicle (OHV) exclusion)	Safford	RP13 Develop a riparian inventory system. Coordinate development and implementation of the system with other land managing agencies. RP20 Maintain and monitor representative relict riparian areas to provide a baseline for future management decisions. RP23 Develop a management plan for Gila Box RNCA.	Gila Box RNCA Management Plan finalized (1998), implemented.
4.1.5		Safford	RP25 During the final stages of AMP implementation, special attention will be given to riparian habitat. Where physically possible riparian habitat will be fenced and managed principally for its wildlife and recreation values.	To maintain or improve 75% of the acreage of riparian vegetation on public lands within the District in good or excellent condition by 1997.
4.1.6	Riparian Fence Exclosures			
4.1.7				
4.1.8				
4.1.9				
4.1.10				
4.2	If any actions you've provided can not be tied to an RMP objective and associated goal, explain why. If all actions are tied to RMP objectives and goals, proceed to PART 4.2.		n/a	

Worksheet for Reporting on Performance Measure 4.1.07:
Percent of Resource Management Plans making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals

PART 4 (con't) – Riparian Planning Decisions and Actions			
	Yes/No	Comments:	Text Answer
4.3	<p>Does this RMP have an implementation strategy for riparian actions?</p> <p>For example, any mechanism(s) for prioritizing actions in the short- and long-term.</p> <p>No</p>	n/a	
5.4	<p>Answer the following question based on the results of PART 1, 2, 3, and 4 as the basis for your response.</p> <p>Have the implemented actions been effective in making significant progress toward achieving riparian condition goals defined in the RMP?</p> <p>Yes</p>	Yes, implemented actions on Gila Box RNCA (Gila River and Bonita Creek), Aravaipa Canyon, and other riparian areas have been effective. Refer to Section 4.1.1 - 4.1.5.	

PART 5 - Evaluation Summary		
This represents the conclusion of the evaluation process.		
5.5	Name of Resource Management Plan (RMP)	Safford District RMP
5.6	Date of Record of Decision (ROD)	September 1992 (Partial ROD I) and July 1994 (Partial ROD II)
5.7	Date of Evaluation	7/12/18
5.8	Name of Lead Evaluator	Amy Corathers
5.9	Review Team Composition	
	Name	Position/Discipline
5.9.1	Held Biasius	Fisheries Biologist
5.9.2	Jeffery Conn	Natural Resource Specialist
5.9.3	Jensen (Jony) Cockman	Lead Natural Resource Specialist
5.9.4	Amy Corathers	Planning & Environmental Specialist
5.9.5	Amy Markston, Jeff Strama, Ben Lomell	Tucson Field Office: Planning & Environmental Coordinator, Biologist, Hydrologist
5.10	Briefing Date and Field Manager Concurrence	Date 8/24/16 
5.11	State Riparian Lead Review Date and Concurrence	8-25-16 Amy Wilkerson

ATTACHMENT C
SAFFORD DISTRICT RMP DECISION STATUS
Date: June 12, 2017

Decision # and Page #	Plan Maintenance	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed
RMP = Safford District RMP UG = Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES EA = Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS					
Desired Outcomes and Goals					
CL01, RMP pages 23, 41. Partial ROD I page 9			x		
CL02, RMP pages 41-42					x
GM01, RMP page 12				x	
GM02, UG ROD page 1				x	
GM12, UG page 1-6				x	
GM32, UG page 1-9				x	
LR04, RMP Land Tenure Amendment page 3			x		
LR06, RMP Land Tenure Amendment pages 3-4			x		
LR08, RMP Land Tenure Amendment pages 4-5			x		
MI01, RMP Partial ROD I page 8		x			
MI02, RMP Partial ROD I page 8				x	
PL01, ROD page 11			x		
PL06, RMP page 47			x		
PL07, RMP page 47			x		
PL08, RMP page 47. Partial ROD I page 11			x		
PL09, RMP page 47			x		
RR01, RMP page 20. Partial ROD I page 5		x			
RR07, RMP Partial ROD I page 7			x		

Safford District RMP 5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Decision # and Page #	Plan Maintenance	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed
RMP = Safford District RMP UG = Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES EA = Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS					
RP01, RMP pages 20, 32. Partial ROD I page 5			x		
RP20, RMP page 33			x		
RP22, RMP page 33				x	
SM03, RMP page 19					x
SM16, RMP Partial ROD II page 4				x	
VM02, RMP pages 24, 45. Partial ROD I page 10			x		
VM04, RMP page 45			x		
WS01, Partial ROD I page 10			x		
WS12, RMP page 46. Partial ROD I page 10			x		
WS13, RMP page 25. Partial ROD I page 10			x		
WS14, RMP page 25. Partial ROD I page 10			x		
WS20, RMP page 46			x		
WS29, RMP page 46			x		
WS34, RMP pages 26, 47. Partial ROD I page 10			x		
WS36, RMP page 47. Partial ROD I page 10			x		
WS37, RMP page 47. Partial ROD I page 10			x		
WF02, RMP Partial ROD I page 6			x		
WF04, RMP page 21			x		
WF05, RMP page 33			x		
WF06, RMP page 33			x		
WF07, RMP page 33				x	

Safford District RMP 5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Decision # and Page #	Plan Maintenance	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed
RMP = Safford District RMP UG = Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES EA = Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS					
WF09, RMP page 33			x		
WF10, RMP page 33			x		
WF11, RMP page 33			x		
WF12, RMP page 33			x		
WF14, RMP page 34			x		
WF17, RMP page 34			x		
WF18, RMP page 34			x		
Land Use Allocation Decisions					
CL05, RMP page 43			x		
GM03, UG ROD page 2					x
GM04, UG ROD page 3				x	
GM06, UG page 1-5			x		
GM07, UG page 1-6			x		
GM08, UG page 1-6			x		
GM24, UG page 1-8			x		
GM49, UG page 1-24			x		
GM50, UG page 1-24			x		
GM51, UG page 1-24			x		
GM52, UG page 1-25			x		
GM83, UG page 3-57				x	
GM84, UG pages 3-57, 3-58			x in part	x in part	
GM91, EA ROD page 2				x	

Safford District RMP 5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Decision # and Page #	Plan Maintenance	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed
RMP = Safford District RMP UG = Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES EA = Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS					
GM93, EA ROD page 2			x		
GM94, EA ROD page 5				x	
GM96, EA DEIS page 5			x		
GM101, EA DEIS page 6			x		
GM104, EA DEIS page 6			x		
GM108, EA DEIS page 7			x		
MI04, RMP pages 37, 40 modified by Partial ROD I page 8, and Partial ROD II page 6			x		
MI05, RMP pages 37, 40 modified by Partial ROD I page 8, and Partial ROD II page 6			x		
MI06, RMP pages 37, 40 modified by Partial ROD I page 8, and Partial ROD II page 6			x		
RR03, RMP page 32. Partial ROD I page 5			x		
RR04, RMP page 32. Partial ROD I page 5		x			
RR05, RMP page 32. Partial ROD I page 5			x		
RP18, RMP page 33			x		
RP19, RMP page 33			x		
SM09, RMP Partial ROD II page 3			x		
SM15, RMP Partial ROD II page 4			x		
SM17, RMP Partial ROD II page 4			x		
SM18, RMP Partial ROD II page 4			x		
SM20, Partial ROD II page 5			x		

Safford District RMP 5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Decision # and Page #	Plan Maintenance	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed
RMP = Safford District RMP UG = Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES EA = Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS					
WS09, RMP page 44			x		
TA01, RMP page 18			x		
TA03, RMP page 27		x			
TA04, RMP page 27			x		
TA05, RMP page 27			x		
VM09, RMP page 45			x		
WF25, RMP page 34			x		
WF26, RMP page 34			x		
WF30, UG page 4-2		x			
WF32, UG page 4-2			x		
Special Designations					
LR01, RMP Land Tenure Amendment page 2			x		
LR13, RMP page 36. Partial ROD II page 6			x		
LR16, RMP page 37. Partial ROD I page 7			x		
RR02, RMP page 32. Partial ROD I. page 5		x			
RR08, RMP page 37. Partial ROD I page 7			x		
RR11, Partial ROD I page 8		x			
RR14, RMP page 38		x			
RR15, RMP page 38			x		
SM04, RMP Partial ROD I page 4, Partial ROD II pages 1, 2			x		
VR01, RMP Partial ROD I page 4, Partial ROD II pages 1, 2			x		

Safford District RMP 5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Decision # and Page #	Plan Maintenance	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed
RMP = Safford District RMP UG = Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing ES EA = Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS					
VR02, RMP page 8			x		
VR03, RMP page 39			x		
VR04, RMP page 39			x		
VR05, RMP page 39			x		
WD01, RMP pages 12, 13				x	
WF28, RMP page 34. Modified by Partial ROD II			x		
Land Tenure					
GM88, ROD page 1				x	
LR03, RMP Land Tenure Amendment page 3			x		
LR10, RMP Land Tenure Amendment pages 6, 7			x		
LR14, RMP page 36			x		
LR15, RMP page 36. Partial ROD I page 7		x			
LR18, RMP page 32, modified by Partial ROD II, pages 1, 2			x		
RP07, RMP page 20			x		

ATTACHMENT D

SAFFORD DISTRICT RMP DECISIONS

DESIRED OUTCOMES AND GOALS

Cultural Resources (CL)

CL01 Cultural resources located on public land within the Safford District will be managed for the broad objectives of information potential, public values and conservation. 1/ RMP page 23 & 41. Partial ROD I page 9. (See Table 2-7 and Appendix 12).

CL02 Prioritize implementation of cultural resource management actions into five categories. 1/ RMP pages 41, 42.

First priority will be given to planned actions protecting threatened and significant cultural resources that would otherwise be lost.

Second priority will be given to the preparation of management plans directing how the district manages its cultural resources.

Third priority will be given in cases where there is good reason to believe that cultural resources are being adversely affected even though they are not located in any area of proposed activity.

Fourth priority will be given to collecting cultural resource field data for planning purposes and for resource utilization not part of any protection or mitigation measure.

Fifth priority will be given to non-field studies designed to collect data for management or scientific purposes and for nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places.

Grazing Management (GM)

GM01 The Upper Gila-San Simon Grazing Environmental Impact Statement was completed in 1978 and its decisions have been implemented since then. Monitoring studies are in place and analysis indicates that rangeland condition is improving under the present management. Present management has the flexibility to modify grazing levels and seasons where necessary. In addition, the Eastern Arizona Grazing Environmental Impact Statement was completed in 1987 and the decisions made in that document are beginning to be implemented. The grazing decisions are incorporated by reference. 1/ RMP page 12.

GM02 It is BLM's decision to implement an intensive grazing management program as described in the proposed action section of the Final Upper Gila-San Simon ES. 2/ UG ROD page 1.

GM12 The general objective of the proposed action is to permit livestock to utilize a harvestable surplus of palatable vegetation-a renewable resource-and thereby produce a usable food product. The proposed livestock management program is based on the multiple-use management concept, which provides for the demands of various resource uses and minimizes the conflicts among those uses or activities. Although the various uses of the rangeland resources can be compatible, competition among uses requires constraints and mitigating measures to realize multiple-use resource management goals. The specific objectives for each grazing unit are shown in Appendix C. 2/ UG page 1-6

GM32 Proper stocking is an essential principle of range management, which should precede or coincide with the initiation of any grazing management system. With stocking rates in balance with the proposed grazing capacities, utilization of key forage species in the key areas would average about 40 percent over a period of years. At a given stocking rate during years of high forage production (e.g. above normal rainfall) utilization in the use pasture might be as low as 20 percent. During years of low forage production utilization could be as high as 60 percent. 2/ UG page 1-9.

Land Tenure (LR)

LR04 Land Ownership Adjustment - The purpose of the program is to adjust land tenure in the Safford District to achieve Bureau resource management objectives and improve service to the public. Consolidation of land ownership within Long-Term Management Areas and disposal of lands outside these areas will be considered to meet these objectives. Refer to Map 27 (amended) for potential land disposal and Long-Term Management Areas. 1/ RMP Land Tenure Amendment page 3.

LR06 Land Acquisition - The following are objectives for land acquisition within Long Term Management Areas:

1. Acquire lands with high public values that complement existing management programs within Long Term Management Areas.
2. Consolidate ownership pattern within Long-Term Management Areas to improve management efficiency.
3. Improve service to the public.

Lands considered for acquisition will possess one or more of the following characteristics:

4. Riparian habitat
5. Watersheds of important riparian areas
6. High value wildlife habitat, including threatened and endangered species habitat and major migration corridors
7. Administrative sites
8. Land for developed recreation sites
9. Land providing access to public lands
10. Significant cultural and paleontological properties
11. Other lands with high public resource values such as inholdings in Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and other types of special management areas.

1/ RMP Land Tenure Amendment pages 3, 4.

LR08 Public Land Disposal - The objectives for disposal of public lands are as follows:

1. Dispose of isolated tracts of public land to improve resource management efficiency and service to the public.
2. Dispose of suitable parcels of public land to facilitate county and city needs for public purposes (parks, landfills, etc.).
3. Dispose of parcels of public land through exchange to acquire lands with higher resource values that meet Bureau management objectives.
4. When lands next to urban areas are disposed of, the resulting boundaries will be manageable, fence able, and identifiable.
5. Prior to disposal, lands will be inventoried and evaluated for significant cultural, threatened and endangered species, and other natural resource values.
6. Access to and across public lands is an issue and will be analyzed during disposal actions. Access across public lands being considered for disposal may be retained by the BLM or transferred to other agencies or individuals. The decision to transfer or retain access will be made during the analysis of specific disposal actions.

The order of preference for disposal will be by: 1), exchange, (2), Recreation and Public Purposes Act, (3), sale, and (4), state indemnity selection. All public lands will be disposed of at fair market value, except for lands disposed of under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act or state indemnity selection. Disposals are subject to valid existing rights.

It is Bureau policy not to dispose of public lands encumbered with properly recorded unpatented mining claims. These lands, however, may be disposed of if the mining claims are found to be void, a mining claimant relinquishes the mining claims to the United States, a mining claim is contested and found to be invalid or policy is changed.

Lands identified for disposal will be inventoried for the presence of significant natural and cultural resources, threatened and endangered plants and animals, flood hazards and other critical factors.

The actual transfer of the land cannot be finalized until these reviews are complete and National Environmental Policy Act analysis and documentation is complete.

According to The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, all lands not identified for disposal must be retained under federal administration to be managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Unforeseen future land management concerns or public demand may necessitate the disposal of other public lands. Such proposals will require this plan to be amended with the appropriate National Environmental Policy Act compliance documentation as part of the amendment. 1/ RMP Land Tenure Amendment pages 4, 5.

Minerals/Energy (MI)

MI01 Consistent with Bureau of Land Management policy the Safford District will encourage and foster the development of energy and mineral resources located on public land while assuring that undue or unnecessary degradation on these or nearby lands does not occur. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 8.

MI02 Entry, sale and lease of mineral and energy resources will be managed through the use of appropriate regulations, withdrawals, and stipulations to avoid undue or unnecessary impacts to other resource values. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 8.

Paleontological Resources (PL)

PL01 Fossil resources located on public land within the District will be managed for the protection of their scientific and public values. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 11.

PL06 Preserve a representative sample of Class I (see appendix 12) paleontological localities. 1/ RMP page 47.

PL07 Ensure that BLM actions avoid inadvertent damage to paleontological resources. 1/ RMP page 47.

PL08 Manage paleontological resources to preserve their scientific and interpretative values. 1/ RMP page 47. Partial ROD I page 11.

PL09 Emphasize management of Class I sites. 1/ RMP page 47.

Recreation Resources Management (RR)

RR01 All public lands within the district will be designated open, closed or limited to off-highway vehicle use to meet public demand, protect resources, and public health and safety, and minimize conflicts. 1/ RMP page 20. Partial ROD I page 5.

RR07 The Safford District will endeavor to provide a variety of recreational opportunities that meets public demand and are compatible with the Bureau's stewardship responsibilities. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 7.

Riparian Resources (RP)

RP01 In accordance with National and State BLM directives, Safford District will manage riparian areas, located on public lands within the District, to achieve good to excellent condition on 75% of the riparian zone acreage by 1997. 1/ RMP page 20 & 32. Partial ROD I page 5. (See Map 26).

RP20 Maintain and monitor representative relict riparian areas to provide a baseline for future management decisions. 1/ RMP page 33.

RP22 Continue to manage the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area according to the guidance in the existing management plan. 1/ RMP page 33.

Special Management Areas (SM)

SM03 The eligible rivers listed above will be afforded adequate interim protection until a final decision is reached on suitability. Management activities and authorized uses will not be allowed to adversely affect the river's eligibility or future suitability. 1/ RMP page 19.

SM16 Muleshoe Ranch livestock grazing was previously suspended for a five-year period by the Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS. This decision was implemented by the signing of a Cooperative Management Agreement between BLM, the Nature Conservancy and the U.S. Forest Service on December 12, 1988. The purpose of this suspension was to improve riparian conditions and wildlife habitat on the Muleshoe Cooperative Management Area. 1/ RMP Partial ROD II page 4.

Vegetation (VM)

VM02 Upland vegetation on public lands within the Safford District will be managed for watershed protection, livestock use, reduction of non-point source pollution, Threatened and Endangered species protection, priority wildlife habitat, firewood and other incidental human uses. Best management practices and vegetation manipulation will be used to achieve desired plant community management objectives. Treatments may include various mechanical, chemical and prescribed fire methods. 1/ RMP page 24 and 45. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 10.

VM04 Public lands will be managed to preserve and enhance the occurrences of special status species and to achieve the eventual delisting of threatened and endangered species. 1/ RMP page 45.

Watershed (Soil, Water, Air) (WS)

WS01 The Safford District goal, for all public land within the District, is to minimize soil erosion and rehabilitate eroded areas to maintain or enhance watershed condition and reduce non-point source pollution that may originate on public lands. Specific objectives include restoration of the eroding flood plains of the San Simon River and the Bear Springs flat area and the reduction of salts entering the Gila River. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 10.

WS12 The objective for management of groundwater is to conserve water for prudent resource management purposes. 1/ RMP page 46. Partial ROD I page 10.

WS13 Water quality necessary to accomplish BLM's programs will be secured through quality monitoring programs, National Environmental Policy Act evaluations of activities proposed on public lands, and designation and management under the State of Arizona's Unique Waters Program. 1/ RMP page 25. Partial ROD I page 10.

WS14 BLM resource activities will employ the best-selected management practices to reduce non-point source pollution from rangeland management and use activities on the public lands. 1/ RMP page 25. Partial ROD I page 10.

WS20 Water quality will be managed to maintain or enhance water quality at or above established standards for designated uses to meet management goals for each water source. BLM will adhere to federal and state water quality laws and standards. 1/ RMP page 46.

WS29 Manage stream segments on public lands, designated as Unique Waters, to maintain or enhance water quality standards, protect the associated resources, and use best management practices selected to reduce non-point source pollution that could result from rangeland uses. 1/ RMP page 46.

WS34 Continue to manage the air shed in accordance with State of Arizona Class II standards, unless accepted as non-attainment or redesignated. Class II standards allow for moderate deterioration of air quality associated with moderate, well-controlled industrial and population growth. 1/ RMP pages 26 and 47. Partial ROD I page 10.

WS36 When implementing BLM or BLM approved activities, minimize surface disturbances to prevent the addition of large quantities of dust to the air. When surface disturbances occur, enforce stipulations to mitigate the impacts to air quality. 1/ RMP page 47. Partial ROD I page 10.

WS37 Continue the rehabilitation of erosion in the San Simon Watershed and Bear Springs Flat area to reduce airborne dust. 1/ RMP page 47. Partial ROD I page 10.

Wildlife/Fisheries (WF)

WF02 District management will focus on priority species and their associated habitats to maintain or enhance population levels. Threatened and endangered, proposed, candidate, State-listed and other special status species will be managed to enhance or maintain District population levels or in accordance with established inter/intra-agency management plans. District management efforts will be directed towards the enhancement of biological diversity. 1/ ROD Part I page 6.

WF04 Retain in public ownership all habitat essential to the survival or recovery of any Threatened and Endangered Species, including habitat used historically by these species. 1/ RMP page 21.

WF05 Maintain and enhance priority species and their habitat. 1/ RMP page 33.

WF06 Focus management actions on a single species only when required by the Endangered Species Act. Actively promote Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery to achieve eventual delisting. 1/ RMP page 33.

WF07 Conserve candidate species to ensure that BLM authorized actions do not contribute to the need to list any species as threatened or endangered. 1/ RMP page 33.

WF09 Manage priority wildlife species habitat (vegetation communities) or special features of that habitat (water, riparian vegetation, cliffs, etc.) to maintain or enhance population levels. 1/ RMP page 33.

WF10 Focus management efforts on enhancing biological diversity. 1/ RMP page 33.

WF11 Establish the following as priority species and habitats. Federal listed, proposed, and candidate Threatened and Endangered Species and their habitat; State-listed Threatened and Endangered species and their habitat; important game species and their habitat; and other sensitive species and their habitat. 1/ RMP page 33.

WF12 The following are a list of priority species at the time of the SDO RMP publication:

Riparian and aquatic habitat dependent species; Gila topminnow, pupfish, southern bald eagle, loach minnow, spike dace, Gila chub, Colorado round tail chub, razorback sucker, western yellow-billed cuckoo, gray hawk, Mississippi kite, common black-hawk, ferruginous pygmy-owl, willow flycatcher, leopard frog, black bear, turkey, and waterfowl. 1/ RMP page 33.

Oak woodland dependent species; white-tailed deer, turkey, black bear, and Montezuma quail. 1/ RMP page 33.

Species identified for reintroduction in Fish and Wildlife Service plans, aplomado falcon and woundfin. 1/ RMP page 33.

Additional species and habitats; Desert tortoise, Desert and Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, Mule deer, Pronghorn antelope, Neotropical migratory birds. 1/ RMP page 33.

Other species and habitats of interest; peregrine falcon, red bat, Sanborn's long-nosed bat, Mexican long-tongued bat,

ferruginous hawk, Swainson's hawk, javelina, mountain lion, dove, quail, and bat roosts. 1/ RMP page 33.

General management objectives for each of the priority species and their habitats are identified in Appendix 4 of the RMP. 1/ RMP page 34.

WF14 Manage habitat for optimum wildlife populations, based on ecological conditions, taking into consideration local, yearly climatic variations. BLM will follow Arizona Game and Fish Department's five-year strategic plans for the various species and will assist the Department in accomplishing its goals for the various species. 1/ RMP page 34.

WF17 Continue to maintain and improve wildlife habitat, emphasizing priority habitat. 1/ RMP page 34.

WF18 Protect springs and associated indigenous riparian vegetation for wildlife water, cover, and forage. 1/ RMP page 34.

LAND USE ALLOCATION DECISIONS

Cultural Resources (CL)

CL05 Exclude grazing from the Tres Alamos Archaeological site (160 acres). 1/ RMP page 43.

Grazing Management (GM)

GM03 Initial adjustments will reduce grazing use from 172,070 AUMs per year to about 114,861 AUMs per year. See Appendix B for information on individual grazing units. 2/ UG ROD page 2.

GM04 In nine grazing units approximately 15,600 acres will be removed from livestock grazing. Areas proposed for this deferment of livestock grazing are critical watershed areas along the San Simon River, and critical riparian and aquatic habitat along Aravaipa Creek, Mescal Creek, Bonita Creek, and the Gila River. Decisions to remove grazing will be issued as soon as fences are constructed. 2/ UG ROD page 3.

GM06 Proper stocking is the average number of cattle required to consume 40% of the perennial forage production. Proper stocking thus leaves 60% of the forage for watershed protection and other non-consumptive uses. Depending on the degree of slope, 60 to 100 percent of the vegetation produced on steep slopes would be left for watershed protection and other non-consumptive uses. 2/ UG page 1-5.

GM07 Allocate 2,128 AUMS (2 percent) of forage for wildlife on the basis of present wildlife population data supplied by Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2/ UG page 1-6.

GM08 For increases in AUMs expected to result from implementation of the proposed action, forage would be allocated to wildlife up to Arizona Game and Fish optimum levels before increases in livestock use are allowed. This would require approximately doubling the present wildlife forage allocation. 2/ UG page 1-6.

GM24 Intensive grazing management is proposed for 87 of the 193 grazing units and would involve 1,040,329 acres of public lands and 632,978 acres of private and state lands. 2/UG page 1-8.

GM49 The public lands with critical riparian and aquatic habitats, including springs, would be fenced to permit the necessary specialized management. Alternative livestock water sources would be constructed outside these areas. These areas would be deferred from grazing for a minimum of 3 to 5 years to allow the propagation and improvement in condition of riparian vegetation. 2/ UG page 1- 24.

GM50 Severely eroded areas proposed for deferment would be grazed after rehabilitation and revegetation, probably after 15 to 25 years. During the deferment period, habitat and vegetation studies would be implemented.

Subsequent management would depend upon the response and improvement of these areas. Where natural revegetation does not occur, desirable species would be planted. 2/ UG page 1-24.

GM51 Following an initial deferment period, grazing might be allowed under the following conditions: (1) that desirable riparian plants be established and maintain, (2) that grazing not occur more often than 1 year out of 3 during the critical March through October growing period, (3) that grazing not occur for longer than an 8 month period at a time, and (4) that utilization of desirable species not exceed 40 percent of the current year's growth. A given watercourse would be divided with fence, where feasible, to prevent livestock from grazing the entire length at any given time. 2/ UG page 1-24.

GM52 Grazing units whose public lands have no grazing privileges are referred to as "unallocated". The Safford District proposes no grazing management on these units and considers any livestock grazing on public lands in these units as trespassing. A qualified applicant, however, could be allowed to graze livestock on these lands upon the completion of an Environmental Assessment Record. Eight grazing units are unallocated, affecting 4,014 acres of public lands and 30,050 acres of private and state lands. 2/ UG page 1-25.

GM83 Research Natural Areas. The proposed action will allow grazing to continue on the four proposed research natural areas. The proposal would reduce livestock numbers to improve the vegetation. The areas and their livestock reductions are: 1) Little Doubtful, grazing unit 45, reduce 60 percent, 2) Dos Cabezas, grazing unit 72, reduce 60 percent, 3) Howell Canyon, grazing unit 73, reduce 73 percent, 4) Government Peak, grazing unit 73, reduce 73 percent. 2/ UG page 3-57.

GM84 Outstanding Natural Areas. The MFP recommendation for the outstanding natural areas (ONA) is to preserve their riparian habitat and their associated birdlife, fish, and animals:

1. Livestock grazing in the Gila Box (grazing units 3, 7, 16, 17, and 167) and Bonita Creek (grazing units 165, 166 and 167) would be deferred for 3 to 5 years to allow for the propagation and improvement in condition of the riparian habitat. Afterward livestock grazing would be allowed.
2. The public lands in Eagle Creek ONA (grazing units 3 and 168) are steep, poorly accessible to livestock, and contain little riparian habitat. Since the public lands are located in the uplands that would be grazed in conjunction with the bottomlands, grazing on the public lands would be low.
3. The riparian habitat of the canyon bottoms of Fishhook Canyon (grazing unit 151), Markham Canyon (grazing units 154 and 158) and Johnny Creek (grazing unit 165) would be grazed in conjunction with the uplands.
4. The Santa Rita three pasture rotation system proposed for a portion of Markham Canyon (grazing unit 158) in 2 to 3 years would provide adequate range rest to improve the condition of the existing riparian vegetation.

2/ UG pages 3-57 to 3-58.

GM91 Since the EIS was written, a new allotment has been formed due to private land exchanges. The San Pedro allotment number 5296, not to be confused with the San Pedro Planning Unit, contains 43,400 acres of public lands with a livestock carrying capacity of 4,068 AUMs. A grazing decision has been issued eliminating grazing upon expiration of the current lease on December 31, 1987. Future leasing for livestock grazing use will depend upon the outcome of pending legislation and BLM's land use planning. 3/ EA ROD page 2.

GM93 Land that is presently unleased for livestock use would remain unleased, with vegetation reserved for wildlife and nonconsumptive use. 3/ EA ROD page 2.

GM94 The alternative selected, which is the environmentally preferred alternative, is Alternative A-- Rangeland improvement. 3/ EA ROD page 5.

GM96 For each of the four alternatives presented in the EIS, target stocking rates have been set for each allotment. (Refer to Appendices 13, 14). In reviewing the target stocking rate figures and other recommended changes it is emphasized that the target Animal Unit Month (AUM) figures are not final stocking rates. Rather, all livestock use adjustments will be implemented through documented mutual agreement or decision. When adjustments are made

through mutual agreement, they may be implemented once the Rangeland Program Summary (record of decision) has been adopted. 3/ EA DEIS page 5.

GM101 Unleased tracts generally will remain available for further consideration for authorized grazing, as provided in the BLM grazing regulations (43 CFR 4110 and 4130). However, certain tracts totaling 18,635 acres are not currently authorized for grazing and will remain unleased. These lands are either unsuitable for grazing or have been scheduled for disposal. 3/ EA DEIS page 6.

GM104 Long-term target AUM figures (from increased vegetation production through revision of grazing systems already implemented, additional grazing systems and various land treatments) would be 117,790 AUMs to livestock. The vegetation increases would be distributed on the basis of 4 percent to livestock and 60 percent to non-consumptive uses. 3/ EA DEIS page 6.

GM108 Stocking additional animals would be allowed in the good ephemeral years where additional but unquantified AUMs of forage are available. 3/ EA DEIS page 7.

Energy and Minerals (MI)

MI04 Withdraw the following eleven areas from mineral entry. 1. Table Mountain RNA ACEC (1,220 acres). 2. Desert Grasslands ACEC (380 acres). 3. Bear Springs Badlands ACEC (2,927 acres). 4. Bowie Mountain Scenic ACEC (2,230 acres). 5. Fourmile Canyon Campground (159 acres). 6. Oliver Knoll Atmospheric Deposition Monitoring Station (10 acres). 7. Yuma Wash Archaeological Site (120 acres). 8. Tres Alamos Archaeological Site (160 acres). 9. Midway Cave Archaeological Site (40 acres). 10. Eagle Creek Bat Cave ACEC (40 acres). 11. Proposed District Office site (12 acres). Future withdrawals will be considered on a case-by-case basis. 1/ RMP page 37 and 40 modified by Partial ROD I page 8, and Partial ROD II page 6.

MI05 Prohibit the sale of mineral materials on 9,960 acres to preserve sensitive resource values in the following areas. Bear Springs Badlands ACEC (2,927 acres). 2. Bowie Mountain scenic ACEC (2,230 Acres). 3. Dos Cabezas Peaks ACEC (25 acres). 4. Riparian areas other than those located in ACECs (4,458 acres). 5. Tres Alamos Archaeological Site (160 acres). 6. Yuma Wash archaeological Site (120 acres). 7. Eagle Creek Bat Cave ACEC (40 acres). Sale of minerals will be prohibited in areas with riparian vegetation. 1/ RMP page 40, modified by Partial ROD I page 9 and Partial ROD II page 6. Gila Box ACEC not designated.

MI06 Issue mineral and energy leases with "No Surface Occupancy" on 11,629 acres in the following areas to preserve sensitive resource values. 1. Bear Springs Badlands ACEC (2,927 acres). 2. Bowie Mountain Scenic ACEC (3,600 acres). 3. Dos Cabezas Peaks ACEC (25 acres). 4. Eagle Creek Bat Cave ACEC (40 acres). 5. Riparian areas other than those located in ACECs (4,458 acres). 6. Desert Bighorn Sheep Lambing Areas (90 acres). 7. Fourmile Canyon Campground (159 acres). 8. Oliver Knoll Atmospheric Deposition Monitoring Station (10 acres). 9. Yuma Wash Archaeological Site (120 acres). 10. Tres Alamos Archaeological Site (160 acres). 11. Midway Cave Archaeological Site (40 acres) Proposed District Office site (12 acres). In addition, surface occupancy will not be allowed in riparian areas, campgrounds, administrative sites or Bighorn Sheep lambing areas February 1 to April 30 each year. 1/ RMP page 40, modified by Partial ROD I page 9 and Partial ROD II page 6. Gila Box ACEC not designated.

Recreation Resources Management (RR)

RR03 Designate the following areas as closed to off-highway vehicle use. All designated wilderness areas, Turkey Creek above Oak Grove Canyon Corral, Oak Grove Canyon, Desert Grasslands RNA ACEC, Wilcox Playa NNL ACEC, and Hot Springs Canyon Riparian Area. 1/ RMP page 32. Partial ROD I page 5.

RR04 Off-Highway vehicle use is limited to designated roads in the San Pedro and Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Areas. 1/ RMP page 32. Partial ROD I page 5.

RR05 Designate the remainder of the public lands in the District limited to off-highway vehicle use. Off-highway

vehicle use will be limited to roads and trails existing at the time of designation and any new roads approved for construction during the life of this Resource Management Plan. 1/ RMP page 32. Partial ROD I page 5.

Riparian Resource (RP)

RP18 Do not permit firewood cutting in riparian areas. 1/ RMP page 33.

RP19 Permit the removal of non-native vegetation for improvement of riparian vegetation. 1/ RMP page 33.

Special Management Areas (SM)

SM09 In order to increase management flexibility and to provide for accelerated rehabilitation of uplands and riparian areas, initiate an immediate 50 percent suspension (2898 Animal Unit Months) of the total preference (5,796 Animal Unit Months) on South Rim Allotment #4529. Collect utilization data annually for that portion of the allotment used by allottee until BLM completes carrying capacity determination and first five-year evaluation of the management prescription for the area. 1/ RMP Partial ROD II page 3.

SM15 Hot Springs Watershed Area of Critical Environmental Concern Hot Springs Watershed will be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern. The management prescriptions for livestock grazing will be developed using the procedures described below. This language replaces the section on page 31 of the Proposed Resource Management Plan that addresses livestock grazing. Other prescriptions described in the Resource Management Plan will remain intact. 1/ RMP Partial ROD II page 4.

SM17 Continue the suspension of grazing use on the Hot Springs Watershed Area of Critical Environmental Concern with the following management actions to be used to determine the final management prescription for the area. RMP Partial ROD II page 4.

... Determine range suitability through a range evaluation process. Suitability will not be used to establish carrying capacity.

... Initiate development of a Coordinated Resource Management Plan for the Muleshoe Cooperative Management Area that includes the Hot Springs Watershed Area of Critical Environmental Concern using a team of BLM resource specialists, landowners, permittees, academia and representatives of other state and federal agencies with management responsibilities in the area.

... Present the resource goals and objectives of the Coordinated Resource Management Plan to The Arizona Nature Conservancy.

... The interdisciplinary team will complete the Coordinated Resource Management Plan for the Muleshoe Cooperative Management Area including the Area of Critical Environmental Concern and propose specific resource allocations and prescriptions for multiple uses to achieve the identified resource objectives.

... Begin implementation of the coordinated plan in FY 1995 including any activation of suspended grazing preference at an appropriate level, and in a prescription consistent with achieving the resource objectives.

SM18 Authorize livestock use on the new Soza Mesa allotment at an initial stocking rate of 44 cattle year-long. Utilization levels will not be permitted to exceed those prescribed in the Eastern Arizona Grazing Environmental Impact Statement (40% average over the full grazing cycle). Allottee will be expected to participate in construction and maintenance of range improvements necessary to facilitate livestock use of allotment. Specific livestock management actions will be identified during the development of an Allotment Management Plan for the area. Adjustments in carrying capacity will be made as part of the Allotment Management Plan evaluation process. 1/ RMP Partial ROD II page 4.

SM20 Desert Grasslands Area of Critical Environmental Concern The management prescription for the exclusion of livestock from the Desert Grasslands Area of Critical Environmental Concern affects only lands not currently accessible to livestock or are not presently being used for grazing. The other prescriptions will be as stated in the

Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement. 1/ RMP Partial ROD II page 5.

Watershed (WS)

WS09 Continue seasonal livestock grazing in the Bear Springs Flat area. 1/ RMP page 44.

Transportation/Access (TA)

TA01 Through the Resource Management Plan, decisions will be made where legal access for vehicle, horse, and foot travel is needed across state, other federal and private lands; where construction of roads or trails is needed to provide access to public lands; and where existing access needs to be closed to protect resource values. Upon completion of the Resource Management Plan, these decisions will be incorporated into the District Transportation Plan. The plan will also address road and trail maintenance needs. 1/ RMP page 18.

TA03 Where needed, reserve access across public lands conveyed out of federal administration. 1/ RMP page 27.

TA04 Obtain public and administrative access to the public lands. 1/ RMP page 27.

TA05 Close roads as needed, to manage visitors, protect resources and meet objectives. 1/ RMP page 27.

Vegetation Management (VM)

VM09 Four firewood cutting areas are designated open to the public:

1. San Simon Fan Structure for tamarisk and mesquite
2. West of the San Simon River, on Sonoita soils for mesquite
3. Mesquite Well area, on Sonoita soils for white thorn and mesquite
4. Horse Mountain area for manzanita, juniper and mesquite

1/ RMP page 45.

Wildlife/Fisheries (WF)

WF25 Close the following Areas to animal damage control activities such as trapping, shooting, aerial gunning, or use of M-44:

Threatened and Endangered Species habitat for those techniques that pose a threat to the species.

Zones around residences and communities and in areas of concentrated recreation use for those techniques that pose a threat to the visitor or to dogs in areas where they are trained, exercised, or used for hunting.

Wilderness areas, and Research Natural Areas except as individually authorized by the Arizona BLM State Director or the District/Area Manager. 1/ RMP page 34.

WF26 Authorize areas that are open for animal damage control in coordination with the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service on a yearly basis. 1/ RMP page 34.

WF30 During periods of drought special measures, such as livestock reduction or removal, will be considered. 2/ UG page 4-2.

WF32 Areas of competition between bighorn sheep and livestock in Aravaipa Canyon will be identified and livestock will be removed. 2/ UG page 4-2.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Lands and Realty (LR)

LR01 Designate 24 Long-Term Management Areas in which the Bureau of Land Management will intensively manage public lands for their multiple resource values as defined in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. (See Table 2-1 and Map 27 (amended)). BLM will retain all public lands (surface and subsurface estate) and may seek acquisition of state land within these areas. 1/ RMP Land Tenure Amendment page 2.

LR13 Five major utility corridors will be designated along existing lines. Any future major cross-District utility rights-of-way proposals will be encouraged to use these corridors.

1. Arizona Electric Power Company 1 mile wide
2. Tucson Electric Power Company 1 mile wide
3. All-American Pipeline 1 mile wide
4. San Pedro 1 mile wide except crossing the San Pedro River where it is 660 ft. wide
5. Hayden/Christmas 1 mile wide

These corridors are RMP page 36. 1/ RMP Partial ROD II page 6.

LR16 Three communication sites will be designated. Site plans will be prepared for all communication sites. Designation of new sites will be analyzed on a case-by-case basis. The designated sites are

1. Guthrie Peak
2. Juniper Flat in the Mule Mountains
3. West end of the Dos Cabezas Mountains

1/ RMP page 37. Partial ROD I page 7.

Recreation Resources Management (RR)

RR02 Designate Hotwell Dunes (1,708 acres) as open to off-highway vehicle use. 1/ RMP page 32. Partial ROD I page 5.

RR08 Designate six areas as Special Recreation Management Areas to manage current recreation use.

Prepare Recreation Area Management Plans for these areas as needed. These areas include:

1. Aravaipa Canyon/Turkey Creek area. 2. Gila Box/Bonita Creek area. 3. Christmas (Gila River below Coolidge dam). 4. Red Knolls/Bear Springs Badlands/Watson Wash areas. 5. Hot well Dunes area. 6. Additional lands in the San Pedro RNCA not included in the existing management plan for the area. RMP page 37. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 7.

RR11 The Black Hills Backcountry Byway will be designated as an interpretive vehicle route. An interpretive plan will be written to manage the developments and activities of the area. 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 8.

RR14 Continue to exclude livestock from the 159 acres of public land around Fourmile Canyon campground. 1/ RMP page 38.

RR15 Unless otherwise established, the maximum length of stay for recreation purposes in any one location is 14 days. 1/ RMP page 38.

Special Management Areas (SM)

SM04 Designate 14 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Districtwide. Three of these ACECs are within the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area (see the San Pedro River Riparian Management Plan and EIS). The

Safford District RMP 5-Year Monitoring and Evaluation Report

ACECs include Turkey Creek Riparian ACEC, Table Mountain RNA ACEC, Desert Grasslands RNA ACEC, Swamp Springs-Hot Springs Watershed ACEC, Bear Springs Badlands ACEC, Guadalupe Canyon ONA ACEC, Bowie Mountain ACEC, Dos Cabezas Peaks ACEC, Eagle Creek Bat Cave ACEC, Wilcox Playa NNL, 111 Ranch RNA ACEC, Saint David Cienega RNA ACEC, San Pedro River RNA ACEC, and San Rafael RNA ACEC. 1/ RMP page 4 Partial ROD I. plus page 1 and 2 Partial ROD II.

Visual Resource Management (VR)

VR01 Designate all areas in the District as Visual Resource Management Class I, II III, or IV. (See RMP pages 38 - 40 and Table 2-4.) 1/ RMP Partial ROD I page 8.

VR02 Class I areas include designated wilderness areas, Bowie Mountain ACEC. 1/ RMP page 38.

VR03 Class II areas include: Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area, Turkey Creek ACEC, Aravaipa Canyon tablelands, Bear Springs Badlands ACEC, Guadalupe Canyon ONA ACEC, Dos Cabezas Peaks ACEC, Eagle Creek Canyon, Willcox Playa NNL ACEC, 111 Ranch RNA ACEC, Muleshoe Ranch, Babocomari River, Baker Canyon WSA, and Brandenburg Mountain. 1/ RMP page 39.

VR04 Class III areas include all major highway corridors, public lands north of Morenci, San Francisco River above and below the Town of Clifton, east of Bowie Mountain around the marble quarry, lands adjacent to the San Pedro RNCA, Whitlock Mountains, Orange Butte, Gila River at Bonita Creek, Gila Mountains, and Jackson Mountain. 1/ RMP page 39.

VR05 Class IV areas include the remainder of the District. 1/ RMP page 39.

Wilderness (WD)

WD01 Districtwide wilderness studies were completed in 1989. On November 28, 1990, President George Bush signed into law the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act, which created six new wilderness areas in the District, an expanded Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and the Gila Box Riparian National Conservation Area. No further analysis of this issue is necessary at this time. Baker Canyon WSA will continue to be managed as a study area until New Mexico addresses Wilderness designation. 1/ RMP page 12 and 13.

Wildlife/Fisheries (WF)

WF28 Designate the following Areas of Critical Environmental Concern for the protection of priority wildlife species and their habitat. Swamp Springs-Hot Springs Watershed ACEC, Guadalupe Canyon Outstanding Natural Area ACEC, Eagle Creek Bat Cave ACEC. 1/ RMP page 34. This decision was modified by Partial ROD II page 1. Gila Box ACEC was not designated.

LAND TENURE

Grazing Management (GM)

GM88 All public lands in allotments 4402, 4403, 4406, 4408, 4411, 4415, 4418, 4419, 4420, 4421, and all public land, except where covered by mining claims, in 4409, 4413, and 4416 has been exchanged to the State of Arizona. 1/ RMP ROD page 1.

Lands/Realty (LR)

LR03 The following areas are identified as Long-Term Management Areas: See Map 27 as amended. 1/ RMP Land Tenure Amendment page 3.

GILA RESOURCE AREA

Aravaipa Ecosystem
North Santa Teresa
Northwest Gila Valley
Southwest Gila Valley
Gila Box System
Cactus Flat

SAN SIMON RESOURCE AREA

San Simon Valley
Dos Cabezas Mountains
Guadalupe Canyon
Willcox Playa

TUCSON RESOURCE AREA

San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area
Mule Mountains
Cascabel
San Manuel
Mammoth
Dudleyville
Muleshoe
Copper Creek
Cienega Creek
Baboquivari
Silver Bell
Picacho Mountains
Tortilita Mountains
Sawtooth Mountains

LR10 Disposal Areas - Public lands outside of the 24 Long-Term Management Areas may be considered for disposal. These public land areas are identified on Map 27 (amended). Public lands qualifying for sale are identified in Appendix 5 (amended). All identified public lands do not have to be disposed of, unforeseen land management concerns, the presence of significant natural resources, or public concerns raised during the National Environmental Policy Act process may prevent disposal. Public lands that may be considered for disposal are found in the following general areas. 1/ RMP Land Tenure Amendment page 6 and 7.

Gila Resource Area

1. Morenci Area (public Lands in and around the Morenci mine)
2. Safford Area (public Lands surrounding Dos Pobres, San Juan, and Lone Star Mines)
3. Fort Thomas area (south of the Gila River)
4. Glenbar/Pima area (Cottonwood Wash area)

San Simon Resource Area

6. York area (tracts near New Mexico border)
7. Artesia area
8. San Simon City area
9. Portal area
10. Dos Cabezas Townsite area
11. San Bernardino Valley area (scattered tracts)
12. Southern Sulfur Springs Valley area (Swisshelm Mountains)
13. Douglas area
14. Texas Canyon area

Tucson Resource Area

15. Tombstone area
16. Bisbee area
17. Red Rock area
18. Friendly Corners area
19. San Xavier area
20. Three Points area
21. Arivaca area
22. All lands previously classified for sale or lease under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act and Sections 203 and 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

LR14 Six areas are established as right-of-way exclusion areas. These areas are as follows: 1/ RMP page 36. Partial ROD I page 6.

1. Dos Cabezas Peaks ACEC
2. Bear Springs Badlands ACEC

3. Wilcox Playa ACEC
4. Wilderness study areas
5. Designated wilderness areas
6. Oliver Knoll Atmospheric Deposition Monitoring station

LR15 Two areas are established as right-of-way avoidance zones. Every attempt will be made to avoid these areas with major cross-District rights-of-way to minimize or eliminate conflicts with sensitive resource values. 1/RMP page 36. Partial ROD I page 7.

1. Muleshoe Ranch
2. Bowie Mountain Scenic ACEC

LR18 Process withdrawals from the public land laws and the mining laws in the following eleven areas. 1. Table Mountain RNA ACEC (1,220 acres). 2. Bear Springs Badlands ACEC (2,927 acres). 3. Bowie Mountain Scenic ACEC (2,230 acres). 4. Fourmile Canyon Campground (159 acres). 5. Oliver Knoll Atmospheric Deposition Monitoring Station (10 acres). 6. Yuma Wash Archaeological Site (120 acres). 7. Tres Alamos Archaeological Site (160 acres). 8. Midway Cave Archaeological Site (40 acres). 9. Desert Grasslands RNA ACEC (380 acres). 10. Eagle Creek Bat Cave ACEC (40 acres). 11. Proposed District Office site (12 acres). Future withdrawals will be considered on a case-by-case basis. 1/ RMP page 37. The proposed decisions in the RMP EIS, Table 2-3, were modified by Partial ROD II, page 1 and 2, in that The Gila Box and Coronado Mountain ACECs were not designated.

Riparian Resources (RP)

RP07 Retain riparian areas in public ownership unless disposal would be in the public interest, as determined by land use planning. 1/ RMP page 20.

-
- 1/ RMP - Safford District Resource Management Plan
 - 2/ UG - Upper Gila - San Simon Grazing Environmental Statement
 - 3/ EA - Eastern Arizona Grazing Environmental Impact Statement