

Chapter 3:
Ecological and Biological Assessments Across Major Landowners in
Arizona and New Mexico
In
Ecological and Biological Diversity of National Forests in Region 3

Bruce Vander Lee, Ruth Smith, and Joanna Bate
The Nature Conservancy



SAVING THE LAST GREAT PLACES ON EARTH

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2-1
List of Tables 2-2
List of Figures 2-3
Introduction..... 2-4
 I. Potential Natural Vegetation Types..... 2-4
 II. Distribution and Condition of Grasslands 2-8
 III. Distribution of Stream Reaches with Native Fish Occurrences..... 2-11
 IV. Ecoregional Assessments and Conservation Areas 2-16
Discussion 2-19
 Potential Natural Vegetation Types 2-20
 Freshwater Species and Systems 2-21
 Ecoregional Assessments..... 2-21
References..... 2-23

List of Tables

Table 3-1. Approximate area (in acres) of potential natural vegetation types (PNVTs) in Arizona and New Mexico across major landowners. The Other landowner category in this table includes: Bureau of Reclamation, non-federal parks, Valle Calderas National Preserve, county lands, Department of Energy, USDA Research, State Game and Fish, and unnamed lands. USFS Region 3 National Grasslands in New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas were not included in this analysis. Data used to generate this table came from The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Program (SWReGAP) and the landownership GIS-based layer. Note that accuracy testing has not been conducted for SWReGAP data. See Chapter 2 for further information regarding these datasets. 2-6

Table 3-2. Approximate area (in acres) of potential natural vegetation types (PNVTs) across 11 Region 3 National Forests in Arizona and New Mexico. Region 3 National Grasslands in New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas were not included in this analysis. Data used to generate this table included The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Program (SWReGAP) and the landownership GIS-based layer. Note that SWReGAP data have not been tested for accuracy and is derived from remote sensing; therefore, analyses at the individual National Forest scale may be inaccurate. See Chapter 2 for further information regarding these datasets. 2-7

Table 3-3. Area (acres) identified as low elevation (<5000 feet) historic grasslands (Schussman and Gori 2004, Gori and Enquist 2003) for nine major landowners and seven National Forests in Arizona and parts of New Mexico that fall within the Apache Highlands Ecoregion. Grassland areas are based on all identified historic grasslands areas, even if the current condition was not determined. 2-9

Table 3-4. Current condition of low elevation (< 5000 feet) grasslands for nine landowner categories and seven National Forests in Arizona and parts of New Mexico that fall within the Apache Highlands Ecoregion (from Schussman and Gori 2004, Gori and Enquist 2003). Areas with undetermined current condition are not listed or included in percentage calculations. 2-10

Table 3-5. Approximate length (miles) of stream reaches with varying numbers of native fish species occurrences (1-9) for nine major landowner categories and six National Forests in Arizona. Native fish occurrences in stream reaches were determined based on occurrence information from 1975 and later. 2-14

Table 3-6. Overlap between conservation areas from eight ecoregional assessments with major landowners and 11 National Forests in Arizona and New Mexico. 2-19

List of Figures

Figure 3-1. Stream reaches with occurrences of a varying number of native fish species (1-9) in Arizona. 2-13

Figure 3-2. Approximate length (miles) of stream reaches with varying numbers of native fish species occurrences (1-9) for the three landowners (Forest Service, tribal, and private) with the most miles of stream with native fish occurrences. 2-15

Figure 3-3. Conservation areas from eight ecoregional assessments in Arizona and New Mexico showing overlap with National Forest boundaries. 2-18

Introduction

Within Arizona and New Mexico, the US Forest Service (USFS) Region 3 National Forests include a broad range of ecological components, including a large diversity of vegetation systems, ranging along elevational gradients from deserts to alpine/tundra, and the species that depend on these systems. In addition, many important aquatic and riparian systems, some of the most threatened in the nation, occur on Region 3 National Forests. While these important ecological systems and species are distributed across many landowners in the Southwest, Region 3 National Forests contain relatively large proportions of certain systems and species. Identifying these systems and species may be useful in planning efforts that focus on ensuring ecological sustainability across the region.

In this chapter, existing regional (Arizona and New Mexico) scale assessment information was used to highlight the ecological importance of Region 3 National Forests within the context of major landowners in Arizona and New Mexico. Additionally, important ecological components of individual National Forests were identified. Four existing regional-scale assessments were used to examine the ecological diversity and conservation opportunities on Region 3 National Forests relative to other landowners. These include assessments relating to the distribution of potential natural vegetation types (PNVTs), distribution and condition of grasslands, distribution of native fish occurrences, and the distribution of conservation areas identified through ecoregional assessments. A fifth data source, the R3 Species Database, contains species diversity information specific to Region 3 National Forests and was used to compare and highlight animal and plant diversity amongst Region 3 National Forests.

I. Potential Natural Vegetation Types

The relative distribution of potential natural vegetation types in Arizona and New Mexico across the various major landowners was assessed. (Refer to Chapter 2, Appendix 2-A and 2-B for a listing and descriptions of PNVTs). Total acreage of each PNVT was also compared amongst the 11 Region 3 National Forests lands in Arizona and New Mexico. Region 3 National Grasslands in New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas were not included in either of these analyses.

To conduct these analyses two geo-spatial datasets (described in detail in Chapter 2) were utilized:

1. The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project (SWReGAP; USGS National Gap Analysis Program 2004). The SWReGAP data are a geo-spatial vegetation dataset based on multi-season data from satellite imagery (Landsat ETM+) and digital elevation models (DEM) from 1999-2001. Ecosystem cover types from SWReGAP were aggregated and cross-walked to PNVTs (see Chapter 2, Appendix 2-A for cross-walk details). Although the accuracy of SWReGAP data have not been assessed, the dataset serves as the most recent and complete data source for all of Arizona and New Mexico at the time of this analysis. Furthermore, because SWReGAP is built upon remote sensing data, inaccuracies are likely to be found when used at finer spatial scales. Therefore, SWReGAP data may be best suited for regional assessments rather than for project planning or district level analyses.

2. The second dataset used was the landownership GIS-based layer. This data layer was generated from information from the Arizona Land Resource Information Service (<http://www.land.state.az.us/alris/index.html>) and the New Mexico Resource Geographic Information System Program (<http://rgis.unm.edu/>). Major landowner categories included in this data layer were: Bureau of Land Management, Department of Defense, National Park Service, private, State Trust, tribal, US Fish and Wildlife Service, USDA Forest Service, and other (which included Bureau of Reclamation, non-federal Parks, Valle Calderas National Preserve, County Lands, Department of Energy, USDA Research, State Game and Fish, and unnamed lands).

Results indicate that Region 3 manages the highest relative proportions of nine of the 25 PNVTs analyzed (36%) across all major landowners in Arizona and New Mexico. These nine PNVTs and the proportions that Region 3 Forests collectively manage for include: aspen forest and woodland (64%), interior chaparral (43%), Madrean encinal woodland (42%), Madrean pine-oak woodland (59%), mixed conifer forest (68%), montane grasslands (47%), ponderosa pine forest (63%), spruce-fir forest (58%) and sub-alpine grasslands (52%; Table 3-1).

Results also demonstrate the diversity and distribution of PNVTs across Region 3 National Forests, and identify which Forests manage large proportions of certain PNVTs within Region 3 (Table 3-2). For example, the Carson National Forest manages the largest proportion of aspen forest and woodlands (35%), gallery coniferous riparian forests (100%), montane grasslands (97%), spruce-fir conifer forests (49%), sub-alpine grasslands (37%), and wetland/cienegas (84%) across all Region 3 Forests. The Cibola National Forest (not including the National Grasslands in New Mexico, Oklahoma or Texas) has the largest proportion of Great Plains grasslands (61%), mixed-broadleaf deciduous riparian forests (34%), and pinyon-juniper woodland (21%). The Coconino National Forest contains the largest proportion of alpine/tundra (80%) and Great Basin/Colorado Plateau grassland and steppe (23%). The Coronado manages 26% of the Madrean encinal found on Region 3 National Forests. The Gila manages the largest proportion (30%) of ponderosa pine forests. The Kaibab National Forest manages 50% of the sagebrush shrubland on Region 3 lands. The Santa Fe National Forest contains the largest proportion of mixed conifer forests (32%) across Region 3. The Tonto National Forest manages the largest proportion of cottonwood willow riparian forests (41%), desert communities (76%), interior chaparral (40%), Madrean pine-oak (41%), montane willow riparian forests (20%), and semi-desert grasslands (37%) on Region 3 Forests. As discussed earlier, these results are based on SWReGAP data that may not be inaccurate at Forest level spatial analyses.

Table 3-1. Approximate area (in acres) of potential natural vegetation types (PNVTs) in Arizona and New Mexico across major landowners. The Other landowner category in this table includes: Bureau of Reclamation, non-federal parks, Valle Calderas National Preserve, county lands, Department of Energy, USDA Research, State Game and Fish, and unnamed lands. USFS Region 3 National Grasslands in New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas were not included in this analysis. Data used to generate this table came from The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Program (SWReGAP) and the landownership GIS-based layer. Note that accuracy testing has not been conducted for SWReGAP data. See Chapter 2 for further information regarding these datasets.

Potential Natural Vegetation Type	US Forest Service	Bureau of Land Management	Department of Defense	National Park Service	Private	State Trust	Tribal	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Other
Alpine/Tundra	1,600	0	0	0	6,100	0	0	0	0
Aspen Forest and Woodland	335,900	500	0	3,400	93,200	2,200	75,900	0	11,600
Barren	0	26,900	13,000	100	35,900	14,900	196,400	2,100	300
Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest	19,500	74,800	14,900	7,100	219,500	55,600	389,000	28,500	11,000
Desert Communities	1,018,300	8,593,300	3,537,800	1,321,000	3,418,000	3,340,700	3,429,500	1,583,200	252,800
Disturbed/Altered	83,300	9,200	600	6,000	218,200	37,200	47,800	5,600	400
Gallery Coniferous Riparian Forest	100	0	0	0	1,100	0	100	0	0
Great Basin/ Colorado Plateau Grassland and Steppe	684,400	2,853,400	23,000	572,300	5,695,500	2,599,300	12,175,500	43,200	18,500
Great Plains Grassland	316,800	1,270,300	29,000	10,000	16,055,000	3,158,400	181,000	14,100	11,400
Interior Chaparral	1,345,900	414,600	33,800	31,300	590,500	350,800	333,100	6,400	11,000
Madrean Encinal Woodland	2,736,200	518,800	151,400	34,400	1,259,800	609,300	1,165,200	14,800	2,200
Madrean Pine-Oak Woodland	831,900	20,200	1,700	5,000	89,200	30,100	438,400	100	200
Mixed Broad Leaf Deciduous Riparian Forest	42,600	36,200	5,000	4,200	115,800	17,300	65,500	7,900	4,300
Mixed Conifer Forest	1,216,300	33,900	2,700	43,500	225,900	13,800	191,000	1,000	52,000
Montane Grassland	17,200	0	0	0	16,900	0	2,300	0	0
Montane Willow Riparian Forest	17,300	14,400	800	600	42,800	11,500	12,100	100	4,100
Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	3,375,200	2,872,700	22,300	556,700	4,442,500	1,505,300	5,647,800	19,000	51,600
Ponderosa Pine Forest	5,835,300	112,500	16,400	94,200	1,408,400	147,000	1,588,900	900	44,100
Sagebrush Shrubland	134,500	685,200	1,600	66,300	642,100	184,700	977,200	21,200	11,700
Semi-desert Grassland	1,642,300	8,013,000	1,463,300	99,000	7,996,600	5,914,600	951,900	321,000	185,000
Spruce-fir Forest	355,200	35,000	1,000	7,000	128,200	2,300	72,000	300	10,000
Sub-alpine Grasslands	311,700	13,900	200	2,500	183,400	10,700	55,700	0	27,000
Urban/Agriculture	20,800	35,100	49,200	2,300	4,119,500	219,000	334,900	5,600	23,900
Water	25,300	25,000	2,300	79,100	122,000	900	38,100	15,600	55,500
Wetland/Cienega	8,900	9,500	200	400	35,000	7,100	6,800	2,900	1,100

Table 3-2. Approximate area (in acres) of potential natural vegetation types (PNVTs) across 11 Region 3 National Forests in Arizona and New Mexico. Region 3 National Grasslands in New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas were not included in this analysis. Data used to generate this table included The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Program (SWReGAP) and the landownership GIS-based layer. Note that SWReGAP data have not been tested for accuracy and is derived from remote sensing; therefore, analyses at the individual National Forest scale may be inaccurate. See Chapter 2 for further information regarding these datasets.

Potential Natural Vegetation Type	Apache-Sitgreaves	Carson	Cibola (Mt. Districts)	Coconino	Coronado	Gila	Kaibab	Lincoln	Prescott	Santa Fe	Tonto
Alpine/Tundra	0	300	0	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aspen Forest and Woodland	29,000	118,400	13,500	18,300	6,600	90,300	7,700	6,100	0	46,000	100
Barren	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest	0	300	1,000	200	5,300	0	0	1,000	200	3,600	7,900
Desert Communities	800	0	19,900	23,000	173,800	4,700	11,000	3,200	10,100	0	771,900
Disturbed/Altered	3,000	3,800	100	10,400	200	9,200	10,300	3,200	500	36,600	5,900
Gallery Coniferous Riparian Forest	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Great Basin/ Colorado Plateau Grassland and Steppe	62,500	51,200	113,400	159,400	13,900	115,900	100,600	1,200	13,900	43,000	9,400
Great Plains Grassland	0	25,000	191,900	0	0	0	0	19,800	0	80,200	0
Interior Chaparral	18,000	32,800	9,500	76,800	151,400	48,800	19,500	53,200	368,400	23,400	543,900
Madrean Encinal Woodland	275,300	0	18,900	219,600	723,900	396,500	500	331,600	370,200	100	399,700
Madrean Pine-Oak Woodland	16,600	0	600	29,700	139,200	32,100	2,900	162,200	103,500	300	344,800
Mixed Broad Leaf Deciduous Riparian Forest	100	2,300	14,300	300	800	200	0	8,900	400	5,400	9,800
Mixed Conifer Forest	146,300	189,500	74,100	31,000	26,800	157,200	70,600	123,100	0	392,700	5,100
Montane Grassland	0	16,600	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	500	0
Montane Willow Riparian Forest	2,500	2,000	2,700	3,100	3,600	1,500	0	5,700	3,300	600	6,200
Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	381,700	278,200	724,800	290,000	100	578,300	640,100	70,800	138,400	269,600	3,300

II. Distribution and Condition of Grasslands

The Arizona Statewide Grasslands Assessment (Schussman and Gori 2004, Gori and Enquist 2003) was used to summarize the extent of low elevation historic grasslands and their current condition by major landowners within Arizona and the portion of the Apache Highlands ecoregion that falls within New Mexico (See Chapter 2, Figure 2-1). The Mexico portion of the Grassland Assessment was not included in this analysis. In addition, grasslands on National Forests within the assessment area were summarized for each Forest. This included all of the Kaibab, Coconino, Prescott, Tonto, Apache-Sitgreaves, and Coronado National Forests in Arizona, and a small portion of the Gila National Forest in New Mexico.

The Grassland Assessment used a combination of expert mapping and intensive field verification and vegetation sampling to identify low elevation (< 5000 feet) historic grasslands in Arizona and determine their current condition. Montane grasslands were not included in the assessment. Current grassland condition was assessed based on relative dominance of native/non-native species, degree of encroachment by woody species, and erosion severity. Based on these factors, grasslands were assigned to five condition types: open native, restorable native, former, non-native, and transitional (see Chapter 2, Table 2-1, for detailed descriptions of these condition types). The current condition of grasslands in parts of the assessment area was not determined.

The extent and current condition of grasslands were determined for major landowners within the analysis area using landownership information from the Arizona Land Resource Information Service and the New Mexico Resource Geographic Information system. Detailed information about this data layer is provided in Chapter 2. For this analysis, areas were calculated for each major landowner as well as for each National Forest. It is important to note that the acreages calculated for National Forests in this section of the report which are based strictly on landownership, differ from acreages presented within the individual Forest chapters (Chapters 4-15), which are based on administrative boundaries and include lands owned by other landowners. Areas where current grassland conditions are undetermined are not included in percentages of grassland conditions by landowner.

The Grasslands Assessment identified over 26.6 millions acres of low elevation grasslands (< 5000 feet) within the analysis area (Table 3-3). Tribal lands, privately owned lands, and state trust lands contain the largest acreages of these grasslands. Nearly 2 million acres (7.5%) fall on National Forest lands. Within the National Forests, the Coronado, Coconino, and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests have the largest acreages of low elevation grassland.

Overall, over 2.9 million acres (18.4%) of grasslands in the analysis area remain in open native condition (Table 3-4). Substantial portions of historic grasslands have experienced some shrub encroachment (restorable native, 37.6%), but can be restored to open native condition, while other portions (30.6%) have experienced significant shrub encroachment and probable conversion to shrubland (former grasslands). Compared to overall conditions in the analysis area, grasslands on National Forests have higher proportions in open native (20.0%) and restorable native condition (58.5%), and lower proportions that have converted to shrublands (12.4%). The proportion of grasslands on National Forests dominated by non-native grasses is similar to the

overall assessment area. However, nearly all non-native grasslands on National Forest occur on the Coronado National Forest, primarily due to the presence of Lehman (*Eragrostis lehmanniana*) and Boer (*Eragrostis chloromelas*) lovegrasses.

Table 3-3. Area (acres) identified as low elevation (<5000 feet) historic grasslands (Schussman and Gori 2004, Gori and Enquist 2003) for nine major landowners and seven National Forests in Arizona and parts of New Mexico that fall within the Apache Highlands Ecoregion. Grassland areas are based on all identified historic grasslands areas, even if the current condition was not determined.

Landowner	Total Acres	% of Assessment Area	Grassland Acres	% of Total Grassland Area
Bureau of Land Management	13,103,000	17.3	3,627,900	13.6
Department of Defense	2,848,700	3.8	59,500	0.2
US Fish and Wildlife Service	1,710,800	2.3	115,500	0.4
National Park Service	2,567,300	3.4	334,400	1.3
Other	304,300	0.4	21,500	0.1
Private	13,836,000	18.3	6,872,300	25.8
State Trust	9,789,400	12.9	5,460,800	20.5
Tribal	20,109,400	26.6	8,186,600	30.7
US Forest Service				
Apache-Sitgreaves N.F	2,013,200	2.7	347,000	1.3
Coconino N.F	1,831,300	2.4	365,100	1.4
Coronado N.F.	1,717,900	2.3	726,400	2.7
Gila N.F.	117,400	0.2	10,000	<0.1
Kaibab N.F	1,541,900	2.0	153,300	0.6
Prescott N.F	1,254,100	1.7	271,600	1.0
Tonto N.F	2,865,400	3.8	119,100	0.4
US Forest Service Total	11,341,200	15.0	1,992,400	7.5
Total	75,610,100	100.0	26,670,900	100.0

Table 3-4. Current condition of low elevation (< 5000 feet) grasslands for nine landowner categories and seven National Forests in Arizona and parts of New Mexico that fall within the Apache Highlands Ecoregion (from Schussman and Gori 2004, Gori and Enquist 2003). Areas with undetermined current condition are not listed or included in percentage calculations.

Landowner	Grassland Condition									
	Open Native		Restorable Native		Former		Non-native		Transitional	
	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
Bureau of Land Management	404,500	12.2	1,101,300	33.1	1,569,800	47.2	18,800	0.6	234,800	7.1
Department of Defense	8,900	14.9	600	1.0	1,200	2.0	48,900	82.0	0	0.0
US Fish and Wildlife Service	3,100	2.7	13,000	11.3	3,800	3.3	95,600	82.8	0	0.0
National Park Service	1,400	1.0	6,400	4.5	131,000	91.9	2,500	1.8	1,200	0.8
Other	500	5.7	4,400	50.0	2,000	22.7	600	6.8	1,300	14.8
Private	1,230,700	23.4	1,862,100	35.4	1,210,700	23.0	646,000	12.3	313,100	5.9
State Trust	747,100	16.5	1,722,100	38.0	1,453,300	32.0	497,500	11.0	117,400	2.6
Tribal	220,100	25.3	317,000	36.4	324,000	37.2	0	0.0	10,500	1.2
US Forest Service										
Apache-Sitgreaves N.F	0		236,400	72.6	89,100	27.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Coconino N.F	3,800	1.4	244,100	90.5	21,800	8.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Coronado N.F.	180,200	24.8	317,500	43.7	75,700	10.4	153,000	21.1	0	0.0
Gila N.F.	9,000	90.0	0	0.0	1,000	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kaibab N.F	0	0.0	23,100	83.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4,700	16.9
Prescott N.F	129,400	47.6	116,900	43.0	23,100	8.5	2,100	0.8	0	0.0
Tonto N.F	27,000	22.7	85,700	72.0	6,300	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
US Forest Service Total	349,400	20.0	58.5		12.4		155,100	8.9	4,700	0.3
Total	2,965,700	18.4	37.6		30.6		1,465,000	9.1	683,000	4.2

III. Distribution of Stream Reaches with Native Fish Occurrences

The Arizona Statewide Freshwater Assessment (Turner and List, *In Prep*; available at www.azconservation.org) was used to summarize the occurrence and distribution of stream reaches with native fishes across major landowners and National Forests in Arizona. This assessment was developed for use in regional planning and includes occurrence information for 33 native fish species. Point localities for each species from 1975 and later, obtained from a variety of sources (see Chapter 2 for more details), were mapped to perennial stream reaches on a 1:100,000 scale linear hydrography layer for Arizona. Native fish occurrences were mapped to stream reaches which approximate the bounds of currently occupied habitat. However, it is recognized that at finer scales these reaches may differ somewhat from current native fish distributions. These differences are addressed on a forest by forest basis in the individual Forest chapters (Chapters 4-15). At the large statewide scale of this analysis, this data set provides the most current and useful information available for understanding the distribution of important stream reaches for native fishes. This analysis includes only Arizona. However, a similar data set for New Mexico is currently being developed, and results from that analysis may be incorporated into this document when available.

The Freshwater Assessment includes a database that integrates the distribution of all 33 native fishes into a single data layer that represents number of native fish species with occurrences on stream reaches across Arizona. This information was used along with landownership information from the Arizona Land Resource Information Service and the New Mexico Resource Geographic Information system (detailed information about this geo-spatial data layer is provided in Chapter 2) to determine the distribution (number of stream miles) of stream reaches with varying levels of native fish richness by major landowners and for individual National Forests in Arizona. In areas where streams serve as the boundary between landowners for a distance greater than five miles, one-half of the length of that stream reach was attributed to each landowner. More detailed information on the species and stream reaches with occurrences are provided in individual Forest chapters (Chapters 4-15).

Approximately 3,650 miles of stream reaches within Arizona have had occurrences of native fish species in the last 30 years, with the number of species with occurrences on stream reaches ranging from one to nine (Figure 3-1). Of major landowners in the state, the largest number of stream miles with native fish occurrences occurs on USFS lands, followed by Tribal and privately owned lands (Table 3-5). Together, these three landowner categories account for more than 75% of the stream miles with native fish occurrence in Arizona. While tribal lands tend to have more stream miles at low native species richness, National Forest lands tend to have the largest number of stream miles with high native fish richness (Figure 3-2). Overall, 50% of the stream miles with occurrences of five or more native fish species occur on Forest lands. Within National Forests, the Apache-Sitgreaves and Tonto National Forests have the majority of stream miles with native fish occurrences, including a large portion of the stream miles with occurrences of a large number of native fish species. However, the Coconino and Prescott National Forests also have noteworthy areas with occurrences of a high number of native fish species.

Of all native species in Arizona, fish may have suffered the largest losses (Minckley & Deacon,

1968; Williams and others 1985; Minckley & Rinne 1991; Olden & Poff 2005). Arizona has been ranked first among states in the proportion of native freshwater species at risk of extinction (Stein 2002). Olden and Poff (2005) documented substantial changes in the abundances of lower Colorado River Basin species that occur on USFS lands in Region 3. For example, the following species have shown population declines: the Gila topminnow (36.8% decline), Apache trout (26.9% decline), speckled dace (16.5% decline), Gila chub (15.9% decline), and desert sucker (13.5% decline). However, some species have shown population increases, such as the longfin dace and Sonora (11.4% and 8.2%, respectively).

The causes of decline are many and have varied over time and space. Demands placed upon the region's limited water supplies are increasing as Arizona's population continues to grow, suggesting that activities occurring outside Forest boundaries could play an increasing role in the status of resources USFS is responsible for managing in a sustainable manner. Regional assessment data summarized here demonstrate the important role USFS plays in managing native fish habitat. Changes documented in native fish distribution combined with increasing pressure on limited water supplies indicate that native fish, watershed, and ground-water management may be an important focal area for comprehensive evaluation in forest plan revisions.

Figure 3-1. Stream reaches with occurrences of a varying number of native fish species (1-9) in Arizona.

Table 3-5. Approximate length (miles) of stream reaches with varying numbers of native fish species occurrences (1-9) for nine major landowner categories and six National Forests in Arizona. Native fish occurrences in stream reaches were determined based on occurrence information from 1975 and later.

Landowner	<i>Native Fish Richness</i>									Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Bureau of Land Management	29	63	88	51	52	13	11	0	0	307
Department of Defense	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
US Fish and Wildlife Service	0	36	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	63
National Park Service	27	71	5	207	0	1	0	0	0	311
Other	1	5	9	19	2	0	5	0	0	41
Private	93	141	163	95	78	37	63	19	7	696
State Trust	25	20	24	44	27	1	2	0	0	143
Tribal	229	305	103	140	168	2	9	6	2	964
US. Forest Service										
Apache-Sitgreaves N.F	95	87	21	97	87	34	4	0	10	435
Coconino N.F	0	13	18	7	12	53	21	7	0	131
Coronado N.F.	34	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Kaibab N.F	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Prescott N.F	13	13	3	2	0	13	17	12	0	73
Tonto N.F	43	43	69	13	130	84	21	0	0	403
US. Forest Service Total	189	197	111	119	230	183	63	19	10	1121
Total	593	842	528	675	557	239	153	44	19	3650

Figure 3-2. Approximate length (miles) of stream reaches with varying numbers of native fish species occurrences (1-9) for the three landowners (Forest Service, tribal, and private) with the most miles of stream with native fish occurrences.

IV. Ecoregional Assessments and Conservation Areas

The results of eight ecoregional assessments (Bell and others 1999, 2004 Marshall and others 2000, 2004, Neely and others 2001, The Nature Conservancy 2001, 2005, Tuhy 2002) were used to identify a network of areas important for sustaining the viability of the region's species and ecological systems across landownerships in Arizona and New Mexico. The individual areas that make up the network are referred to as conservation areas. Ecoregional assessments are comprehensive and systematic efforts to identify the minimum network of conservation areas on the landscape that are necessary to maintain the biological diversity of the ecoregion.

Ecoregions are large, contiguous units of land or water defined by ecological and environmental elements, rather than geo-political boundaries, and typically contain geographically distinct assemblages of species, natural communities, and environmental conditions. Because ecoregions typically include large proportions of ecosystem, community, and species distributions, they are useful for conservation planning. The ecoregional assessment process includes the identification of conservation targets (including species, ecological systems, and important biological features) that represent the biological diversity within the ecoregion. Conservation goals (including distribution, size and minimum number of viable occurrences) are established for each conservation target within the ecoregion. An iterative process is used to identify a network of conservation areas that most efficiently meets the conservation goals for all conservation targets within the ecoregion. These conservation areas, collectively called a conservation portfolio, represent the most current and scientifically robust hypotheses on the magnitude and distribution of areas on the landscape necessary to protect the biodiversity of the region. A more detailed description of the ecoregional assessment process can be found in Chapter 2, and the specific methods used for each ecoregion can be found within the ecoregional assessments. Many of the assessments are available for download at <http://www.azconservation.org>.

In general, ecoregional assessments serve several conservation, management and scientific purposes, including:

1. A spatial hypothesis on how to maximize the viability of a region's native species and ecological systems.
2. A spatial delineation of areas where land-uses and land management activities should be evaluated to identify and minimize potential adverse effects to the viability of species and ecological systems.
3. A spatial delineation of priority areas that land managers and others interested in promoting conservation should evaluate first to ensure that disturbance processes that perpetuate native ecological systems (e.g., fire, flooding) are maintained at a scale, frequency, and intensity that falls within the historical range of variation.
4. A network of cross-jurisdictional priorities that could serve as a basis for collaboration and the efficient use of limited resources to maximize conservation values.

While nine ecoregional assessments overlap Arizona and New Mexico (See Chapter 2, Figure 2-2), information from eight ecoregions was synthesized as part of this analysis. The Central Shortgrass Prairie Ecoregional Assessment (The Nature Conservancy 1998), which overlaps a

small portion of northeast New Mexico (not including any National Forest lands), was not included in this analysis. As part of a regional data rollout effort, The Nature Conservancy merged conservation area information from six individual assessments (Apache Highlands, Arizona-New Mexico Mountains, Colorado Plateau, Mojave Desert, Sonoran Desert, and the Southern Rocky Mountains) into a single regional data layer (<http://www.azconservation.org>). This dataset includes conservation area boundaries and attributes for the conservation targets that occur within each conservation area in those ecoregions. The assessments for Chihuahuan Desert Ecoregion, which overlaps a small part of the Lincoln National Forest, the Southern Shortgrass Prairie Ecoregion, which includes portions of the Santa Fe National Forest and Cibola Grasslands, were included individually.

The amount of overlap between conservation areas from the eight ecoregional assessments and major landowners within Arizona and New Mexico was calculated using landownership information from the Arizona Land Resource Information Service and the New Mexico Resource Geographic Information system. Detailed information about this geo-spatial data layer is provided in Chapter 2. It is important to note that the acreages calculated for National Forests here, based strictly on landownership, differ from those presented within the individual Forest chapters (Chapters 4-15), which are based on administrative boundaries and include lands owned by other landowners.

Nearly 57 million acres (37.6%) of land within Arizona and New Mexico have been identified as part of the network of conservation areas (Figure 3-3). The majority of these acres occur on private (29.7%), Region 3 US Forest Service (17.1%), and Bureau of Land Management (15.8%) lands (Table 3-6). However, the highest percentage overlap with conservation areas occurs on US Fish and Wildlife Service (93.1%), National Park Service (83%), and the Department of Defense (72.4%) lands, followed by US Forest Service (47.1%). Within National Forests, the Tonto (1,349,500 acres), Coconino (1,294,700 acres), Coronado (1,067,200 acres), and Gila (1,016,200 acres) National Forests have the largest acreages within conservation areas, while the Coconino (70.7%), Coronado (62.1%), and Santa Fe (58.8%) National Forests have the highest proportion of their lands overlapping with conservation areas.

Conservation Areas in Arizona and New Mexico




Figure 3-3. Conservation areas from eight ecoregional assessments in Arizona and New Mexico showing overlap with National Forest boundaries.

Table 3-6. Overlap between conservation areas from eight ecoregional assessments with major landowners and 11 National Forests in Arizona and New Mexico.

Landowner	Total Acres Overlapped by Conservation Areas	% in Conservation Areas	% of All Conservation Areas
Bureau of Land Management	8,940,200	34.9	15.8
Department of Defense	3,876,500	72.4	6.8
US Fish and Wildlife Service	1,950,300	93.1	3.4
National Park Service	2,448,100	83.0	4.3
Other	366,200	46.3	0.6
Private	16,834,500	35.7	29.7
State Trust	6,372,300	35.0	11.2
Tribal	6,244,700	22.2	11.0
US Forest Service			
Apache-Sitgreaves N.F.	943,500	46.9	1.7
Carson N.F.	769,000	51.7	1.4
Cibola N.F.	683,300	39.1	1.2
Coconino N.F.	1,294,700	70.7	2.3
Coronado N.F.	1,067,200	62.1	1.9
Gila N.F.	1,016,200	31.1	1.8
Kaibab N.F.	547,200	35.5	1.0
Lincoln N.F.	539,600	49.3	1.0
Prescott N.F.	560,500	44.7	1.0
Santa Fe N.F.	918,100	58.8	1.6
Tonto N.F.	1,349,500	47.1	2.4
US Forest Service Total	9,688,800	47.5	17.1
Total	56,721,700	37.6	100.0

Discussion

This synthesis of existing regional assessment information highlights the ecological components that exist on National Forests and places them in context of other major landowners in Arizona and New Mexico. This information may be useful in identifying the opportunities and challenges that National Forests across the region face in developing forest plans that meet the ecological sustainability standard of the new forest planning rule [36 CFR sec. 219.10(b)]. In addition, the synthesis also provides a comparison of the ecological components across individual Forests. Each Forest contains ecological components that are either unique or occur disproportionately on their lands.

Potential Natural Vegetation Types

Within Arizona and New Mexico, Region 3 National Forests contain large proportions of several PNVTs that support unique plant and animal species. For example, according to SWReGAP data (note limitations of these data discussed earlier in this Chapter), Region 3 (led by the Carson, Gila, and Tonto National Forests) manages more high elevation PNVTs (aspen forest and woodlands, Madrean pine-oak, mixed conifer forests, montane grasslands, ponderosa pine forests, spruce-fir forests, and sub-alpine grasslands) than other major landowners in the Southwest. Also, Region 3 manages more interior chaparral (led by the Tonto National Forest) and Madrean encinal (led by the Coronado National Forest) than other landowners. It is obvious that Region 3 National Forests have an important role to play in maintaining the sustainability of these systems and the species that depend on them. Within the forest planning process, it may be important to consider the range of ecological processes that shaped historic conditions within these PNVTs, and evaluate the ability of current management actions to support ecosystem and species diversity. By understanding the context in which these PNVTs exist on National Forests, this information can be used to identify processes and conditions that support sustainability, formulate strategic goals, and evaluate the need to change management to meet the goal of ecological sustainability across the region.

According to the Arizona Grasslands Assessment (Schussman and Gori 2004) National Forests within the Southwest contain a relatively small proportion of low elevation (< 5000 feet) grasslands compared to other landowners. While a similar proportion of grasslands on National Forests remain in open native condition compared to other landowners, the proportions of other grassland conditions differ from other landowners in notable ways. For example, it is apparent that grasslands for all landowners, including National Forests face significant threats from encroachment by woody species as noted by the high proportion of grasslands in restorable native and former grassland conditions. However, on National Forests, a smaller proportion of these encroached grasslands have undergone a type conversion to shrublands while a larger proportion retains the potential for restoration to open native condition. Amongst National Forests, the Apache-Sitgreaves has seen a larger proportion of its grasslands converted to shrublands. The Coronado National Forest, due to the threats from non-native lovegrasses, has the largest proportion of non-native grasslands.

Based on the documented loss of grasslands region-wide, the need for appropriate maintenance and restoration goals and management to arrest declines is paramount. Based on this analysis, the Coronado, Prescott, Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, and Tonto National Forests, with their large acreages of open native and restorable grasslands, can make a significant contribution to regional sustainability of grasslands by identifying and evaluating the drivers of grassland change and developing strategic goals that would provide for the restoration and maintenance of this important ecological system.

Protecting and restoring grasslands in the Southwest from encroaching shrubs and non-native grasses are some of the major challenges landowners, including USFS, face in maintaining the ecological and biological integrity of grassland systems. Brunson and others (2001) suggest that prescribed burns can be utilized to reduce shrub cover when sufficient fuel loads are present, which may require rest from grazing. According to Schussman and Gori (2004), some

grasslands in Arizona could be burned with only three growing seasons or less of rest, while other sites would require longer periods of rest to build adequate fuel loads. In contrast, fire may not be a useful approach when attempting to control the spread of non-native grasses. Because some non-native grasses may spread further when burned and the general lack of information of how many non-native grasses respond to fire, Schussman and Gori (2004) suggest using caution when burning areas dominated by non-native grass species such as Lehmann lovegrass (*Eragrostis lehmanniana*), Boer lovegrass (*Eragrostis chloromelas*) and especially cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*).

Freshwater Species and Systems

It is widely recognized that native freshwater fishes in the United States are highly imperiled, and Arizona and New Mexico have some of the highest percentages of threatened fish species (85% and 30%, respectively; Warran and Burr 1994). It is thought that the first and most dramatic decline in native fishes in the Southwest occurred between 1890 and 1935 as a result of intensive water management, introduction of non-native species, and the construction of dams (Mueller and Marsh 2002, Olden and Poff 2005). Today, many native fish species in the Southwest have limited distributions, making their continued viability particularly vulnerable to local and regional threats. Within Arizona, National Forests have a vital role in assuring the sustainability of these species. Amongst major landowners, National Forests have the largest proportion of stream miles with occurrences of one or more of 33 native fish species. The Apache-Sitgreaves and Tonto National Forests, in particular, have substantial stream miles with native fishes. Compared to other landowners, National Forests have a greater proportion (as much as one-half) of the stream miles with high native fish species richness. From a planning perspective, these areas, which are identified in individual Forest chapters (Chapters 4-15) may serve as important areas in considering the sustainability of aquatic vertebrate species. Given the magnitude and rate of loss of native fishes in the Southwest, and the potential role Region 3 can play in maintaining biodiversity of freshwater systems, it is vital that these systems and the species that depend upon them are an integral component of the ecological sustainability of forest plans.

Ecoregional Assessments

The ecoregional assessments that address Arizona and New Mexico provide a useful regional perspective on areas important for sustaining biodiversity. They also point to the role that National Forest lands play in maintaining biodiversity in the region. The degree of overlap between ecoregional conservation areas and National Forests in Arizona and New Mexico underscores the important ecological values that exist on National Forests lands. Nearly one-half of National Forest lands overlap conservation areas, representing over 17% of all conservation areas in the two-state region, which is the second highest percentage of any landowner overlap. Nearly all Region 3 National Forests have significant areas of overlap, led by the Tonto, which has the largest acreage (1,349,500 acres) and proportion (2.4%) of overlap.

The suite of conservation areas, when considered as a whole, represents not only priority locations in these two states for maintaining biodiversity, but also the minimum area on the landscape needed to maintain the region's biodiversity. As such, the suite of areas is intended to

be highly strategic and can provide important leverage for maintaining biodiversity at large, ecoregional scales. Furthermore, none of the identified conservation areas should be considered inconsequential for maintaining biodiversity at an ecoregional scale. Each conservation area is important and should be evaluated in terms of currently allowable uses and activities and their associated impacts to biodiversity. In some cases, analyses of this type may indicate the need for management change.

It is important to note that these conservation areas do not necessarily imply the need for special protections; nor does it necessitate blanket restriction of activities within these areas. Rather, conservation areas can be viewed as priority areas for assessment of impacts associated with ongoing uses and activities and determination of their compatibility with sustaining biodiversity at ecoregional scales. From the perspective of forest planning for the maintenance of ecosystem and species diversity, conservation areas can serve several important functions. First, they can be used as an analysis tool for assessing land use suitability. Second, they can be used to help determine appropriate objectives for individual management areas; for example, managing ecosystem characteristics and processes within the historic range of variability. Third, they can aid in identifying specific plan components, including management objectives and guidelines, for species whose sustainability is threatened.

To further aid in planning efforts, each conservation area has associated with it a number of conservation targets (species, vegetation systems, and ecological features), which are representative of the biodiversity in the area. An analysis and breakdown of these conservation targets is provided for each National Forest in the individual Forest chapters (Chapters 4-15). These conservation targets and the threats they face can be used to analyze and address the likely impacts of current management on ecological sustainability in terms of both ecosystem and species diversity. These targets can also aid in identifying and characterizing the need for management change and evaluating new management strategies for addressing sustainability, i.e., maintaining both ecosystem and species diversity.

Given the regional perspective of the ecoregional assessments and the strategic nature of the conservation areas, use of conservation areas and conservation targets as analysis tools for addressing the threats facing biodiversity can provide a key step, within the context of forest planning, in sustaining the ecosystems and species that exist in the region.

References

- Bell, G.P., Baumgartner, J., Humke, J., Laurenzi, A., McCarthy, P., Mehlhop, P., Rich, K., Silbert, M., Smith, E., Spicer, B., Sullivan, T., and Yanoff, S. 1999. Ecoregion Conservation Analysis of the Arizona-New Mexico Mountains. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy with support from agency and institutional partners. 151 pp. Document available at <http://www.azconservation.org>.
- Bell, G.P., Yanoff, S., Cotera, M., Guadarrama, E., Brenner, J., Arango, A.M., García Garza, M.E., Sullivan, T., Najera, S., Gronemeyer, P., Weigel, J., Karges, J., McCreedy, R., Mehلمان, D., Bergan, J., King, J., Gallyoun, M., Certain, D.L., Potts, R., Wrinkle, J., Bezaury, J., Arias, H.M., Atchley Montoya, J., Parra, I.E., Muldavin, E., Neville, T., Kittel, G. 2004 Ecoregional Conservation Assessment of the Chihuahuan Desert. Pronatura Noreste, Monterrey, MX, The Nature Conservancy, Santa Fe, NM, World Wildlife Fund, Chihuahua, MX.
- Brunson E., Gori, D., and Backer, D. 2001. Watershed improvement to restore riparian and aquatic habitat on the Muleshoe Ranch CMA. Report to the Arizona Water Protection Fund, Project Number 97-035. Arizona Department of Water Resources.
- Gori, D.F., and C.A.F. Enquist. 2003. An assessment of the spatial extent and condition of grasslands in central and southern Arizona, southwestern New Mexico, and Northern Mexico. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy, Arizona Chapter. 28 pp.
- Marshall, R.M., Anderson, S., Batcher, M., Comer, P., Cornelius, S., Cox, R., Gondor, A., Gori, D., Humke, J., Aguilar, R.P., Parra, I.E., and Schwartz, S. 2000. An Ecological analysis of conservation priorities in the Sonoran Desert ecoregion. Prepared by the Nature Conservancy Arizona Chapter, Sonoran Institute, and Instituto del Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo Sustentable del Estado de Sonora with support from Department of defense Legacy Program, Agency and Institutional partners. 146 pp. Document available at <http://www.azconservation.org>.
- Marshall, R.M., Turner, D., Gondor, A., Gori, D., Enquist, C., Luna, G., Aguilar, R.P., Anderson, S., Schwartz, S., Watts, C., Lopez, E., and Comer, P. 2004. An Ecological analysis of conservation priorities in the Apache Highlands ecoregion. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy of Arizona, Instituto del Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo Sustentable del Estado de Sonora, agency and institutional partners. 152 pp. Document available at <http://www.azconservation.org>.
- Minckley, W.L., and J.E. Deacon. 1968. Southwestern fishes and enigma of endangered species. *Science* 159:1424-1432.
- Minckley, W.L., and J.N. Rinne. 1991. Native fishes of arid lands: a dwindling resource of the desert southwest.
- Mueller, G. A. and Marsh, P.C. 2002. Lost, a desert river and its native fishes: a historical perspective of the Lower Colorado River, Information and Technology Report USGS/BRD/ITR-2002-0010: U.S. Government Printing Office, Denver, CO.

- Neely, B., Comer, P., Moritz, C., Lammert, M., Rondeau, R., Pague, C., Bell, G., Copeland, H., Humke, J., Spackman, S., Schulz, T., Thoebold, D., Valutis, L. 2001. Southern Rocky Mountains: An Ecoregional Assessment and Conservation Blueprint. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy with support from U.S. Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region, Colorado Division of Wildlife, and Bureau of Land Management. 354 pp. . Document available at <http://www.azconservation.org>.
- Olden, J.D. and Poff, N.L. 2005. Long-term trends of native and non-native fish faunas in the American Southwest. *Animal Biodiversity and Conservation* 28: 75-89.
- Schussman, H. and Gori D.F. 2004. An ecological assessment of the Bureau of Land Management's Current Fire Management Plans: Materials and Recommendations for future fire planning. The Nature Conservancy, Tucson, Arizona.
- The Nature Conservancy. 1998. Ecoregion-based conservation in the Central Shortgrass Prairie. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy of Colorado with support from agency and institutional partners. 221 pp.
- The Nature Conservancy. 2001. Ecoregion-based conservation in the Mojave Desert. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy of Nevada with support from agency and institutional partners. 332 pp. Document available at <http://www.azconservation.org>.
- The Nature Conservancy. 2005. A Biodiversity and Conservation Assessment for the Southern Shortgrass Prairie Ecoregion. Southern Shortgrass Prairie Ecoregional Planning Team. The Nature Conservancy. San Antonio, TX.
- Tuhy, J.S., Comer, P., Dorfman, D., Lammert, M., Humke, J., Cholvin, B., Bell, G., Neely, B., Silbert, S., Whitham, L., Baker, B., The Nature Conservancy, and The Colorado Plateau Ecoregional Planning Team. 2002. A Conservation assessment of the Colorado Plateau ecoregion. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy of Utah with support from agency and institutional partners. 110 pp. + appendices. Document available at <http://www.azconservation.org>.
- Turner, D.S. and List, M. In Prep. Mapping Arizona's Native Fish Distributions: A Tool for Conservation Analysis.
- U.S. Geological Survey National Gap Analysis Program. 2004. Provisional Digital Land Cover Map for the Southwestern United States. Version 1.0. RS/GIS Laboratory, College of Natural Resources, Utah State University.
- Warren, M. L., Jr. and Burr, B. M. 1994. Status of freshwater fishes of the United States: overview of an imperiled fauna. *Fisheries* **19**: 6-18.
- Williams, J.E., D.B. Bowman, J.E. Brooks, A.A. Eschelle, and R.J. Edwards. 1985. Endangered aquatic ecosystems in North American deserts with a list of vanishing fishes of the region. *Journal of the Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences* 20(1): 1-61.