



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

**Southwestern  
Region**

**August 2013**



# Lands Specialist Report

## Forest Plan Revision DEIS

**Submitted by:**

/s/ Judith B. Adams

**Judith B. Adams**

Lands Team Leader

Coconino National Forest, August 2013

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination against its customers, employees, and applicants for employment on the bases of race, color, national origin, age, disability, sex, gender identity, religion, reprisal, and where applicable, political beliefs, marital status, familial or parental status, sexual orientation, or all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program, or protected genetic information in employment or in any program or activity conducted or funded by the Department. (Not all prohibited bases will apply to all programs and/or employment activities.)



# Preface

The information in this specialist report reflects analysis that was completed prior to and in conjunction with the completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the revision of the 1987 Coconino National Forest Land Management Plan (the Plan). The primary purpose of specialist reports associated with the DEIS is to provide detailed information to assist in the preparation of the DEIS. As the DEIS was prepared, review-driven edits to the broader DEIS resulted in modifications to some of the information contained in some of the specialist reports. As a result, some reports no longer contain information and analysis that was updated through an interdisciplinary review process and is included in the DEIS in its entirety. This specialist report retains the additional information on the environmental consequences that was not included in the summarized information in the DEIS. However, analysis and information for this resource that is included in its entirety in the DEIS is not duplicated in this report. Efforts have been made to ensure that the retained information in the specialist reports is consistent with the DEIS. If inconsistencies exist between specialist reports and the DEIS, the DEIS should be regarded as the most current, accurate source of analysis.

# Executive Summary

## Summary of Affected Environment:

The Lands program is broken into two general analysis areas: land adjustment and special uses. The Coconino National Forest (NF) contains approximately 2,013,804 acres that includes approximately 157,849 acres of non-federal land. National Forest acreage within the forest boundary totals approximately 1,855,955 acres. Applicable portions of the Coconino National Forest comprise about 12 percent of Coconino County and 8 percent of Yavapai County, respectively. There are also approximately 6,063 acres of the Coconino NF within Gila County. Several incorporated communities are located within the forest boundaries, including the City of Flagstaff, City of Sedona, Town of Camp Verde, Town of Clarkdale and City of Cottonwood. Actions and plans of local communities and their growth and development influence National Forest through land adjustment cases, land exchange concerns, utility needs and development and residential impacts. These communities are also partners in maintaining and acquiring open space and providing needed services to residents and users of the forest. There is approximately 39,900 acres of State of Arizona land within the Coconino National Forest that includes four state parks and mostly Arizona State Trust Lands. There are four National Monuments within the Coconino NF boundaries – Montezuma Castle, Tuzigoot, Walnut Canyon and Sunset Crater National Monuments. All of these entities and their management plans influence adjacent National Forest in some way, through uses or development influences. There has been a net increase in Coconino NF acreage of approximately 14,500 acres since the 1987 Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1,841,425 acres, 1987 LAR Report/ 2010 NFS land 1,855,955 acres, Forest Service 2010 Land Areas Report) through a variety of land adjustment processes. Community needs resulted in conveyance of lands for uses, such as schools, wastewater treatment facilities, fire stations and landfills. Land purchase cases acquired 7,139 acres for a cost \$43,661,000. Land exchanges between 1987 and 2006 resulted in a net acreage gain to the Forest of 5,266 acres, gaining 8,528 acres and conveying 3,262 acres into private ownership. Concerns about land exchanges and the resulting loss of NFS land have caused restrictive wording for the Sedona and Walnut Canyon areas of the forest. Local communities have continued to express concerns about land exchanges and land exchange projects continue to be difficult and controversial even though important forest resources are acquired in these cases.

Special use authorizations on the Coconino National Forest continue to be an important and demanding program that has been the result of population growth. High percentage population growth factors in the State of Arizona and all of the communities within the Coconino NF since 1987, have resulted in infrastructure demands, including widened and improved roadways and widened and new utility corridors and communications facilities. . The forest, as of 2007, has total of 580 long-term permits of which 194 are focused on recreation and the remaining 386 are non-recreation permits. All of these permits are issued for more than one year. These numbers do not include short-term or special-product permits issued for one year or less, such as filming or group events. Annual or shorter-term recreation and lands permits have ranged from 100 to 130 issued per year over the past few years. Approximately 20-40 of the temporary permits are commercial photography and filming. There are 456 active lands permits of record in 2011. There are additional permits in progress and temporary permits that are in various stages of action throughout the year. Overall, the trend is an increasing demand for all permitted activities, especially those related to reliable and renewable energy resources and communications facilities.

## **Summary of Environmental Consequences:**

Many lands effects are common between the four alternatives considered.

- Alternative A “1987 Plan” is the existing forest plan direction. It provides specific land adjustment criteria, identified base in exchange and a list of high priority lands for purchase. Lands to be acquired through land adjustments emphasize valuable forest resources. This plan also identifies procedures and priority direction for special uses as well as direction on where certain uses are appropriate. It includes a goal to manage special uses to best meet public needs while protecting resources and meeting existing plan direction for other resources. Communication facility locations and uses are specifically identified and therefore restrict new facilities and wireless communication desires. Larger areas of the forest have modification (or moderate) scenery values which allow flexibility in consideration of new uses and corridors.
- Alternative B - Modified Proposed Plan – This alternative has revised land adjustment guidelines even though the general characteristics of lands to be conveyed or acquired are similar and results of land adjustment cases would be similar. Guidelines continue to emphasize valuable forest resources such as threatened and endangered species, archeology and riparian. Specific land exchange direction for Sedona and Walnut Canyon are retained. Recommended additions of wilderness areas could impact future special use locations to a small extent as well as maintenance and management of some small areas of existing uses while protecting the scenery and recreation experience values in these areas. Larger areas of the forest have high and very high scenery objectives that would restrict areas for new special use corridors to existing corridors, protecting the scenery values from long term impacts of new uses.
- Alternative C - This alternative includes eight wildlife habitat management areas and 13 recommended wilderness areas that cover large areas adjacent to highway and utility corridors. The expanded recommended wilderness areas in this alternative may limit the forest’s ability to allow new or expanded special uses for public needs, especially for utility companies and ADOT. Wilderness and recreation experience would be protected in these recommended Wilderness areas but would limit the locations of future public infrastructure or utility needs in these areas.
- Alternative D – This alternative does not recommend any additional wilderness areas. Consequences of this alternative are similar to Alternative B, except there would not be impacts to existing utilities that area adjacent to the proposed wilderness areas. Existing utilities would be able to work along the existing corridors without additional restrictions where the corridors are close to proposed Wilderness. These areas could be considered for utility corridor expansion however the existing Wilderness boundaries substantially limit expansion in that area so impacts would be similar to the existing management of the area.

# Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Relevant Laws, Regulations, and Policy that Apply .....	1
Methodology and Analysis Process .....	3
Assumptions.....	4
Issues Addressed in this Analysis .....	5
<b>Affected Environment.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Land-Ownership, Open Space, Land Exchanges, and other Land-ownership Adjustments .....	6
<b>Supplemental Environmental Consequences and Cumulative Effects.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Supplemental Consequences common to all alternatives .....	10
Alternative A.....	11
Alternative B.....	13
Alternative C.....	14
Alternative D.....	15
<b>Adaptive Management .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Specialist Information.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Land Special Uses.....	30

## Introduction

This specialist report evaluates and discloses the potential environmental consequences not included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the lands resource that may result with the adoption of a revised land management plan.

## Relevant Laws, Regulations, and Policy that Apply

All alternatives are designed to guide the Coconino NF's management activities in meeting all applicable Federal and State laws, regulations, and policies.

**Act of 1866 General Mining Law** authorizes rights-of-way across public lands for ditches and roads.

**Act of March 3, 1925** (43 Stat. 1133, as amended)

**The Act of March 4, 1915, as amended July 28, 1956, (16 U.S.C. 497).** This act authorizes term permits for structures or facilities on National Forest System land, and sets maximum limits of 80 acres and 30 years.

**The Act of November 16, 1973, (30 U.S.C. 185).** This act, amending Section 28 of the 1920 Mineral Leasing Act, authorizes the Forest Service to issue authorizations for oil and gas pipelines and related facilities

**Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, 1980** provides direction for providing access to non-federally owned land within the boundaries of the Forest.

**An Act to Repeal Timber-Culture Laws, 1891** authorizes ditch easements across public lands and Forest Reserves.

**Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979** provides the authority for archeological investigations and research permits.

**Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, Section 31-33** authorizes most rights-of-way, except those on National Grasslands.

**Colorado Ditch Act of 1986 (FLPMA amendment)** resolves title claims for certain water uses and provides authority for easements for water conveyances.

**Energy Policy Act of 2005** directed the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, and the Interior to designate energy transport corridors for oil, gas, and hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands in portions of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

**Education Land Grant Act**



**Exchange for Schools Act (Sisk Act)** of December 4, 1967 (81 Stat. 531, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 484a, 521c-521i).

**Executive Order 11990 (Wetlands) and Executive Order 11988 (Floodplains)**

**Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976** updated authority for management of National Forest lands, provided general authority for use and occupancy of Forest lands, required fair market value for uses on the Forest, and repealed sections of many previous acts.

**Forest Service Manual 2700 Special Uses Management**

**Forest Service Facilities Realignment Act of 2005 (119 Stat 559-563; 16 U.S.C. 580d, as amended).**

**General Exchange Act of 1922** authorizes land adjustments within Forest boundaries.

**Granger-Thye Act of 1950, section 7** authorizes use of government-owned improvements.

**Highway Act of August 27, 1958, (23 U.S.C. 317)**, supplemented by the Act of October 15, 1966 (49 U.S.C. 1651) This act authorizes the Federal Highway Administration to grant easements to States for highways that are part of the Federal-aid system or that are constructed under the provision of Chapter 2 of the Highway Act.

**Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of September 3, 1964**

**Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended on November 16, 1973, (30 U.S.C. 185(1))** authorizes the issuance of permits and easements for oil and gas pipelines. It requires annual payments in advance which represent fair market rental value and provides for reimbursement to the Government for administrative and other costs incurred in monitoring, construction (including costs for preparing required environmental analysis and documentation), operation, maintenance, and termination of oil and gas pipelines.

**National Forest Roads & Trails Act 1964** authorizes construction and/or use of roads and trails by public road agencies and also landowners who join the Forest Service in operating mutually beneficial road systems.

**Oil and Gas Pipeline amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act, Section 28** authorizes oil and gas pipelines.

**Organic Act of 1897** provides for rules to regulate occupancy and use of the Forest Reserves.

**Occupancy Permits Act (March 4, 1915)** authorizes use and occupancy of National Forest land for recreation purposes including resorts and recreation residences.

**Preservation of American Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906** provides authority for cultural resource survey permits, including site disturbance, excavation and collection.

**Small Tracts Act of January 12, 1983 (96 Stat. 2535; 16 U.S.C. 521c-i).**

**Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-104)** provides rules for competition and reduced regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications. The goal of this new law is to let anyone enter any communications business -- to let any communications business compete in any market against any other.

**Term Permit Act of March 4, 1915, amended July 28, 1956** authorizes recreation residences, hotels, resorts and other industrial and commercial public service facilities.

**Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, part 254, subpart A (36 CFR part 254, subpart A).**

**National Forest Townsite Act** of July 31, 1958 (72 Stat. 483; 7 U.S.C. 1012a; 16 U.S.C. 478a) as amended by Section 213 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2760).

**Water Conveyance Act of 1986** amended FLMPA to authorize permanent easements for agricultural water systems.

**Weeks Law of March 1, 1911**(36 Stat. 961 as amended; 16 U.S.C. 516).

## **Methodology and Analysis Process**

Various methodologies were used to develop this analysis. Data was obtained through the following resources and databases:

Methodology and analysis process for this report included query of the Infra special uses database (SUDS), use of GIS for inventory and identification of landownership patterns, Forest Service records and case files, and census data to review population trends. SUDS reports of special uses by Township and Range were also used to evaluate possible impacts to existing uses with proposed Wilderness and other special areas. In addition, the final rents report was used to determine fee receipts from land and recreation uses.

The Infra – Special Uses Database (SUDS) was used to determine the type, number, and status of lands special use authorizations. Some use codes were combined into general categories as listed in the Forest Service Handbook 27091.11, Chapter 50 – Terms and conditions use chart. Special use permit numbers were calculated using the status of application approved, pending signature and issued status on June 11, 2011. There may be some inaccuracies in the database, including permits that are expired that are shown as issued and may not be reissued or closed or expired permits that may still have active uses but are

currently not authorized or counted. Short term permits are not separated from longer term permits in this query.

Automated Lands Program (ALP)/Land Status Records System (LSRS) Production geodatabase was used to determine land acreages and changes in landownership since the 1987, including method used. Total Coconino NF acreages were obtained from the Land Areas of the National Forest report. (<http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/index.html>).

Review of existing private property locations and their locations in relation to proposed Wilderness and other special areas was done using Coconino County's GIS mapping program (<http://gis-map.coconino.az.gov/ccgis/>) and forest GIS land ownership layers.

## Assumptions

In the analysis for this resource, the following assumptions have been made:

- The land management plan provides a programmatic framework for future site-specific actions.
- Land management plans do not have direct effects. They do not authorize or mandate any site-specific projects or activities (including ground-disturbing actions).
- Land management plans may have implications, or environmental consequences, of managing the forests under a programmatic framework.
- The plan decisions (desired conditions, objectives, standards, guidelines, management areas, monitoring) will be followed when planning or implementing site-specific projects and activities.
- Laws, regulations, and policies will be followed when planning or implementing site-specific projects and activities.
- Monitoring will occur and the land management plan will be amended, as needed.
- We will be funded similar to past budget levels (past 5 years).
- The planning timeframe is 15 years; other timeframes may be analyzed depending on the resource (usually a discussion of anticipated trends into the future).
- The agency has the capacity to screen, process, and manage special uses, including energy corridors.
- The population of Arizona will continue to grow and be dependent on electricity.
- The economy will fluctuate over time and influence energy corridor development.
- Community and public needs for use of federal land for services and infrastructure, including roads and energy corridors, will continue.
- Consumers will continue to demand reliable electricity and other utilities.
- It is anticipated that over the life span of the proposed forest plan that there will be a net increase in forest land acreage although at a much smaller scale than in the previous plan's time period.

## Issues Addressed in this Analysis

Several issues that were raised in the forest planning process directly relate to land ownership and lands special uses. These are considered in the affected environment and environmental consequences and are as follows:

**8 Wildlife Habitat Area Proposals** **Issue:** Current draft Plan language may not fully address disturbance of wildlife species from motor vehicle noise in areas on the Forest that are noted by the proposals.

**Indicator:** Likely motor vehicle disturbance and associated impacts to wildlife species on the forest that are listed in the proposal. (Impacts to existing special use permits/power lines, road corridors and access to private land. Impacts to new special use proposals.)

**Wilderness Issue 2:** Recommending additional wilderness areas would unnecessarily prohibit and further geographically constrain management activities and uses that would otherwise be allowed.

### Indicators:

- Opportunities provided by plan language for primitive, undeveloped settings.
- Proportion of the Forest/acres of wilderness and recommended wilderness areas
- Impacts on existing special use permit management or potential new use locations.

**Habitat Connectivity Issue:** The revised plan may not adequately promote habitat connectivity, nor promote the identification/removal of potential barriers to wildlife movement.

- **Indicator:** Environmental consequences of plan language on habitat connectivity, including road impacts.

Existing and future roadway corridors impact on habitat connectivity.

There are other concerns related to open space values that may be impacted by future land adjustment activities. Also there are concerns about maintaining scenic quality values in the Sedona area. Both of these concerns may relate to land adjustment cases and effects of potential and existing special use activities.

## Affected Environment

The lands program area includes several different activities. The affected environment description is divided into two broad areas. Land ownership includes land exchanges, purchases, boundary management, and other activities that are primarily real estate type activities. Special use authorizations are a permit, term permit, lease or easement which allows occupancy, use, rights or privileges of National Forest (NF) System lands. (36CFR 251.51, Definitions). These uses can be things such as utility corridors, private and public roadways, churches, communications sites, research projects or signs. This report addresses lands special uses.

Recreation special uses, such as ski areas and outfitter and guides, are addressed in the recreation specialist report.

## **Land-Ownership, Open Space, Land Exchanges, and other Land-ownership Adjustments**

The Coconino National Forest is primarily located within two large counties: Yavapai and Coconino. Yavapai County is one of Arizona's original territorial counties formed in 1864 and currently encompasses 8,122 square miles (5,198,912 acres). Thirty-eight percent of the land is administered by the U.S. Forest Service, 11.6 percent by the Bureau of Land Management, 24.6 percent by the State of Arizona, 25 percent is held privately by individuals or corporations, and 0.5 percent is Native American Reservations. Coconino County, carved out of the previously designated Yavapai County in 1891, is the second largest county in the United States and the largest county in Arizona encompassing 18,617 square miles (11,915,148 acres). American Indian reservations cover 38.1 percent of Coconino County, 28.5 percent is administered by the U.S. Forest Service, 5 percent by the Bureau of Land Management, 9.5 percent by the State of Arizona, other public lands comprise 6.8 percent, and 13.3 percent is held privately by individuals or corporations (Coconino County, 2003). Total acreage within the Coconino National Forest boundaries is 2,013,804 acres that includes 157,849 acres of non-federal land. The Coconino National Forest administers approximately 1,855,955 acres (2010 Land Area Report) (1,842,700 acres -2005 Land Area Report) of national forest system lands, about 12 percent is in Coconino County and 8 percent in Yavapai County. There are also approximately 6,063 acres of the Coconino National Forest within Gila County, approximately 2 percent. The Coconino NF land in Gila County is located within the Fossil Creek Wilderness.

As a whole, land ownership within the assessment area involves large amounts of American Indian and National Forest System land and relatively small amounts of private land. The relative lack of private land has caused greater demands to be placed on the National Forests, in particular, to accommodate many needs that in most areas of the nation are provided for by private lands. County land uses within the assessment area ranges from traditional uses such as ranching in rural areas to concentrations of residential, industrial, and commercial uses in and around urban population centers.

Preservation of open space is a particularly difficult land-use issue given both the public's desire to maintain the "rural character" of county lands and the need to accommodate rapidly growing populations and municipalities. For example, the population of Yavapai County increased rapidly in the last thirty-eight years—from 31,000 inhabitants in 1962 to 62,300 in 1978 to 107,714 in 1990 to 167,517 in 2000. The population increase of 56 percent from 1990 to 2000 made Yavapai the second fastest growing county in Arizona. The trend continues between 2000 and 2010 with the population in Yavapai County increasing by 26 percent (to 211,033) compared to the overall increase in population of 24.6 percent in the State of Arizona from 2000 to 2010. Coconino County's population increased 15.6 percent (<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states>) between 2000 and 2010 to 134,421. The provision of adequate, affordable infrastructure as well as sufficient water supplies is a growing concern for planners, residents, and land managers throughout the assessment area.

Included in the 2007–2012 Forest Service Strategic Plan is a goal to conserve open space. The Coconino National Forest has been involved with various local community planning efforts that have acknowledged open space needs including the Coconino County Comprehensive Plan,

Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan, and the Open Space and Greenways Plan. The Greater Flagstaff Area Open Spaces and Greenway Plan defines goals for open space, which is acknowledged as contributing significantly to the quality of life in the greater Flagstaff landscape. This plan set some direction as to where and how much of the existing open space will continue into the future with an increasing population and demand for development. The Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan and the Coconino County Comprehensive Plan talk about areas that are appropriate for certain kinds of development and areas that should be kept as open space. These plans generally make an effort to provide for a non-residential buffer in new developments adjacent to Coconino National Forest lands. Coconino County has taken action to address concerns about open space and in 2010 acquired 2,200 acres around Rogers Lake under the Arizona Preserve Initiative.

Yavapai County's General Plan also includes references to open space values and that the public land, including the Coconino National Forest, within the county boundaries provide some of these values. Yavapai County has developed new ordinances (Open Space and Sustainable Development Option – Section 441 and the Cluster and Open Space Option – Section 442) to promote flexibility in land development to promote protection of important private open space and sensitive resources. This includes areas adjacent to National Forest lands. The Verde Valley Regional Land Use Plan identified National Forest as valuable community open space and a high level of concern about potential land adjustment activities that would promote additional growth and development. This plan also recommended that the communities develop an open space plan with the Forest Service (Prescott and Coconino NF) and adopt a strategy for land exchanges including “no net loss”, respect water use limitations and provide criteria for urban forest interface.

Incorporated communities within the Coconino National Forest boundaries include the City of Flagstaff, City of Sedona, City of Cottonwood, Town of Clarkdale and the Town of Camp Verde. All community plans now address open space as required under state law. Most include large acreages of National Forest within their incorporated boundaries and identify these lands for their open space values to the communities.

The Forest Service may acquire lands through exchange, purchase, donation, or condemnation. Land exchange and land purchase have been, and will continue to be, the means by which the Coconino National Forest acquires key wildland resources and open space areas. It should be noted that land exchange processes include the conveyance of federal land for equal valued non-federal land. They are invariably controversial, complex because of the concern about conveyance of federal lands and, unless the case processing is funded by the proponents, are not considered a high priority for Forest funding. Most of the federal lands conveyed to private ownership through an exchange process are within or adjacent to existing communities. Conversely, the majority of land acquired by the Forest Service is located in more remote portions of the Forest. Generally, on a per-acre basis, lands near existing communities and related infrastructure have higher land values than those acres in more remote acreages. Because of this difference in value, land exchange projects on the Coconino National Forest during the period of 1987 through 2006 resulted in a net acreage gain to the Forest of 5,266 acres. Most of these exchanges involved multiple National Forests in Arizona. The Coconino gained 8,528 acres and 3,262 acres went into private ownership. Land purchases on the Forest during an eight-year period between 1998 through 2005 acquired 7,139 acres valued at approximately \$43,661,000, which came from a variety of funding sources but primarily from the national Land and Water Conservation Fund. Through a variety of land exchanges and other land adjustment processes, the

Coconino NF has increased in net acreage by approximately 14,500 acres between 1987 and 2010. Landownership planning in the 1987 Plan included criteria to determine if a parcel of land is appropriate for forest acquisition. In addition, the 1987 Plan identified criteria for lands that could be considered for exchange as well as 21,133 acres of base-for-exchange. Base-for-exchange is a term that identified National Forest Lands that meet Forest Plan direction for disposal into private or other ownership. However many base-for-exchange parcels were the focus of a lot of public concern but in reality did not get conveyed in greater numbers than other parcels that met the land adjustment criteria. All land exchanges go through environmental analysis and public involvement processes.

Only about 13 percent of the land in Coconino County is privately owned, limiting land available for development. Nine large ranch holdings account for approximately 71 percent of the private land, which has limited the available land base for development even further. Population growth has surpassed predictions written into the county plans. As a result, within Coconino County there is support for both private and public agency land exchanges and other types of land-ownership adjustments with the Forest Service, which result in additional private land to accommodate future development. Some individuals and groups have opposed land exchanges, particularly in specific areas of the Forest. The general public sentiment in the areas of Sedona and the Village of Oak Creek is opposition to land exchanges near these communities. Amendment 12 to the current Forest Plan outlined restrictive land exchange direction Sedona and Village of Oak Creek areas. The Walnut Canyon Management Area near Flagstaff is another location where there has been opposition to land exchange. This restrictive sentiment was documented as a standard in Amendment 17 to the current Forest Plan. There is a segment of the public who want to carry the Sedona and Walnut Canyon direction forward into the Forest Plan Revision. The opposition to exchange is specific to land disposal, as acquisition of lands in these respective areas by exchange or purchase remains acceptable. Recent trends, over the past five years, have included a significant increase in requests by other governmental entities to acquire Forest land by purchase under the authority of specific sale or grants such as the National Forest Townsite Act or the Education Land Grant Act. Another trend has been for land exchange proponents to lobby for and obtain special legislation for their exchange in an attempt to circumvent portions of the administrative process and/or to get their proposal priority through Congressional mandate.

The night sky is a major contribution to northern Arizona's economy. Flagstaff has been designated the world's first International Dark Sky City by the International Dark Sky Association. The natural surroundings of the Coconino NF contribute to the preservation of dark skies. Four observatories exist on the Coconino NF and adjacent lands, including the new Discovery Channel telescope. Increased light pollution is a consequence of population growth and development in the dark sky areas surrounding the observatories. If the predicted trends of increased development occur in the area, there could be a loss of dark skies within communities, depending on the type and enforcement of local government lighting ordinances. At the same time there is an increasing demand for more developed and undeveloped night sky viewing opportunities on the Coconino NF, including expansion of Lowell Observatory's facilities at Anderson Mesa.

There is approximately 39,900 acres of State of Arizona land within the Coconino National Forest. While there are smaller acreages of five state parks (Slide Rock, Red Rock, Fort Verde, Riordon Mansion and Dead Horse Ranch State Parks within the forest boundary, the majority of state lands are Arizona State Trust lands. State Trust lands have the potential to be leased for uses or auctioned for development purposes. Current economic trends have resulted in fewer auctions,

with most of the activity being in the Phoenix metropolitan area and not in rural Arizona. State Trust lands within the Coconino NF boundary are mostly used for grazing and other lease uses. State lands in other areas of the state have been recently leased for wind energy turbines. State Trust lands near Flagstaff are in a checkerboard ownership pattern with NF lands. Any activities on State Trust Lands including timber sales, grazing activities and especially sale and development result in additional access routes and potential utility development on the adjacent NF lands as well as fragmentation of habitats. Large blocks of State land near Cottonwood have long term potential for substantial residential population growth and potential increased recreation activities, encroachments, and infrastructure needs on adjacent NF lands. Interspersed State land also has the potential to restrict access for management activities such as timber or fuels projects or restricting public access depending on reciprocal right of way agreements.

There are four National Monuments within the Coconino NF boundaries. All have influenced NF management in some form. Sunset Crater and Walnut Canyon National Monuments (NMs) manage facilities and roads on the forest and are considering expansion or acquisition of additional lands into their management. Walnut Canyon took over management of some NF lands in the early 1990's and a current study is under way to evaluate further additions to the monument. Montezuma Castle NM has acquired land through a legislated land exchange process and continues to encourage the forest to acquire additional lands around their boundaries as well as protect adjacent NF lands. Tuzigoot NM has recently acquired private land adjacent to NF land and is developing a management plan for these wetlands. Wupatki NM is adjacent to the forest boundary.

### **Special-Use Permits**

Special use authorizations on the Coconino National Forest continue to be an important and demanding program as a result of population growth. Overall, the trend is an increasing demand for all permitted activities. As Forest uses, development of lands within and around the Forest, and the need to cross the Forest all increase, the need for special use permits will also increase. The term or authorized use period of a special-use permit is variable depending primarily on the type of use. Most of the land permits and facility-related recreation use permits are issued for multiple years. . The forest, as of 2007, has total of 580 long-term permits of which 194 are focused on recreation and the remaining 386 are lands/non-recreation permits. All of these permits are issued for more than one year. These numbers do not include short-term or special-product permits issued for one year or less, such as filming or group events. Annual or shorter-term recreation and lands permits have ranged from 100 to 130 per year over the past few years. Temporary lands/non-recreation permits are primarily commercial photography or filming. There were 456 active lands permits of record in 2011. There were 433 active lands permit in May 2013. There are additional permits in progress and temporary permits that are in various stages of action throughout a year. Exhibit B contains a list of lands permits by use type as of June 2011. While research is not often considered to be a major use of federal lands, the Coconino National Forest issues a number of special-use permits for research purposes. Research on flora, fauna, water quality, seismic activity, weather, and wildland fire effects is conducted by universities, private institutions, and other federal, state, and local agencies. Due to the volume of requests for research permits, the Coconino National Forest has worked with Northern Arizona University (NAU) to develop a master special use permit process, to review research proposals, keep a database of applications and research projects and coordinate the location of the activities. Although this master permit expired in December 2012, coordination with NAU is continuing.



Forests also commonly allow communities, industry, and other entities to use public lands for infrastructure, including power lines, rights of way, telecommunications, and the like. Special-use permits for developments such as cell towers have increased over the past twenty years. With the changes in technology, the trend will be an increased need and demand for more of these types of developments and the services they provide. The increased demand for energy has generated increased emphasis on the management of utility corridors to provide additional service and to expand or create new corridors. Renewable energy resources such as wind and solar are resulting in new corridors being needed beyond the connections between existing traditional energy generator locations. The Forest has been increasingly involved in activities to accomplish this objective. It is expected that this trend will continue. There are social and aesthetic concerns related to how these types of uses are designed and built on public lands.

The City of Flagstaff and Verde Valley incorporated communities, and Coconino and Yavapai counties are increasing in population, causing increasing water demand. Increased domestic water demand in Flagstaff will necessitate additional well drilling and procurement of additional water supply. Forest management of the municipal watershed in the Inner Basin, and the Lake Mary watershed, a source of additional water for the City of Flagstaff, affects domestic water quality and supply. The State of Arizona administers surface water rights and grants permission to drill wells. The Forest Service has limited authority to limit well drilling activities except when that actual well is located on National Forest land. Requests for other water related facilities, such as pipelines and water tanks, on National Forest continues as development and population increases occur.

The Coconino NF and its landscapes create a strong sense of place. People have said that the Forest, its resources, open space, recreational opportunities, and quality of life, make this part of Arizona special. The relationships between the Coconino NF and associated communities, agencies and groups are important and vital to planning, getting things done, and problem solving at local and regional scales. The Coconino NF works closely with other federal agencies as well as city, county and state governments, research entities, and various groups.

## **Supplemental Environmental Consequences and Cumulative Effects**

The land management plan provides a programmatic framework that guides site-specific actions but does not authorize, fund, or carryout any project or activity. Because the land management plan does not authorize or mandate any site-specific projects or activities (including ground-disturbing actions), there can be no direct effects. However, there may be implications, or long-term environmental consequences, of managing the forests under this programmatic framework.

### **Supplemental Consequences common to all alternatives**

Consequences are described in the DEIS. The following is information that is supplemental to the consequences for all alternatives described in the DEIS.

#### **Land ownership, boundary management, land adjustment and right of way –**

Amendment 12 and 17 standards concerning land exchanges in the Sedona and Walnut Canyon areas have been carried forward with updates for parcels that have already been conveyed. Procedures for processing cases and public participation is determined by set policies, rules and

regulations and would not differ between alternatives. Working with interested parties and local governments early in the process may result in better understanding of the trade-offs and benefits each project and therefore build support of land exchange projects. Early involvement and discussion may result in changes to the land exchange proposal or a proponent's commitment to address concerns through mitigation measures or development agreements. The improved communication may also result in successful completion of land exchange projects and acquisition of key resource properties identified in the land ownership guidelines.

Land adjustment cases because of their complexity will be less frequent. Non-federal lands are being developed instead of acquired through land adjustment programs. Expanding communities will continue to request federal land to provide for their needs. Conveyance of federal land to meet those needs would reduce any net gain of acreage from other land acquisition projects. Land adjustment projects (i.e., purchases, land exchange,) that result in protection of key resources or provide for public needs and have strong public support are those most likely to be completed under any forest plan alternative.

Coordination efforts with other government entities were identified for the Sedona area to address local concerns about land exchanges. These efforts are necessary to successfully complete land adjustment cases and are key to acquiring key parcels and resources.

### **Special uses –**

Procedures for the review and response times for special use applications and requests are now set by policy and regulation. All alternatives would follow these procedures even though the wording in the 1987 Plan may contradict somewhat with current regulations. Combining uses in existing corridors results in keeping impacts to places where they exist already and to consolidate impacts of new uses on scenery, recreation experience and wildlife habitat over potentially smaller areas of the forest. This direction shows potential land use applicants locations where new uses may be more appropriate than creating new facilities in areas that do not currently have impacts. Uses should primarily remain in places that already have impacts thus preserving undeveloped settings and scenic resources as well as reducing impacts to other resources such as soils, watershed and wildlife habitat in remaining areas of the forest.

## **Alternative A**

### **Supplemental Environmental Consequences -**

Environmental consequences for Alternative A are described in the DEIS. The following information is supplemental to those consequences.

#### ***Land ownership, boundary management, land adjustment and right of way –***

- The current plan includes 8 ownership categories for land acquisition, each with separate detailed criteria. These detailed criteria are helpful for evaluating land adjustment cases and providing information to potential proponents about how land adjustment proposals may be considered, however they are too detailed for the programmatic style of new forest plans. These criteria may result in discouraging cases where proponents may not be aware of resource values on their property and so they do not approach the agency on a potential land adjustment project. This could result in lost opportunities to acquire properties with key resource values. Important resource values may be lost because the list of high priority

properties is not updated regularly instead of working directly with a proponent on a potential land adjustment project and identifying key parcels at the time of interest.

- The current plan limits other resource activities on base in exchange lands (such as Timber Stand Improvement TSI and range betterment) that is inconsistent with long term management for wildland urban interface and current community wildfire plans. The majority of identified base in exchange land is located adjacent to non –federal land where resource management activities need to occur under other resource direction (i.e. Wildland Urban Interface and fuels treatments.) This direction does not consider the need for fuel reduction or other infrastructure needs over the long term of the plan when base in exchange areas are not in an active or imminent land exchange and may never ultimately be exchanged. Continued limitations could leave larger acreages of NF untreated and not meeting desired resource conditions.
- Open space values are not addressed, although the classification criteria identify important resources for acquisition or retention. The plan allows for conveyance of lands adjacent to existing communities and for community expansion needs meeting the criteria. These criteria resulted in conveyance of lands that were perceived by some as valuable community open space. Public concern resulted in the specific direction advance public involvement direction in the Sedona area on land exchange proposals as well as the land exchange restrictions in Sedona and Walnut Canyon. There continues to be public concern about land exchange possibilities adjacent to communities and community desires to have NF lands maintained as their community open space.
- The current plan addresses boundary management and timelines to address unauthorized occupancy and resolution of these issues. Reduced budgets in lands have resulted in less priority on boundary posting and resolution of difficult trespass issues and an increased backlog of cases. Only those cases that can be resolved through immediate action are worked on. The forest has not met the intention of this direction and therefore more cases are occurring and impacts to forest resources adjacent to private lands are occurring. The longer an encroachment is in place the more difficult it is to resolve and a backlog continues to increase as development occurs adjacent to public lands.

Overall the 1987 forest plan focused attention and local concerns on base in exchange lands for conveyance but many land adjustment cases used the criteria to allow lands to be exchanged instead of identified base in exchange. Those criteria allow for the flexibility to deal with changing situations on adjacent non-federal and local government needs in locations that are not easily anticipated for 10-15 years in the future. Land exchanges will to continue to be difficult and controversial and will need the support of communities to be successful. They will likely be smaller and more focused in order to achieve that public support. Land adjustment cases under the criteria would meet forest plan goals for improved forest and resource management. This direction continues to provide for acquisition of key resources through land adjustments, however the complexity and controversy of land adjustment projects will likely limit those projects to the highest priority ones with proponents who are able to afford to take the time and provide financial resources in order to complete cases. Fewer lands would be expected to be acquired under this scenario and possibly inholdings of private land that do not have highly valued resources will get developed by the private landowner instead of acquired. This could cause resource impacts in surrounding National Forest lands to support the private land development (i.e., increased and changes in recreation use and experience, new utility corridors and improved road access.) Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) is used to purchase key non-federal lands. Acquisition

of lands using these funds would continue based on funds availability, national prioritization of acquisition and political support for specific acquisitions. These funds are typically used to acquire key resources such as lands that provide for recreation needs, are in congressionally designated areas and include threatened and endangered species habitat. Acquisitions under this program are limited and would continue to include only the most desirable properties whether this criteria is stated in the forest plan or not.

The forest has not been meeting objectives for boundary line. Encroachments continue to occur and long term encroachments are not resolved. Less boundary line has been posted and maintained and this increases the potential for new encroachments as adjacent non-federal land is developed. Not resolving existing and especially long term encroachments result in the appearance of National Forest being privately owned and promotes additional encroachment further into National Forest lands. Encroachments can adversely impact cultural resources, wildlife habitat and soils and water resources.

#### ***Special uses -***

- Forest plan amendments are required to allow any new communication site or change the type of use on an existing site even if there were no resource specific concerns in an area. While this was intended to minimize new sites and limit impacts to scenery on mountaintops, it does not address the continuing demand for telecommunications and expansion of those services, particularly cellular telephone services and the changes in technology that could mitigate resource concerns with different locations and scale of equipment.
- Only allowing one access route into private land limits impacts to resources on the surrounding National Forest land to one spot while still providing the needed access to private land. Scenery values and wildlife habitat are better protected around the remaining parcel by only allowing a single vehicle access point.
- There are existing closure orders and limitations associated with sensitive and threatened and endangered species that restrict special use permit activities, such as in Anderson Mesa with vehicle restrictions. Forest Orders allow for access into closure areas with an appropriate permit and special use permit holders could be allowed into closure areas after appropriate consultation and approval. The current forest plan does not limit administrative or permitted access. There are potential disturbances to wildlife species and habitat as a result of access and activities associated with special use permits in these areas during public closures.
- The specific direction in the 1987 Plan on communication sites and energy corridors unnecessarily restrict these facilities and are not consistent with current National Energy Policy or the Telecommunication Act of 1996 that direct facilitation of these services. These restrictions were intended to preserve long term timber production that may be impacted by larger acreage special uses like utility corridors and communication facilities. Scenery and recreation values were protected as a result of these restrictions.

## **Alternative B.**

### **Supplemental Environmental Consequences**

Environmental consequences for Alternative B are described in the DEIS. The following information is supplemental to those consequences.

***Land ownership, boundary management, land adjustment and right of way-***

- Alternative B is focused on acquisition of specific resources but does not address the more indirect effects of development of those inholdings or other private lands that do not have key resource values. Development of some private properties result in effects to surrounding NFS lands, such as the need for improved road access and infrastructure which could impact scenery, recreation experience and general wildlife habitat values.
- Lack of program direction in the plan related to boundary survey and encroachments may dilute any emphasis to deal with encroachment issues resulting in continued resource impacts on National Forest system lands from unauthorized uses. Existing budget constraints already limit the ability to resolve complicated and controversial encroachments, such as the Mountaineer project with many homes encroaching as a result of survey errors. Individual case processing is expensive and all parties may not be willing or able to afford to resolve the cases and therefore results in continued trespass issues. Long term trespass/encroachments that extend along several ownerships (along subdivisions) typically result in some owners expanding encroachments or new encroachment even further into National Forest with the resulting impacts and loss of National Forest character and resources.
- Lands that are conveyed from federal ownership are typically adjacent to existing development, do not have unique or important natural resources values and would have a lesser impact to overall forest resources if developed than those lands that would be acquired into National Forest ownership. This is similar to effects of Alternative A.

***Special uses –***

The environmental consequences of Alternative B are described in the DEIS.

**Alternative C.**

**Supplemental Environmental Consequences**

Environmental consequences for Alternative C are described in the DEIS. The following information is supplemental to those consequences.

***Land ownership, boundary management, land adjustment and right of way –***

The environmental consequences of Alternative C are described in the DEIS.

***Special uses -***

Supplemental consequences for Recommended Wilderness Areas for Alternative C are described below:

Wildlife habitat management areas (WHMAs) and the management of these areas should not result in impacts to existing permitted activities and do not preclude consideration of new permitted activities. Consideration of mitigation measures to minimize impacts to wildlife species and their habitat would be considered as part of specific permit actions or as part of consideration of new permits or permitted activities.

The 13 proposed wilderness areas would limit any new lands special use permits and would restrict motorized and mechanized activities associated with existing authorized uses on the edges of these areas. The following information is supplemental to environmental consequences of recommended wilderness areas stated in the DEIS.

When vegetation management of existing infrastructure is difficult and requires use of cross cut saws and limited access, these restrictions result in conflicts with the National Energy Policy which directs the agency to facilitate reliable power resources which can be threatened by hazardous vegetation. Power utilities would have increased costs due to increased time required by limits on access and use of non-motorized equipment. Highway corridors in areas of growing populations are typically expanded within the existing corridors. The landownership pattern of the Coconino National Forest, including existing Wilderness areas already limits many new potential travel routes. Designating new Wilderness adjacent to existing corridors does not allow for expanding roads to meet higher traffic numbers and address safety, or to construct facilities such as wildlife crossings, improved drainages structures or slope stabilization structures that may become necessary in the future. This type of infrastructure typically benefits forest resources by controlling access and improving facilities (watershed) that were constructed some time ago and may need repair or replacement for long term stability and public safety.

## **Alternative D.**

### **Supplemental Environmental Consequences**

#### ***Land ownership, boundary management, land adjustment and right of way –***

Environmental consequences for Alternative D are described in the DEIS.

#### ***Special uses -***

The following is supplemental to environmental consequences described in the DEIS. Existing permitted facilities (WAPA line) would be maintained using vehicles and motorized equipment as approved through regular coordination and under current management of the area. This routine maintenance would result in noise and motorized uses in areas adjacent to the existing power line facilities for maintenance and repair of power line facilities and removal of hazardous vegetation using motorized tools. Expansion of the existing power line corridor in these areas could be considered. While expansion might impact the primitive experience in the immediate area, since the power line is already in place and close the edge of the existing Wilderness boundaries, the experience change would be more minor in scale since the existing Wilderness boundary already limits expansion of utility corridors beyond that point.

### **Supplemental Cumulative Effects Common to All Alternatives**

Cumulative effects are described in the DEIS. The following are supplemental cumulative effects in addition to effects stated in the DEIS.

#### ***Land ownership, boundary management, land adjustment and right of way –***

- The Nature Conservancy's interest in partnering with the forest on acquisition of Verde River properties and water rights may result in continued land acquisition cases depending on available L&WCF funding. The interest in protecting the Verde River may become higher as Northern Arizona University works on their Verde Valley Initiatives. Support for land acquisition or other forms of protection of the Verde River and its tributaries may result from this educational process.
- Additional expansion of Walnut Canyon NM is inconsistent with the standard that national forest jurisdiction will be maintained on all lands in the Walnut Canyon MA.
- Yavapai County's Ordinances: Open Space and Sustainable Development Option – Section 441 and the Cluster and Open Space Option – Section 442, are intended to buffer boundaries

to sensitive areas and could provide some protection of forest boundaries and reduce encroachments. Other communities in the Verde Valley are considering similar ordinances. This type of ordinance would only be helpful in communities that have large undeveloped parcels. While these ordinances do not apply to National Forest lands, they could result in reduced impacts to adjacent forest lands by creating buffers and reducing infrastructure needs.

- Coconino County's Plan zoning for outlying areas that includes 10 acre minimum lot sizes assists in reducing development density within the forest but still allows for widespread "ranchettes" and potential impacts to forest resources around these parcels.

#### ***Special uses -***

- Decreases in available water due to climate change predictions and increased water needs for communities, such as Flagstaff and their acquisition of the Red Gap Ranch, will likely result in the need for new authorizations for pipelines.
- While new proposed special use requests, such as new road or utility corridors, could be inconsistent with plan direction, locations and potential effects are speculative and therefore not considered in this cumulative effects analysis.

## **Adaptive Management**

All alternatives assume the use of adaptive management principles. Forest Service decisions are made as part of an ongoing process. The land management plan identifies a monitoring program. Monitoring the results of actions will provide a flow of information that may indicate the needs to change a course of action or the land management plan. Scientific findings and the needs of society may also indicate the need to adapt resource management to new information.

Special use authorizations are monitored by periodic inspections, inventories, and annual billings. Authorized energy corridor developments are monitored by periodic inspections, development of Vegetation Corridor Management Plans, and annual billing. Adjustments or permit amendments can be made to adapt the authorized uses to current conditions and technologies, provided changes are not ground-disturbing and are within the context of the original intent as approved by the line officer. Land ownership is monitored by surveying and posting boundary lines and inspecting the Coconino NFs property boundary for encroachments. Potential land adjustment cases and those lands that may be suitable for conveyance can change over time based on adjacent non-federal land development and impacts to wildland character and changes in resource sensitivity.

## References

- Arizona Corporation Commission. (2010). *Renewable Energy Standard and Tariff*. Retrieved on June 21, 2011 from <http://www.cc.state.az.us/divisions/utilities/electric/environmental.asp>
- Arizona State Land Department. (2010) *Annual Report 2009-2010*, Retrieved June 21, 2011 and again on May 6, 2013 with new website [http://www.azland.gov/report/report2010\\_full.pdf](http://www.azland.gov/report/report2010_full.pdf)
- City of Flagstaff & Coconino County. (2001). *Flagstaff Area Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan*. Flagstaff, AZ.
- Clean Line Energy Partners, Centennial West Clean Line. *Centennial West Project SF299* sections. Retrieved on June 21, 2011 from . <http://www.cleanlineenergy.com/> Houston, Texas
- Coconino County Development Department. (2003). *Coconino County Comprehensive Plan*, Flagstaff, Arizona. Coconino County. Retrieved on August 9, 2011 from <http://www.coconino.az.gov/comdev.aspx?id=142>
- Coconino County Interactive Mapping Web site. <http://gis-map.coconino.az.gov/ccgis/> Data retrieved on June 13-15, 2011.
- Code of Federal Regulations, Part 36, Section 251 Subpart B (July 2010), Retrieved August 9, 2011 from <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/cfr-table-search.html#page1>.
- Code of Federal Regulations, Part 36, Section 251 Subpart C (May 1, 2013), Retrieved May 3, 2013 from <http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/ECFR?SID=794a6d9ff2d833d2a33e46d1e26f623f&page=browse>
- Forest Service, U.S .Department of Agriculture. (2010). *Analysis of the Management Situation*. Flagstaff, AZ: Coconino National Forest.
- Forest Service, U.S .Department of Agriculture. (2011) *Automated Lands Program (ALP)/Land Status Records System (LSRS) Production Geodatabase* Retrieved through the Washington Office Lands team, data as of 6/9/2011.
- Forest Service, U.S .Department of Agriculture.(2010) *Southwestern Region Climate Change Trends in Forest Planning: A Guide for Addressing Climate Change in Forest Plan Revisions for Southwestern National Forests and National Grasslands*. Southwestern Region, Albuquerque, NM
- Forest Service, U.S .Department of Agriculture. (1987). *Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*. Flagstaff, AZ: Coconino National Forest.
- Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2011). *Coconino National Forest Draft Land Management Plan*. Flagstaff, AZ: Coconino National Forest.
- Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2011). *Draft Potential Wilderness Area Report*. Flagstaff, AZ: Coconino National Forest.
- Forest Service, US Department of Agriculture. (1987) *Land Areas Report*. Retrieved May 3, 2013 from <http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/index.html>



- Forest Service, US Department of Agriculture. (2010) *Land Areas Report*. Retrieved June 21, 2011 from <http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/LAR2010/lar2010index.html>
- Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2008). *Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment*. Flagstaff, AZ: Coconino National Forest.
- Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 2011 *IWEB Special Uses Database (SUDS)*. Coconino National Forest, query on 06/13/2011, Report Name Special Uses Final Rents SUFR010L, Queries on 06/08/2011, Report: Special Uses Application and Authorization Status SPUR 038L – Status: Issued, Pending Signature and Application Approved.
- National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. (2007). *Final Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan*. Flagstaff, AZ. Walnut Canyon National Monument.
- National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. (2002). *Final Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan*. Flagstaff, AZ: Sunset Crater National Monument.
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation. (2013). Various information on standards and regulatory authority. Retrieved on August 19, 2013 from <http://www.nerc.com/AboutNERC/Pages/default.aspx>
- Yavapai County. (2011) *Planning and Zoning Ordinance*. Retrieved on June 21, 2011 from <http://www.co.yavapai.az.us/Content.aspx?id=17160>
- Yavapai County. (2006). *The Verde Valley Regional Land Use Plan*. Prepared by Community Sciences Corporation & Verde Valley Technical Advisory Committee. Prescott, AZ: Yavapai County.
- Yavapai County. (2009). *Verde Valley Multimodal Transportation Study*. Prepared by Lima and Associates. Prescott, AZ, Yavapai County. Retrieved June 21, 2011 from <http://www.yavapai.us/publicworks/files/2012/05/VerdeValleyMultimodalTransportationStudy.pdf>
- Yavapai County Planning and Zoning Commission. (2003). *The Yavapai County General Plan 2003*. Prescott, AZ: Yavapai County.

## **Specialist Information**

Judith B. Adams, Lands Team Leader, Coconino National Forest.

Bachelor of Science, Forestry, Michigan Technological University,

25 years of experience with the Forest Service in Lands, Minerals and NEPA roles.

## **Exhibit A: Applicable Direction for 1987 and Proposed Forest Plan**

### **Alternative A is the “1987 Plan”**

#### **Lands Goals**

- Acquire lands that are needed for landownership consolidation and improved management efficiency through land exchange, purchase, or donation.
- Acquire the road and trail rights-of-way needed to administer the Forest and produce resource outputs.
- Resolve unauthorized occupancy and trespass.
- Administer the Small Tracts Act to best serve the public and benefit the resources.
- Administer special uses to best meet public needs.
- Minimize the number of electronic sites and utility corridors consistent with appropriate public services that can only be met on Forest lands.

#### **Special-Use Management (Nonrecreation)**

- Process special-use applications within 60 days or less of receipt. Processing can include referral back to the applicant to provide additional information relevant to the environmental analysis. In these cases a decision may not always be reached within 60 days, but an appropriate action will be taken.
- Special-use applications are processed and approved by priority. Top priority is for those that benefit the public interest, the National Treasury, or the National Forest. Require applicants to do the appropriate part, or all of the scoping, data collection, analysis, and documentation of analysis as needed for the NEPA process.
- Urban expansion needs are evaluated and appropriate action taken to meet community needs on public lands where environmentally acceptable and logical to do so.
- Government agencies with permanent or long-term, high-investment use of Forest land will generally be required to acquire the land for such uses as landfills, airports, and sewage facilities. Exceptions will be made only when it is clearly in the overriding public interest.
- Landfills are generally not permitted on the Forest. However, when exceptions are made, they are operated to use the land as efficiently as possible by maximizing the depth of the pit, compaction of the trash, and/or otherwise using methods to minimize the surface area required.
- Evaluate requests for transmission corridors based on public need, economics, and environmental impacts of the alternatives. Use existing corridors to capacity with compatible utilities where additions are environmentally and visually acceptable before evaluating new routes. Overbuilding and underbuilding are considered for additions.
- New corridors will avoid wildernesses, RNA's, geological and botanical areas, Elden Environmental Study Area, and the ponderosa pine and mixed conifer vegetation types. New corridors will be evaluated for their potential impacts on T&E habitats
- New corridors are managed to maintain current resource protection and outputs to the degree possible.
- Power lines and towers are built (construction or reconstruction) to specifications compatible with raptor use.

- Inspect special-use authorizations for compliance when authorizations are reissued. Inspect electronic sites annually. Other authorizations are inspected through a documented "self-inspection" system implemented by the Ranger or Forest Supervisor whenever an acceptable inspection program can be implemented in this way. If a "self-inspection" system cannot or should not be implemented, then inspections will be made on a priority basis or, if not critical, on an opportunity basis.
- New proposals for electronic sites are evaluated on a case-by-case basis for compatibility with other uses and are limited to the existing developed sites (see Forest Electronic Sites Inventory, Appendix C). Nontraditional uses are evaluated and, where appropriate, approved to consolidate users at existing sites, or if necessary, at new sites selected to reduce resource impacts. They are identified and documented through the NEPA process.
- Consider use of fire lookouts for electronic sites if certain criteria are met. These include but are not limited to:
  - Applicable Visual Quality Objectives will be met;
  - Plowing of snow for access during winter months would be performed by the permittee(s), or access by over-the-snow equipment would be required;
  - Radiation levels at the lookout tower must not exceed Federal standards;
  - The integrity of the tower must not be compromised if antennas are placed on it;
  - No antennas will be allowed to obscure the lookout's line-of-sight for detection.
- Proposals for increased development by Lowell Observatory on the Anderson Mesa site use the NEPA process and have a site development plan. Construction/reconstruction of FR128 considers observatory needs.
- Emphasize coordination of research projects from entities, such as universities, that want authorizations. Ensure protection of resource values and eliminate duplication of projects.
- There is a charge for new authorizations whenever appropriate. Convert free-use to charge authorizations when fees are justified. Otherwise, fees are reviewed in accordance with schedules in FSM and FSH.
- Authorizations are terminated or suspended when authorization conditions are not met and the holder refuses to comply.
- Evaluate all existing special uses during the first decade to determine whether continued use is justified. If not justified, take actions to terminate on a Forest priority basis.
- Appropriate multiple special-use authorizations to a single person, organization, or agency are consolidated into master authorizations in the first decade.
- In evaluating proposed apiary permit sites, minimize conflicts between the bears and the bees. Individual sites should be at least 3 miles apart to ensure available forage. Locate hives far enough from livestock/wildlife waters, developed recreation sites, and known concentrated dispersed recreation sites to avoid conflict caused by excessive concentrations of bees.

### **Right-of-Way Grants for Roads and Trails**

- Process special-use applications for roads and trails within 60 days or less of receipt. Processing can include referral back to the applicant to provide additional information relevant to the environmental analysis. In these cases a decision may not always be reached within 60 days, but an appropriate action will be taken.
- Right-of-way grants are processed by priority, first priority being the public interest and National Forest needs. Generally, only one access road is approved to a parcel of private property whether there are one or many owners. Where there are multiple landowners to be

served by the access, issue right-of-way to either local government, an improvement district, or a homeowners association with authority to collect funds for road maintenance. In evaluating requests for access to private land across National Forest fully use the NEPA process including evaluation of all reasonable alternatives (from an engineering and environmental standpoint) regardless of the applicant's stated preference, including those across non-National Forest land.

- Grant rights-of-way and authorization for road construction only on locations and to plans and specifications that effectively protect National Forest, and other affected ownerships, lands and resources. Counties are encouraged to apply for easements on roads that they maintain.
- Special-use authorizations to the State for public highways are converted to easements on a priority basis. Counties and cities are issued easements for access to new subdivisions.
- Easements for new or reconstructed State or County roads are applied for immediately upon completion of construction, at which time temporary special use authorizations terminate

### **Land Status Maintenance**

- Maintain current Forest land status records.

### **Property Boundary Location**

- Survey and post National Forest landline in conformance with national standards (approximately 26 miles per year). Priorities are:
  - Where proposed projects are adjacent to private land;
  - Areas of known and potential trespass;
  - Backlog, including wilderness boundaries.
- Request BLM resurveys where development is occurring or complex ownership patterns.
- On sites adjoining private land and in Oak Creek Canyon, recreation and cultural resource sites are surveyed and posted as the lands are surveyed.
- Use cooperative agreements with adjacent private landowners to share costs of survey whenever possible and desirable.

### **Enforcement**

- Document known unauthorized occupancies as they are discovered.
- Use Small Tracts Act where appropriate to resolve encroachments.
- Decide how to handle new cases as discovered. Assign priorities, as follows:
  - (1) cases where permanent impairment of resources is occurring or is imminent;
  - (2) cases needed to support other resource management activities; or
  - (3) cases that can be easily resolved.
  - In the first decade resolve at least one-third of the documented existing unauthorized occupancies at the time of Plan approval
- Enforce provisions of 36 CFR (Part 261) and Title 18 USC (prohibitions).

### **Landownership Planning/Land Classification**

The Forest has 8 ownership categories for potential land acquisition. The Land Exchange Program operates under several authorities and can be employed to acquire lands that meet the

acquisition criteria. The following criteria are applied to a specific parcel of property to determine if lands are appropriate for acquisition.

*Wilderness and Other Administratively Designated Areas* -- These include wilderness, undeveloped lands contiguous to wildernesses, geological, archaeological, historical, and botanical areas, Experimental Forests, research natural areas, and administrative sites. Criteria are:

- Acquire private lands within administratively designated areas.
- Acquire private lands with development potential adjacent to designated areas.
- Acquire private lands to achieve ownership patterns to meet management objectives consistent with an area's designation, the applicable standards and guidelines, and the Forest Plan implementation schedule.

*Communities* -- There are lands adjacent to or within the communities such as Flagstaff, Sedona, Cottonwood, and Camp Verde. Criteria are:

- Non-National Forest lands in and adjacent to the communities will generally not be acquired.
- National Forest lands identified as needed and suitable for community expansion will not be committed to uses incompatible with prospective community needs.

*Recreation Use and Development Areas* -- These are lands within existing or potential recreation sites or locations of concentrated public use. Criteria are:

- Acquire private lands to achieve a landownership pattern that adequately provides for present and foreseeable public needs, such as recreation development, landscape protection, pollution prevention, access to water and public properties, and open space.
- Acquire private lands or the control of unique or outstanding natural features or significant waters.

*Municipal Watersheds* -- These are designated area areas where communities obtain municipal water supplies by special authorization, such as Woody Well Field, Peaks Inner Basin, and Lake Mary Well Field. Criteria are:

- Cooperate with municipalities and water companies to achieve an ownership pattern necessary to protect and improve the watershed.
- Acquire non-public lands within a watershed to improve or correct management activities incompatible with maintenance of watershed condition and water quality. \

*State and Federal Lands Not Administered by the Forest* -- These are State lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department, State Parks, Game and Fish Department, or National Guard, and National Monuments administered by the Park Service. Criteria are:

- Favor landownership adjustments with Agencies where consolidation of ownership provides for more cost efficient management and enhances public use.

*Wildlands with Large Non-Forest Ownerships* -- These are Forest lands in checkerboard patterns or otherwise intermingled with large private landowners. Criteria are:

- Acquire into Forest ownership to achieve cost efficient management of Forest lands and to maintain them as Forest type lands.

- Review acquisition and base-in-exchange plans when private land uses change from wildland and undeveloped uses towards more intensive uses.
- Pursue acquisition where special resource needs such as key wildlife habitat or key public recreation sites are identified.
- Acquire threatened and endangered species habitat if adjacent Forest lands do not provide adequate habitat.
- Acquire riparian habitat, where adjacent riparian areas are in Forest ownership.

*Wildlands with Small Non-Forest Ownership* -- These areas where ownership patterns vary from occasional scattered private holdings to small privately held tracts. Criteria are:

- Acquire where necessary to correct or discourage land uses not compatible with adjacent Forest uses.
- Acquire where ownership consolidation substantially improves management, is cost efficient, and enhances public use.
- Special consideration is given to cooperators, such as range permittees, City, County, and State, where acquisition would not be in the best interest of continuing their existing operations.
- Acquire where special resource needs such as key wildlife habitat or key public recreation sites are identified.
- Acquire threatened and endangered species habitat if adjacent Forest lands do not provide adequate habitat.
- Acquire riparian habitat, where adjacent riparian areas are in Forest ownership.

Lands offered by the United States in a land exchange are tentatively classified as base-in-exchange. Currently, the Forest has 21,133 acres classified as base-in-exchange. Because local and physical conditions may change during the life of this plan, other lands may be considered for exchange. They will generally meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Lands needed to meet the needs of expanding communities;
- Isolated tracts or scattered parcels that cannot be efficiently managed;
- Lands that provide consolidation of the public lands;
- Lands that will improve management, benefit specific resources, or increase management efficiency;
- Lands that are necessary to meet overriding **local, regional, and national** public needs;
- Lands within the boundaries of incorporated communities or annexed thereto.

**Review base-in-exchange plans when private land uses change from wildland and undeveloped uses towards more intensive uses.**

Reclassification must include appropriate public involvement through the NEPA process. The lands classified should be in accordance with local jurisdiction plans and needs.

A parcel of land originally designated as base-for-exchange in the Forest Plan may be deleted from base when:

- The character of the designated parcel or land adjacent to it has changed from its original character.
- Local or State zoning affecting the parcel has changed, altering potential uses in such a way that they conflict with Forest management objectives and practices.

## **Land Exchange**

- Accept land exchange proposals on an opportunity basis. Process by priorities agreed to by Forest Supervisor and Regional Forester. Prohibit encumbrances, such as special-uses, or activities on base-in-exchange lands that will reduce the fair market value or reduce the disposal opportunities.
- No major investments such as TSI or range betterment projects will be planned on base-in-exchange lands.
- Land exchange proposals for the base-for-exchange lands between Cosnino and Velvet Valley Subdivisions will not be accepted for three years following approval of the Forest Plan, unless they are from a local government or other entity that proposes to manage the area as a community area, greenbelt, or for other recreation use according to the wishes of the local residents. If an agreement has not been entered into for such an exchange after three years, other exchange proposals will be considered.

## **Land Acquisition (L&WCFA)**

The land purchase program is authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (L&WCFA). The following lands are eligible for acquisition with L&WCFA funds:

- Congressionally designated areas;
- Threatened and endangered species habitat;
- Recreation acquisition composites and inholdings. The goals of the composite program are to acquire:
  - Lands needed for construction of public recreation facilities;
  - Lands needed for dispersed recreation and open space;
  - Protection of public recreation resources;
  - Prevention of private usurpation of public resources and facilities on nearby public land.

The following properties are also classified as eligible for acquisition with L&WCFA funds:

- Bull Pen Ranch properties on West Clear Creek -- 90 acres;
- Upper Beaver Creek properties on Wet Beaver Creek -- 300 acres;
- San Francisco Mountain properties including Hart Prairie, Viet Springs, and Dry Lake Hills--1,700 acres;
- Secret Mountain properties including those at the base of the Red Rock- Secret Mountain Wilderness in T.18N., R.4E.,--618 acres, and T.18N., R.5E.,--225 acres.

Lands eligible for acquisition with L&WCFA funds can also be acquired by exchange or donation. They will be acquired by these if the opportunity occurs and it is appropriate.

## **Rights-of-Way Acquisition**

Acquire rights-of-way to support other resource management activities with emphasis on the timber program.

## **Sedona Amendment 12:**

### **Community Goals**

1. Harmony exists between residents and visitors. Residents have a sense of safety and security concerning National Forest lands directly adjacent to residential development.



2. Land ownership patterns of private holdings and National Forest meet the needs of the community and achieve National Forest goals.
3. The community shares National Forest stewardship goals. Community members understand their stake in ecological health and collaborate in National Forest decisions that are mutually beneficial to the National Forest and the community.
4. The Forest Service provides leadership in planning efforts that involve National Forest/community interface issues and multiple-agency jurisdictions.

### **Objectives**

#### **1. Refer to Coconino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan pages 84-88 for additional land acquisition policy direction.**

2. Acquire priority private parcels from willing sellers, when possible, through methods other than land trades within the planning area
3. Cooperate with local governments to identify and maintain appropriate trail access on private lands through the private land development process.
4. Protect community values by reducing fire hazard and risk. Update the Fire Prevention Strategy and address the fire risk and hazard that exist in the urban interface.
5. Ensure that residents adjacent to National Forest lands understand the natural environment and are partners in managing the neighboring Forest lands for public use and resource protection.
6. Collaborate with local governments, agencies and residents to protect resources and address residents' concerns.
7. Work with land owners and local and regional governments to encourage private land uses that are compatible with National Forest goals for the Sedona/Oak Creek Ecosystem.
8. Collaborate with local and regional governments and transportation agencies to meet future local and regional transportation needs, including the design and location of roadway improvements and routes and alternative modes of transportation.
9. Collaborate with local and regional governments in regional planning efforts to achieve land use patterns and land development consistent with community and National Forest goals.
10. Work with local and regional governments and road agencies to develop transportation solutions that reduce traffic and vehicle impacts on National Forest lands. Consider solutions that:
  - restrict recreation site access to shuttle only;
  - provide land for park-and-ride solutions;
  - create incentives for the use of shuttles and other high-occupancy vehicles;
  - place limits and fees on parking; and
  - encourage alternative modes of transportation.

### **Standards**

1. Land exchanges that dispose of National Forest in the Sedona/Oak Creek Ecosystem will occur only if they result in acquisition of National Forest lands in the Sedona/Oak Creek Ecosystem.
2. Base-for-exchange lands are National Forest lands located at:
  - Brewer Road (approximately 21 acres, Neighborwoods MA),
  - Chapel of the Holy Cross (approximately 11 acres, Neighborwoods MA),
  - Slide Rock area (approximately 13 acres, Oak Creek MA),
  - Village of Oak Creek Golf Course (approximately 5 acres, Neighborwoods MA) and
  - The Dells (up to 800 acres, Gateway and Savannah MAs).
3. Land exchanges that dispose of National Forest land in The Dells area will occur only if they result in acquisition of high-priority private parcels elsewhere in the Sedona/Oak Creek Ecosystem. High priority private parcels total approximately 783 acres. (Refer to Map 2 – Base-for- Exchange/Priority Acquisition Lands) High-priority land acquisition parcels include:
  - Lincoln Canyon,
  - Woo Ranch,

- Hancock Ranch,
- Bradshaw Ranch,
- Tree Farm,
- Cockscomb and
- Tucker Property.

4. Secondary priority land acquisition parcels include: Johnston, Bill Gray Ranch, Windmill Ranch, Thompson, Deer Pass and Long Canyon (Seven Canyons).

5. To comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the appropriate level of environmental analysis and public involvement will be conducted for any land exchange or disposal.

### **Guidelines**

1. Consider the effects of potential land development on infrastructure (such as transportation and sewer); utilities (such as water and power); and adjacent National Forest, private lands and other public lands in all land exchange proposals.
2. Discourage new utility corridors on National Forest lands. When no other alternative exists, combine new utilities with existing utility corridors or road/trail corridors.
3. Encourage open space designations on private land between private development and National Forest lands as a buffer to minimize conflicts between residents and other National Forest users.
4. Encourage local governments to consider transportation and energy efficiency, recycling, water conservation and increased environmental sensitivity when working with local and regional governments and concessionaires on National Forest lands.
5. National Forest parcels less than or equal to 10 acres in size could be disposed of under the Small Tracts Act, Townsite Act or General Exchange Act to resolve encroachment issues or provide lands needed for public purposes.
6. Encourage local governments and private parties to use such methods as deed restrictions, development agreements, joint planning authority and master planning to mitigate effects from future land exchanges on the community and National Forest.
7. Encourage local governments or agencies, private landowners and/or other appropriate entities (e.g. Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Land, local land trust) to protect the resources and character of National Forest surrounding high priority private parcels through methods such as, conservation easements, land trust management, deed restrictions, or public acquisition.

## **Alternative B**

### **Desired Conditions for All Scenic Resources**

Structures required for serving public use of scenic and recreation resources include viewing platforms such as roads, parking areas, trails, trail heads, buildings, decks, observation points, etc. To be functional, these facilities are normally visible in immediate foregrounds and often create more contrast than will be acceptable in areas designed for high and moderate scenic integrity objectives. These structures are part of the expected image of the public being served; however allowable limits of contrasts do not exceed the structure's functionality. Travel route structures need to be clearly distinguishable for a distance commensurate with normal speeds or intended use of such routes. Structures exempted from meeting scenic integrity objectives in immediate foregrounds includes those associated with interstates, major State highways and regional travelways, except for segments that are designated scenic byways, and associated structures.

### **General Description for Land Adjustments**

Land adjustments are the real estate transactions on the Forest including sales, purchases, exchanges, conveyance, and rights-of-way. Land exchange and land purchase have been, and will continue to be, the means by which the Coconino NF acquires key wildland resources and open space areas.

### **Desired Conditions for Land Adjustments**

The Coconino NF has a mostly contiguous land base that provides for biologically diverse public lands with minimal impacts from adjacent land uses. Most of the Forest has a natural-appearing landscape that has not lost its wildland character. Open-space values, including those related to naturally appearing landscapes, wildlife habitat, riparian/wetland character, and recreational opportunities are retained.

#### *Rights of Way*

Easement rights of way help provide adequate access to the Forest. Appropriate trail access through private lands is identified and managed or acquired through the private land development process, in cooperation with local governments. Reasonable access is provided to private inholdings.

### **Guidelines for Land Adjustments**

Lands that the Forest considers for acquisition should have one or more of the following qualities:

- Contains habitat for threatened or endangered species and sensitive species
- Contributes to the continuity of wildlife habitat
- Contains or influences wetlands, riparian areas, or other water-related features
- Contains important cultural resources
- Provide needed access, protect public lands from fire or encroachment, or prevent damage to resources
- Contributes to areas of high or very high scenic integrity
- Improves the ability to manage a designated special area.

- Contains significant sites with cultural, scientific, or recreational values.

Lands that the Forest is willing to exchange or sell have one or more of the following qualities:

- Isolated from other NFS lands
- Without unique cultural or ecological resources
- Managed for a single commercial or other special use, for which it is being exchanged or sold
- Has lost its wildland characteristics
- Lands needed to meet the needs of communities and the public, such as land for a water treatment plant.

#### *Rights of Way*

When responding to requests for new access permits or easements, easements should be granted in reciprocity, if appropriate, to ensure administrative and public access to the Forest.

### **Management Approaches for Land Adjustments**

Consult with the local governments about land adjustment proposals the Forest plans to take forward into NEPA. Public input on land exchange begins at the time a site-specific land exchange is proposed.

If acquisition cannot occur, collaborate with private land owners and county governments in the land development process to protect unique resources such as scenery, adjacent Wilderness, archaeological values and threatened and endangered species habitat. Encourage local governments or agencies, private landowners and/or other appropriate entities (e.g. Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Land, Archeological Conservancy, local land trust) to protect the resources and character of National Forest through methods such as conservation easements, land trust management, deed restrictions, or public acquisition of adjacent, high priority parcels.

Work with land owners and local and regional governments to encourage private land uses that are compatible with the Forest's desired conditions. Provide input to the design requirement of new developments (especially when they are adjacent to the Forest), participate as a government liaison concerning open space issues, continue linking city and county trails to Forest Service trails, share public outreach and education tools, and share information about future plans.

Encourage open space designations on private land between private development and national forest lands as a buffer to minimize conflicts between residents and other Forest users. Review and participate in local government plans to encourage open space objectives that are consistent with national forest management direction and policies.

#### *Rights of Way*

Work with local and regional governments and road agencies to develop transportation solutions that reduce traffic and vehicle impacts on national forest lands.

## **Land Special Uses**

### **General Description for Land Special Uses**

Special uses permits authorize a large variety of activities on the national forest. Land special uses are not related to recreation and may include activities such as utility lines, road use, communication sites, research, and wind energy development. Utility and energy transmission corridors, along with communication sites, are generally long-term commitments of NFS lands. Increased demand is expected for additional utility lines, renewable energy sources, community infrastructure, private land access and local, state and federal public transportation systems to serve the growing populations of Arizona and the Southwest.

### **Desired Conditions for Land Special Uses**

Infrastructure on national forest lands associated with private land needs (e.g., utilities, waterlines, roads and bridges) meets scenic goals, particularly as viewed from the highways, concern level 1 travelways, and recreation sites. New utility construction and reconstruction of existing utility lines uses existing rights-of-ways to the extent practical to provide utility access and services to private land and communities. Utility lines, such as pipelines, power lines, fiber optic lines, and telephone lines are buried unless there are overriding environmental or technical concerns that would prevent burial. Vegetative clearing for utility and energy transmission corridors provide an aesthetic edge effect. The location of new, large linear infrastructure such as power lines has minimal effects to wildlife and minimizes habitat fragmentation.

Existing communication sites and utility corridors are used to their maximum capacity with compatible utilities where additions are environmentally and visually acceptable before considering new routes and sites. New corridors will avoid research natural areas, geological and botanical areas, and environmental study areas. New communication sites occur only when a broad public need is demonstrated. Power lines and towers are built (construction or reconstruction) to specifications compatible with raptor use.

Information about the screening process for special use permits is available and understandable to the public.

The Forest supports alternative energy production and facilitates its development while mitigating impacts to resources and public values. Alternative energy developments, such as wind energy, are designed to minimize impacts to other uses and resources, in particular wildlife and scenic integrity.

Research permitted on the national forest is focused on improving the scientific understanding of natural and social systems. Research projects conducted under special use permits: helps realize and understand the scientific potential of the abundant cultural and natural resources found on the Coconino National Forest

- are clearly related to the mission of the Forest Service
- do not interfere with recreation opportunities for the general public
- do not introduce new invasive exotic plants or animals
- do not negatively impact long-term vegetation structure and composition or vegetation management objectives for the vegetation type.

- provide needed data or other resources for future forest management
- are co-located with other research activities, when possible
- expand the knowledge of rare species on the Forest

### **Guidelines for Lands Special Uses**

Utility rights-of-ways should be located and maintained to conform with natural-appearing patterns of native vegetation to the extent possible.

New overhead utility lines and support towers should be located to minimize adverse environmental and scenic impacts and screened, where possible.

Structures, such as communication sites and utilities,, should be designed to reduce contrast with the desired landscape character in accordance with scenic integrity objectives.

Expansion of existing utility corridors with equipment of a comparable scale should be allowed before creating new sites or corridors.

Expansion of existing communications sites as allowed by existing or updated communication plans should be considered before creating new sites. The number of towers should be minimized by approving designs capable of co-locating multiple communication carriers/services. Where environmental or technical concerns prevent the burial of utility lines, scenic integrity objectives should be maintained to the extent feasible.

Aircraft activities related to commercial filming should be restricted to protect threatened, endangered, and sensitive species from noise disturbance.

Special use permits for diversion ditches across NFS lands should be maintained in a way that minimizes disturbance of vegetation and hydrological conditions.

Commercial filming at cultural sites should generally be prohibited.

### **Management Approaches for Land Special Uses**

Encourage early involvement of the Forest when developing proposals.

Work to ensure that all communication sites have a Communication Site Plan in place.

Look at Management Area-specific scenery desired conditions, when considering whether or not a permit would be consistent with the scenic integrity objectives. For instance, astronomical facilities in the Ponderosa Pine and Anderson Mesa LCZ's.

Coordinate with the research community to identify and manage long-term research locations with the intent of balancing research and management needs.

Prioritize research that addresses issues and concerns relevant to current and future management needs.

### **Standards for Walnut Canyon Management Area**

*Lands Special Uses*

No NEW paved roads or utility corridors occur except on the boundaries of the Walnut Canyon Management Area.

#### *Lands Adjustment*

In the Walnut Canyon Management Area, national forest jurisdiction will be maintained for all lands in the Walnut Canyon Management Area. No land exchanges will occur unless the purpose is to acquire land within this management area through exchange of national forest lands elsewhere.

### **Guidelines for Walnut Canyon Management Area**

#### *Lands Special Uses*

Research projects within rock shelters and archaeological sites caves should require a permit. Permits are issued on a case-by-case basis by the district ranger.

#### *Roads*

Road construction activities should be designed to maintain or improve of soil condition and watershed function.

### **Desired Conditions for Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area**

#### *Land Adjustments*

Priority parcels in the Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area<sup>1</sup> are acquired from willing sellers, through methods other than land exchanges, when possible.

Lands Special Uses Facilities that provide access to or occur near the cliffs remain visually subordinate to the cliffs and to the surrounding landscape. Views of the cliffs from the travel corridors are enhanced or maintained through various means such as: limiting the use of intervening areas for parking, camping and/or utilities, limiting motor vehicle traffic between access corridors and the cliffs, or acquisition of intervening private properties with emphasis on undeveloped parcels.

### **Standards for Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area**

#### *Land Adjustments*

Land exchanges that dispose of national forest land in the Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area will occur only if they result in acquisition of national forest lands in the Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area.

Land exchanges that dispose of national forest land in The Dells area will occur only if they result in acquisition of high-priority private parcels elsewhere in the Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area. High priority private parcels total approximately 95 acres (see map XX). High-priority land acquisition parcels include: Lincoln Canyon (25 acres) and Hancock Ranch (70.3) acres.

---

<sup>1</sup> Priority parcels are those listed in the standards and guidelines.

Base-for-exchange lands are national forest lands located at: Chapel of the Holy Cross area (approximately 11 acres, Sedona Neighborwoods Management Area), Slide Rock area (approximately 13 acres, Oak Creek Management Area), Village of Oak Creek Golf Course area (approximately 5 acres, Sedona Neighborwoods Management Area) and The Dells area (up to 300 acres, Sedona-Oak Creek and House Mountain-Lowlands Management Areas).

#### *Lands Special Uses*

Prohibit plant collection for commercial activities within the Sedona-Oak Creek Management Area outside of the House Mountain-Lowlands Management Area, except for the legitimate purposes of federally-recognized tribes.

### **Guidelines for Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area**

#### *Land Adjustments*

Priority parcels in the Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area<sup>2</sup> should be acquired from willing sellers, through methods other than land exchanges, when possible.

National Forest parcels less than or equal to 10 acres in size in the Sedona/Oak Creek Management Area could be disposed of under the Small Tracts Act, Townsite Act or General Exchange Act to resolve encroachment issues or provide lands needed for public purposes.

Base-for-exchange lands at the Chapel of the Holy Cross area is intended for church acquisition only; base-for-exchange at Village of Oak Creek Golf Course is intended for golf course acquisition.

Slide Rock base-for-exchange land should be available for acquisition by Slide Rock State Park to better facilitate management of the creek and the park.

#### *Lands Special Uses*

Commercial filming using aircraft should not be allowed in the Sedona-Oak Creek MA except within the House Mountain-Lowlands MA.

---

<sup>2</sup> Priority parcels are those listed in the standards and guidelines.



**Exhibit B**  
**Coconino NF Lands Special Use Permit Types**

<b>Permit type</b>	<b>Use code</b>	<b>Number of Permits</b>
Apiary	214	2
Fish hatchery	216	1
Fence	222	2
Non-commercial group	311	9
Cemetery	321	2
Church	322	1
Marker	331	1
Monument	332	3
Sign	333	2
Sewage transmission lines	343	5
Transfer station	345	3
Debris disposal area	345	1
Shelter	364	1
Mailbox	365	1
Parking lot	366	1
Site survey and testing	411	5
Resource survey	412	1
Research study	422	18
Weather station	423	6
Observatory	425	2
Education center	432	1
Nondisturbing use	442	17
Disturbing use, 1979 Act	443	7
Construction camp and residence	511	3
Warehouse and storage yard	521	2
Stockpile site	522	6
Still photography	551	3
Commercial filming	552	9

<b>Permit type</b>	<b>Use code</b>	<b>Number of Permits</b>
Mineral material site	562	2
Oil and gas pipeline	631	9
Oil and gas pipeline related facility	632	1
Powerline	643	14
Other utility improvement	644	4
Railroad right-of-way	731	1
Department of Transportation Easement	741	30
Forest Road and Trail Act easement	751	54
Federal Land Policy and Management Act easement	752	20
Federal Land Policy and Management Act permit	753	87
Amateur radio	801	2
Microwave common carrier	803	4
Microwave industrial	804	9
Private mobile radio service	806	7
Broadcast translator/Low power TV & FM	808	3
Amateur radio	810	5
Natural resource and environmental monitoring	814	2
Commercial Mobile	815	9
AM/FM	816	5
TV Broadcast	817	1
Facility Manager	818	20
Telephone	821	8
Telephone, REA Financed	822	1
Fiber Optical Line	823	6
Other Communication	831	1
Irrigation Ditch	911	5
Irrigation Ditch Greater than 12 inches	913	3
Water Transmission pipe > 12 inches	914	3

<b>Permit type</b>	<b>Use code</b>	<b>Number of Permits</b>
Water Transmission pipe less than 12 inches	915	24
Ditch Easement	916	23
Debris and siltation impoundment	921	3
Dam, reservoir	922	7
Water diversion, weir	923	2
Reservoir	924	1
Well, spring, windmill	931	8
Wildlife water supply	933	14
Water storage tank	935	4
Water quality monitoring station	942	4
Water treatment plant	951	1

**This data was queried using the Special Uses Database on June 29, 2011. It reflects permits that contain these use types. Some permits authorize multiple use types and so may be in more than one type. These numbers continue to change as permits are issued, expire or close.**