

Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Wilderness Evaluation Report


Blue Range Wilderness Presidential
Recommendation Exclusions

PW-03-01-069

November 2010

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Background..... | 2 |
| Capability Evaluation | 6 |
| Availability Evaluation | 8 |
| Need Evaluation | 10 |
| Effects of Recommendations | 13 |
| Appendix A: Wilderness Evaluation Process | 19 |
| Appendix B: Capability Evaluation and Ratings..... | 22 |
| Appendix C: Availability Evaluation and Ratings..... | 26 |
| Appendix D: Need Evaluation | 29 |



Disclaimer Statement

The USDA Forest Service uses the most current and complete data available. GIS data and product accuracy may vary. Using GIS products for purposes other than those for which they were intended may yield inaccurate or misleading results. The USDA Forest Service reserves the right to correct, update, modify, or replace GIS products without notification. This map is not a legal land line or ownership document. Public lands are subject to change and leasing, and may have access restrictions; check with local offices. Obtain permission before entering private land.
 Map created June 2009 by etreiman. Modified February and October 2010 by etreiman

Introduction

As part of the Forest Plan Revision process for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (ASNFs), the Forest Service has prepared this Wilderness Evaluation Report for the exclusions to the Blue Range Wilderness Presidential Recommendation.

Purpose

The Forest Service must evaluate all lands possessing wilderness characteristics for potential wilderness during plan revision. Completion of a potential wilderness inventory and evaluation is an essential step in the plan revision process. Wilderness is just one of many special area designations that the Forest Service considers during plan revision, but it is one of only three special area evaluations that are mandatory. If an area is recommended for wilderness designation, then the revised plan would contain desired conditions, objectives, guidelines, and/or standards that would protect its wilderness characteristics.

The Process

The wilderness evaluation process began with an inventory of potential wilderness, which includes areas of federal land over 5,000 contiguous acres and other areas that meet the criteria in FSH 1909.12, Chapter 70, Section 71, and then determined if those areas meet the definition of wilderness. Once a list of potential wilderness areas was created, each area was evaluated for capability, availability, and need. These evaluation factors are described in the introduction to each evaluation step and in Appendix A. This report summarizes the wilderness capability, availability, and need evaluations based on the best available information. This report also presents the potential effects of a wilderness or non-wilderness recommendation.

The ASNFs will use this report to determine whether or not to make a preliminary administrative recommendation for wilderness designation for any of the exclusions to the Blue Range Wilderness Presidential Recommendation. The Responsible Official's (Regional Forester) recommendation will be documented in the final revised Plan and the Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision. Public comments on this report will be accepted and considered throughout the plan revision process. If a potential wilderness is recommended for wilderness, the recommendation will receive further review by the Chief of the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Chief of the Forest Service intends to move forward with a wilderness recommendation, the Forest Service will complete a detailed analysis of the trade-offs and impacts in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, including further public review and comment. Ultimately, only Congress has the authority to designate wilderness.

Background

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Name | Blue Range Wilderness Presidential Recommendation Exclusions |
| Number | PW-03-01-069 |
| Acres | 32,810 |
| Ranger Districts | Clifton and Alpine |
| History (if applicable) | <p>The Blue Range Primitive Area was administratively designated by the Forest Service (L-20 regulations) in 1933 to preserve its wilderness qualities.</p> <p>In 1971, the Forest Service submitted a recommendation to the president for the Blue Range Wilderness in New Mexico and Arizona. The president forwarded the recommendation to Congress, who eventually acted on a portion of the recommendation. In 1980 Congress designated, and the president signed into law, the Blue Range Wilderness in New Mexico. That portion of the Forest Service and presidential recommendation in Arizona has not been acted upon; the Blue Range Primitive Area continues to be the only remaining “Primitive Area” in the United States.</p> <p>The entire Blue Range Primitive Area has been managed as wilderness as prescribed in the 1987 Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Plan.</p> <p>Several portions of the Blue Range Primitive Area were found to not have wilderness character and were excluded from the Forest Service and presidential recommendations. The following rationale for the exclusions is from the 1971 Blue Range Wilderness proposal:</p> <p>Exclusion 1 (6,940 acres)¹ is unsuitable because of the large areas of highly developed private land, roads, and power lines, with wood, fence post, and saw log cutting having been done over several portions of the area. Signs of the early cutting are still visible.</p> <p>Exclusion 2 (7,995 acres) bears the unmistakable imprint of man’s activities. Roads, ranching headquarters, and many structural range improvements, as well as areas where timber has been cut for various purposes invade the area in several places. Manmade structures are numerous.</p> <p>Exclusion 3 (4,665 acres) would eliminate land believed to be potentially valuable for minerals. There are many lode mining claims already located on it. Several actively eroding bulldozer roads are located here. The area varies little from the surrounding country which is not wilderness in character.</p> <p>Exclusion 4 (10,404 acres) has been severely abused by man. Logging, post and pole cutting, over-grazing, structural improvements, and three tracts of privately owned land have destroyed the wilderness character of the area. It is generally a fairly open, rolling country, more similar to the nonwilderness to the south than the high quality wilderness to the north.</p> |

¹ Exclusion acreages are from GIS and are approximate.

Exclusion 5 (2,804 acres) is a high, timbered area above the Mogollon Rim. It is relatively flat had has been partially logged over the past. A low standard road crosses the area from east to west. Past abuse by livestock is evident on some meadows in the area.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Location, Vicinity, and Access | Approximately 23 miles north of Clifton, Arizona, and 30 miles south of Springerville in Greenlee County. The areas are located in the ASNFs in eastern Arizona. Primary access from the north is via U.S. Highways 180 and 191 and Forest Roads (FR) 281 and 567. Access from the south is via U.S. Highway 191, FR 475, and trails. |
| Geography and Topography | The general Blue Range area is characterized by rough broken terrain with deep rocky canyons. There is little flat terrain in the area. The Mogollon Rim traverses the northern end. The Blue River flows north to south through the area. Numerous side canyons and drainages feed into the Blue River. Elevations range from 4,500 feet in the south to over 9,000 feet in the north. |
| Surroundings | <p>Most of the areas are located between the Blue Range Wilderness presidential recommendation and surrounding potential wildernesses. The Arizona/New Mexico state line delineates the eastern edge of Exclusions 2a and 2b. There are eight pieces of private land² in Exclusion 1. FRs 281, 281I, 281U, 281V, 281W, 281X, 281Y, and 281Z³ are located within Exclusion 1. FR 232 forms the north boundary of Exclusion 2a. FR 711 is located within Exclusion 2b. U.S. Highway 191 and FR 8357 make up portions of the north boundary of Exclusion 5.</p> <p>Since 1971 the Forest Service has acquired one piece of private land in Exclusion 1 and three pieces of private land in Exclusion 4.</p> |
| Special Designations | The Blue River suitable Wild and Scenic River (WSR) is located within Exclusions 3 and 4. Little Blue Creek eligible WSR is adjacent to Exclusion 3. |
| Vegetation | <p>A variety of vegetative communities is found within the potential wildernesses. Vegetation types vary with elevation, aspect, and slope and include spruce-fir forest (5)⁴, wet mixed conifer forest (5), dry mixed conifer forest (5), ponderosa pine forest (1, 2a, 3, and 4), Madrean pine-oak woodland (1, 2a, 2b, and 3), piñon-juniper woodland (1), interior chaparral (3), semi-desert grassland (1, 2b, 3, and 4), wetland/cienega (5), montane willow riparian forest (1, 2a, and 4), and mixed broadleaf deciduous riparian forest (1, 3, and 4).</p> <p>Vegetation is a WSR Outstandingly Remarkable Value (ORV) for the Blue River because of the great diversity of vegetation communities associated with the changes in elevation, including the deciduous shrub and tree canopies.</p> |
| Appearance and Key Attractions | The area is characterized by rough broken terrain with deep rocky canyons. Unusual and spectacular rock formations are common throughout the area. The box canyons along the Blue River are unique. Key attractions are the Blue River, diverse scenery, and wildlife hunting and viewing. |

² 1) T 02 N, R 30 E, section 14; 2) T 02 N, R 30 E, section 11; 3) T 03 N, R 31 E, section 31; 4) T 03 N, R 31 E, section 30; 5) T 03 N, R 31 E, sections 20 and 21; 6) T 03 N, R 31 E, sections 21 and 22; 7) T 03 N, R 31 E, sections 14 and 15; and 8) T 03 N, R 31 E, section 14.

³ Roads may be bounded on one or both sides by the potential wilderness. Where a road is bounded on both sides, a non-potential wilderness corridor or “cherrystem” surrounds the road. Roads that end at the potential wilderness boundary are not listed.

⁴ Numbers in () are the exclusion number.

Scenery is a WSR ORV for the Blue River because of the diversity of landforms, colors, and vegetation found along the river corridor. Scenery is also a WSR ORV for Little Blue Creek because of the diversity of landscapes along the creek, which range from high mountain meadows to an incised narrow canyon to a semi-slot canyon.

CURRENT USES

Recreation

Current recreation activities are primarily hunting, hiking, backpacking, horseback riding, fishing, and viewing scenery and wildlife. There are four trailheads and all or portions of ten trails (10.2 miles) in Exclusion 1, one trailhead and all or portions of two trails (1.7 miles) in Exclusion 2a, three trailheads and all or portions of five trails (10.3 miles) in Exclusion 2b, all or portions of six trails (6.5 miles) in Exclusion 3, all or portions of four trails (12.1 miles) in Exclusion 4, and two trailheads and all or portions of seven trails (11.5 miles) in Exclusion 5. All of the areas have a recreation emphasis of Primitive.

Recreation is a WSR ORV for the Blue River and Little Blue Creek because of the diversity of recreation opportunities in a remote and primitive setting.

Wildlife

Large wildlife species found in the area include elk, mule deer, black bear, and mountain lion. A variety of small animals and birds also inhabit the area. Threatened Mexican spotted owls are found in the area (1, 2a, 2b, and 5). A northern goshawk (sensitive) post-fledging family area is also located in the area (5). Threatened loach minnow are found in the Blue River (1, 3, and 4). Threatened Gila trout are found in Raspberry Creek (1). Candidate wildlife species include western yellow-billed cuckoo, Mexican gartersnake, and New Mexico meadow jumping mouse. Mexican gray wolves were re-introduced into the area in 1998. Sensitive wildlife species include bald eagle, American peregrine falcon, northern goshawk, Arizona Bell's vireo, narrow-headed gartersnake, Arizona toad, and lowland leopard frog. Sensitive fish species include longfin dace, Sonora sucker, and desert sucker.

Fish species and habitat are WSR ORVs for the Blue River because of the high number of native fish species. Wildlife species and habitat are WSR ORVs for the Blue River because of the diversity of species and habitats.

Range

The potential wildernesses are within the Bush Creek (2a), Fishhook/Steeple Mesa (1 and 5), Raspberry (1), KP Summer (5), Cow Flat (1 and 2a), Bobcat-Johnson (2a), Alma Mesa (2b and 3), Sandrock (3 and 4), AD Bar-Hogtrail (4), Foote Creek (5), and Hannagan (5) Allotments. The numbers of cattle in many allotments have been reduced since 1971. Grazing has not occurred Sandrock Allotment since the early 1980s. There is a total of 23.2 miles of fence, of which 4.8 are forest boundary, in Exclusion 2a (0.4 miles of allotment boundary fence), Exclusion 2b (15.5 miles of interior fence, of which 4.8 are forest boundary), Exclusion 3 (2 miles of allotment boundary fence), and Exclusion 4 (3.7 miles of allotment boundary fence and 1.6 miles of interior fence). There are no fences in Exclusion 5.

- Water** The Wild (3 and 4) sections of the suitable Blue River WSR are partially within or adjacent to the areas. The Wild section of the eligible Little Blue Creek WSR is adjacent to Exclusion 3. Perennial streams include Raspberry (1), McKittrick (1), Steeple (1), Fishhook (1), Foote (1), Grant (1 and 5), and Little Blue (3) Creeks; Lanphier (1) and Steeple (1 and 2a) Canyons; and the Blue River (1, 3, and 4). Other streams are intermittent or ephemeral. Of the 30 springs in Exclusions 1, 2b, 3, 4, and 5; 15 are developed. There is also a well (2b). There is one stock tank in Exclusion 1, one in Exclusion 2a, eight in Exclusion 2b, four in Exclusion 3, and two in Exclusion 4.
- Minerals** As of 4/18/2009, there are no mining claims, mineral withdrawals, or coal, oil, gas, or geothermal leases in the potential wildernesses. The Blue River Metallic Mineral District (3) is an unclassified altered zone, with no historic production.
- Heritage Resources** Portions of the potential wildernesses are within the area that was used extensively by the prehistoric Mogollon culture.
- Historic resources are a WSR ORV for the Blue River because of the length of post-settlement use in the area. Prehistoric resources are also a WSR ORV because the Blue River corridor contains extensive evidence of occupation and use by the Mogollon culture.
- Fire** Seventy-three fires (most smaller than ¼ acre and the largest approximately 185 acres) occurred between 1968 and 2008. The majority, including the largest, were caused by lightning. Twenty-seven fires occurred in Exclusion 1, 1 in Exclusion 2a, 4 in Exclusion 2b, 15 in Exclusion 3, 7 in Exclusion 4, and 19 in Exclusion 5.

Capability Evaluation

Wilderness capability describes the basic characteristics that make the area appropriate and valuable for wilderness designation, regardless of the area's availability or need. Five factors are used to determine capability: naturalness, level of development, opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation, special features, and the ability of the Forest Service to manage the area as wilderness. The first four factors consider how the current conditions of the potential wilderness fit the definition of wilderness. Manageability is slightly different because it evaluates features of the area that would make it more or less difficult to manage as wilderness, such as size, shape, and juxtaposition to external influences. The following summarizes the information found in Appendix B.

Summary

Natural

High - 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1

Low - 1, except Sawmill Creek and the southern end

Exclusion 1, with the exception of Sawmill Creek and the southern end, is essentially unnatural and contains a bladed road, several trailheads, and numerous structures. The other potential wildernesses are essentially natural and the diversity of vegetation and wildlife species is a key feature. Vegetation includes spruce-fir, wet mixed conifer, dry mixed conifer, ponderosa pine, montane willow riparian, and mixed broadleaf deciduous riparian forests; Madrean pine-oak and piñon-juniper woodlands; interior chaparral; semi-desert grassland; and wetland/cienega. The areas provides habitat for a wide variety of special status animal species. Free-flowing, perennial streams include Raspberry, McKittrick, Steeple, Fishhook, Foote, Grant, and Little Blue Creeks; Lanphier and Steeple Canyons; and the Blue River. There are no known impoundments. The Blue River has been found to contain *E. coli* bacteria below Strayhorse Creek; there are no other known water quality concerns. The Blue River through Exclusions 3 and 4 is a suitable WSR with a classification of Wild. Little Blue Creek is an eligible WSR with a proposed classification of Wild. Mullein, a non-native plant, is found along U.S. Highway 191 (5) and FRs 281 (1) and 232 (2a). Tamarisk, also a non-native plant, is found along the Blue River (1, 3, and 4). Musk thistle, a non-native plant, is found along a section of FR 281 (1). Bull thistle, a non-native plant, is found along a section of U.S. Highway 191 (5). Other non-native species may be present, but no surveys have specifically been conducted in the area. The night sky is not affected by ranch lights along the Blue River.

Undeveloped

High - 2a, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1

Low - 1 (except Sawmill Creek and the southern end) and 2b

2a, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - There is currently little evidence of human activity. With the passage of time, many of the human-caused features described in the 1971 wilderness proposal are no longer evident. Exclusion 2a has a fence, a stock tank, and a corral. Exclusion 3 has a fence, corrals, developed springs, and stock tanks. Exclusion 4 has fences, corrals, stock tanks, and a cabin.

1 (except Sawmill Creek and the southern end) and 2b - There is obvious evidence of human activity. Exclusion 1 includes a bladed county road, a stock tank, and extensive private lands with structures. Exclusion 2b has fences, a well, a developed spring, stock tanks, corrals, and a cabin.

Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

High - 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1

Low - 1, except Sawmill Creek and the southern end

2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - There are outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation, especially when considered with the presidential wilderness recommendation. Recreation opportunities include backpacking, fishing, horseback riding, hunting, wildlife viewing, and photography.

1, except Sawmill Creek and the southern end - There are few opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation because of the bladed road, private lands, and configuration of the area.

Special Features and Values

High

Special features and values include outstanding panoramic views, unusual and spectacular rock formations, box canyons, high potential for ecological and cultural research, and habitat for a variety of rare or unique species, including Mexican spotted owl (1, 2a, 2b, and 5), northern goshawk (5), Apache trout (5), Gila trout (1), and loach minnow (1, 3, and 4).

Manageability

High - 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1

Low - 1, except Sawmill Creek and the southern end

2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - These potential wildernesses could be managed to protect their wilderness character because they are currently managed as wilderness. There are no known encumbrances or resource conflicts.

1, except Sawmill Creek and the southern end - This area has a bladed road through it and cannot be managed as wilderness.

OVERALL CAPABILITY

High - 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1

Low - 1 without Sawmill Creek and the southern end.

Because the overall capability of Exclusion 1, without Sawmill Creek and the southern end, is **Low**, this portion will not be carried forward. Availability and Need evaluations and the potential effects of wilderness recommendation discussion will not be completed for the main portion of Exclusion 1.

Approximately 2,553 acres of Exclusion 1, encompassing Sawmill Creek and the southern end, will be carried forward.

Potential Boundary Changes

As described above, potential boundary changes include separation of the Sawmill Creek area and the southern end of Exclusion 1 from Exclusion 1. It was also recommended that the width of Exclusion 1 be reduced to ¼ mile on either side of FR 281. A variable width of Exclusion 1 has also been suggested.

Availability Evaluation

Availability criteria indicate the availability of a potential wilderness for wilderness designation by describing other resource and land use potentials for the area. Availability examines the potential impact of designating an area as wilderness to both the current and future land uses and activities. In essence, it is a summary of the trade-offs between wilderness and other uses. The following summarizes the information found in Appendix C.

Summary

Water Yield

High

2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - The areas are of value for water yield. However, no impoundments are needed.

Habitat Management

High - 2a, 3, 4, 5, and Sawmill Creek

Medium - 2b

Low - Southern end of 1

2a, 3, 4, 5, and Sawmill Creek - No wildlife or aquatic habitat management activities have been identified.

2b - Some habitat management activities requiring motorized equipment may be needed in the area.

Southern end of 1 - This area may need frequent habitat management over the next decade for aquatic animals.

Aquatic Restoration

High - 2a, 2b, 5, and Sawmill Creek

Medium - Southern end of 1, 3, and 4

2a, 2b, 5, and Sawmill Creek - There are currently no aquatic restoration activities identified.

Southern end of 1, 3, and 4 - Aquatic restoration activities are needed. Tamarisk is currently found along the Blue River.

Vegetation Restoration

Medium

2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - Vegetation treatments, primarily burning, may be needed to reduce fuels and to restore grassland and forest ecosystems.

Public Access Needed

High

2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - There are no unique characteristics that would require developed public access.

Land Use Authorizations

High - 2a, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1

Low - 2b

2a, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - Current authorizations, primarily grazing permits, do not conflict with potential wilderness.

3 and 4 - These areas are mostly located in the Sandrock Allotment which is not currently permitted for grazing. Grazing has not been permitted since the early 1980s.

2b - Current permitted grazing use and the ability to use motorized equipment and tools within the area to maintain range developments is critical to the operation and effectiveness of grazing management. Stateline Cabin is used extensively for the management of the Alma Mesa Allotment. There is a special authorization for the grazing permittee to access to this cabin with motor vehicles.

Adjacent Non-FS Lands

High - 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, and Sawmill Creek

Medium - Southern end of 1

2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, and Sawmill Creek - There are no inholdings or non-federal lands adjacent to the potential wildernesses.

Southern end of 1 - There is one piece of private land adjacent to this potential wilderness.

Minerals

High

2a, 2b, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - There is a low potential for future mineral uses.

3 - There is a low to moderate potential for future mineral uses.

OVERALL AVAILABILITY

High - 2a, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1

Medium to High - 2b

Need Evaluation

The evaluation criteria below indicate how the potential wilderness might fit into the National Wilderness Preservation System, which includes all wilderness areas in the United States. Need is considered at the regional level and must incorporate public participation. The criteria used to evaluate need include consideration of other wilderness and non-wilderness areas that provide opportunities for unconfined outdoor recreation or preservation of certain ecosystem characteristics. The following summarizes the information found in Appendix D. Individual factors are rated in this summary but are not in Appendix D. Appendix D presents only an overall rating.

Summary

Factor 1 - The location, size, and type of other wildernesses in the general vicinity and their distance from the proposed area. Consider accessibility of areas to population centers and user groups. Public demand for wilderness may increase with proximity to growing population centers.

Low

There are adequate wilderness opportunities in the vicinity of the exclusions to the Blue Range Wilderness Presidential Recommendation. Within 100 miles of these potential wildernesses there are 1,076,435 wilderness acres. Within 130 miles of Tucson, there are 342,514 potential wilderness acres on the ASNFs and 1,463,897 wilderness acres.

Factor 2 - Present visitor pressure on other wildernesses, the trends in use, changing patterns of use, population expansion factors, and trends and changes in transportation.

Medium

According to the 2001 National Visitor Use Monitoring study, approximately 38,000 people visited the three Wilderness areas on the ASNFs. Most of this use was concentrated in the two smaller, more easily accessed Wilderness areas, Mount Baldy and Escudilla. Visitor use in Mount Baldy is locally considered high, while visitor use in Escudilla is considered moderate to high. Use in Bear Wallow Wilderness is lighter because it is less easily accessed and slightly larger. Wilderness users on the ASNFs are predominantly male, white or Hispanic/Latino, between the ages of 31 and 60, and live in the Phoenix and Tucson areas.

Approximately 70 percent of the Arizona visitors to the ASNFs are from the Phoenix (58 percent) and Tucson (11 percent) metropolitan areas. Populations in these areas have increased much faster than in the more rural areas. Visitors from the four counties where the ASNFs are located account for another 20 percent. In general, there has been no to moderate population growth in these counties. Recently, there have been major highway improvements between Phoenix and the ASNFs.

It can be assumed that with increasing populations and improved transportation features, wilderness use on the ASNFs would continue to increase, especially in those areas where the trailheads are easily accessed.

Surrounding National Forests (Coconino, Coronado, Gila, and Tonto) all have much higher numbers of wilderness visits than the ASNFs. Use on the Coconino, Coronado, and Gila is high, while use on the ASNFs and Tonto is medium.⁵

⁵ This is based on use categories developed by the Forest Service Wilderness Advisory Group, with low use defined as 0-10,000 visits, medium as 10,001 – 30,000 visits, and high being greater than 30,000 visits. Total wilderness use for a forest from NVUM was divided by the number of wildernesses the forest is lead for, to get an average amount of use per wilderness.

Regionally, increased demand for additional wilderness in both Arizona and New Mexico should be anticipated based on population growth from 1990 to 2000, which far exceeded the national growth rate. Assuming Arizona continues to grow at a rate much higher than the national rate; visits to wilderness will continue to increase. Arizona, in particular, could benefit from additional wilderness.

Public demand increases with proximity to six population centers: Flagstaff, Phoenix, Tucson, Santa Fe, Taos, and Albuquerque. Wilderness recommendations should be considered within 100 miles of those cities to provide for that demand. Some additional public demand for wilderness in the Southwestern Region will occur from people moving to rural communities near the National Forests.

Nationwide, Wilderness represents 17 percent of all federal agency acres. In the Southwestern Region, 13 percent of the Forest Service lands are Wilderness. Only 6 percent of the federal acres in northeast Arizona are wilderness acres. For wilderness acres in the Southwestern Region to be at the national average would require the addition of about 1 million acres.

Factor 3 - The extent to which nonwilderness lands on the NFS unit or other Federal lands are likely to provide opportunities for unconfined outdoor recreation experiences.

Low

There are adequate nonwilderness lands on or near the ASNFs that could provide unconfined outdoor recreation experiences. Within 130 miles of Tucson, there are over 1 million acres of primitive area, Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRA), and Bureau of Land Management Wilderness Study Areas. Additionally, there are over 383,000 acres managed for Semi-Primitive and Primitive recreation on the ASNFs. Many of these acres overlap with Wilderness areas, the Blue Range Primitive Area, IRAs, and potential wilderness.

Factor 4 - The need to provide a refuge for those species that have demonstrated an inability to survive in less than primitive surroundings or the need for a protected area for other unique scientific values or phenomena.

Low

The ASNFs have identified 11 Threatened and Endangered species, 45 sensitive animal species, and 21 sensitive plant species that occur or are found on the forests. None of these species require a primitive wilderness environment to survive. However, some (Mexican gray wolf, for example) would benefit from reduced disturbance and human encounters.

Factor 5 - Within social and biological limits, management may increase the capacity of established wildernesses to support human use without unacceptable depreciation of the wilderness resource.

Medium

There is little opportunity for management to increase the capacity of Wilderness areas on the ASNFs. Both Mount Baldy and Escudilla Wilderness areas are heavily used, are less than 10,000 acres, are easily accessed by motor vehicles, and have limited trail systems. Encounters with other wilderness visitors in both areas are high. No management changes have been identified for Bear Wallow Wilderness because the use is much lighter and spread throughout the area and there are more trails.

Factor 6 - An area's ability to provide for preservation of identifiable landform types and ecosystems. Consideration of this factor may include utilization of Edwin A. Hammond's subdivision of landform types and the Bailey-Kuchler ecosystem classification. This approach is helpful from the standpoint of rounding out the National Wilderness Preservation System and may be further subdivided to suit local, subregional, and regional needs.

Medium

These potential wildernesses contain one underrepresented ecosystem: 5,740 acres of semi-desert grassland (2b, 3, 4, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1).

OVERALL NEED

Low to Medium - 2b, 3, 4, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1; contain one underrepresented ecosystem

Low - 2a

Effects of Recommendations

| | RECOMMENDATION | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | WILDERNESS | NONWILDERNESS | |
| | | PRIMITIVE AREA | NONWILDERNESS |
| MANAGEMENT DIRECTION | Manage to protect and maintain wilderness characteristics | Manage to protect and maintain wilderness characteristics | Manage for multiple use, ecosystem restoration, and social and economic values |
| Wilderness Characteristics | EFFECTS ON WILDERNESS RESOURCES AND VALUES | | |
| Natural Undeveloped Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation Special Features and Values | Wilderness characteristics would be maintained and protected. The area would remain natural and generally undeveloped. Outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation would continue to be present. Any existing special features and values would be protected. | Same as Wilderness. | Minimal management activities are expected within the area. It is anticipated that the wilderness character of the area would remain. |
| Resource/Use | EFFECTS ON OTHER RESOURCES AND USES | | |
| Soils | Long-term soil productivity may increase because the acreage is generally not available for management activities. Shorter-term risks to soil productivity may be increased until fire-adapted ecosystems (especially ponderosa pine) are restored. Soil erosion risk would be reduced. | Same as Wilderness. | The natural functions of watersheds could be affected by activities. The threat of soil erosion from associated motorized uses and land-disturbing activities would increase with the degree of use. However, mitigation would be required. Compaction from recreation uses in popular areas would likely continue. Treatments may reduce soil loss by reducing the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire. |

| | | | | RECOMMENDATION | | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------|---|--|--|
| | | WILDERNESS | NONWILDERNESS | | | |
| | | | PRIMITIVE AREA | NONWILDERNESS | | |
| Water Quality and Quantity | The natural functions of watershed systems would be maintained. The risk of human-caused alterations, other than fire, affecting the watershed condition would be primarily limited to localized recreation activities. There could be short-term risks to watersheds until fire-adapted ecosystems (especially ponderosa pine) are restored. Water quality would more likely be affected by management outside of wilderness. | Same as Wilderness. | | Water quality could be affected by management activities. However, mitigation would be required to reduce effects to water quality. Management activities could be conducted to increase water yield. Treatments may reduce sedimentation by reducing the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire. | | |
| Air Quality | There would be no direct effects to air quality specifically from wilderness designation. Wilderness designation would not preclude the use of prescribed fire or wildland fire for resource benefit, which may result in short-term air quality impacts. | Same as Wilderness. | | There may be some short-term direct effects to air quality from fugitive dust from product removal and smoke from slash disposal. Prescribed fire, wildland fire for resource benefit, and wildland fire could result in short-term air quality degradation. | | |
| Wildlife Habitat | Wilderness designation would provide greater protection for wildlife and wildlife habitat. Wildlife would not be harassed by motorized uses and habitat fragmentation would be minimized. Repair and replacement of existing wildlife improvements may be allowed, but new improvements and habitat enhancements would be rare and would be authorized only to protect and improve management of the wilderness resource. | Same as Wilderness. | | Vegetation treatments may result in a greater mosaic of habitat types and associated species diversity. Opportunities to restore and/or manipulate habitat would be available. There could be some wildlife harassment from motorized use. Fragmentation and loss of habitat from road construction may occur with increased activities. | | |
| Aquatic Restoration | Natural processes would primarily affect aquatic species and their habitat. Motorized and mechanized travel and many management activities would not be allowed. Natural events and climatic variation would influence sedimentation, riparian vegetation, and nutrient cycles. Opportunities to do riparian area restoration may be precluded. | Same as Wilderness. | | Natural processes that affect aquatic habitats would be interrupted to a degree commensurate with activities. Motorized uses, road construction, and other land-disturbing activities may increase sedimentation and potentially adversely affect riparian habitat and nutrient cycles. However, the use of BMPs would mitigate most effects. | | |

| | | | | RECOMMENDATION | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| | | WILDERNESS | NONWILDERNESS | | | |
| | | | PRIMITIVE AREA | NONWILDERNESS | | |
| Vegetation | Natural ecological succession would be allowed to continue and, over time, restore ecological conditions. Levels of insect infestation and disease could reach endemic levels as ecological systems move toward their historic ranges of variability. Dispersal of non-native plants would generally be limited to trail systems and river corridors. Plant diversity would be slow to change, but would move towards a dominance of mature trees and late successional habitats. | Same as Wilderness. | | Natural ecological succession could be interrupted by activities associated with other resource management objectives. Incidents of insects and disease would still occur, but would be more aggressively prevented or managed through vegetation treatment practices. The ability to detect and treat infestations would be greater than in wilderness and thus infestations could be prevented or contained earlier. Plant diversity would depend on the management objectives for the area. | | |
| Insects and Disease | Forest stands would be more likely to be over-mature and provide areas suitable for insect and disease outbreaks. Insect or disease control would not be permitted unless necessary to prevent unacceptable damage to resources on adjacent lands or unnatural loss to the wilderness resource from exotic pests. When necessary, control measures would have the least adverse effect on wilderness. | Same as Wilderness. | | Response to insect and disease outbreaks would be more direct and rapid. A range of control and treatment options would allow more flexibility in containing outbreaks. | | |
| Non-Native Species | Non-native plants may be treated by grubbing or with chemicals when they threaten lands outside wilderness or when they are spreading within the wilderness, provided there are no serious adverse impacts on wilderness values. | Same as Wilderness. | | All options to address non-native plants would be available, including no treatment, hand pulling, herbicides, and biological control. Motorized and mechanized equipment can be used. | | |

| | | RECOMMENDATION | |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| | | WILDERNESS | NONWILDERNESS |
| | | | PRIMITIVE AREA |
| | | | NONWILDERNESS |
| Recreation | Recreation use is managed to minimize the evidence of human use and provide outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation. Only primitive, non-mechanized access and recreation activities are permitted. Only those facilities required for the safety of users and protection of wilderness resources are provided. The use of mechanized tools for trail construction and maintenance would be restricted. In many cases, wilderness designation has elevated an area's visibility to the public, increasing its popularity and recreation use. Increased use can result in increased damage to trails and other resources, as well as reduced opportunities for solitude and other wilderness values. | Same as Wilderness. | Activities can reduce the primitive or semi-primitive recreational character through altered recreation settings, experiences, and access. The sights and sounds of human presence are usually increased by activities. Recreationists seeking a primitive or semi-primitive experience would choose not to visit such an area. Activities may also provide greater recreational access and more motorized and mechanized recreation experiences would be available. |
| Visual Quality | Visual quality would be protected because ground-disturbing activities would be extremely limited. The Scenic Integrity Objective would be Very High. The long-term scenic characteristics would be representative of how the landscape would appear if relatively unaffected by human activity. | Same as Wilderness. | The Scenic Integrity Objective would range from Low to High. There would be a greater potential for landscapes to show obvious signs of human activities. Scenic Integrity Objectives would constrain or modify activities to mitigate adverse effects to scenic resources, especially in areas seen from major recreation facilities and Scenic Byways. |
| Heritage Resources | Heritage resources are already protected by law. Exclusion of ground-disturbing activities lessens threats to known and unidentified heritage resources. Fewer sites or resources may be identified. | Same as Wilderness. | Heritage resources are already protected by law. Project-level inventories associated with ground disturbing and other activities may increase identification of previously unknown sites or resources. Mitigation measures would be applied at the project level. |
| Special Use Authorizations | Structures and other developments would be limited to those actually needed for management, protection, and use of the wilderness for the purposes for which the wilderness was established. | Same as Wilderness. | Special use authorizations would be allowed, subject to suitability. |

| | | RECOMMENDATION | |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| | | WILDERNESS | NONWILDERNESS |
| | | | PRIMITIVE AREA |
| | | | NONWILDERNESS |
| Range | Grazing allotments and developments would be managed under the Congressional Grazing Guidelines and allotment management plans. | Same as Wilderness. | Grazing allotments would continue to be managed under current allotment management plans, laws, policies, and regulations. |
| Forest Products | Wilderness would be removed from the suitable timber base. No timber sales or firewood cutting would be permitted. Only firewood collection incidental to recreation would be allowed. | Same as Wilderness. | Timber production may be allowed, subject to suitability, law, policy, and regulation. Forest products, commercial and non-commercial, could be a byproduct of the restoration treatments. |
| Minerals | The area would be withdrawn from further mineral entry and leasing. Mineral development is possible in areas with valid existing rights. Consistent with the valid existing rights, operating plans would incorporate reasonable terms and conditions for the protection of the wilderness character, and provide for restoration as near as practicable of the disturbed lands promptly upon abandonment of operations. | Area would be open to mineral entry and leasing. Mechanized equipment and motorized access may be used. However, these activities and the reclamation of all disturbed lands are typically designed to minimize and mitigate impacts to the roadless character. Operating plans should incorporate reasonable terms and conditions for the protection of the roadless character and for the restoration of the disturbed lands. | These lands would be open to oil, gas, and mineral development except where specifically withdrawn or restricted for other purposes. Although a full range of activities and methods may be allowed and employed, developments and activities would be mitigated to reduce adverse impacts to other resources. |
| Special Designations | Wilderness designation would increase the number and diversity of areas within the Southwestern Region and the National Wilderness Preservation System. There would be no effects to other special designations - the most restrictive management would apply. | Same as Wilderness. | The opportunity to recommend additional wilderness within the Southwestern Region would be foregone at this time. There would be no effects to other special designations. Any restrictions associated with other special designations could affect management activities. |
| Fire | Wilderness designation does not preclude the use of prescribed fire or wildland fire for resource benefit. Mechanical treatments and timber harvest would not be allowed, which may increase the risk of uncharacteristic wildfires. Suppression actions would be guided by Minimum Impact Suppression Tactics (MIST). | Same as Wilderness. | The risk of uncharacteristic wildfires would be reduced because of the opportunities to treat mechanically and harvest timber. The full range of suppression tactics and management approaches would be available for use. |

| | | | | RECOMMENDATION | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | WILDERNESS | NONWILDERNESS | | | |
| | | | PRIMITIVE AREA | NONWILDERNESS | | |
| SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS | | | | | | |
| | Local population numbers, income, or employment would generally not be affected. | Same as Wilderness. | Local population numbers, income, or employment would not be affected unless major mineral activity occurs. | | | |
| | Costs related to the maintenance of range facilities could increase because of limitations on methods. | Same as Wilderness. | There would be no increased costs associated with the construction and maintenance of range facilities. | | | |
| | Timber production revenues would be foregone, if any commercial stands are suitable and harvestable. | Same as Wilderness. | Revenues and jobs from timber production could increase, if any commercial stands are suitable and harvestable. | | | |
| | Local lifestyles would not be affected unless major mineral activity occurs. | Local lifestyles would not be affected unless major mineral activity occurs. | Local lifestyles would not be affected unless major mineral activity occurs. | | | |
| | Revenues associated with mineral development would be foregone, because the lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry. | Revenues could be generated, if minerals are found and developed. | Revenues could be generated, if minerals are found and developed. | | | |
| | Wilderness is recognized as contributing to healthy economies and healthy lifestyles. Direct benefits are derived from primitive recreation and as a "quality-of-life" factor to attract new businesses and residents. The wilderness characteristics/values that attract visitors to the area would be maintained. | Same as Wilderness. | Management activities would contribute to local lifestyles and healthy economies. The wilderness characteristics/values that attract visitors to wilderness would be affected. | | | |
| | Ecosystem services (natural processes such as the air and water purification functions of undisturbed lands) would be protected and maintained, | Same as Wilderness. | Ecosystem services could be decreased with increased activities. | | | |
| | Opportunities for primitive recreation and public awareness of the values associated with wilderness, including spiritual and natural qualities, would be increased. | Same as Wilderness. | Opportunities for primitive recreation would decrease. Opportunities for semi-primitive and more developed recreation could increase. | | | |

Appendix A: Wilderness Evaluation Process

The following is summarized from Forest Service Handbook 1909.12, Chapter 70. This process is used by the Forest Service to determine whether there are areas that could be recommended for wilderness designation by Congress. The process includes three steps: an inventory of potential wilderness areas, an evaluation of the potential wilderness areas, and a determination if a recommendation will be pursued for any potential wilderness areas.

Inventory of Potential Wilderness Areas

The first step in the evaluation of potential wilderness is to identify and inventory all areas within National Forest System Lands that satisfy the definition of wilderness found in the 1964 Wilderness Act.

Areas identified through this process are called potential wilderness areas. This inventory of potential wilderness is not a land designation. It is completed with the express purpose of identifying all lands that meet the criteria for being evaluated for wilderness suitability and possible recommendation to Congress for wilderness designation.

The inventory of areas relies on local knowledge and judgment regarding unique, site-specific conditions of each area being considered. The boundaries of areas for the potential wilderness inventory should facilitate easy on-the-ground identification.

Inventory Criteria

Areas qualify for inclusion in the potential wilderness inventory if they meet the statutory definition of wilderness and meet either criteria 1 and 3 or criteria 2 and 3 below.

1. Areas contain 5,000 acres or more.
2. Areas contain less than 5,000 acres, but meet one or more of the following criteria:
 - a. Can be preserved due to physical terrain and natural conditions.
 - b. Self-contained ecosystems, such as an island, that can be effectively managed as a separate unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System.
 - c. Contiguous to existing wilderness, primitive areas, Administration-endorsed wilderness, or potential wilderness in other Federal ownership, regardless of their size.
3. Areas do not contain forest roads (36 CFR 212.1) or other permanently authorized roads, except as permitted in areas east of the 100th meridian (sec. 71.12).

Areas may be included in the potential wilderness inventory even though they include the types of areas or features listed in FSH 1909.12, 71.11.

On the ASNFs, GIS was used to identify those areas that met the inventory criteria. Site-specific information was gathered from Ranger District (District) personnel to provide background information, identify features not shown in GIS, and determine where the Region 3 criteria on roaded areas, fingers, and extrusions should be applied.

Evaluation of Potential Wilderness Areas

An area recommended for wilderness must meet the tests of capability, availability, and need. In addition to the inherent wilderness quality it possesses, an area must provide opportunities and experiences that are dependent upon or enhanced by a wilderness environment. The ability of the Forest Service to manage the area as wilderness is also considered.

Capability

The capability of a potential wilderness is the degree to which an area contains the basic characteristics that make it suitable for wilderness recommendation without regard to its availability for or need as wilderness. The following characteristics are considered in evaluating a potential wilderness area:

1. Natural - an area is substantially free from the effects of modern civilization and generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature.
2. Undeveloped - the degree to which an area is without permanent improvements or human habitation.
3. Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation - the capability of the area to provide solitude or primitive and unconfined types of recreation. This includes a wide range of experiential opportunities. Solitude is the opportunity to experience isolation from sights, sounds, and the presence of others from developments and evidence of humans.
4. Special Features and Values - an area is capable of providing other values such as those with ecologic, geologic, scientific, educational, scenic, historical, or cultural significance.
5. Manageability - the ability to manage an area as wilderness as required by the Wilderness Act and how boundaries affect manageability of an area.

Responses to the capability questions were drafted at the ASNFs Supervisors Office and reviewed by District personnel. Any changes were incorporated into the capability evaluation.

If an area is found to not be capable of being wilderness (a rating of Low), it is not carried forward into the Availability Evaluation.

Availability

Areas determined to meet wilderness capability requirements are considered potentially available for wilderness designation. The determination of availability is conditioned by the value of and need for the wilderness resource compared to the value of and need for other resources. Other resource potential including current use and potential future use is analyzed for the various resources involved.

Constraints and encumbrances on lands may also govern the availability of lands for wilderness. The degree of Forest Service control over the surface and subsurface of the area is also considered. The Forest Service should have sufficient control to prevent development of incompatible uses that would negatively affect wilderness character and potential.

Responses to the availability questions were drafted by at the ASNFs Supervisors Office and reviewed by District personnel. Any changes were incorporated into the availability evaluation.

Need

The need for an area to be designated as wilderness is determined through an analysis on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and representation of landforms and ecosystems to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System. This need is demonstrated through a public involvement process, including public input to the evaluation report.

A set of GIS models, information papers, and analyses were provided by the Southwestern Regional Office. This information was synthesized at the ASNFs Supervisors Office and reviewed by District personnel. Any changes were incorporated into the need evaluation.

Documentation of Potential Wilderness Areas

Draft wilderness evaluation reports were developed for each potential wilderness; each report includes summaries of the capability, availability, and need assessments. The draft reports were made available for public comment in June 2009. Public comments were incorporated and information on the potential effects of wilderness and nonwilderness recommendations was added to the final evaluation reports. The effects of nonwilderness recommendation may be split to reflect nonwilderness, lands with roadless character, or primitive area categories.

Appendix B: Capability Evaluation and Ratings

Capability Characteristics

Natural

1. Presence of non-native species.

High - Non-native species are not evident.

Medium - Non-native species are evident in isolated spots.

Low - Non-native species are common or scattered throughout the area.

Rating: **Medium** - Mullein, a non-native plant, is found along U.S. Highway 191 and FR 281 and 232. Musk thistle, a non-native plant, is found along a section of FR 281. Bull thistle, a non-native plant, is found along a section of U.S. Highway 191. Tamarisk, a non-native plant, is found along the Blue River. Other non-native species may be present, but no surveys have specifically been conducted in the area.

2. Rivers within the potential wilderness are in free-flowing condition.

High - Rivers within the area are considered free-flowing.

Medium - Some rivers have impoundments or other issues that affect their free-flowing character.

Low - Rivers within the potential wilderness are seasonal or heavily impacted by impoundments.

Rating: **High** - Perennial streams in the areas include Raspberry, McKittrick, Steeple, Fishhook, Foote, Grant, and Little Blue Creeks; Lanphier and Steeple Canyons; and the Blue River. All other drainages are either intermittent or ephemeral. There are no known impoundments. The Blue River through Exclusions 3 and 4 is a suitable WSR with a classification of Wild. Little Blue Creek is an eligible WSR with a proposed classification of Wild.

3. Quality of night-sky as affected by light pollution.

High - The night sky is clear with little to no interference from light pollution.

Medium - Some stars are visible and there is moderate degradation from light pollution.

Low - Few stars are visible at night and the presence of light pollution is evident.

Rating: **High** - There are no nearby population centers and the night sky is not affected by ranch lights along the Blue River.

4. Presence of pollutants that degrade water.

High - All rivers/streams have been sampled and there are no water quality issues.

Medium - There are no known water quality issues within the area but the not all rivers/streams have been sampled.

Low - There are rivers within the area that are listed on the State Impaired Waters List (303d).

Rating: Low to Medium - The Blue River has been sampled and has been found to be impaired below Strayhorse Creek because of *E. coli* bacteria. The remaining streams in the potential wildernesses have not been sampled; there are no known water quality issues with these waters.

5. Area provides elements of biological diversity and naturalness, including unique habitats, TES or rare plants and wildlife.

High - Has critical or unique habitats and diverse ecological conditions.

Medium - Has a mix of habitats and ecological conditions.

Low - Has limited ecological conditions and habitats.

Rating: High - Biological diversity is high and essentially natural. The areas provides habitat for a wide variety of special status animal and plant species. Vegetation, Wildlife species and habitat, and Fish species and habitat are ORVs for the eligible and suitable WSRs adjacent to and within these areas.

6. Area contains a variety of natural resources, including a variety of tree species and structures, intermingled grasslands or meadows, numerous recreation opportunities, diversity of wildlife habitats, and wildlife, etc.

High - Diverse amount of natural resources.

Medium - Mixed amount of natural resources.

Low - Limited amount of natural resource diversity.

Rating: High - Diversity of natural vegetation and wildlife species are key natural features. Vegetation includes spruce-fir forest, wet mixed conifer forest, dry mixed conifer forest, ponderosa pine forest, Madrean pine-oak woodland, piñon -juniper woodland, interior chaparral, semi-desert grassland, wetland/cienega, montane willow riparian forest, and mixed broadleaf deciduous riparian forest. The potential wildernesses also contain some areas of old spruce, fir, and other conifers. Hiking, fishing, horseback riding, hunting, wildlife viewing, and photography are the main recreation opportunities. Wildlife species and habitat are diverse because the varied topographic, soil, and vegetative conditions within the area combine with perennial streams to provide habitat for numerous wildlife species.

Undeveloped

7. Area has current or past evidence of human activity.

High - Little or no evidence of human activity.

Medium - Unnoticeable or unobjectionable human activity.

Low - Obvious evidence of human activity.

Rating: High and Low - There is currently little evidence of human activity in Sawmill Creek, the southern end of Exclusion 1, and Exclusions 2a, 3, 4, and 5 and obvious evidence in Exclusions 1 and 2b. With the passage of time, many of the human-caused features described in the 1971 wilderness proposal are no longer evident. Most of Exclusion 1 includes a bladed county road and extensive private lands with structures. Exclusion 2a has a fence, a stock tank, and a corral. Exclusion 2b has fences, a well, a developed spring, stock tanks, and corrals. There are corrals, a fence, developed springs, and stock tanks in Exclusion 3. Exclusion 4 has fences, corrals, stock tanks, and a cabin.

Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

8. Area provides physically and mentally challenging recreation opportunities that promote adventure and self-reliance.

High - Most of the area provides challenging recreation opportunities.

Medium - Some parts of the area have the potential for challenging recreation opportunities.

Low - Few parts of the area can provide challenging recreation opportunities.

Rating: High - The areas, except for most of Exclusion 1, provide physically challenging recreation opportunities, especially when considered with the proposed wilderness.

9. Opportunity to experience solitude and isolation from human activities while recreating in the area.

High - Significant feeling of being alone or remote from civilization.

Medium - Feeling of being alone is possible but signs of civilization are likely.

Low - Little opportunity of feeling alone.

Rating: High - The areas, except for most of Exclusion 1, provide opportunities for solitude especially when considered with the proposed wilderness. Signs of civilization are only visible in conjunction with U.S. Highway 191 and FR 281.

10. Opportunity to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation such as backpacking, kayaking, hunting, fishing, etc.

High - There are many opportunities for engaging in primitive recreation.

Medium - There are some opportunities for engaging in primitive recreation.

Low - There are few to no opportunities to engage in primitive recreation.

Rating: High - The areas, except for most of Exclusion 1, provide a wide variety of primitive recreation opportunities including backpacking, fishing, horseback riding, hunting, wildlife viewing, and photography.

Special Features and Values

11. Area contains outstanding or distinct features like rock formations, panoramic views, etc.

High - Many distinct features or few but exceptional features.

Medium - Some distinct features.

Low - One or no distinct features.

Rating: High - There are outstanding panoramic view throughout the areas. Unusual and spectacular rock formations are common throughout the area. The box canyons along the Blue River are unique.

12. Area has potential for scientific research, environmental education, or historic/cultural opportunities.

High - Good potential for two or more types of these opportunities.

Medium - Potential for one type of opportunity.

Low - Little or no potential for this type of opportunity.

Rating: High - There is the potential for scientific research because of the ecological diversity of the areas and the presence of cultural resources.

13. Area contains unique or rare species of plants and/or animals.

High - Area has several unique or rare plants and/or animals.

Medium - Area has a few unique or rare plants and/or animals.

Low - Area has no unique or rare plants and/or animals.

Rating: **High** - A variety of rare or unique species, including Mexican spotted owl (1, 2a, 2b, and 5), northern goshawk (5), Apache trout (5), Gila trout (1), and loach minnow (1, 3, and 4) are found in the areas.

Overall Capability: **High** - Sawmill Creek, the southern end of 1, and Exclusions 2-5

Low - Exclusion 1, without Sawmill Creek and the southern end

Manageability

14. Ability to manage the area for wilderness character, including distance and influence from outside activities; opportunity to access the area; and resource conflicts or encumbrances.

High - Isolated from areas of activity; controlled or limited access; no encumbrances or resource conflicts.

Medium - Somewhat isolated from areas of activity; adequate access opportunities; some resource conflicts and/or encumbrances.

Low - Areas of activity are nearby; many access opportunities; many resource conflicts and/or encumbrances.

Rating: **High** - Sawmill Creek, the southern end of 1, and Exclusions 2-5. Access to Exclusions 2b and 5 is good. The areas are currently managed as wilderness. There are currently no mining claims in any of the areas.

Low - Exclusion 1, without Sawmill Creek and the southern end. Access is good. The area surrounds private lands and includes many areas of activity.

15. Motorized use within the area.

Yes - Has motorized vehicle use.

No - Does not have any motorized vehicle use.

Rating: **No** - Exclusions 2-5 are currently managed as wilderness.

Yes - Most of Exclusion 1 has a road through it, but motorized vehicle use is not allowed off the road.

Overall Manageability: **High** - Sawmill Creek, the southern end of 1, and Exclusions 2-5

Low - Exclusion 1, without Sawmill Creek and the southern end

Appendix C: Availability Evaluation and Ratings

Availability Characteristics

1. Areas that are of high value for water yield or on-site storage where installation and maintenance of improvements may be required.

High - No impoundment needed.

Medium - Minor improvements will have an effect.

Low - Identified impoundment that will have an effect on wild characteristics.

Rating: 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - **High** - The areas are of value for water yield. However, no impoundments are needed.

2. Areas needing management for wildlife or aquatic animals that **MIGHT** conflict with wilderness management.

Low - Intense management (motorized equipment: helicopters, chainsaws, broadcast burning) and frequent entries (= or <5 yrs).

Medium - Management requires helicopters but no motorized equipment on the ground and frequency is generally less than 10 years.

High - Low management requirements with no motorized equipment required to meet objectives and infrequent entries.

Rating: Southern end of 1 - **Low** - The area may need frequent management over the next decade for aquatic animals.

2a, 3, 4, 5, and Sawmill Creek - **High** - No wildlife or aquatic animal management activities have been identified.

2b - **Medium** - Some management activities requiring motorized equipment may be needed in the area.

3. Area needing active aquatic restoration activities.

Low - The majority of watershed needs attention.

Medium - Site-specific improvements needed.

High - Properly functioning with no or little restoration activities needed.

Rating: Southern end of 1, 3, and 4 - **Medium** - Aquatic restoration activities are needed.

Tamarisk is currently found along the Blue River (1, 3, and 4). Should a major flood occur on the Blue River, there would be a need to restore and improve the floodplain.

Sawmill Creek, 2a, 2b, and 5 - **High** - There are currently no aquatic restoration activities identified.

4. Area needing active vegetative restoration activities due to specific species survival (such as White Bark Pine restoration) or identifiable fuel reduction activity to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire or known areas of severe insect infestation that will lead to heavy tree mortality.

Low - The need for vegetation restoration is a higher priority and requires long-term management and mechanized or motorized equipment.

Medium - Areas needing high intensity management activities for a short time period (< or = 5 years). These areas could be available for wilderness after those activities are completed (like fuel reduction activities). Some intense restoration work over small areas could be accomplished without conflicting with wilderness management (species conservation work not requiring motorized equipment).

High - The area needs little vegetative restoration.

Rating: 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - **Medium** - Vegetation treatments, primarily burning, may be needed to reduce fuels and to restore grassland ecosystems.

5. Areas having such unique characteristics or natural phenomena that general public access should be developed to facilitate public use and enjoyment.

High - Does not exist or minimal development will be provided.

Medium - Requires minor development or improvement that does not qualify as a developed recreation site but is a higher development level than is normally found within wilderness.

Low - Has a developed recreation site or features that warrant construction of a developed recreation site.

Rating: 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - **High** - There are no unique characteristics that would require developed public access.

6. Lands committed through contracts, permits or agreements that would be in conflict with wilderness management (some minor permitted uses may be still be allowed).

High - Current authorizations do not conflict with potential wilderness.

Medium - Current authorization(s) but can be terminated or there is long-term authorization or commitment but does not require motorized equipment for access or maintenance.

Low - Currently exists, must be retained (long-term commitments), and requires motorized equipment for access or maintenance.

Rating: 2a, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - **High** - Current authorizations, primarily grazing permits, do not conflict with potential wilderness.

2b - **Low** - Current permitted grazing use and the ability to use motorized equipment within the area and tools to maintain range developments is critical to the operation and effectiveness of grazing management. Stateline cabin exists within 2b and is used extensively for the management of the Alma Mesa Allotment. There is a special authorization for the grazing permittee to access to Stateline cabin with motorized vehicles.

3 and 4 - **High** - These areas are mostly located in the Sandrock Allotment which is not currently permitted for grazing. Grazing has not been permitted since the 1987 ASNFs Forest Plan.

7. Forest Service has sufficient control to prevent development of irresolvable, incompatible use that would lessen wilderness character and potential.

High - No inholdings and no non-federal lands adjacent to potential wilderness.

Medium - No inholdings but adjacent lands may be private.

Low - Inholdings exist.

Rating: 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1 - **High** - There are no inholdings or non-federal lands adjacent to these potential wildernesses.

Southern end of 1 - **Medium** - There is one piece of private land adjacent to this potential wilderness.

Mineral potential was evaluated using the *R3 Plan Revision Guidance: Minerals Information Related to the Evaluation of Potential Wilderness and Research Natural Areas*. This guidance uses several databases to consider the presence and status of mining claims, mineral leases, and mineral districts. Based on the information contained in the above databases, and as described in the Background section of this evaluation, there is low mineral potential for most of this potential wilderness - exclusions 2a, 2b, 4, 5, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1. There is low to moderate potential for future mineral uses in exclusion 3.

Rating: **High**

Overall Availability: Southern end of 1 and 2b - **Medium to High**

Sawmill Creek, 2a, 3, 4, and 5 - **High**

Appendix D: Need Evaluation

Factor 1 - The location, size, and type of other wildernesses in the general vicinity and their distance from the proposed area. Consider accessibility of areas to population centers and user groups. Public demand for wilderness may increase with proximity to growing population centers.

There are 24 Wilderness areas within 100 miles of PW-03-01-069. The total acreage of these areas is 1,076,435 acres. The Forest Service (FS) manages 13 of these areas, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages 9, and the National Park Service (NPS) manages 2.

| Potential Wilderness | Wilderness Area within 100 Miles | Wilderness Acreage | Distance from Potential Wilderness | Managing Agency |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| PW-03-01-069 | Aldo Leopold | 206,700 | 71 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Apache Kid | 44,835 | 96 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Aravaipa Canyon | 19,790 | 81 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Bear Wallow | 11,113 | 9 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Blue Range | 35,815 | 8 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Cebolla | 66,445 | 97 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Chiricahua | 88,793 | 100 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Chiricahua National Monument | 12,161 | 94 | NPS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Dos Cabezas Mountains | 11,855 | 83 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Fishhooks | 11,400 | 47 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Galiuro | 75,585 | 86 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Gila | 558,549 | 41 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Mount Baldy | 7,627 | 25 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Needle's Eye | 6,277 | 83 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | North Santa Teresa | 5,733 | 64 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Peloncillo Mountains | 19,244 | 71 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Petrified Forest | 52,058 | 86 | NPS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Redfield Canyon | 6,206 | 90 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Salome | 18,688 | 100 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Salt River Canyon | 32,035 | 87 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Santa Teresa | 28,769 | 68 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | Sierra Ancha | 18,198 | 93 | FS |
| PW-03-01-069 | West Malpais | 37,839 | 97 | BLM |
| PW-03-01-069 | Withington | 18,973 | 95 | FS |
| | TOTAL | 1,076,435 | | |

There are 34 Wilderness areas and 1,463,897 wilderness acres within 130 miles of Tucson. There are 13 potential wilderness areas and 342,514 potential wilderness acres on the ASNFs within 130 miles of Tucson (only acres within 130 miles are shown; actual and potential wilderness areas may be larger).

| Population Center | Wilderness Area within 130 Miles | Wilderness Acres within 130 Miles | Potential Wilderness within 130 Miles | Potential Wilderness Acres within 130 Miles |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Tucson | Aravaipa Canyon | 19,790 | PW-03-01-054 | 15,524 |
| | Baboquivari Peak | 2,776 | PW-03-01-058 | 5,222 |
| | Bear Wallow | 11,100 | PW-03-01-053 | 17,541 |
| | Chiricahua | 88,793 | PW-03-01-057 | 5,698 |
| | Chiricahua National Monument | 12,161 | PW-03-01-067 | 30,365 |
| | Coyote Mountains | 5,795 | PW-03-01-051 | 44,106 |
| | Dos Cabezas Mountains | 11,855 | PW-03-01-052 | 139,894 |
| | Fishhooks | 11,400 | PW-03-01-050 | 7,955 |
| | Four Peaks | 60,487 | PW-03-01-064 | 172 |
| | Galiuro | 75,585 | PW-03-01-047 | 1,023 |
| | Mazatzal | 42,986 | PW-03-01-049 | 74,149 |
| | Miller Peak | 20,381 | PW-03-01-066 | 865 |
| | Mount Wrightson | 25,596 | TOTAL | 342,514 |
| | Needle's Eye | 6,277 | | |
| | North Maricopa Mountains | 61,157 | | |
| | North Santa Teresa | 5,733 | | |
| | Organ Pipe Cactus (NPS) | 280,403 | | |
| | Organ Pipe Cactus (FWS) | 120,043 | | |
| | Pajarita | 7,897 | | |
| | Peloncillo Mountains | 19,244 | | |
| | Pusch Ridge | 56,743 | | |
| | Redfield Canyon | 6,206 | | |
| | Rincon Mountain | 38,611 | | |
| | Saguaro | 77,119 | | |
| | Salome | 18,688 | | |
| | Salt River Canyon | 32,035 | | |
| | Santa Teresa | 28,769 | | |
| | Sierra Ancha | 18,198 | | |
| | Sierra Estrella | 14,746 | | |
| | South Maricopa Mtns | 58,963 | | |
| | Superstition | 158,920 | | |
| | Table Top | 34,696 | | |
| | White Canyon | 6,981 | | |
| | Woolsey Peak | 23,763 | | |
| | TOTAL | 1,463,897 | | |

Factor 2 - Present visitor pressure on other wildernesses, the trends in use, changing patterns of use, population expansion factors, and trends and changes in transportation.

Item 1

Each Federal agency that manages wilderness collects and reports visitor use information differently. The Forest Service reports wilderness use by each national forest, not each wilderness. The National Park Service collects backcountry visitor use only for overnight stays. The Bureau of Land Management reports use for each wilderness.

According to the 2001 National Visitor Use Monitoring study, approximately two percent of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (ASNFs) users visited the three wilderness areas on the forest. This figure is similar to other non-urban forests in the Southwestern Region. More urban forests (Cibola and Coronado) reported approximately 25 percent of their users visited wilderness areas.

Most of the wilderness use on the ASNFs is concentrated in the two smaller wilderness areas, Mount Baldy and Escudilla. These areas are each less than 10,000 acres, are easily accessible by motor vehicles, and have limited trail systems. Visitor use in Mount Baldy is considered high with use concentrated on two of the three trails. Visitor use in Escudilla is considered moderate to high with use concentrated on one trail. Encounters with other wilderness visitors in both areas are high. Use in Bear Wallow Wilderness is lighter because it is less accessible and is slightly larger. There are no accurate use figures for the Blue Range Primitive Area, which is managed as wilderness.

Approximately 70 percent of the Arizona visitors to the ASNFs are from the Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas. Populations in these areas have increased much faster than in the more rural areas. Visitors from the four counties where the ASNFs are located account for another 20 percent. In general, there has been no to moderate population growth in these counties. Recently, there have been major highway improvements between Phoenix and the ASNFs.

It can be assumed that with increasing populations and improved transportation features, wilderness use would continue to increase in those wilderness areas on the ASNFs that are easily accessible to the recreating public.

Item 2

The ASNFs include three designated wilderness areas, the nation's sole remaining primitive area, and 322,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas. Users of designated wilderness areas fit a profile similar to other forests' users: 1) they are predominantly male (81 percent), 2) white (91 percent) or Hispanic/Latino (6 percent), 3) between the ages of 31 and 60, and 4) often travel from the Phoenix and Tucson areas. NVUM data suggest that roughly 45,000 wilderness visits were made during fiscal year 2001 although the error rate on this data is very high (± 56 percent) because of the relatively low number of visitors interviewed (Kocis et al. 2002). There are no use figures specific to the Blue Range Primitive Area or the inventoried roadless areas.

Regional Demand for Wilderness

1. Increased demand for additional wilderness in both Arizona and New Mexico should be anticipated based on population growth during the period of 1990 to 2000, which exceeded the national growth rate.

2. Assuming Arizona continues to grow at a rate greatly outpacing the national rate (predicted to be about 3 times the national rate), the number of visits to existing wilderness will continue to increase, and Arizona in particular could benefit from additional wilderness.
3. Demographics related to visitor race and ethnicity will affect the rate of increase in wilderness visits in the Southwestern Region. Even though the faster growing racial/ethnic groups have relatively low participation rates, wilderness use is still expected to increase because of the overall population growth rate.
4. Public demand increases with proximity to six population centers: Flagstaff, Phoenix, Tucson, Santa Fe, Taos, and Albuquerque. Consider wilderness recommendations within 100 miles of those cities to provide for that demand.
5. Some additional public demand for wilderness in the Southwestern Region will occur from the influx of people moving to communities in the vicinity of the National Forests.
6. In terms of geographic distribution of wilderness, the Southwestern Region is under-represented with five percent fewer wilderness acres as compared with the representation nationally. Additionally, all quadrants in Arizona and New Mexico are under-represented with the exception of the southwest and southeast quadrants in Arizona. The most under-represented quadrants are southeast and northwest New Mexico and northeast Arizona, which are at 6 percent or less in the number of wilderness acres (compared with total federal wilderness acres).
7. Desirability of the scenic mountainous settings available in the rural communities within and adjacent to national forests in the Southwestern Region will attract new retirees and others, further contributing to a growth in wilderness visitation.

Factor 3 - The extent to which nonwilderness lands on the NFS unit or other Federal lands are likely to provide opportunities for unconfined outdoor recreation experiences.

There are 42 Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) and 860,959 IRA acres within 130 miles of Tucson
There are 6 BLM Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and 42,180 WSA acres within 130 miles of Tucson (only acres within 130 miles are shown, actual IRAs and WSAs may be larger).

Within 130 miles of Tucson and on the ASNFs, there are 101,939 acres managed for Semi-Primitive Motorized recreation, 189,810 acres managed for Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized recreation, and 92,218 acres managed for Primitive recreation. Many of these acres overlap with Wilderness areas, the Blue Range Primitive Area, IRAs, and potential wilderness.

| Population Center | Inventoried Roadless Area within 130 Miles | IRA Acres within 130 Miles | National Forest |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Tucson | Bear Wallow | 784 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Black Cross | 5,959 | Tonto |
| | Black River Canyon | 734 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Boulder | 40,310 | Tonto |
| | Butterfly | 42,278 | Coronado |
| | Catalina St. Pk. | 950 | Coronado |
| | Cdo Wsa | 1,954 | Coronado |
| | Cherry Creek | 11,357 | Tonto |
| | Chiricahua | 76,892 | Coronado |
| | Galiuro | 28,314 | Coronado |
| | Goldfield | 15,239 | Tonto |
| | Happy Valley | 7,971 | Coronado |
| | Hell Hole | 15,498 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Hell Hole | 19,536 | Gila |
| | Horse Mesa | 9,136 | Tonto |
| | Hot Air | 31,677 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Lime Creek | 8,662 | Tonto |
| | Lower Dragoon | 1,165 | Coronado |
| | Lower Rincon | 3,278 | Coronado |
| | Lower Romero WSR | 10 | Coronado |
| | Lower San Francisco | 1,045 | Gila |
| | Lower San Francisco | 36,279 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Mazatzal | 2,626 | Tonto |
| | Middle Dragoon | 10,544 | Coronado |
| | Middle Romero WSR | 60 | Coronado |
| | Mitchell Peak | 35,362 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Oracle | 22,354 | Coronado |
| | Painted Bluffs | 43,074 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Peloncillo | 56,469 | Coronado |
| | Picacho | 4,963 | Tonto |
| | Pinaleno | 130,834 | Coronado |
| | Pipestem | 34,560 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Pipestem/Lower San Francisco | 152 | Apache-Sitgreaves |

| Population Center | Inventoried Roadless Area within 130 Miles | IRA Acres within 130 Miles | National Forest |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | Salome | 2,928 | Tonto |
| | Salt House | 21,822 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Santa Rita | 6,079 | Coronado |
| | Santa Teresa | 8,921 | Coronado |
| | Sierra Ancha Wilderness Contiguous | 7,778 | Tonto |
| | Sunset | 28,920 | Apache-Sitgreaves |
| | Tumacacori | 44,626 | Coronado |
| | Upper Dragoon | 2,533 | Coronado |
| | Upper Rincon | 2,990 | Coronado |
| | Upper Romero WSR | 150 | Coronado |
| | Whetstone | 20,733 | Coronado |
| | Winchester | 13,453 | Coronado |
| | | 860,959 | |

| Population Center | BLM Wilderness Study Area within 130 Miles | WSA Acres within 130 Miles |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Tucson | Apache Box | 6,218 |
| | Baker Canyon | 4,697 |
| | Blue Canyon | 14,565 |
| | Gila Lower Box | 8,515 |
| | Guadalupe Canyon ISA | 4,204 |
| | Peloncillo Mountains | 3,981 |
| | | 42,180 |

Factor 4 - The need to provide a refuge for those species that have demonstrated an inability to survive in less than primitive surroundings or the need for a protected area for other unique scientific values or phenomena.

The ASNFs have identified 11 Threatened and Endangered species, 45 sensitive animal species, and 21 sensitive plant species that occur or are found on the forests. None of these species require a primitive wilderness environment to survive. However, some (Mexican gray wolf, for example) would benefit from reduced disturbance and human encounters.

Factor 5 - Within social and biological limits, management may increase the capacity of established wildernesses to support human use without unacceptable depreciation of the wilderness resource.

There are three Wilderness areas on the ASNFs, all on the Apache side. Two, Mount Baldy and Escudilla, are less than 10,000 acres, are easily accessed by motor vehicles, and have limited trail systems. Visitor use in Mount Baldy is considered high with use concentrated on two of the three trails. Visitor use in Escudilla is considered moderate to high with use concentrated on one trail. Encounters with other wilderness visitors in both areas are high. For these two areas there are limited management opportunities to accommodate additional use. The third wilderness, Bear Wallow, is slightly larger, is more difficult to access, and has five trails. Visitor use is considered low. Here, additional demand could be accommodated without management changes.

Factor 6 - An area's ability to provide for preservation of identifiable landform types and ecosystems. Consideration of this factor may include utilization of Edwin A. Hammond's subdivision of landform types and the Bailey-Kuchler ecosystem classification. This approach is helpful from the standpoint of rounding out the National Wilderness Preservation System and may be further subdivided to suit local, subregional, and regional needs.

The Southwestern Regional Office used the process outlined in Loomis and Echohawk (1999)⁶ to determine the underrepresented landforms and ecosystem types in Wilderness within the Southwestern Region.

The following landforms within the White Mountains-San Francisco Peaks-Mogollon Rim ecoregion section (where the ASNFs are located) are underrepresented in Wilderness in the region: Burro Mountains Oak-Juniper Woodland, Coconino Plateau Woodland, and San Francisco Peaks Coniferous Forest. Only Burro Mountain Oak-Juniper Woodland and Coconino Plateau Woodland are found on the ASNFs.

The following ecosystems types are underrepresented in Wilderness in the region: Desert Communities, Great Basin/Colorado Plateau Grassland, Great Plains Grassland, Piñon-Juniper Woodland, Sagebrush Shrubland, and Semi-desert Grassland. Only Great Basin Grassland, Piñon-Juniper Woodland, and Semi-desert Grassland are found on the ASNFs.

These potential wildernesses contain one underrepresented ecosystem: 5,740 acres of Semi-desert Grassland (2b, 3, 4, Sawmill Creek, and the southern end of 1).

Overall Need: Low

⁶ Loomis, John and Echohawk, J. Chris. 1999. Using GIS to identify under-represented ecosystems in the National Wilderness Preservation System in the USA. *Environmental Conservation*. 26 (1): 53–58.

UNDERREPRESENTED LANDFORMS

| Potential Wilderness | Name | Acreage | Acres of Burro Mountains Oak-Juniper Woodland | Acres of Coconino Plateau Woodland |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--|---|
| PW-03-01-001 | Leonard Canyon | 22,405 | | 7,171 |
| PW-03-01-003 | West Chevelon Canyon | 9,493 | | 3,689 |
| PW-03-01-011 | Black Canyon | 4,913 | | 4,911 |
| PW-03-01-053 | Cold Spring Mountain | 17,541 | 1,878 | |
| PW-03-01-054 | Hells Hole | 15,524 | 15,439 | |
| PW-03-01-056 | Chevelon Canyon North | 6,673 | | 6,612 |
| PW-03-01-057 | Coal Creek | 5,698 | 370 | |
| PW-03-01-058 | Big Lue Mountains | 5,222 | 4,932 | |

UNDERREPRESENTED ECOSYSTEMS

| Potential Wilderness | Name | Acreage | Acres of Great Basin Grassland | Acres of Piñon-Juniper Woodland | Acres of Semi-Desert Grassland |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| PW-03-01-001 | Leonard Canyon | 22,405 | | 9,245 | |
| PW-03-01-003 | West Chevelon Canyon | 9,493 | | 5,273 | |
| PW-03-01-006 | Wildcat Canyon South | 6,972 | 5 | 993 | |
| PW-03-01-011 | Black Canyon | 4,913 | 819 | 3,963 | |
| PW-03-01-040 | Mother Hubbard | 2,656 | | 922 | |
| PW-03-01-042 | Nolan | 7,841 | | 333 | |
| PW-03-01-049 | Hot Air/Salt House | 76,127 | | | 5,743 |
| PW-03-01-050 | Sheep Wash | 7,965 | | | 1,259 |
| PW-03-01-051 | Painted Bluffs | 44,106 | | | 6,896 |
| PW-03-01-052 | West Blue/San Francisco | 160,013 | | | 33,081 |
| PW-03-01-053 | Cold Spring Mountain | 17,541 | | | 4,790 |
| PW-03-01-054 | Hells Hole | 15,524 | | | 4,856 |
| PW-03-01-056 | Chevelon Canyon North | 6,673 | 2,244 | 4,372 | |
| PW-03-01-057 | Coal Creek | 5,698 | | | 1,027 |
| PW-03-01-058 | Big Lue Mountains | 5,222 | | | 1,172 |
| PW-03-01-060 | Centerfire | 15,268 | | 503 | |
| PW-03-01-062 | Chevelon Lake | 6,585 | | 596 | |
| PW-03-01-063 | Milk Creek | 5,387 | 400 | 2,039 | |
| PW-03-01-067 | Sunset | 30,365 | | | 17,755 |
| PW-03-01-068 | BRW Recommendation | 166,588 | | 1,604 | 9,471 |
| PW-03-01-069-1 | BRWPR Exclusion 1 | 2,553 | | | 90 |
| PW-03-01-069-2B | BRWPR Exclusion 2b | 6,958 | | | 3,404 |
| PW-03-01-069-3 | BRWPR Exclusion 3 | 4,665 | | | 304 |
| PW-03-01-069-4 | BRWPR Exclusion 4 | 10,404 | | | 2,032 |