

Appendix C. Coordination with Other Public Planning Efforts

Overview

Per the provision of the 1982 planning regulations, the responsible official shall review the planning and land use policies of other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and American Indian tribes. In addition, the Chief of the Forest Service, Tom Tidwell, has called for an “all-lands approach” to accomplish ecosystem restoration. This will involve landowners and stakeholders working together across boundaries to decide on common goals for the landscapes they share. In order to facilitate this all-lands approach, it is important to understand the goals and anticipated activities landowners adjacent to the national forest. The following sections provide a summary of those goals and activities. Table 198 lists the other public planning efforts that were considered in the plan revision process.

Table 1. Other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and American Indian tribes planning efforts considered in the plan revision process

Apache County, Arizona	Show Low, Arizona	Arizona Department of Agriculture
Coconino County, Arizona	Pinetop-Lakeside, Arizona	Arizona Department of Transportation
Greenlee County, Arizona	Greer, Arizona	Arizona Game and Fish Department
Navajo County, Arizona	Springerville, Arizona	Arizona State Forestry Division
Catron County, New Mexico	Eagar, Arizona	Arizona State Land Department
Graham County, Arizona	Nutrioso, Arizona	Arizona State Parks
Gila County, Arizona	Alpine, Arizona	Governor’s Forest Health Councils
Grant County, New Mexico	Blue, Arizona	Bureau of Land Management
Heber-Overgaard, Arizona	Eagle Creek, Arizona	Federal Highway Administration
Forest Lakes, Arizona	White Mountain Apache Tribe ¹	Coconino National Forest
Clay Springs, Arizona	San Carlos Apache Tribe	Tonto National Forest
Pinedale, Arizona	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality	Gila National Forest
Linden, Arizona	Arizona Department of Water Resources	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

¹ The Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Other Lands and Land Use Plans only reviewed American Indian tribes that have reservations that border the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs. Other tribes that affect forest management are described in the DEIS.

Counties

The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs lie in five counties: Apache, Coconino, Greenlee, and Navajo Counties in Arizona and Catron County in New Mexico. The Apache National Forest portion that lies in New Mexico is administered by the Gila National Forest. The forest borders three other counties: Graham and Gila Counties in Arizona and Grant County in New Mexico.

County comprehensive plans can be used as a source of information on the history of land use within the region, the patterns of development, desired conditions, and current county land use policies. County governments hold no legal authority over independent jurisdictions such as Federal and state lands, incorporated cities and towns or American Indian tribal reservations.

County land use within the planning area ranges from traditional uses such as farming and ranching in rural areas to denser concentrations of residential, industrial, and commercial uses in and around more urban areas (e.g., Show Low, Pinetop-Lakeside, Springerville, Eagar, Heber-Overgaard). One of the common themes is how, and whether, private owners and public land managers can manage the competing priorities of resource conservation and economic development – in particular how to cope with the growing demands for housing and recreation while ensuring preservation of a shrinking natural resource base that contributes to Arizona’s highly valued “rural character.”

Apache County

The comprehensive county plan’s (2004) vision statement includes “Apache County offers a rural character of natural beauty and abundance. This includes values such as independence, privacy, and personal freedom that attract many seeking both permanent residence and seasonal refuge.”

Only 13 percent of the county is privately owned, more than 65 percent is covered by American Indian Reservations, and 21 percent is in public ownership. There are three incorporated communities in the county, two of which border the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs: Springerville and Eagar. County lands adjacent to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs are classified as range land, community village, and rural edge.

The county plan recognizes the National Forest System land exchange process as a growth management tool to help facilitate development new communities and discourage development in remote or sensitive areas. There is one goal with direct ties to the national forest:

- Goal 9: Reduce the danger from fire for all residents living in a wildland-urban interface or near a national forest boundary.

Greenlee County, Arizona

The vision for Greenlee County from the comprehensive county plan (2003) includes the rural character, outdoor recreation, access, and natural resource harvesting and extracting. Forest Service land makes up 64 percent of the county. Only 6 percent of the county is privately owned. The county has two incorporated towns – Clifton and Duncan. The county goals directly tied to the national forest include:

- Connect the forest trails with new trails.
- Return to the multi-use of the land.
- Consider local concerns and implement appropriate actions.
- Maintain a healthy sustainable forest that provides raw materials while limiting incompatible uses.
- Develop roads in the forest for people that cannot hike or use horses.

Navajo County, Arizona

The comprehensive county plan (2004) “character areas” describe the vision for the county by helping to protect the existing community character while maximizing balanced economic development. The lands adjacent to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs are characterized as community village, rural edge, and rural ranch.

Almost 66 percent of Navajo County is American Indian reservation land. The Forest Service and BLM lands make up 9 percent of the county. The county has six incorporated cities/towns: Holbrook, Pinetop-Lakeside, Show Low, Snowflake, Taylor, and Winslow.

The Rodeo-Chediski Fire prompted a focus on long-term forest health as critical to future growth and development of the county. In particular, the plan focuses on population centers, paved roads, and previously treated forest areas as central to managing similar fires in the future. The plan recommends strategically located treatment programs in areas where multiple canyons converge or where canyons allow fires from below the Mogollon Rim to reach and gain strength at higher elevations. It also recommends that the Mogollon Rim Road and State Route 260 be paved to provide broader firebreaks. It also recommends treatment of a defensible area one mile outside each populated area. The plan advocates a forestwide management plan and professional treatment program that would eliminate excess fuels while providing forest-related jobs for the local economy.

Coconino County, Arizona

The comprehensive county plan’s (2003) vision for Coconino County is based on a conservation framework and emphasizes healthy landscapes where natural resources are conserved and land is used efficiently.

Forest Service land makes up 28 percent of the county, most of the land lies within the Coconino and Kaibab National Forests and the rest lies within the Apache-Sitgreaves and Prescott National Forests. Incorporated cities/towns include: Flagstaff, Fredonia, Page, Sedona, and Williams.

The county goals tied to the national forest include:

- Improve forest health and promote the restoration of forest ecosystems.
- Manage recreational uses in a manner that minimizes impacts to communities and the environment.
- Concentrate development in designated growth areas while preserving open space and landscapes.

Catron County, New Mexico

Catron County borders the Apache National Forest along its eastern border. The primary land owner along the forest boundary is the Gila National Forest, although there are also several non-Federal parcels.

The primary purpose of the plan for Catron County (1992) is to protect the custom, culture, and livelihoods of county residents in the face of onerous state and Federal regulations. The plan states that county citizens are particularly vulnerable to “aggressive” state and Federal land use policies given the fact most of the county is managed under other jurisdictions. Government land

agencies (primarily BLM and Forest Service) have jurisdiction on over 70 percent of lands in Catron County. Reserve is the only incorporated town in Catron County.

In response to a perceived abuse of Federal authority on county lands, the plan explains “all natural resource decisions affecting Catron County shall be guided by the principles of protecting private property rights, protecting local custom and culture, maintaining traditional economic structures through self-determination, and opening new economic opportunities through reliance on free markets”

The plan describes Federal and state land use restrictions as arbitrary barriers that have been “illegally imposed” without county government input. This sentiment is found throughout the plan and emphasizes close coordination on the development of Federal and state land use policies that are responsive to the public interest.

The Catron County plan describes both the custom and culture of the county as being linked to traditional land use practices such as livestock grazing, timber harvesting, mining, and hunting. A primary basis for the plan is the stated notion that Federal regulations aimed at protecting the environment and endangered species have had a particularly detrimental effect on the economy and social stability of Catron County.

The plan does not specifically address topics such as preferred locations and densities for residential, commercial, and industrial land uses, nor does it provide guidelines or standards pertaining to community infrastructure of services. The Catron County plan is currently being revised.

Graham County, Arizona

Graham County borders the west side of the Apache National Forest. The San Carlos Indian Reservation occupies the county adjacent to the forests. See the “San Carlos Apache Tribe” section for more info.

Gila County, Arizona

Gila County borders the far southwest portion of the Sitgreaves National Forest along the Mogollon Rim. The county lands adjacent to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs are not zoned, platted, developed, or are in extremely remote or difficult-to-access locations. The goal for these areas is to maintain a rural, very low density, large lot residential development (LVA Urban Design Studio, 2003).

The “Southern Gila County Community Wildfire Protection Plan” (Logan Simpson Design, Inc., 2010) does not identify wildland-urban interface directly adjacent to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs. There are several wildland-urban interface areas located southwest of the forests within 20 miles.

Grant County, New Mexico

Grant County borders the far southeast portion of the Apache National Forest along the New Mexico border. The primary landowner along the boundary is the Gila National Forest, although there are also several non-Federal parcels. The county currently does not have a comprehensive land use plan.

Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)

Three community wildfire protection plans (CWPP) outline goals for at-risk-communities within and around the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs. These plans are:

- “Community Wildfire Protection Plan for At-Risk Communities of the Apache National Forest in Apache County” (Logan Simpson Design, Inc., 2004a)
- “Community Wildfire Protection Plan for At-Risk Communities of the Sitgreaves National Forest in Apache, Coconino, and Navajo Counties” (Logan Simpson Design, Inc., 2004b)
- “Greenlee County Community Wildfire Protection Plan for At-Risk Communities of the Apache National Forest in Greenlee County” (Logan Simpson Design, Inc., 2005)

The primary goal of the plans is for Federal land to return to Condition Class I where wildfire can be incorporated into long-term management practices to sustain forest health. The plans also delineate the wildland-urban interface where human development meets and intermingles with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuels. The plans are used by Apache-Sitgreaves NFs’ managers to help prioritize areas for fuel reduction treatments.

Communities, Towns, and Cities

There are several communities, towns, and cities within or adjacent to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs. These include Heber-Overgaard, Forest Lakes, Clay Springs, Pinedale, Linden, Show Low, Pinetop-Lakeside, Greer, Springerville, Eagar, Nutrioso, Alpine, Blue, and Eagle Creek.

The communities surrounding the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs have a history of involvement with and dependence upon the national forests and natural resource topics in general. Arizona has long been dependent upon natural resources for commodity production, clean water, tourism, and aesthetic enjoyment. As a result the public has frequently expressed interest in the use and management of these resources. Some recent examples:

- Town of Pinetop-Lakeside – In 2008, the town inquired about a special designation for Woodland Lake Park. The park is under permit by the town and is within city limits, however, it is located on NFS land.
- City of Show Low – In 2009, the city adopted a resolution supporting the Four-Forest Restoration Initiative, a strategy to implement landscape-scale restoration of the region’s forests, and authorizing the signing of a letter of support urging Congress to provide the necessary resources to implement it.
- Town of Eagar – In 2010, the town council adopted a resolution requesting the Apache-Sitgreaves NF maintain the existing management practice (allowing cross-country travel) and the accessibility of all existing roadways and trails as they currently are within the forests.

One of the most common concerns of these communities is the risk associated with uncharacteristic wildfire and hazardous fuel buildup. This issue has been articulated in the community wildfire protection plans (see above).

Tribes

Federally recognized American Indian tribes occupy about 53.5 million acres (7 percent) of land in the western states. Two tribal reservations border the west side of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs: Fort Apache Indian Reservation and San Carlos Apache Reservation. These tribes are legally considered to be sovereign nations, meaning the Forest Service has a government-to-government relationship with the tribes. Tribes that enter into contracts with the Federal government do so just as state governments or sovereign nations do.

In addition, the Federal government also holds a special responsibility to consult with tribes over management concerns that may affect them. This process is governed by a variety of Federal regulations and policies, including the Forest Service Handbook 1509.13, the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act, the Tribal Forest Protection Act, the Archeological Resources Protection Act, and several presidential executive orders.

Tribes' use of Forest Service land includes free, non-permitted activities such as gathering boughs and basket materials as well as the use of products such as sawtimber. In addition, the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs include traditional cultural places, the locations of which are known only to the tribes.

Fort Apache Indian Reservation (White Mountain Apache Tribe)

Forest Management

The 2005-2014 Forest Management Plan (Fort Apache Agency, 2005) identifies several reservationwide forest management objectives. They include:

- Utilize a variety of silvicultural tools including commercial harvesting, precommercial thinning, prescribed fire, site preparation, and natural and artificial regeneration to move stand structure, composition, and other characteristics toward that of the target forest.
- To the extent possible, practice uneven-aged management within ponderosa pine and mixed conifer stands. Even-aged methods are silviculturally appropriate for spruce and aspen stands, fire damaged areas, or areas with severe insect or disease infestations.
- Maintain forest qualities that will protect or provide wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, good forage, quality scenery, clean rivers and streams, and other multiple-use values.
- Improve wildlife habitat by increasing production of forage and browse and diversity in species, density, and cover.
- Enhance opportunities for livestock production by increasing abundance and vigor of palatable forage, through density management of overstory trees. Work with range conservationists to coordinate any grazing deferments or systematic grazing schedules that benefit the resource as a whole.
- Protect soil and water quality by developing prescriptions that will enhance watershed condition through time.
- Conduct harvest operations to obtain as complete utilization of forest products as practical. Assist the White Mountain Apache Tribe in developing markets for previously under-utilized forest products or species.

- Minimize threat to life and property, and damage to forests, soils and watersheds from catastrophic wildfire through effective fire prevention, enforcement, pre-suppression, and suppression programs.
- Provide sufficient initial attack forces to confine fires as soon as possible. For fires which escape, or are expected to escape initial attack, systematically build up suppression and support forces to the level required to bring about control in a safe, effective, and efficient manner.
- Manage natural and activity-created wildland fuels to reduce wildfire size, intensity, behavior, and threat to life and property.

The forest management plan divides the reservation into twelve management emphasis areas (MEAs) including wilderness, sensitive fish, sensitive plants, water, sensitive wildlife, recreation, sensitive sites, scenic byways, community, fuels management, limited management, and forest products.

Recreation and Wildlife

Recreation is managed with a permit system for fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, river rafting, sightseeing, picnicking, biking, and cross-country skiing. The tribe offers a trophy elk hunting program that has been in operation since 1976 (White Mountain Apache Tribe, 2010).

Transportation

There are approximately 1,000 miles of roadways on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation. There are also about 128 miles of State highways, including State Route 73 located in the northern part of the reservation and passing through the communities of Fort Apache and White Mountain. U.S. Highway 60/State Route 77 runs from the Salt River Canyon and the border with the San Carlos Indian Reservation to the intersection with State Route 260, just north of the reservation border. State Route 260 is an east-west route in the northeast corner of the reservation that goes through Hon-Dah and McNary. The BIA agency roads engineer works closely with the tribe on transportation. The BIA has staff on the reservation and is responsible for the roads' programming and maintenance. The BIA has a consulting contract to develop the long-range transportation plan for the tribe. As of 2004, ongoing and proposed road projects included the reconstruction of BIA Road 690, the construction of dirt and gravel roads in residential areas of McNary, the stabilization, and resurfacing of an 8-mile stretch of BIA Road 69, and a cooperative project with ADOT to improve the intersection of State Road 73 and State Road 260 (FHWA 2004).

San Carlos Apache Tribe (Nde Nation)

Forest Management

The Tribe has a forest resources program, including timber sales, thinning, wood cutting, and fire activities (San Carlos, 2011).

Recreation and Wildlife

A recreation permit is required for non-tribal members and allows entry on the Reservation for any recreational activities (e.g., hike, picnic, tour, camping), other than hunting or fishing. Wildlife resources include Rocky Mountain Elk, Coues whitetail deer, Rocky Mountain bighorn

sheep, desert big horn sheep, javelina, pronghorn antelope, black bear, mountain lion, wild turkey, predators, and other small game. The Drylake and Hilltop trophy elk units are managed for older age structure and have produced some of the largest elk in the world (San Carlos, 2010).

Transportation

The San Carlos Apache Tribe does not receive the same Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) transportation planning support as the White Mountain Apache Tribe; however, information on transportation concerns on the San Carlos Apache Reservation can be requested through the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona's Transportation Working Group.

State of Arizona

The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs is located in the State of Arizona. State regulatory agencies, as well as adjacent State-owned lands, affect the management of the national forest.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality's mission is to protect and enhance public health, welfare, and the environment in Arizona. The agency serves as the State's environmental regulatory agency in the areas of air and water quality and waste programs. Forest management activities strive to be in compliance with the applicable Arizona Revised Statutes (particularly Title 49 which outlines specifics such as water quality standards and total maximum daily loads).

Arizona Department of Water Resources

The Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) mission is to secure long-term dependable water supplies for Arizona (ADWR, 2011). The ADWR administers and enforces the State's groundwater code and surface water rights laws. Title 45 of the Arizona revised statutes contains the provisions related to water and groundwater resources.

Arizona Department of Agriculture

The Arizona Department of Agriculture is the State's regulatory agency for agriculture, including animals, plants, and environmental services (ADA, 2010). Title 3 of the Arizona Revised Statutes contains the provisions related to agricultural topics such as dangerous plant pests and diseases, pesticides, brands and marks, and seizure of livestock.

Arizona Department of Transportation

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is responsible for planning, building, and operating a state highway system and maintaining bridges.

Improvement and Construction

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for Fiscal Years 2010-2013 (ADOT, 2010) was completed in January 2010. The 2011-2015 Five-year Transportation Facilities Construction Program was approved on June 23, 2010. These documents identify planned

improvements and construction over the next several fiscal years. The planned improvements to the following highways and forest highways may affect forest management:

- Forest Highway 43-1 Sunrise Park to Big Lake – FY2010 grading, drainage and paving work were initiated; project expected to be complete in FY2013
- State Route 260 Heber to Show Low – FY2011 construct passing lanes
- U.S. Highway 60 Show Low to Little Mormon Lake – FY2014 widen highway
- National Scenic Byways Statewide – FY2011 install signs

Several highway improvement studies are also underway.

Long Range Planning

ADOT's long-range transportation plan for 2010-2035 was completed in November 2011 (ADOT, 2011). It serves as the principal high-level capital programming guide for ADOT and identifies broader statewide transportation investment needs.

Scenic Byways

The Arizona Department of Transportation's Environmental and Enhancement Group prepared the "Coronado Trail Corridor Management Plan" in March 2005. This plan identifies the goals and objectives for the byway corridor.

Arizona Game and Fish Department

The Arizona Game and Fish Department's (AZGFD) Strategic Plan for the Years 2007-2012 Wildlife 2012 (AZGFD, 2007) provides the management direction for the department's program of work. The plan contains several goals and objectives that may have an impact on Apache-Sitgreaves NFs management:

- Wildlife Resource Management – Conserve, preserve, enhance, and restore wildlife populations and their habitats.
- Wildlife Recreation – Increase the opportunity for the public to enjoy Arizona's wildlife resources, while maintaining and improving wildlife resources. In addition, address the underlying reasons for denial of public access across private lands by providing technical and financial assistance to private landowners and educating the public about ethical use and habitat protection.
- Public Awareness, Support and Involvement – Maintain an informed and supportive public that recognizes its ownership and stewardship responsibilities for wildlife resources and helps to disseminate and act upon messages about watercraft safety and the safe, responsible and ethical use of off-highway vehicles.
- Off-highway Vehicle, Watercraft and Shooting Sports Recreation Goals – Increase the opportunity for the public to enjoy shooting sports. Encourage participation in education and information programs supporting safe and responsible use of off-highway vehicles and watercraft, while maintaining or improving wildlife resources and habitats.
- Customer Diversity – Increase customer diversity to better reflect the demographics of Arizona.

- Partnerships – Maintain and develop effective partnerships that enable the Department and its partners to reach mutual goals.

The Arizona State Wildlife Action Plan, titled “Arizona’s Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005-2015” (AZGFD, 2006) provides the vision for managing Arizona’s fish, wildlife, and wildlife habitats over the next 10 years. The plan contains several key elements which may provide information to or have an impact on Apache-Sitgreaves NFs management:

- Species of Greatest Conservation Need – The AZGFD prioritized a list of species for conservation actions aimed at improving conditions for those species through intervention at the population or habitat level. Over 300 species were identified as being vulnerable or the species with the greatest conservation needs.
- Habitats of Greatest Conservation Need – The AZGFD divided the State into 17 vegetation types. All of these habitats were treated as habitat in need of conservation. A statewide habitat analysis that answers the question of where to focus in each habitat has not been completed.
- Stressors/Threats to Arizona’s Wildlife and Wildlife Habitats – The AZGFD identified 70 stressors that have serious impacts to habitat in Arizona and an additional 4 stressors that act on species alone. The stressors were categorized into: a rapidly increasing human population, changes to water storage and delivery systems in the Southwest, alteration of communities by invasive nonnative species, and the ongoing drought and warming trend.
- Conservation Actions for Arizona’s CWCS – The AZGFD identified several action items to address stressors, these action items will be implemented where feasible and appropriate.

Arizona State Forestry Division

The Arizona State Forester oversees the Arizona State Forestry Division (ASFD). The ASFD mission is to manage and reduce wildfire risk to Arizona’s people, communities, and wildland areas and provide forest resource stewardship through strategic implementation of forest health policies and cooperative forestry assistance programs. In 2010, the ASFD released the “Arizona Forest Resource Assessment” (Arizona State Forestry Division, 2010) and “Arizona Forest Resource Strategy” (Arizona State Forestry Division, 2010a).

The strategy identifies major resource issues and their related goals. The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs is a key partner and stakeholder in helping to implement this strategy.

- People and Forests-Goal 1: People and communities receive maximum benefits from forests and trees.
- People and Forests-Goal 2: Minimized human impacts to trees and forests.
- Ecosystem Health-Goal 1: Resilient and diverse ecosystem structures, processes, and functions.
- Ecosystem Health-Goal 2: Progress toward landscape scale outcomes, restoration of unhealthy ecosystems, and enhanced sustainability with limited negative impacts.
- Water-Goal 1: Improved water quality and quantity from forested watershed.
- Water-Goal 2: Improved health and resiliency of forested aquatic systems (riparian areas, springs, and wet meadows.)

- Water-Goal 3: Increased public understanding of the importance of forests to Arizona's water quality.
- Air-Goal 1: Improved air quality.
- Air-Goal 2: Increased public understanding of the importance and effects of fire on Arizona's air quality.
- Fire-Goal 1: Wildland ecosystems where appropriate fire regimes maintain health and resiliency of natural vegetation.
- Fire-Goal 2: "Fire Adapted Communities" that provide shared stakeholder responsibility for healthy landscapes and wildfire prepared communities.
- Fire-Goal 3: Enhanced wildland fire management capacity in Arizona.
- Fire-Goal 4: An Arizona public and government leadership that is well informed about wildland fire management, science, and prevention issues.
- Economics-Goal 1: Realized long-term economic potential of sustainable forest products and bioenergy (while achieving Ecosystem Health goals).
- Economics-Goal 2: Protection of areas with economic development potential related to ecosystem services.
- Economics-Goal 3: Community recognition of the economic importance to protecting healthy natural systems.
- Climate Change-Goal 1: Increased resilience of ecosystems to climate change.
- Climate Change-Goal 2: Reduced rate of future climate change through maximized carbon sequestration in Arizona forests and trees.
- Culture-Goal 1: Improved communication between all land management agencies, indigenous tribes, and other cultural groups about varying perspectives and beliefs related to forests, trees, and other natural resources.
- Culture-Goal 2: Effective collaboration mechanisms for sharing of information about resources, priorities, policies, and management strategies between Tribes and non-Tribal organizations.

Arizona State Land Department

The practice of allocating public lands for various beneficiaries in Arizona dates back to the founding of the territory in 1863. The current system of managing these lands, referred to as State Trust lands, was established with the Arizona State Land Department (AZSLD) in 1915 (AZSLD, 2011a and 2011b).

Since its inception, the AZSLD has been granted authority over all trust lands as well as the natural products they provide. This authority over trust land is central to the AZSLD's primary mission of maximizing revenues for its beneficiaries, a role that distinguishes it from other agencies charged with management of public lands (e.g., national parks, national forests, state parks).

As of 2008, the AZSLD managed over 9 million acres in land holdings for 14 beneficiaries, the most prominent of which is the K-12 public school system. Most of the state lands can be used for livestock grazing purposes only. Public use of the lands is regulated by permit. A recreational permit allows the signatory limited privileges to use State Trust Land for some recreation, namely

hiking, horseback riding, picnics, bicycling, photography, sightseeing, and bird watching. Camping is restricted to no more than 14 days per year. Off-highway vehicle travel on State Trust Land is not permitted without proper licensing.

The AZSLD may dispose of (exchange) or lease the lands for natural resource use or commercial development purposes. Since state lands border much of the national forests, especially the southern portion of the Apache and the northern portions of both the Apache and Sitgreaves, any changes in management could affect the management of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs. The AZSLD prepares a fire year plan that represents potential areas of concern to initiate land sales and long term leases. As of July 2012, this plan was not available.

Arizona State Parks

The mission of the Arizona State Parks (ASP) is to manage and conserve Arizona's natural, cultural, and recreational resources for the benefit of the people, both in the parks and through our partners (Arizona State Parks, 2010).

ASP manages several parks across Arizona. Four of these parks are near or on the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs; these include Fool Hollow Lake, Lyman Lake, Tonto Natural Bridge, and Roper Lake. The Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area, located on the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs, is operated by ASP.

Arizona State Parks have seen a continual increase in visitation over the years, with over 1,000,000 visitors in 1985 to over 2,000,000 visitors in 2010 (Arizona State Parks 2010). The State and National financial crisis impacted the management of state parks. In FY2010, the ASP reduced the number of employees and closed 13 of its 28 parks (Arizona State Parks 2010).

The 2008 "Arizona Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan" (SCORP) identifies the State's outdoor recreation priorities. The priority issues include: secure sustainable funding; plan for growth/secure open space; resolve conflicts; improve collaborative planning and partnerships; respond to the needs of special populations and changing demographics; fill the gaps between supply and demand; secure access to public lands and across State Trust Lands; protect Arizona's natural and cultural resources; communicate with and educate the public (Arizona State Parks 2007). Several action items have the potential to influence NFS lands:

- Look holistically across geographic boundaries, disciplines, governments, private interests, and generations and examine all benefits and costs, not just fiscal costs (in reference to growth).
- Expand options such as private landowner incentive programs and recreational liability laws, which would allow public access across private and State and Federal leased lands,
- Provide for OHV use on public lands but manage it properly, to reduce conflicts with other recreation users and minimize the activity's impacts on natural and cultural resources, as is done for other recreational activities. Implement standards for constructing sustainable OHV routes, involving user groups in planning, building and maintaining satisfactory routes and facilities, and enacting and enforcing consistent OHV laws and regulations.
- State and Federal agencies should implement coordinated interagency planning efforts for new recreational areas and trail systems to ensure an equitable regional distribution of desired recreational opportunities and access to natural environments.

The SCORP also identifies the major impacts and trends related to outdoor recreation in Arizona. Arizona offers a wide variety of outdoor recreation opportunities with 6 national forests, 21 national park sites, 8 national wildlife refuges, 8 Bureau of Land Management field offices, 21 American Indian tribes, 30 State Parks, 23 State wildlife areas, and hundreds of county and city parks and recreation areas. These public lands provide opportunities for activities such as picnicking, developed and primitive camping, wilderness backpacking, hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, cross-country skiing, wildlife watching, hunting, fishing, boating, water skiing, rock climbing, four-wheel driving, motorized trail biking, all-terrain vehicle riding, and snowmobiling, among others (Arizona State Parks 2007).

The Arizona Trails 2010: State Motorized and Nonmotorized Recreation Trails plan provides information and recommendations to guide ASP and other agencies in their management of trails. The priority recommendations for motorized trails are: protect access to trails/acquire land for public access; maintain and renovate existing trails and routes; mitigate and restore damage to areas surrounding trails, routes, and areas; and establish and designate motorized trails, routes, and areas. The priority recommendations for nonmotorized trails are: maintain existing trails, keep trails in good condition; and protect access to trails/acquire land for public access (Arizona State Parks 2009).

Governor's Forest Health Councils

In 2003, Governor Janet Napolitano formed the Forest Health Advisory Council and the Forest Health Oversight Council in response to the growing number, frequency, and intensity of uncharacteristic wildfires threatening Arizona's resources and communities. In 2007, the councils produced the "Statewide Strategy for Restoring Arizona's Forests" (Governor's Forest Health Councils, 2007). The report identifies five key strategies:

1. Increase the human and financial resources dedicated to restoring Arizona's forests and protecting communities.
2. Coordinate and implement action at the landscape scale.
3. Increase the efficiency of restoration, fire management, and community protection activities.
4. Encourage ecologically sustainable, forest-based economic activity.
5. Build public support for accomplishing restoration, community protection, and fire management across the state.

Federal

Other Federal agencies affect the management of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs, either because they have lands that adjoin the forests (e.g., Bureau of Land Management, other national forests), they manage features that occur on the national forest (e.g., Federal Highway Administration), or they have oversight responsibilities (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).

Bureau of Land Management

The majority of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land that is adjacent to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs occurs on the southern border of the Apache and is administered by the Safford Field Office. The 1991 “Safford District Resource Management Plan” (BLM, 1991) provides guidance to the district in the management of its resources. The plan addresses the following issues: access, area of critical environmental concerns and other types of special management areas, off-highway vehicles, riparian areas, wildlife habitat, lands and realty, outdoor recreation and visual resource management, energy and minerals, cultural resources, soil erosion, vegetation, water resources, air quality, and paleontological resources.

The focus of active management includes riparian improvement treatments, wildlife habitat improvement projects (including prescribed fire and suppression), soil erosion reduction, land treatments or vegetation manipulation including mechanical, chemical or prescribed fire, and firewood cutting. The majority of the public lands are managed to limit off-highway vehicle use to existing roads and trails. The 1,708-acre Hot Well Dunes is open to off-highway vehicle use anywhere in the area (Brady, 2011).

The only Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) or Coordinated Resource Management Plan Area that borders the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs is the 120-acre Coronado Mountain Research Natural Area (RNA) ACEC. This area is managed to exclude rights-of-way, mineral entry and woodcutting; use prescribed fire; and preserve their scenic quality.

Future Activities

A review of the 2011 NEPA Project Log for the Safford Field Office (BLM, 2011) showed that no projects are currently planned. However, personal communication with the district staff highlighted activities that are occurring near Apache-Sitgreaves lands: renewable energy (including windfarm installations north of the forest and potential energy transmission corridors), potential juniper thinning on BLM lands north of the forest, and burning south of the forests.

The district has several ongoing projects (Aravaipa Ecosystem Management Plan, Proposed SunZia Southwest Transmission Line Project, Chiricahua FireScape Project), although they occur in the southeastern part of the State.

Federal Highway Administration

The role of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is to ensure that America’s roads and highways are safe and technologically up-to-date. Although most highways are owned by State, local, and tribal governments, FHWA provides financial and technical support (FHWA, 2011). The Federal Lands Highways funding provides dollars for roads and highways within federally owned lands, such as national forests.

The Central Federal Lands Highway division, of which Arizona is a part, is in the process of developing its long-range transportation plan (FHWA, 2010). The planning effort has identified two major trends: (1) Arizona population is increasing primarily in urban areas, and (2) forest visitation and recreation is increasing as a result of population increase. Within Arizona, 12 percent of the paved forest highway network is rated as poor or failed, while 7 percent of the unpaved network is rated as poor or failed, and 3 percent of the bridges are in poor condition.

Forest Highway 43 improvements, including paving, are near completion as of January 2011. These upgrades to the highway have the potential to change visitor use.

Table 2. Forest Highways located on the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs

Forest Highway	Owner	Road Type	Condition
FH 41	Federal	Paved	Poor
FH 40	Federal	Unpaved	Good
FH 11 (SR 260)	State	Paved	Good
FH 30	State	Paved	Excellent
FH 43	State	Paved/Unpaved	Excellent
FH 35 (SR 261)	State	Paved	Fair
FH 20 (U.S. 180)	State	Paved	Good
FH 42	Federal	Unpaved	Good
FH 19 (U.S. 191)	State	Paved	Fair

Forest Service

Three national forests border the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs: the Coconino, Tonto, and Gila National Forests. Each of these forests' management is guided by a land management plan. The Coconino National Forest is currently in the process of revising their plan; the Tonto and Gila National Forests are expected to revise their plans in the near future. As forest management changes are proposed, the forests coordinate and adjust their management strategies as appropriate.

Coconino National Forest

The Coconino National Forest is managed by their forest plan originally developed in August 1987 (Forest Service, 1987). The plan identifies several forestwide goals for 19 topic areas, including: (1) outdoor recreation, (2) wilderness, (3) wildlife and fish, (4) riparian, (5) range, (6) noxious and invasive weeds, (7) timber, (8) soil, water and air quality, (9) minerals, (10) lands, (11) transportation and administrative facilities, (12) protection, (13) law enforcement, (14) research natural areas, botanical areas, and geological areas, (15) Elden environmental study area, (16) public affairs, (17) human resources, (18) land management planning, and (19) general administration.

The management areas of the Coconino NF that border the western edge of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs are:

- Management Area 10: Grassland and Sparse Piñon-Juniper Above the Rim – The management emphasis is range management, watershed condition, and wildlife habitat. Other resources are managed to improve outputs and quality. Emphasis is on prescribed burning to achieve management objectives.
- Management Area 7: Piñon-Juniper Woodland, Less than 40 Percent Slope – The management emphasis is firewood production, watershed condition, wildlife habitat, and

- livestock grazing. Other resources are managed in harmony with the emphasized resources.
- Management Area 6: Unproductive Timber Land – Emphasis is a combination of wildlife habitat, watershed condition, and livestock grazing. Other resources are managed in harmony with the emphasized resources.
 - Management Area 3: Ponderosa Pine and Mixed Conifer, Less than 40 Percent Slope – Emphasis is a combination of multiple-uses including a sustained yield of timber and firewood production, wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, high quality water, and dispersed recreation.
 - Management Area 19: Mogollon Rim – Emphasis is dispersed and developed recreation, visual quality, and wildlife travel corridors across the Rim, generally the heads of major canyons running to the northeast. Dwarf mistletoe is aggressively treated.

The Coconino NF is currently in the process of revising their forest plan.

Gila National Forest

The Gila National Forest Plan is managed by their forest plan, originally published in September 1986 (Forest Service, 1986). The plan identifies goals in 17 topic areas including: (1) range, (2) recreation, (3) wilderness, (4) timber, (5) wildlife and fish habitat, (6) minerals, (7) soil and water, (8) riparian, (9) air quality, (10) fire, (11) law enforcement, (12) lands and special uses, (13) facilities, (14) cultural resources, (15) land management planning, (16) human resources, and (17) research natural areas.

The management areas of the Gila NF that border the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs from north to south along the New Mexico border are:

- Management Area 3D – management emphasis is to provide for a long term increase of about 20 percent in herbaceous forage for wildlife; manage woodlands and forests to provide wildlife habitat; manage suitable timber to provide long-term sustained yield; firewood harvest to provide sustained yield; recreation opportunities range from semiprimitive to roaded natural.
- Management Area 3B - management emphasis is to provide for a long term increase of about 40 percent in herbaceous forage for wildlife; manage woodlands and forests to provide wildlife habitat; manage suitable timber to provide long-term sustained yield; firewood harvest to provide sustained yield; recreation opportunities range from semiprimitive to roaded natural.
- Management Area 3A – management emphasis is to provide for a long term increase of about 60 percent in herbaceous forage for wildlife; manage woodlands and forests to provide wildlife habitat; manage wilderness resource to protect and restore natural conditions; manage suitable timber to provide long-term sustained yield; firewood harvest to provide sustained yield; recreation opportunities range from primitive to roaded natural.
- Management Area 4B - management emphasis is to provide for a long term increase of about 10 percent in herbaceous forage for wildlife; manage woodlands and forests to provide wildlife habitat; manage wilderness resource to protect and restore natural conditions; manage suitable timber to provide long-term sustained yield; firewood

- harvest to provide sustained yield; recreation opportunities range from primitive to roaded natural.
- Management Area 7 – management emphasis is to provide for a long term increase of about 30 percent in herbaceous forage for wildlife; manage woodlands and forests to provide wildlife habitat; manage wilderness resource to protect and restore natural conditions; firewood harvest to provide sustained yield; recreation opportunities range from semiprimitive motorized to roaded natural.
 - Management Area 4C - management emphasis is to provide for a long term increase of about 20 percent in herbaceous forage for wildlife; manage woodlands and forests to provide wildlife habitat; manage wilderness resource to protect and restore natural conditions; manage suitable timber to provide long-term sustained yield; firewood harvest to provide sustained yield; recreation opportunities range from semiprimitive to roaded natural.

Tonto National Forest

The Tonto National Forest is currently managed by their forest plan originally developed in October 1985 (Forest Service, 1985). The plan identifies 5 forestwide goals for the following topics: (1) soil water and air quality, (2) fire management, (3) pest management, (4) wildlife and fish, and (5) transportation and utility corridors.

There is only one Tonto NF management area that lies adjacent to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs:

- Management Area 4D: Payson Ranger District, Mogollon Rim Area – The management emphasis is to manage for a variety of renewable resource outputs with primary emphasis on intensive, sustained yield timber management, timber resource protection, creation of wildlife habitat diversity, increased populations of harvest species and recreation opportunity. Recreation opportunities range from semiprimitive to urban.

Four-Forest Restoration Initiative

The Four-Forest Restoration Initiative is a collaborative effort to restore forest ecosystems on portions of four national forests—Coconino, Kaibab, Apache-Sitgreaves, and Tonto—primarily along the Mogollon Rim in northern Arizona. Environmental analysis for the proposed action began in 2010 and the contract to begin implementation was awarded in 2012.

The overall goal of the four-forest effort is to create landscape-scale restoration approaches that will provide for fuels reduction, forest health, and wildlife and plant diversity. A key objective is doing this while creating sustainable ecosystems in the long term. Business will play a key role in the effort by harvesting, processing, and selling wood products. This will reduce treatment costs and provide restoration-based work opportunities that will create good jobs.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The main role of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) is to administer the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (USFWS, 2011). Section 7 (a)(1) of the ESA directs Federal agencies to aid in conservation of listed species and section 7 (a)(2) requires that agencies, through consultation with the USFWS, ensure that their activities are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence

of listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat. As projects and activities are planned, forest managers consult with the USFWS.

The USFWS also issues national policies to promote the conservation and recovery of listed species, including species recovery plans. The USFWS is in the process of developing a strategic plan to react to climate change.

The USFWS manages the National Wildlife Refuge System; there are no refuges near the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs. They occur primarily in the far west and southern portions of Arizona and central New Mexico.

Other Landowners

The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs border and surrounds other ownerships besides those listed above. There is no known inventory of these landowners activities and potential impacts to the forests.

Conclusion

As identified above, other landowners and land policies have the potential to impact the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs and vice-versa. In the development of the land management plan, these considerations have been taken into account. Table 200 identifies some of the key potential impacts and how the proposed plan deals with those impacts. Table 201 identifies potential activities on adjacent lands that may impact forest management. Impacts of actions on adjacent lands is analyzed in the cumulative environmental consequences section of chapter 3 in the DEIS. No major conflicts with Forest Service planning have been identified at this time.

Table 3. Potential impacts to forest management and their relationship to the proposed plan

Potential Impacts/Issues	How the Proposed Plan Addresses
Call for multiple-use of the forests	The overall goal of managing National Forest System lands is to sustain the multiple uses of its resources in perpetuity while maintaining the long-term productivity of the land. The proposed plan carries out that goal.
Community growth demand	The proposed plan identifies a management emphasis to work with local communities to understand their community expansion needs and retain access to NFS land.
Danger from fire for residents living in a wildland-urban interface	Desired Condition: The composition, density, structure, and mosaic of vegetative conditions reduce uncharacteristic wildfire hazard to local communities and forest ecosystems. Desired Condition: Forest visitors have access to information about topics of concern related to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs (e.g., ecosystem restoration, unmanaged recreation, uncharacteristic wildfire), including appropriate visitor behavior (e.g., follow forest orders, pack out trash, appropriate sanitation). The vegetative treatment objectives are prioritized in priority watersheds and areas identified in community wildfire protection plans.
Improve forest health and promote the restoration of ecosystems	The desired conditions describe a healthy, sustainable forest and the objectives identify actions that would help restore ecosystems.

Potential Impacts/Issues	How the Proposed Plan Addresses
Maintain a healthy, sustainable forest that provides raw materials	Desired Condition: The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs provide a sustainable supply of forest products (e.g., small roundwood, sawlogs, biomass, firewood, cones, Christmas trees, and wildings) to business and individuals within the capability of the land.
Forest-related jobs for the local economy	Timber production and tree cutting continue and contribute to the local and regional economy. Other multiple uses of the forests, including recreation and wildlife, also contribute to the local economy. See the “Economic Contribution” section of the DEIS.
Support local traditional custom and culture	The uses of livestock grazing, timber harvesting, mining, and hunting continue to be allowed in the proposed plan. The proposed plan recognizes that many local residents have traditional ties, such as forest product collection, hunting, holiday celebrations, and annual picnics. Loggers and ranchers continue to be an important part of the forests’ history and their traditional uses remain an important part of the cultural landscape.
Protect private property rights	The proposed plan honors the continuing validity of private, statutory, or pre-existing rights.
Consider local concerns; collaborate with government agencies; consult with tribes	Throughout the proposed plan, there is a management emphasis on collaboration and cooperation with Federal, State, and local governments, tribes, and stakeholders.
Growing demand for recreation (e.g., hiking trails, designated OHV routes)	Desired Condition: The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs offer a spectrum of recreation settings and opportunities varying from primitive to urban and dispersed to developed, with an emphasis on the natural-appearing character of the forests. Although the proposed plan does not identify specific new developments, it does allow for it, if needed. The proposed plan focuses on maintaining existing recreation opportunities and improving their quality.
Manage recreation and impacts to communities	Desired Condition: Apache-Sitgreaves NFS lands provide less developed opportunities than residents and visitors find in urban settings, such as greenbelts and parks. Desired Condition: The construction or placement of fences and gates, structures, signs, or other private property on NFS land (occupancy trespass) rarely occurs. Disposal of personal property (e.g., dumping) rarely occurs on NFS lands. Guideline: Access points to NFS land from adjacent non-NFS developments and subdivisions should be limited and provide all residents (not just edge lot owners) common entry points. Individual access points should be discouraged to minimize the development of unauthorized roads or trails.
Tribal use and traditional cultural properties	Desired Conditions: Significant cultural resources (i.e., archaeological, historic, and traditional cultural properties (TCP) and known American Indian sacred sites) are preserved and protected for their cultural importance and are generally free from adverse impacts. Desired Conditions: Members of affiliated tribes have access to gather traditional forest resources and products for traditional cultural purposes (e.g., medicinal plants, boughs, basket materials, pollen, and plants and minerals for pigments). Desired Conditions: Traditionally used resources are not depleted and are available for future generations. Desired Conditions: Sacred sites and significant TCPs are accessible and generally free of adverse impacts allowing for culturally affiliated tribes to gather traditional forest products and conduct ceremonies.

Appendix C. Coordination with Other Public Planning Efforts

Potential Impacts/Issues	How the Proposed Plan Addresses
	<p>Desired Conditions: All sacred objects, human remains, funerary objects, and objects of cultural patrimony removed from lands of Apache-Sitgreaves NFs are repatriated to the appropriate tribe.</p>
<p>Conserve, preserve, enhance, and restore wildlife and their habitats</p>	<p>Desired Condition: Habitat quality, distribution, and abundance exist to support the recovery of federally listed species and the continued existence of all native and desirable nonnative species.</p> <p>Desired Condition: Habitat is well distributed and connected.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed plan focuses on restoring vegetative conditions and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Desired Condition: Large blocks of habitat are interconnected, allowing for behavioral and predator-prey interactions, and the persistence of metapopulations and highly interactive wildlife species across the landscape.</p> <p>Desired Condition: Wildlife are free from harassment and from disturbance at a scale that impacts vital functions (e.g., breeding, rearing young) that could affect persistence of the species.</p> <p>The proposed plan also contains other desired conditions, including vegetation-specific desired conditions. In addition, the Wildlife Quiet Area Management Area focuses on wildlife habitat.</p>
<p>Provide opportunities for wildlife-related recreation</p>	<p>Desired Condition: Dispersed recreation opportunities (e.g., hunting, fishing, hiking, and camping) are available and dispersed recreation sites (e.g., campsites, trailheads, vistas, and parking areas) occur in a variety of settings throughout the forests.</p>
<p>Minimize impacts from invasive species</p>	<p>Desired Condition: Invasive species are in low abundance or nonexistent.</p> <p>Objective: Annually, contain, control, or eradicate invasive species (e.g., musk thistle, Dalmatian toadflax, and cowbirds) on 500 to 3,500 acres.</p> <p>Objective: Annually, control or eradicate invasive species (e.g., tamarisk, crayfish) on at least 2 stream miles.</p>
<p>Provide opportunities for shooting sports, off-highway vehicles, and watercraft</p>	<p>The proposed plan continues to allow these activities.</p>
<p>Threats related to changes in water availability</p>	<p>Desired Condition: Water developments contribute to fish, wildlife, and riparian habitat as well as scenic and aesthetic values.</p> <p>Desired Condition: Apache-Sitgreaves NFs water rights are secure and contribute to livestock, recreation, wildlife, and administrative uses.</p> <p>Desired Condition: Surface water is generally not diminished by groundwater pumping.</p> <p>Desired Condition: Dams, diversions, or other water control structures function properly to conserve water resources.</p>
<p>Threats related to changes in climate</p>	<p>Appendix A of the proposed plan provides information and discussion about climate change and considerations for land management planning</p>

Potential Impacts/Issues	How the Proposed Plan Addresses
Public education to benefit wildlife	<p>Desired Condition: Forest visitors have access to information about topics of concern related to the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs (e.g., ecosystem restoration, unmanaged recreation, and uncharacteristic wildfire), including appropriate visitor behavior (e.g., follow forest orders, pack out trash, and appropriate sanitation).</p> <p>Desired Condition: Forest visitors have access to information about the features of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs, its ecosystems, multiple uses, and other management aspects of the forests.</p> <p>Desired Condition: Interpretive information (e.g., ecology, cultural resources, unique geologic features, and Forest Service mission) is available to forest visitors at Apache-Sitgreaves NFs visitor centers, administrative offices, recreation sites, and along major forest roadways.</p>

Table 4. Activities on adjacent lands that may impact forest management

Activities on Adjacent Lands that May Impact Forest Management	
Land exchanges (changes in ownership)	Commercial harvesting and thinning; forest restoration and thinning; removal of overstory trees/juniper treatments
Highway improvements	Prescribed fires
Fire suppression	Recreation improvements and new construction
Permitted recreation use (restrictions on types of uses)	Renewable energy development (e.g., wind farms, energy corridors)
Removal of nonnative fish species and restoration of native aquatic species	Continued livestock grazing
Noxious and invasive weed treatments	Four-Forest Restoration Initiative

References

- Apache County. (2004). Apache County Comprehensive Plan. St. Johns, AZ. <http://www.co.apache.az.us/pdfs/PlanningandZoning/P&ZPage/ApacheCountyComprehensivePlan.pdf>
- Arizona Department of Agriculture (ADA). Annual Report FY2009-2010. Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). (2010). Arizona State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fiscal Years 2010–2013. Phoenix, AZ. http://www.azdot.gov/MPD/Priority_Programming/index.asp
- Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). (2011). What Moves You Arizona, Long-Range Transportation Plan 2010-2035. The Arizona Department of Transportation. Phoenix, AZ. <http://whatmovesyourarizona.gov/PDF/LRTP-2011-1129.pdf>
- Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR). (2011). Missions and Goals. Phoenix, AZ. <http://www.azwater.gov/AzDWR/PublicInformationOfficer/MissionAndGoals.htm>

Appendix C. Coordination with Other Public Planning Efforts

- Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD). (2006). Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005–2015. Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD). (2007). Wildlife 2012 Strategic Plan. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona State Forestry Division. (2010). Arizona Forest Resource Assessment. Phoenix, AZ. http://www.azsf.az.gov/forest_strategy.asp
- Arizona State Forestry Division. (2010a). Arizona Forest Resource Strategy. Phoenix, AZ. http://www.azsf.az.gov/forest_strategy.asp
- Arizona State Land Department (AZSLD). (2011a). Real Estate Division. Phoenix, AZ. <http://www.land.state.az.us/programs/realestate/futureDisp.htm#apache>
- Arizona State Land Department (AZSLD). (2011b). State Land Department Historical Overview. Phoenix, AZ. <http://www.land.state.az.us/history.htm>
- Arizona State Parks. (2007). Arizona 2008 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona State Parks. (2009). Arizona Trails 2010: A Statewide Motorized and Nonmotorized Recreational Trails Plan. Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona State Parks. (2010). Arizona State Parks FY09/10 Annual Report July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010. Phoenix, AZ.
- Brady, Lance. (2011). Personal Communication. Safford District Bureau of Land Management.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). (1991). Safford District Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management. Safford, AZ.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). (2011). U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management Arizona 2011 NEPA Project Log.
- Catron County. (1992). Catron County Comprehensive Land Use and Policy Plan. Bountiful, UT: National Federal Lands Conference.
- Coconino County. (2003). Coconino County Comprehensive Plan. Flagstaff, AZ. <http://www.coconino.az.gov/comdev.aspx?id=142>
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). (2010). Planning Update 1: Long Range Transportation Plan for Forest Highways in Arizona. U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). (2011). About FHWA. U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/about/>
- Forest Service. (1985). Tonto National Forest Plan. United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Southwestern Region.
- Forest Service. (1986). Gila National Forest Plan. United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Southwestern Region.

- Forest Service. (1987). Coconino National Forest Plan. United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Southwestern Region.
- Fort Apache Agency White Mountain Apache Tribe. (2005). Forest Management Plan 2005 – 2014. White River, AZ.
- Governor’s Forest Health Councils, State of Arizona. (2007). The Statewide Strategy for Restoring Arizona’s Forests. Aumack, E., T. Sisk, and J. Palumbo, editors. Published by Arizona Public Service. Phoenix, AZ.
- Greenlee County. (2003). Greenlee County Comprehensive Plan. Clifton, AZ. <http://www.co.greenlee.az.us/pz/pdfs/ComprehensivePlan.pdf>
- Logan Simpson Design, Inc. (2004a). Community Wildfire Protection Plan for At-Risk Communities of the Apache National Forest in Apache County. Tempe, AZ.
- Logan Simpson Design, Inc. (2004b). Community Wildfire Protection Plan for At-Risk Communities of the Sitgreaves National Forest in Apache, Coconino, and Navajo Counties. Tempe, AZ.
- Logan Simpson Design, Inc. (2005). Greenlee County Community Wildfire Protection Plan for At-Risk Communities of the Apache National Forest in Greenlee County. Tempe, AZ.
- Logan Simpson Design, Inc. (2010). Southern Gila County Community Wildfire Protection Plan. Tempe, AZ.
- LVA Urban Design Studio, L.L.C., Kimley-Horne and Associates, Inc. (2003). Gila County Comprehensive Plan. Globe, AZ.
- Navajo County. (2004). Navajo County Comprehensive Plan.
- San Carlos Apache Tribe. (2010). San Carlos Apache Tribe - Recreation and Wildlife. San Carlos, AZ. University of Arizona. <http://www.scatrwd.com/>
- San Carlos Apache Tribe. (2011). San Carlos Forestry Web Site. <http://forestry.scatsn.gov/publicweb/forestry.html>
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). (2011). Consultations – Overview. United States Department of Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/consultations-overview.html>
- White Mountain Apache Tribe. (2010). Wildlife and Outdoor Recreation Division. Whiteriver, Arizona. <http://wmatoutdoors.org/>

