

Four Forest Restoration Initiative, Rim Country EIS

Recreation Report

Prepared by:

Jennifer Wright, Recreation Specialist

for:

4FRI Rim Country EIS

Date: March, 2022

We make every effort to create documents that are accessible to individuals of all abilities; however, limitations with our word processing programs may prevent some parts of this. We make every effort to create documents that are accessible to individuals of all abilities; however, limitations with our word processing programs may prevent some parts of this document from being readable by computer-assisted reading devices. If you need assistance with any part of this document, please contact the Coconino National Forest at: (928) 527-3600.

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (for example, Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at [How to File a Program Discrimination Complaint](#) and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

Table of Contents

Introduction/Project Information.....	6
Purpose of and Need for Action.....	6
Proposed Action.....	6
Relevant Law, Regulation, and Policy	6
Federal Laws.....	6
Forest Service Manuals.....	7
Land Management Plan Direction.....	8
Affected Environment	26
Existing Conditions.....	26
Recreation Activities within the Project Area.....	33
Issues/Indicators/Analysis Topics	45
Assumptions and Methodology	45
Summary of Alternatives and Resource Protection Measures.....	46
Environmental Consequences.....	46
Alternative 1 – No Action.....	46
Alternative 2 – Modified Proposed Action	51
Direct and Indirect Effects	51
Cumulative Effects.....	58
Alternative 3 – Focused Alternative	60
Direct and Indirect Effects	60
Cumulative Effects.....	66
Effects Common to Both Action Alternatives	66
Effects Unique to Each Action Alternative and Differences among Them	68
Effects from Rock Pit Use and Expansion.....	69
Effects from Use of In-woods Processing and Storage Sites	72
Effects from the Land Management Plan Amendment.....	75
Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	75
Other Agencies and Individuals Consulted	76
Acronyms	76
Glossary.....	76
References Cited.....	76
Appendix 1. Identification of recreation facilities in Rim Country project area	79
Appendix 2. Special Use Activities within the Rim Country Analysis Area	82

Tables

Table 1: Recreation direction in the Apache-Sitgreaves Land Management Plan (USDA- Forest Service 2015)	8
Table 2: Recreation direction in the Coconino Land Management Plan (USDA- Forest Service 2008)....	21
Table 3: Recreation direction in the Tonto Land Management Plan (USDA- Forest Service 1985).....	24
Table 4: Population growth in counties in Rim Country project area, Arizona and the U.S. (Headwaters Economics 2021a).....	27
Table 5: Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto NF visitation comparison by year, site type and forest (USDA Forest Service 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2021d, 2021e, 2021f, 2021g, 2021h, 2021i)...	28
Table 6: Comparison of selected recreation activity participation in 2005, 2010 and 2015 for the Coconino National Forest (USDA Forest Service 2021a, 2021d, 2021g).....	28
Table 7: Comparison of recreation activity participation in 2007 and 2014, 2018 for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest (USDA-Forest Service 2021b, 2021f, 2021i)	29
Table 8: Comparison of recreation activity participation in 2008, 2013and2016 for the Tonto National Forest (USDA Forest Service 2021c, 2021e, 2021h).....	30
Table 9: Comparison of visitor origin for Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto NF (USDA Forest Service,2021j).....	31
Table 10: Substitution behaviors for forest visitors (USDA Forest Service 2021j).....	31
Table 11: Percent of National Forest Visits by Distance Traveled* (USDA Forest Service 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2021d, 2021e, 2021f, 2021g, 2021h, 2021i)	32
Table 12: Region 3 visitation comparison by Forest (USDA Forest Service 2021j).....	33
Table 13: Summary of recreation facilities in Rim Country project area	33
Table 14: Mileage of trails per trail class per National Forest within the project area	35
Table 15. Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridor by Forest.....	38
Table 16. Inventoried roadless areas acreage by ROS by forest.....	39
Table 17: ROS settings and characteristics (USDA Forest Service, 1986)	42
Table 18: Acres of land by recreation opportunity spectrum in the Rim Country project area	43
Table 20. Approximate acres of current, ongoing, and foreseeable vegetation management activities within the project area.....	50
Table 21. Alternative 2 Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridors Acres Per Treatment	54
Table 22. Inventoried Roadless Area Recreation Opportunity Spectrum acres treated by proposed action	54
Table 23. Acres of mechanical and prescribed treatment per ROS Code for Alternative 2	57
Table 24. Alternative 3 Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridors Acres Per Treatment	61
Table 25. Acres by treatment by Inventoried Roadless Area by Recreation Opportunity Spectrum.....	62
Table 26. Acres of mechanical and prescribed treatment per ROS Code for Alternative 3	64
Table 27. Proposed in-woods processing sites.....	72

Figures

Figure 1. Percentage of land per ownership for the state of Arizona.....	27
Figure 2 Rim Country Developed Recreation Sites.....	34
Figure 3 Rim Country National Scenic and Recreation Trails	37
Figure 4. Eligible Wild and Scenic River Segments with Current Tonto Eligibility Study.....	38
Figure 5. Inventoried roadless areas in the project area.....	39
Figure 6: Recreation Opportunity Spectrum, USDA ROS Primer and Field Guide 2011	41
Figure 7 Rim Country Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Class	43
Figure 8: National Scenic and Recreation Trails in the Rim Country project area.....	47

Figure 9 Treatments in the project area and ROS designations for Alternative 2 57
Figure 10 Treatments in the project area and ROS designations for Alternative 3..... 63
Figure 11 Rim Country project rock pits location and recreation opportunity spectrum..... 70
Figure 12 Potential in-woods processing site locations 74

Introduction/Project Information

The Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, and Tonto National Forests are proposing to conduct restoration activities within 1.24 million acres of ponderosa pine ecosystem over approximately 20 years. Treatment areas are located on the Black Mesa, and Lakeside Ranger Districts of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest, the Mogollon and Red Rock Ranger Districts of the Coconino National Forest, and the Payson and Pleasant Valley Ranger Districts of the Tonto National Forest. Project treatments would occur in the vicinity of Happy Jack, Payson, Young, Heber-Overgaard, Show Low, and Pinetop-Lakeside, Arizona.

Purpose of and Need for Action

This section analyzes the potential effects on recreation activities of the alternatives proposed for the 4FRI Rim Country Project. The purpose of the Rim Country Project is presented Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

Proposed Action

To meet the purpose and need for the Rim Country Project and move the project area toward desired conditions, the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, and Tonto National Forests propose mechanical thinning, prescribed fire, and other restoration activities throughout the project area that would make the forest more resilient to natural disturbances such as fire, insects and disease, and climate change. Restoration activities are needed to maintain or restore forest structure and pattern, desired fire regimes, and watershed and ecosystem function in ponderosa pine, ponderosa pine-Gambel oak, ponderosa pine-evergreen oak, frequent fire mixed conifer (dry mixed conifer), aspen, and grassland cover types, moving them toward conditions within the natural range of variation. Facilitative operations may be needed in other cover types (such as pinyon juniper) to enable or complete treatments in target cover types, by reducing uncharacteristic fire risk, reducing ground disturbance from fireline construction, or improving operability. Restoration activities proposed for the Rim Country Project Area are presented in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Relevant Law, Regulation, and Policy

Federal Laws

Multiple statutes, regulations and executive orders identify the general requirement for the application of economic and social evaluation in support of Forest Service planning and decision making. These include, but are not limited to, the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 215; 16 USC 528-531), National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852; 42 USC 4321, 4331-4335, 4341-4347), and the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600).

- **The Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act** of 1960 (74 Stat. 215; 16 USC 528-531) requires that economic impacts are considered when establishing management plans or decision that may affect the management of renewable forest and rangeland resources. This report meets the requirements of this law by specifically considering the economic impacts of the implementation of the Travel Management Rule to local communities.
- **National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)** of 1969 (83 Stat. 852; 42 USC 4321, 4331-4335, 4341-4347) requires that economic and social impacts of Federal actions be considered through environmental analysis. This specialist report includes analysis on social and economic issues identified during the scoping process to meet the terms of the NEPA and regulations.
- **National Forest Management Act (NFMA)** of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600) and regulations require that the economic impacts of decisions or plans affecting the management of renewable resources are analyzed and that economic stability of communities whose

economies are dependent on materials from national forest lands are considered. This analysis meets the requirements of the NFMA by specifically considering the economic impacts of the implementation of the 4FRI project and its impacts on local communities and minority populations.

- **Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988** (16 U.S.C. 4301–4309) provides the basis for identifying and managing significant caves on National Forest System lands.
- **National Trails System Act of 1968** (16 USC 1241) provides for establishment and management of national scenic, historic and recreation trails. This specialist report includes analysis of the Arizona National Scenic Trail and General Crook National Recreation Trail.
- **The Wilderness Act (1964)** – The act dictates that Wilderness is an area of Federal land that will be managed to retain its primeval character and untrammeled setting. It is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural condition and the imprint of man’s work must be substantially unnoticeable.
- **The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (1968)** – The outstandingly remarkable scenic values of rivers eligible or suitable to be included in the system must be carefully managed. Any management activities that could negatively impact the scenic resources, where they are an identified outstandingly remarkable value, should not be conducted or mitigated according the rivers comprehensive management plan.

Forest Service Manuals

- FSM 2020.5 “Sustainability. Meeting needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Sustainability is composed of desirable social, economic, and ecological conditions or trends interacting at varying spatial and temporal scales, embodying the principles of multiple-use and sustained-yield (FSM 1905).”
- 2310.1 - Authority. Recreation planning on National Forest System lands is an integral part of Forest land and resource management planning as required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (RPA) of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976, and described in 36 CFR 219 and FSM 1920. The specific requirements of recreation resource planning are set forth at 36 CFR 219.21.
- 2310.3 - Policy. In addition to general planning policy presented in 36 CFR 219.1, FSM 1903, FSM 1920.3, FSM 1922.03, and FSM 2303.
 - Use the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (see existing conditions for a summary of the ROS classes) to establish planning criteria, generate objectives for recreation, evaluate public issues, integrate management concerns, project recreation needs and demands, and coordinate management objectives.
- 2350 – Trail, River, and Similar Recreation Opportunities - Policy.
 - Consider trail management in the context of an administrative unit or Ranger District.
 - 2353 Administration of National Recreation, Historic and Scenic Trails
 - 1.b. National Scenic Trails. These extended trails are located so as to provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for conservation and enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which these trails pass (16 U.S.C. 1242(a)(2)).

- 1.c. National Historic Trails. These trails follow as closely as possible a route of historic significance, so as to protect the route and its artifacts for public use and enjoyment.
 - 2. Ensure that management of each trail in the National Trails System addresses the nature and purposes of the trail and is consistent with the applicable land management plan (16 U.S.C. 1246 (a)(2)).
 - 2353.11 – Relationship Between National Recreation, National Scenic, and National Historic Trails and NFS Trails
 - Manage National Recreation, National Scenic, and National Historic Trails as NFS trails. Administer each National Recreation, National Scenic, and National Historic Trail corridor to meet the intended nature and purposes of the corresponding trail (FSM 2353.31)
 - 2353.41 – Objectives
 - Develop and administer National Scenic and National Historic Trails to ensure protection of the purposes for which the trails were established and to maximize benefits from the land.
 - 2370 – Special Recreation Designations - Policy
 - Manage each special area as an integral part of the National Forest System with emphasis on the primary values and resources as directed by the law that established the area.

Land Management Plan Direction

The Coconino National Forest Plan provides management direction for recreation resource as follows:

Table 1: Recreation direction in the Apache-Sitgreaves Land Management Plan (USDA- Forest Service 2015)

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page number
Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Grasslands	Obliteration and rehabilitation of unauthorized roads and trails may be needed.		56
Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Interior Chaparral	Since the interior chaparral is the PNV closest to reference conditions, the management approach is to maintain that condition into the future, primarily	DC: A maintained roads and motorized trail system is in place and provides for safety and access for the use (e.g., recreation, minerals, vegetation treatment, fire protection) of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs.	59- 60

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page number
	by using fire (unplanned and planned ignitions).		
Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Wildlife and Rare Plants	The management approach is to provide a diversity of habitats, well distributed, with ecological conditions that support native and desired nonnative animal species over the long term.	<p>GL: Active raptor nests should be protected from treatments and disturbance during the nesting season to provide for successful reproduction. Specifically for northern goshawk nest areas, human presence should be minimized during nesting season of March 1 through September 30.</p> <p>GL: Any action likely to cause a disturbance and take to bald and golden eagles in nesting and young rearing areas should be avoided per the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.</p> <p>GL: Rare, unique habitats (e.g., talus slopes, cliffs, canyon slopes, caves, fens, bogs, sinkholes) should be protected.</p>	62-64
Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Invasive Species	Numerous invasive species pose risks to native species and ecosystem function and to the production of forest goods and services. Invasive plants, of which there are over 50 species, are currently (2008) found on at least 30,000 acres of the forests.	<p>GL: Project areas should be monitored to ensure there is no introduction or spread of invasive species.</p> <p>GL: Treatment of invasive species should be designed to effectively control or eliminate them; multiple treatments may be needed.</p> <p>GL: Pesticide use should minimize impacts on nontarget plants and animals.</p>	65-66
Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Managed Recreation	The primary management approach is to continue the availability of outdoor opportunities visitors seek and which are not readily available from other public or private entities. These opportunities must be	<p>Overall Recreation Opportunities</p> <p>DC: The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs offer a spectrum of recreation settings and opportunities varying from primitive to rural and dispersed to developed, with an emphasis on the natural appearing character of the forests.</p> <p>DC: Inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) maintain their overall roadless character.</p>	70-71

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
	<p>compatible with the environment and other uses.</p> <p>To better understand future recreation needs, supply and demand studies (capacity analyses) may be completed for high use recreational areas and outfitter and guide permits. There is a focus on reducing conflicts between users and resources, utilizing tools such as law enforcement, public involvement, and education. Private ventures and partnerships may be used to help provide recreation opportunities to forest visitors.</p> <p>The recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) map establishes desired ROS classes for the management areas of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs.</p>	<p>DC: Recreation activities occur within the ability of the land to support them and with minimal user conflicts.</p> <p>DC: Recreation enhances the quality of life for local residents (e.g., social interaction, physical activity, connection with nature), provides tourist destinations, and contributes monetarily to local economies.</p> <p>DC: Recreation opportunities provide for a variety of skill levels, needs, and desires in partnership with recreation permit holders, private entities, volunteer groups, community groups, and State, Federal, and tribal governments.</p> <p>DC: Visitors can easily access information about recreation activities and safe and proper use of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs.</p> <p>DC: Recreation use does not negatively affect wildlife habitat and populations. Negative interactions between people and wildlife are minimized.</p> <p>DC: The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs are free from vandalism and refuse.</p> <p>DC: Recreation use does not negatively affect the use and character of cultural resources.</p> <p>DC: "Leave No Trace" principles are practiced.</p> <p>GL: Recreation related project level decisions and implementation activities should be consistent with mapped classes and setting descriptions in the recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS).</p> <p>GL: Developed and dispersed recreation sites and other authorized activities should not be located in places that prevent wildlife or livestock access to available water.</p> <p>GL: Food and other items that attract wildlife should be managed to prevent reliance on humans and to reduce human-wildlife conflicts.</p> <p>GL: Constructed features should be maintained to support the purpose(s) for which they were built. Constructed features should be removed when no longer needed.</p>	

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Dispersed Recreation	Forest managers recognize the importance and popularity of dispersed recreation and seek to balance the strong desire people have for freedom of choice (in terms of their recreation activity) with adequate protection of cultural and natural resources. Focus is on providing quality dispersed recreation opportunities and reducing conflict among recreation users. Where intensive dispersed use—including camping—occurs (e.g., Bear Canyon Lake, south of Big Lake), managers consider the development of a management plan to delineate the intensive use area, address resource concerns, and provide for sustainable recreation.	<p>DC: Dispersed recreation opportunities (e.g., hunting, fishing, hiking, camping) are available and dispersed recreation sites (e.g., campsites, trailheads, vistas, parking areas) occur in a variety of ROS classes throughout the forests.</p> <p>DC: Facilities for dispersed recreation activities are appropriate for the ROS class and scenic integrity objective of the location and are designed to the minimum necessary to protect natural and cultural resources.</p> <p>DC: Wildlife viewing areas are dispersed throughout the forests and provide opportunities to view waterfowl, migratory birds, elk, and other species.</p> <p>DC: Access, parking, regulations, orientation, and safety information are in place to provide safe and enjoyable dispersed recreation opportunities.</p> <p>DC: Water-based settings are available and the associated recreation opportunities (e.g., canoeing, fishing, waterfowl hunting) do not degrade aquatic resources.</p> <p>DC: Winter nonmotorized areas provide a variety of nonmotorized recreation opportunities in a quiet, natural setting (including groomed and ungroomed ski trails). Noise from motorized use is uncommon in areas away from main road corridors.</p> <p>DC: Winter motorized areas provide a variety of motorized recreation opportunities with a variety of challenges including areas open to cross-country, over-snow motorized use, some with groomed or ungroomed trails.</p> <p>DC: Roads and trails provide a variety of opportunities to view natural landscapes and wildlife.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <p>Annually, rehabilitate, stabilize, revegetate, or relocate an average of five dispersed campsites to improve recreation opportunities and/or protect the environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the planning period, work with the AZGFD, ADOT, and other partners to provide at least 10 new wildlife viewing opportunities. <p>Standards:</p> <p>Dispersed campsites shall not be designated in areas with sensitive soils or within 50 feet of streams, wetlands, or</p>	71-73

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page number
		<p>riparian areas to prevent vegetation and bank damage, soil compaction, additional sediment, or soil and water contamination.</p> <p>GL: In dispersed areas, the priority for facilities or minor developments should be access and protection of the environment, rather than the comfort or convenience of the visitors.</p> <p>GL: Timing restrictions on recreation uses should be considered to reduce conflicts with wildlife needs or soil moisture conditions.</p> <p>GL: Dispersed campsites should not be located on or adjacent to archaeological sites or sensitive wildlife areas.</p>	
<p>Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Developed Recreation</p>	<p>Focus is on maintaining the forest recreation and administrative developments in a safe and sustainable manner while providing for quality opportunities for visitors.</p> <p>As the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs move into the future, the emphasis is to balance new construction with current and future maintenance requirements.</p> <p>Forest managers assess Apache-Sitgreaves NFs recreation and administrative facilities in order to establish a program that is sustainable, realistic, and responsive to public need. Facilities may be redesigned, as necessary, in order to accommodate persons with disabilities, respond to demographic changes, and reduce conflicts with</p>	<p>DC: Developed recreation sites provide opportunities for people to camp, obtain information, and participate in day-use activities (e.g., picnic areas, fishing piers, scenic overlooks, wildlife viewing sites).</p> <p>DC: Facilities are maintained, accessible, and complement the forests' natural character. Facilities range from primitive to highly developed, with an emphasis on blending the facilities with the landscape.</p> <p>DC: Forest vegetation in developed sites is healthy (species, size, and age) and complements recreational activities, scenery, and human safety.</p> <p>DC: Developed campgrounds are places where structures and human caused vegetation changes may be seen but they do not dominate the view or attract attention (low to moderate scenic integrity). Human activities in the areas visible from campgrounds (foreground to middle ground, 300 feet to 4 miles) should not attract attention or stand out, and the landscapes should appear natural (moderate to high scenic integrity).</p> <p>DC: Developed campgrounds provide roaded natural or roaded modified recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>73-74</p>

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
	<p>cultural and natural resources as outlined in the recreation facility analysis and master plan. Recreation site plans describe the detailed management for each developed recreation area, including vegetation management plans for campgrounds. Future recreational rental designations (e.g., cabins) are considered on a case-by-case basis including administrative and public benefits.</p>	<p>Obj: Within the planning period, reduce the developed recreation deferred maintenance backlog at plan approval by 10 percent.</p> <p>Within the planning period, accessible and wildlife-resistant trash facilities should be provided in all developed sites where trash is collected.</p> <p>Standards: Where trash facilities are provided, they shall be bear resistant.</p> <p>GL: Developed recreation sites should not be constructed unless validated with a capacity analysis.</p>	
<p>Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Motorized Opportunities</p>	<p>The management approach is to enhance opportunities for motorized trail users, relocate trails to reduce conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized users or other resources, and develop management plans for designated motorized use areas.</p>	<p>DC: A maintained road and motorized trail system is in place and provides for safety and access for the use (e.g., recreation, minerals, vegetation treatment, fire protection) of the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs.</p> <p>DC: Users have opportunities for motorized access and travel on a system of designated NFS roads, NFS motorized trails, and motorized areas²⁵.</p> <p>DC: The transportation system provides a variety of recreation opportunities including varying degrees of difficulty, from OHV trails to paved scenic byways, while limiting resource and/or user conflicts.</p> <p>DC: NFS roads, motorized trails, and motorized areas are easily identified on the ground (e.g., well marked).</p> <p>DC: The road and trail system is accessible from local communities, State, county, and local public roads and trails.</p> <p>DC: Loop trails exist for motorized trail users.</p> <p>DC: Tread Lightly!® principles are commonly practiced.</p> <p>DC: The location and design of roads and trails does not impede wildlife and fish movement.</p>	<p>75- 77</p>

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
		<p>Obj: Annually, maintain at least 20 percent of the passenger vehicle and 10 percent of the high-clearance vehicle NFS roads.</p> <p>Annually, maintain at least 20 percent of NFS motorized trails.</p> <p>Standards: Motorized vehicle travel shall be managed to occur only on the designated system of NFS roads and motorized trails and designated motorized areas.</p> <p>Unless specifically authorized, motorized cross-country travel shall be managed to occur only in designated motorized areas.</p> <p>Temporary road construction shall minimize the impacts to resource values and facilitate road rehabilitation. Temporary roads shall be rehabilitated following completion of the activities for which they were constructed.</p> <p>Road maintenance and construction activities shall be designed to reduce sediment (e.g., water bars, sediment traps, grade dips) while first providing for user safety.</p> <p>GL: New motorized trails or additions to designated trails should include destinations and loops to provide for a variety of opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New roads or motorized trails should be located to avoid Mexican spotted owl protected activity centers, northern goshawk post-fledging family areas, and other wildlife areas as identified; seasonal restrictions may be an option. • New roads, motorized trails, or designated motorized areas should be located to avoid meadows, wetlands, seeps, springs, riparian areas, stream bottoms, sacred sites, and areas with high concentrations of significant archaeological sites. The number of stream crossings should be minimized or mitigated to reduce impacts to aquatic species. • As projects occur in riparian or wet meadow areas, unneeded roads or motorized trails should be closed or relocated, drainage restored, and native vegetation reestablished to move these areas toward their desired condition. 	

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As projects occur, roads or motorized trails that contribute to negative impacts on cultural resources should be closed or relocated. • As projects occur, redundant roads or motorized trails should be removed to reduce degradation of natural resources. • Roads and motorized trails removed from the transportation network should be treated in order to avoid future risk to hydrologic function and aquatic habitat. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trail markings (e.g., signs) should be designed to complement the character of the surrounding lands. • Roads and motorized trails should be designed and located so as to not impede terrestrial and aquatic species movement and connectivity. • As projects occur, existing meadow crossings should be relocated or redesigned, as needed, to maintain or restore hydrologic function using appropriate tools such as French drains and elevated culverts. • After management activities occur in areas with high potential for cross-country motorized vehicle use, methods (e.g., barriers, signing) should be used to control unauthorized motorized use. 	
<p>Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Nonmotorized Opportunities</p>	<p>Access and opportunities to experience areas through nonmotorized travel are key components of recreation. The Apache-Sitgreaves NFs provide a serviceable and sustainable trail system that meets the need for public access, land management, resource protection, and user safety. Emphasis is on reconstructing or adding nonmotorized trails near population centers or developed recreation sites to provide additional</p>	<p>DC: Nonmotorized opportunities are available in a variety of settings that provide differing levels of challenge and seclusion.</p> <p>DC: Blocks of forest land accessible from populated areas are available for nonmotorized opportunities. These areas are free from the sights and sounds of motorized recreation.</p> <p>DC: Opportunities for primitive recreation are available.</p> <p>DC: A maintained and environmentally sound nonmotorized trail network is in place, providing for user safety and access to locations of interest for a variety of uses.</p> <p>DC: Nonmotorized trails are defined and marked.</p> <p>DC: Destination and loop trails exist for nonmotorized users.</p> <p>Obj.: Annually, maintain at least 20 percent of nonmotorized trails.</p>	<p>78- 79</p>

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
	<p>or enhanced nonmotorized recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Signing, enforcement, public information, seasonal and special closures, maintenance, construction, and restoration take place as appropriate. Emphasis is placed on reducing user conflict and resource damage. Educational techniques (e.g., brochures, signs) enhance visitor knowledge of proper nonmotorized use etiquette.</p> <p>Trail maintenance priorities are based on providing user safety, minimizing erosion, providing appropriate recreation opportunities, and accommodating administrative needs. Partnerships are in place prior to new nonmotorized trail construction to facilitate trail maintenance. The forests work with partners, user groups, and volunteers to maintain trails, including the Adopt-A-Trail Program.</p>	<p>GL: Trail markings (e.g., signs, blazes) should be designed to complement the character of the surrounding lands.</p> <p>GL: New nonmotorized routes should avoid meadows, wetlands, seeps, springs, riparian areas, stream bottoms, sacred sites, and areas with high concentrations of significant archaeological sites. The number of stream crossings should be minimized or mitigated to reduce impacts to aquatic habitat.</p> <p>GL: To maintain nonmotorized user opportunities, nonmotorized trails should not be collocated on open motorized routes.</p> <p>GL: New trails and trail relocations should be designed and located so as to not impede terrestrial and aquatic species movement and connectivity.</p> <p>GL: Meadow crossings should be designed or redesigned to maintain or restore hydrologic function using appropriate tools such as French drains and elevated culverts.</p>	

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
<p>Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction National Recreation Trails</p>	<p>The forests have four national recreation trails (NRTs), all designated in 1979: Blue Ridge, General George Crook, Eagle, and Escudilla. NRTs provide a variety of outdoor recreation opportunities and are accessible from urban areas. NRTs are considered a special area by the Forest Service.</p>	<p>DC: The Blue Ridge NRT provides a nonmotorized trail opportunity where visitors can experience the scenic qualities of the area.</p> <p>DC: The General George Crook and Eagle NRTs provide nonmotorized trail opportunities where visitors can experience the historic and scenic qualities of the area.</p> <p>DC: The immediate foreground (0 to 200 feet) views from the NRTs vary from natural appearing landscapes where human activities do not stand out (high scenic integrity) to unaltered landscapes where generally only ecological changes occur (very high scenic integrity).</p> <p>Obj.: Within 5 years of plan approval, initiate the process for the regional forester to remove the NRT designation from the Escudilla trail in conformance with Forest Service Manual 2353.57 – Management of National Recreation Trails.</p> <p>Standards: Visual impacts from vegetation treatments, wildland fire, recreation uses, range developments, and other structures will blend with the overall landscape character along national recreation trails.</p> <p>GL: Trail markings (e.g., signs, blazes) should be designed to complement the character of the surrounding lands.</p> <p>GL: National recreation trails should be managed for nonmotorized or mechanized travel where permitted; however, the General George Crook and Eagle NRTs may have motorized travel where the trail coincides with a designated road or motorized trail.</p> <p>GL: New developments which do not support use of, or enhance, a national recreation trail should not be placed within the visual corridor of the trail.</p> <p>GL: The General George Crook National Recreation Trail should be managed to preserve evidence of historic roadway and landscape character, including r</p>	<p>80-81</p>
<p>Chapter 2 Forestwide Direction Wildland Fire Management</p>	<p>Wildland fire objectives are based on factors such as movement of PNVTs toward desired conditions, fuel conditions, current and expected weather and fire behavior, topography, resource availability, and values to be protected. Social and economic considerations (e.g., smoke) may also affect objectives, as well as adjoining jurisdictions</p>	<p>DC: Human life, property, and natural and cultural resources are protected within and adjacent to NFS lands.</p>	<p>105-110</p>

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page number
	having similar or differing missions and directives.		
Chapter 3 Management Area Direction General Forest	The emphasis of this area is to restore priority 6th level HUC watersheds, restore fire-adapted ecosystems, reduce the threat of uncharacteristic wildfire, and provide forest products. A wide variety of management activities occur and a wide variety of forest products are available within this management area. Lands identified as suitable for timber production have a regularly scheduled harvest of commercial timber.	DC: Recreation opportunities range from semiprimitive nonmotorized to rural.	112
Chapter 3 Management Area Direction Community- Forest Intermix	Forest managers work toward achieving the goals outlined in the CWPPs for the counties within the Apache-Sitgreaves NFs. A higher degree of temporary ground disturbance may occur. The amount of snags and residual large coarse woody debris is generally lower than in the General Forest Management Area. In addition, forest openings are larger and basal areas are lower than in the General Forest	DC: There is legal and adequate access to public lands for resource management and recreation. DC: As a result of forest management, most wildfires are low to mixed severity surface fires resulting in limited loss of structures or ecosystem function. DC: Recreation opportunities range from roaded natural to rural.	113- 114

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
	<p>Management Area. The management approach within this management area is to complete initial treatments to reduce fire hazard.</p>		
<p>Chapter 3 Management Area DirectionComm unity Wildlife Quiet Area</p>	<p>There is an emphasis on improving wildlife habitat and maintaining existing wildlife developments. Management of habitat within WQAs may provide a benchmark for assessing effects of activities on generally undisturbed wildlife populations. The road in the Open Draw WQA is managed as open on a seasonal basis.</p>	<p>DC: WQAs lack disturbance from motorized vehicles, resulting in less stress to wildlife.</p> <p>DC: WQAs provide an undisturbed, nonmotorized hunting experience.</p> <p>DC: WQAs provide semiprimitive nonmotorized recreation opportunities, including relatively quiet recreation opportunities close to or adjacent to intensively used areas.</p> <p>DC: Landscapes in WQAs vary from slightly altered where human activities may be seen but do not attract attention (moderate scenic integrity) to natural appearing where human activities do not stand out (high scenic integrity).</p> <p>DC: Willow Springs Horse Trap and Beaver-Turkey Ridge WQAs provide quiet areas for big game amid the intensive recreation uses on the Black Mesa Ranger District.</p>	<p>119- 120</p>
<p>Chapter 3 Management Area DirectionComm unity Natural Landscape</p>	<p>The management emphasis is to retain the natural appearing character of these areas. Management activities occur mostly for ecological restoration because of natural ecological events or previous management actions. Management activities may include restoration of ecological conditions or habitat components, soil stabilization, planned and unplanned ignitions,</p>	<p>DC: Landscapes vary from natural appearing where human activities do not stand out (high scenic integrity) to natural where generally only ecological changes occur (very high scenic integrity), except as described below.</p> <p>DC: Developed campgrounds, picnic areas, trailheads, and roads passable by passenger cars provide roaded natural recreation opportunities. Landscapes within and immediately adjacent to these features remain scenic. They may be slightly altered where human activities may be seen but do not attract attention (moderate scenic integrity) to natural appearing where human activities do not stand out (high scenic integrity).</p> <p>DC: While emphasizing semiprimitive nonmotorized and primitive recreation opportunities, motorized travel may occur on existing roads and motorized trails.</p>	<p>121- 122</p>

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Forest Plan Desired Condition (DC), Standards, Guidelines (GL)	Page numb er
	<p>hazardous fuels reduction, and invasive species reduction. Livestock grazing may occur where appropriate</p>	<p>DC: Natural landscapes contribute to preserving natural behaviors and processes that sustain wildlife populations.</p> <p>Guidelines:</p> <p>GL Temporary road construction and motorized equipment may be used in order to achieve ecological desired conditions.</p> <p>GL: Existing roads should be maintained to the minimum standard to meet the objective maintenance level.</p>	
<p>Chapter 3 Management Area Direction High Use Developed Recreation Area</p>	<p>In addition to recreation use, other uses (including livestock grazing, timber management, and wildlife management) may occur in combination with surrounding recreation and scenic desired conditions.</p>	<p>DC: The evidence of management activities is common.</p> <p>Guidelines:</p> <p>GL: Roads, facilities, and signing should be designed to blend with surroundings.</p> <p>GL: Management should focus on operation and maintenance, safety, aesthetics, and control of noxious weeds and nonnative invasive species.</p>	<p>115</p>
<p>Chapter 3 Management Area Direction Energy Corridor</p>	<p>Energy corridors are generally not managed to provide recreation opportunities. They are managed for very low scenic integrity where vegetation and structural changes may attract attention and dominate the landscape when viewed from nearby.</p>	<p>GL: Within and adjacent to energy corridors, vegetation should be managed similarly to the Community-Forest Intermix Management Area so that facilities stay operational and reduce the hazards of human-caused damage, wildfire ignition, damage from wildland fire, and falling trees.</p> <p>GL: Clearing of vegetation along rights-of-way, facilities, and permitted sites should be limited to that which achieves desired conditions, abates an identified hazard to the facility, or for operational efficiency and weed control.</p> <p>GL: Trees and shrubs in riparian areas should only be removed when there is an imminent threat to facilities and, in these cases, trees should be left for large coarse woody debris recruitment to the stream and riparian system.</p>	<p>116- 117</p>

Table 2: Recreation direction in the Coconino Land Management Plan (USDA- Forest Service 2008)

Section	Plan Direction	Page Number
Goals	<p>Manage the recreation resource to increase opportunities for a wide variety of developed and dispersed experiences.</p> <p>Preserve and protect non-renewable cave resources so their scientific and aesthetic value does not diminish.</p>	22
<p>Forest-wide and Management Area Standards and Guidelines</p>	<p>Use the ROS inventory to analyze impacts to ROS classes due to management activities such as timber sales, range projects and firewood sales.</p> <p>Surface land management decisions include consideration of potential impacts to all cave resources. Any management activity planned near or within a known cave area is examined for its potential impacts to caves and karst features. Cave entrances and karst features are also not to be used as disposal sites for slash, waste rock or fill materials, and other refuse. Evaluate a 300-foot radius around cave entrances for the effect on cave resources.</p> <p>The Arizona Trail is a state-wide trail of which a portion traverses the Coconino NF. This trail will be a non-motorized pathway.</p> <p>Dispersed Recreation: other areas may be seasonally closed to provide opportunities for recreation in a setting without vehicular disturbance such as temporarily changing the ROS class social and managerial settings toward the primitive end of the spectrum. Initially, the Pine Grove and Rattlesnake areas, or approximately 12,600 and 11,100 acres, respectively are closed annually from August 15 through December 31.</p>	<p>51</p> <p>51-2</p> <p>59</p>
<p>Flagstaff/Lake Mary Ecosystem Analysis</p> <p>Area-wide Goals, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines</p>	<p>Goals and Objectives: there is a range of recreational setting opportunities for people to enjoy the area's many scenic and aesthetic qualities. The diversity and quality of recreation opportunities, settings, and experiences are within acceptable limits of change to ecosystem stability and condition.</p> <p>Guidelines: ROS objectives guide management. Manage for social encounters, signing, scenery, and a sense of exploration that meets ROS objectives. Management activities should generally comply with the requirements of the adopted ROS classes on the Objectives for Recreation Opportunity Spectrum map. (This includes an increase in opportunities for semi-primitive non-motorized and semi-primitive motorized ROS experiences to better manage the high demand for this type of recreation setting.)</p>	New page 206-62

Section	Plan Direction	Page Number
Goals and Objectives	<p>Camping: dispersed campsites are maintained to protect forest resources and maintain visitor experience.</p> <p>Rock Climbing: rock climbing areas are managed and maintained for appropriate experience, natural settings, attributes and conditions, considering ROS objectives, wildlife, heritage and soil and water resources.</p> <p>Non-motorized Trails: There are opportunities for a variety of trail experiences and challenges that are consistent with protection of sensitive resources, meet the needs of a diverse public emphasize the natural environment, and meet ROS objectives.</p>	<p>New page 206-63</p> <p>New page 206-66</p> <p>New Page 206-67</p>
Guidelines	<p>Roads and off-road driving: conduct obliteration and re-vegetation work as funds become available. When choosing areas to conduct road maintenance and obliteration, focus efforts in semi-primitive motorized and semi-primitive non-motorized areas. Of the semi-primitive motorized and semi-primitive non-motorized areas, consider Lake Mary and Oak Creek Watersheds as priorities for water quality reasons. Also focus work adjacent to the National Monuments.</p>	<p>New page 206-72</p>
Forestry Goals and Objectives	<p>Grass, forbs, and shrubs on the forest floor contribute to the biological diversity of the ponderosa pine forest. Fire should continue to play a natural ecological role within the constraints of human health and safety.</p>	<p>Replacement page 206-75</p>
MA 31 Management Emphasis	<p>Maintain semi-primitive motorized ROS settings throughout the MA, with Roded Natural corridors in between.</p>	<p>Replacement page 206-84</p>
MA 32 Management Emphasis	<p>Progress towards the setting...this includes expanding the current semi-primitive motorized areas...Maintain the roded natural settings along passenger car corridors and the large KV electric line.</p>	<p>Replacement page 206-88</p>
MA 33 Management Emphasis	<p>Reintroduce fire's natural role as much as possible. Balance recreation demands with protection of soils, water and vegetation. Restore natural grasslands...</p> <p>Expand semi-primitive motorized settings in other areas and continue roded natural corridors along major roads.</p> <p>Focus road and trail rehabilitation work on the large cinder cones, in meadows and grasslands where impacts are occurring to soil, plants and cultural sites.</p>	<p>Replacement page 206-91</p> <p>Replacement page 206-92</p> <p>Replacement page 206-93</p>

Section	Plan Direction	Page Number
<p>MA 35 Management Emphasis</p>	<p>Per the objectives for ROS map, expand semi-primitive motorized areas and maintain roaded natural corridors along major roads. New semi-primitive non-motorized patches should be created on Mormon Mountain in sensitive species habitat.</p> <p>Continue current seasonal motorized restrictions in the Pinegrove Seasonal Closure Area.</p> <p>Continue the current non-motorized Arizona Trail corridor through the MA.</p>	<p>Replacement page 206-98</p> <p>Replacement page 206-99</p> <p>Replacement page 206-100</p>
<p>MA 36 Management Emphasis</p>	<p>Per the objectives for ROS map, maintain the semi-primitive non-motorized setting in the Dry Lake Hills and expand the semi-primitive non-motorized setting below the waterline Road. Expand semi-primitive motorized settings in the remainder of the MA with roaded natural corridors along major roads.</p>	<p>Replacement pages 103-104</p>
<p>MA 37 Management Emphasis</p>	<p>Provide recreational opportunities. Maintain the quality of the recreation experience throughout this MA.</p> <p>Expand semi-primitive non-motorized settings on Campbell Mesa, around Walnut Canyon, in the Skunk/Fay Canyon area and northwest of Fisher Point.</p>	<p>Replacement page 206-108</p>
<p>MA 38 Management Emphasis</p>	<p>Along Woody Ridge there are large tracts of un-fragmented habitat and remote recreation opportunities including semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized ROS settings with roaded natural corridors.</p> <p>Per the objectives for ROS map, maintain semi-primitive non-motorized settings on portions of Woody Ridge, A-1 Mountain and west of A-1 Mountain. In the remainder of NFS lands, maintain patches of semi-primitive motorized habitat with roaded natural corridors along major</p>	<p>Replacement page 206-114</p>

Table 3: Recreation direction in the Tonto Land Management Plan (USDA- Forest Service 1985)

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Land Management Plan Desired Condition, Standards, Guidelines	Page numb er
<p>Management Direction Specific standards and guidelines are found in individual management area prescriptions under decision units 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and activities A01, A02, A03, A04, A05, A06, A07, A08, A10, A14, A16, A18, A21.</p>	<p>Outdoor Recreation Maintain and enhance visual resource values by emphasizing recreation resource management which will increase opportunities for a variety of developed and dispersed experiences. Provide those developed sites needed to meet most of the public demand and to support dispersed visitor use. Emphasize visual quality objectives in all resource planning and management activities. Conduct inventory, evaluation, nomination, management protection, scientific study, public interpretation, and enhancement of cultural resources in accordance with the management prescriptions, and objectives and priorities identified in Appendix H. Coordinate planning for these activities with the State Cultural Resource Plan, and planning activities of the State Historic Preservation Office, and with other State and Federal agencies.</p>	<p>Standards and guidelines to achieve the objectives are found in the Management Prescriptions section. Objectives for the Forest are shown in the following tables. Objectives which must be achieved in the short- term in order to meet projected outputs over the planning horizon (200 years) are shown for Periods 1, 2, and 3. Those which are long-term and are a result of budget emphasis or other resource activity are displayed for Periods 5 and 6. Table 2 - Lists program outputs, activities, and costs for the Forest over the first fifty years. A comparison of RPA targets with Period 1 and 5 outputs can be found in Table 65 of the EIS. Table 3 - Existing Recreation Site Rehabilitation - Periods 1 and 2. Table 4 - Schedule for Recreation Site Construction - Periods 3, 4, 5, and 6. Table 5 - Trail Construction/Reconstruction Schedule - Periods 1 and 2. Table 6 - Administrative Facilities Construction Schedule - Period 1.</p>	<p>Replace ment page 21-23</p>
<p>Management Areas 3I, 4D, 5D</p>	<p>Management Prescriptions</p>	<p>Maintain a full service level for visitor information services (VIS).</p>	<p>Replace ment Page 39</p>
<p>Management Areas All except 3F, 3I, 4D, 5D</p>	<p>Management Prescriptions</p>	<p>Visitor information and interpretive service programs will be at a level that encourages basic user safety. This would entail primarily issuance of Forest and recreation maps only and office receptionist service to the public.</p>	<p>Replace ment Page 39</p>
<p>Management Areas 3F, 3J, 4D, 5B</p>	<p>Management Prescriptions</p>	<p>Install interpretive signs at selected locations throughout the Forest, keyed to crucial and/or interesting aspects of multiple use management.</p>	<p>Replace ment Page 39</p>

Section	Description/ Management Approach	Landscape or MA Scale Land Management Plan Desired Condition, Standards, Guidelines	Page numb er
Management Areas All	Management Prescriptions	<p>Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classes will be managed according to the existing inventory (See Appendix E).</p> <p>Commercial recreation special use permits may be issued to qualified applicants whose services are available to all members of the public when the proposed use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) fulfills a demonstrated public need without unduly infringing on the use by the general public, (b) is identified in and is in accordance with an approved implementation plan (where called for), and will not cause the carrying capacity of the involved area to be exceeded, (c) does not serve a function that can logically be provided by private enterprise off National Forest System lands and will provide a type of recreation activity naturally associated with a National Forest, and (d) is complementary to Forest Service and Management Area objectives, programs, and purposes. <p>Continue administration of existing recreation special use permits to assure compliance, and to assure that a quality public service is provided consistent with Forest Service and Management Area objectives.</p>	Replace ment Page 39
Management Areas All	Management Prescriptions	<p>Use established outfitter/guide allocations contained in the Standards and Guidelines for each Management Area as the basis for all decisions/recommendations (except for the category of "fishing guide" which is unlimited at this time). When unused service days are available, the maximum number of service days per permit may be temporarily increased, so long as the maximum number of permits and total service days per year are not exceeded (this is not allowed with "pool" service days).</p> <p>Continue to cooperate with other agencies and governments to coordinate recreation management.</p>	Replace ment Page 40
Management Areas 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, 1F, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 3F, 3I, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4F, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5G, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6J	Management Prescriptions	<p>Establish a Forestwide Total Service Day allocation for hunting as shown in table below. Issue priority and temporary permits from this allocation. Require permittees to submit an annual operating plan identifying the desired service days and Management Areas for hunting services.</p>	Replace ment Page 40

Affected Environment

Existing Conditions

Recreation Trends

The Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, and Tonto National Forest provide diverse outdoor recreation opportunities connecting people with nature in a variety of settings. Forest users can hike, bike, drive motorized vehicles, camp, fish, view wildlife and scenery and explore historic and prehistoric places. They enjoy opportunities for year-round recreation activities from birding and wildflower observing in the spring, hiking in summer months, fall color viewing and hunting, to cross country skiing in the winter.

Recreation activities provide physical challenge, require development of skills and inspire wonder and curiosity about the natural world. Recreation contributes to the physical, mental and spiritual health of individuals, families, and friends. Federal lands contribute significantly, and in many cases uniquely, to the provision of nature-based outdoor recreation opportunities (USDA 2016).

Forest users may occasionally experience short term or temporary disruptions in their recreation activities as a result of other groups currently occupying a preferred site, forest management activities such as current thinning or prescribed fire projects, fire restrictions or fire closures due to hot, dry weather and extreme fire danger, as well as natural occurrences such as fallen trees blocking a roadway or trail, and so on. When asked how visitors would react to such disruptions in their plans, they reported in the National Visitor Use Monitoring survey (NVUM) using substitution behaviors such as coming back another time, going elsewhere for a different activity, going elsewhere for the same activity, going to work, some other substitution or staying at home (USDA Forest Service 2021g, USDA Forest Service 2021h, USDA Forest Service 2021i). The number one response for all three forests was by far, going elsewhere for the same activity.

Demographic shifts and lifestyle changes have affected the demand for recreation opportunities on national forests. Today about 80% of the population lives in urban settings (United States Census Bureau .. In the West, growth of retirement communities and other population shifts have created urban settings close to public lands. Both of these trends have created challenges to Forest Service recreation managers to meet demands for an ever-increasing number of recreation users as well as a diverse number of desired recreation activities.

Arizona has a high percentage of public land compared to private lands. Figure 1 displays land ownership for Arizona (Headwaters Economics 2021b). Private land is notably scarce in Arizona. Residents are more likely to rely on public land for recreation activities due to the lack of private facilities. In addition, public lands provide recreational, environmental and lifestyle amenities.

Arizona’s population was one of the fastest growing in the United States from 2000 to 2010. It grew 24.6% during this time period (<http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-01.pdf>). The rate has slowed down in the last decade, to 12.9% from 2010 to 2019 (Headwaters Economics 2021a). The populations of Coconino and Yavapai Counties continue to grow steadily. These counties include attractive cities such as Flagstaff, Sedona and Prescott. Rapid development and infill of limited private land also places more pressure on public land agencies to provide open space and recreation opportunities.




Figure 1. Percentage of land per ownership for the state of Arizona

Table 4: Population growth in counties in Rim Country project area, Arizona and the U.S. (Headwaters Economics 2021a)

Population Change 2010-2017						
Year	Coconino County	Navajo	Arizona	U.S.	Yavapai	Gila
2010	131,824	107,060	6,246,816	303,965,272	209,260	53,272
2019	141,274	109,2704	7,050,299	324,697,795	228,067	53,246
Percent Change	7.2%	3.2%	12.9%	6.8%	11.4 %	0.5%

An increasing population, along with growing participation in outdoor activities, contributes to increased visitation to the Coconino National Forest according to the most recent NVUM data. However, the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest shows a dramatic decrease in visits from 2007 to 2014. This could possibly be attributed to staff changes in the implementation of the survey design and/or to the implantation of field interviews. The 2018 NVUM results indicate an 8.6% increase visitation from 2007. National Forest visits for the Tonto were similar for 2013 and 2016. Population growth is expected to continue and will increasingly affect national forest management activities, as well as ability to provide satisfying recreation opportunities.

Participation in recreation activities continues to increase across the country. In 2009 Cordell et al compiled recreation participation data in the US from the 1980’s to 2000’s. Table 5 displays this

information and shows trends in the data over almost 20 years. Recreation activities that occur on National Forests were included in the table, activities such as “attend outdoor concerts and plans” were removed as not applicable to the analysis.

Table 5 provides local recreation information available for the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto National Forests. All forests have been surveyed several times in the NVUM. NVUM estimates the volume of recreation visitation to National Forests and Grasslands and produces descriptive information about that visitation, including activity participation, demographics, visit duration, measures of satisfaction, and trip spending connected to the visit.

Table 5: Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto NF visitation comparison by year, site type and forest (USDA Forest Service 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2021d, 2021e, 2021f, 2021g, 2021h, 2021g, 2021i)

Forest	Site Type					Total National Forest Visits
	Day Use Developed	Overnight Developed	Undeveloped Areas	Wilderness	Skiing	
Apache-Sitgreaves 2007	865,000	660,000	206,000	5,000	0	1,173,000
Apache-Sitgreaves 2014	385,000	148,000	204,000	7000	0	520,000
Apache-Sitgreaves, 2018	483,000	171,000	605,000	16,000		1,274,000
Coconino 2005	2,308,000	148,000	2,700,000	384,000	138,000	3,275,000
Coconino 2010	2,244,000	128,000	1,842,000	501,000	130,000	2,868,000
Coconino 2015	1,312,000	84,00	3,155,000	506,000	121,000	4,390,000
Tonto 2008	800,000	961,000	3,195,000	152,000	0	4,801,000
Tonto 2013	595,000	305,000	1,724,000	340,000	0	2,514,000
Tonto 2016	1,182,000	366,000	1,327,000	169,000	0	2,580,000

The Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest most drastic site type visits are the decrease in day Use Developed and Overnight Developed (campgrounds) sites and major increase in undeveloped areas visitation. The Coconino NF visits show increased in Undeveloped Areas and decreased in Day Use Developed and Overnight Developed over the last five years. The Tonto National Forest displays major changes with an increase in Day Use Developed and a decrease in Wilderness.

According to NVUM, most visitors to the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto NF use day use developed sites (such as picnic areas, observation points, and trailheads) and undeveloped areas (the general forest area with no developed facilities). The types of activities that people participate in are displayed in the next three tables (6, 7 and 8) displayed by forest.

Table 6: Comparison of selected recreation activity participation in 2005, 2010 and 2015 for the Coconino National Forest (USDA Forest Service 2021a, 2021d, 2021g)

Activity	Percent Participation 2005	Percent Participation 2010	Percent Participation 2015
Viewing Natural Features	84.2	73.1	83.1
Hiking/Walking	71.2	70.8	74.0

Viewing Wildlife	63.9	48.7	38.8
Relaxing	60.2	62.3	49.1
Driving for Pleasure	51.3	46.1	33.9
Visit Historic Sites	30.9	29.2	10.6
Nature Study	18.2	17	9.7
Picnicking	14.8	21.4	9.3
Fishing	5.8	4.8	2.6
Bicycling	5.7	6.2	5.6
OHV Use	5.6	9.0	1.9
Motorized Trail Activity	5.4	3.8	1.7
Developed Camping	4.4	5.5	2.0
Downhill Skiing	4.4	5.0	2.9
Primitive Camping	4.2	4.2	3.0
Motorized Water Activities	2.6	1.0	0.3
Hunting	2.1	2.1	1.1
Backpacking	1.7	1.4	0.6
Horseback Riding	0.9	1.2	0.2
Cross-country Skiing	0.2	1.2	0.5

The percent of participation in the activities varies by survey year, but the types of activities have not varied. The Coconino NF data shows increase in the amount of people viewing natural features and hiking/walking. Other notable changes include decrease in all other activities but more important decrease in viewing historic sites, nature study and picnicking.

On the Apache-Sitgreaves NF, changes differed as hiking/walking and picnicking increase in the percent participation by activity type between the two survey years. Large decreases can be seen in relaxing, viewing wildlife, and viewing natural features. There are more variations in smaller positive and negative changes.

The Tonto NF saw important increases in OHV, non-motorized water, some other activity and viewing natural features. Other notable changes are important decrease in hiking/walking, relaxing and driving for pleasure. There are similar smaller positive and negative variations in all other activities like on the Apache-Sitgreaves NF.

Table 7: Comparison of recreation activity participation in 2007 and 2014, 2018 for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest (USDA-Forest Service 2021b, 2021f, 2021i)

Activity	% Participation * 2007	% Participation* 2014	% Participation* 2018
Hiking / Walking	35.8	59.0	60.8
Relaxing	80.2	58.7	28.6
Viewing Wildlife	68.9	48.2	26.0
Driving for Pleasure	44.6	42.2	20.4
Viewing Natural Features	64.8	38.8	26.2
Fishing	38.5	38.0	24.6
Picnicking	20.9	33.5	6.1
Developed Camping	34.7	31.0	12.7
Nature Study	14.6	15.5	7.1
Non-motorized Water	4.9	5.1	3.2
Motorized Trail Activity	4.3	5.0	2.5
Other Non-motorized	3.9	5.0	1.6
Bicycling	7.7	4.5	3.4
Nature Center Activities	4.9	4.3	1.6

Activity	% Participation * 2007	% Participation* 2014	% Participation* 2018
OHV Use	6.8	4.0	2.5
Some Other Activity	3.1	3.7	4.6
Primitive Camping	3.8	3.6	3.0
Gathering Forest Products	8.5	3.3	2.2
Visiting Historic Sites	9.2	3.2	1.9
Resort Use	2.5	1.6	1.0
Motorized Water Activities	7.6	1.4	0.6
Hunting	1.7	1.2	2.0
Cross-country Skiing	0.1	1.0	0.0
Other Motorized Activity	0	0.9	0.5
Horseback Riding	1.6	0.0	0.9
Snowmobiling	0	0.0	0.0
Downhill Skiing	0	0.0	0.6
No Activity Reported	0.6		0.4
		0.0	
Backpacking	4.0	0.0	1.2

Table 8: Comparison of recreation activity participation in 2008, 2013 and 2016 for the Tonto National Forest (USDA Forest Service 2021c, 2021e, 2021h)

Activity	% Participation * 2008	% Participation* 2013	% Participation* 2016
Hiking / Walking	26.3	50.5	29.3
Relaxing	23.4	33.6	22.6
Fishing	23.3	23.2	17.9
Viewing Wildlife	17.7	22.1	25.1
Driving for Pleasure	15.0	19.4	10.5
Picnicking	14.8	15.1	7.7
Viewing Natural Features	14.5	13.8	22.2
Motorized Water Activities	11.0	13.4	12.5
Developed Camping	10.6	8.2	7.9
Other Non-motorized	10.6	6.7	11.1
Motorized Trail Activity	10.4	5.7	3.5
Some Other Activity	8.3	5.5	14.5
Hunting	5.1	4.9	1.5
Nature Center Activities	4.6	4.4	0.7
Primitive Camping	4.3	4.3	4.1
Non-motorized Water	3.5	3.7	14.9
OHV Use	2.9	3.6	27.5
Visiting Historic Sites	2.8	2.5	2.8
Nature Study	2.5	2.3	5.9
Gathering Forest Products	1.1	2.2	0.7
Horseback Riding	1.0	2.1	0.3
Bicycling	0.9	1.7	1.5
Other Motorized Activity	0.8	0.5	0.1
Resort Use	0.7	0.0	0.3
Snowmobiling	0.7	0.0	0.2

Activity	% Participation* 2008	% Participation* 2013	% Participation* 2016
Downhill Skiing	0.6	0.0	0.1
Cross-country Skiing	0.1	0.0	0
No Activity Reported	0.0	0.0	0.4
Backpacking	0.0	0.0	0.4

People who participated in the NVUM came from mainly Coconino County, Yavapai County, Maricopa County, Arizona. Table 7 compares all three NF figures regarding residence, and Table 8 presents a comparison of distance travelled on the day that they were interviewed on each forest. Coconino NF has the most international visitors with 21%. About one-third of visitors to the Coconino and the Tonto NF came from Maricopa County (including the Phoenix metro area).

Table 9: Comparison of visitor origin for Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto NF (USDA Forest Service,2021j)

Location	Approximate Percent of Visitors of Apache-Sitgreaves NF	Approximate Percent of Visitors to Coconino NF*	Approximate Percent of Visitors to Tonto NF*
Coconino County, AZ	0	33	26
Yavapai County, AZ	0	27	0
Gila County, AZ	3.9	0	6
Navajo	64.4	0	0
Pima	0	0	8.6
Pinal	7.8		
Apache	6.5	0	0
Maricopa County, AZ (Phoenix metro area)	19.2	16	55
International	0	21	5.1

When visitors were asked about substitution behaviors for the trip that they were on, more than half of all visitors on each NF reported they would have gone somewhere else to participate in the same activity (USDA Forest Service 2021j). The second preferred option was come back another time for the Coconino and Tonto NF while the Apache-Sitgreaves NF visitors preferred staying home.

Table 10: Substitution behaviors for forest visitors (USDA Forest Service 2021j)

Substitution Behavior	Percent Reporting Behavior for the Apache-Sitgreaves NF	Percent Reporting Behavior for the Coconino NF	Percent Reporting Behavior for the Tonto NF
Come back another time	11	18	9
Gone elsewhere for a different activity	9	14	3
Gone elsewhere for the same activity	49	53	80
Gone to work	1	1	0
Another substitution	11	2	3
Stay at home	20	12	5

The Coconino NF has more than 50% of their visitors traveling over 100 miles to recreate on the National Forest with 62%. The Tonto and the Apache-Sitgreaves on the other hand, is nearing 50% of their visitors from less than 25 miles from the forest and 74% and 61.1% respectively of visitors from within a radius of less than 50 miles. This indicates that most of the visitors are local. The Coconino NF receives the most visitors traveling more than 300 miles representing 37.2%. This correlates with the relatively high international visitors (21%).

Table 11: Percent of National Forest Visits by Distance Traveled* (USDA Forest Service 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2021d, 2021e, 2021f, 2021g, 2021h, 2021i)

Distance	Percent for Apache-Sitgreaves NF (2007)	Percent for Apache-Sitgreaves NF (2014)	Percent for Apache-Sitgreaves NF (2017)	Percent for Coconino NF (2010)	Percent for Coconino NF (2015)	Percent for Tonto NF (2013)	Percent for Tonto NF (2016)
0-25 miles away	33.8	17.8	47.8	30	23	36.2	42.4
26-50 miles away	5.0	6.0	10.7	11	6.1	30.9	31.8
51-75 miles away	0.1	1.2	2.6	3	2.8	10.9	9.1
76-100 miles away	3.4	4.9	8.3	12	6.3	13.1	4.4
101-200 miles away	27.6	50.1	16.4	16	16.5	3.8	5.5
201-300 miles away	19.3	17.8	7.9	6	8.3	2.0	2.0
300+ miles away	10.7	2.2	6.3	22	37.2	3.1	4.7

*National Forest Visits are defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

Visitation to the Coconino National Forest has increased concurrently with population growth in Arizona. Data on visitation is collected by National Forests every five years and is part of the National Visitor Use Monitoring Program. Data collected in 2015 shows the Coconino National Forest has about 4.7 million visitors per year (USDA Forest Service 2021j). During this time, the Coconino National Forest had the most visitors of all the National Forests in Arizona followed by the Tonto National Forest, with about 3 million visitors each year. Adjacent National Forests, like the Kaibab and Prescott, had substantially lower visitors; all under 1 million visitors.

The NVUM data highlights the Coconino National Forest is the most popular national forest in the southwestern region, but the data also shows that the forest serves an interesting niche. The Coconino National Forest is heavily used by non-local and international visitors; it is estimated that 60% of the 4.7 million visitors come a long distance (over 100 miles) to visit the National Forest (USDA Forest Service, 2021j). While large amounts of visitors to the Apache-Sitgreaves come from areas (primarily the Phoenix metropolitan area) to visit the area mainly for the change of scenery and ideal climate and relief from extreme summer temperatures in nearby major metropolitan areas. The Rim Country project area covers a wide array of recreationists coming from different places within Arizona and from other states and

countries. This reflects the desire of many recreationist to participate in the extensive possibilities of recreation activities in the area.

Table 12: Region 3 visitation comparison by Forest (USDA Forest Service 2021j)

Forest	Site Visits (1,000s)*
Apache-Sitgreaves NF, AZ	1,274
Carson NF, NM	945
Cibola NF, NM	1,815
Coconino NF, AZ	4,715
Coronado NF, AZ	2,912
Gila NF, NM	528
Kaibab NF, AZ	757
Lincoln NF, NM	921
Prescott NF, AZ	806
Santa Fe NF, NM	905
Tonto NF, AZ	3,044

*A Site Visit is the entry of one person onto a national forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time.

Recreation Activities within the Project Area

There are several USFS trails and developed recreation facilities within the Rim Country project area including developed campgrounds. Most of the recreation facilities are located on the Apache-Sitgreaves NF. The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classification within the project area includes Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (SPNM), Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM), Roaded-Natural (RN) and Rural (R). The recreation facilities within the Rim Country project area are shown on Figure 2 and are summarized in Table 11. The full list of name of each recreation facilities is displayed in Appendix 1.

Table 13: Summary of recreation facilities in Rim Country project area

Facility	Apache-Sitgreaves NF	Coconino NF	Tonto NF
Boating site	4	2	0
Campground	14	5	11
Camping area	15	0	1
Day Use Area	13	0	0
Group Campground	3	2	4
Interpretative Site	3	0	0
Info Site/Fee Station	0	3	1
Interpretive Site		1	
Lookout/Cabin		1	
Observation Site	2	0	2
OHV Staging Area	2	0	0
Organization Site	2	0	2
Other Recreation Concession	2 dump stations	0	0
Picnic Site	2	1	4
Recreation Residence	0	0	2
Trailhead	4	5	14
Wildlife Viewing Site	0	1	0




Figure 2 Rim Country Developed Recreation Sites

Developed Campground

There are a total of 30 developed campgrounds in the Rim Country project area. Campgrounds generally operate from May to October depending on weather. These campgrounds see high use on weekends typically from mid-May to mid-September.

Trails

There are portions of several Forest System Trails within the project area. There is a total of 728 miles of trails identified in the project area. Table 12 shows the number of miles of trail per trail, class per forest. The Forest Service Handbook (FSH 2353, Section 14.2, Exhibit 01) defines trail classes as general categories reflecting trail development scale, arranged along a continuum. The Trail Class identified for a National Forest System (NFS) trail prescribes its development scale, representing its intended design and management standards.¹ Local deviations from any Trail Class descriptor may be established based on trail-specific conditions, topography, or other factors, provided that the deviations do not undermine the general intent of the applicable Trail Class.

The Apache-Sitgreaves NF contains the most mileage of trails with more than double that of the Coconino and the Tonto NFs. Also, the ASNf is the only forest to have snow trails. It totals 92 miles of snow trails and 359 miles of terra trails.

Table 14: Mileage of trails per trail class per National Forest within the project area

Trail class	Typical ROS	Apache-Sitgreaves	Coconino	Tonto	Total miles per trail class
1: Minimally developed	Natural, unmodified Primitive to Roaded Natural	0	5	0	5
2: Moderately developed	Natural, essentially unmodified Primitive to Roaded Natural	94	76	5	176
3: Developed	Natural, primarily unmodified Primitive to Roaded Natural	235	43	123	401
4: Highly developed	May be modified Semi-Primitive to Rural	115	0	9	124
5: Fully developed	May be highly modified Commonly associated with visitor centers or high-use recreation sites Roaded Natural to Urban	4	0	0	4
No trail class identified		9	4	7	20
Total		457	128	143	728

Arizona National Scenic Trail

The Arizona National Scenic Trail (Arizona Trail) was designated a National Scenic Trail by Congress in the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. It extends approximately 800 miles across the State of Arizona from the border with Mexico to the border with Utah. The ANST is intended to be a primitive, non-motorized, long distance trail that highlights the state's topographic, biologic, historic, and cultural diversity. Administration of the Arizona Trail is the responsibility of the Regional Forester. Figure 2 shows the trail alignment within the Rim Country project area.

The Arizona Trail is Arizona's only National Scenic Trail and provides local hiking opportunities around the Flagstaff area, as well as a recreational experience to long distance hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians. The Arizona Trail corridor represents a connected landscape across the state. As the trail becomes a better known, people from the U.S and internationally are coming to experience a unique cross-section of Arizona that can only be seen by traveling the Arizona Trail.

Per 16 USC 1246 Administration and Development of National Trails System, each federal agency is required to select the trail right of way and publish its location. Per Section 2, "Development and management of each segment of the National Trails System shall be designed to harmonize with and complement any established multiple-use plans for that specific area in order to insure continued maximum benefits from the land." Forest Service Manual 2353.41 also provides guidance "Develop and administer National Scenic and National Historic Trails to ensure protection of the purposes for which the trails were established and to maximize benefits from the land" and in 2353.42 "Administer National Scenic and National Historic Trail corridors to be compatible with the nature and purposes of the corresponding trail."

The revised Draft Coconino NF Management Plans (2011) provides desired conditions for the trail including "*the Trail will emphasize a semi-primitive recreation experience in a predominantly natural or natural-appearing landscape. Where infrastructure and facilities impact the scenic integrity along*

the trail, mitigation is applied appropriately. Recreation does not negatively impact cultural and natural resources, or scenic integrity.”

The Arizona National Scenic Trail (AZNST) traverses 39.7 miles through the project area from South to North on its way from Mexico to Utah. The trail is intended to be a primitive, long distance trail highlighting the state’s topographic, biologic, historic, and cultural diversity. The trail receives use by day hikers and overnight backpackers, as well as by through-hikers attempting to hike or ride all the more than 800 miles of trail across the state of Arizona. The Arizona Trail Association is an active volunteer organization, which maintains the trail and performs a variety of stewardship actions, including advocacy for the trail.

General George Crook National Recreation Trail

The General Crook National Recreation Trail (GCNRT) traverses 98.4 miles through the project area. The GCNRT traverses both the APSNF (58.5mi) and CONF (36.9mi). The GCNRT follows the historic route of General George Crook of the US Army from Fort Whipple in Prescott, to Fort Apache. The route was established in the 1870s to serve as a supply and patrol road. Some sections of the trail have been replaced by modern Forest System Roads, but the trail still provides for spectacular views over the Mogollon Rim and invites adventurers to explore this historic route. The Apache-Sitgreaves Land Management Plan provides management direction for both the GCNRT and the Blue Ridge National Recreation Trail as the National Trails are considered a special area in the Forest Plan. The desired conditions, objectives and guidelines are found in Table 1.

Blue Ridge National Recreation Trail

The Blue Ridge NRT, located on the Lakeside Ranger District of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest is approximately 9 miles long. The trail climbs the west side of Blue Ridge Mountain (7,650 feet in elevation) through a mixture of pines, junipers, and many varieties of wildflowers. The mountain itself is a volcanic remnant. There are scenic views from the summit. The entire trail is in the Rim Country Project area.

Highline National Recreation Trail

The 50-mile-long Highline National Recreation Trail is on the Payson Ranger District of the Tonto National Forest. The west terminal of the trail is at 5,360 feet and ends at 6,620 feet. The Dude Fire of 1990 burned portions of the forest along the Highline Trail. The Highline Trail, established in 1870, was used to travel between homesteads and to attend school in Pine. Zane Grey and Babe Haught used the Highline Trail while hunting. The portion of the Highline Trail from Washington Park TH and Pine TH is part of the Arizona Trail. This trail ties to several other trails, providing opportunities for loop hikes and rides. The Highline Trail runs essentially east to west, below the Mogollon Rim and roughly following it.




Figure 3 Rim Country National Scenic and Recreation Trails

Wild and Scenic Rivers

There are currently no designated segments of wild and scenic rivers in the Rim Country project area. There are however, currently 9 segments of eligible wild and scenic rivers on the Apache-Sitgreaves and Coconino National Forest in the project area. In addition, as part of its Land Management Plan revision process, the Tonto NF is completing an updated eligibility report for wild and scenic rivers to replace the existing eligibility report from 1993. Five eligible wild and scenic rivers occur on the Tonto National Forest and were identified in a 1993 eligibility report covering all the national forests in Arizona (USDA Forest Service 1993). As part of its ongoing Land Management Plan Revision process, the Tonto National Forest is completing a wild and scenic river eligibility study that will replace the 1993 study (USDA Forest Service 2018). For analysis purposes and to be consistent with the Land Management Plan revision, the Rim Country FEIS includes the eligible rivers listed in the most current eligibility study based on comments received from the 2017 Tonto National Forest Draft Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Study. The figure below illustrates the locations of the eligible wild and scenic rivers on the Apache-Sitgreaves and Coconino National Forest relative to the project area and the rivers from the 1993 eligibility report and the current eligibility study (ongoing) respectively.

Table 15. Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridor by Forest

Eligible Wild & Scenic River Corridors	Acres	Miles
by Forest		
Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Total	16,206	74
Chevelon Creek	7,281	25
East Clear Creek*	899	6
Leonard Canyon*	3,164	24
Willow Creek	4,861	19
Coconino National Forest Total	13,693	61
Barbershop Canyon	3,741	14
East Clear Creek*	5,118	23
Leonard Canyon*	3,069	24
Tonto National Forest Total	3,103	10
Canyon Creek	1,914	7
Christopher Creek	890	2
Pueblo Canyon	9	N/A
Tonto Creek (Upper)	208	0.1
Workman Creek	82	0.1
Grand Total	33,002	114




Figure 4. Eligible Wild and Scenic River Segments with Current Tonto Eligibility Study

Inventoried Roadless Area

Roadless area characteristics are described in the Roadless Area Conservation, Final Rule¹ and wilderness attributes of roadless areas are described in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, section 72.1 – Wilderness Evaluation.

Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRA’s) are a special area designation found within the project boundary. The project area contains 8 inventoried roadless areas totalling 45,745 acres within the forests. However, 17,683 acres, representing 39% of the total IRA acreage, is included in the project area. Table 16 displays the acreage of ROS by IRA in the project area and outside the project area. The map below highlights the location of each IRA within the project boundary. Table 16 shows the acreage within the project area. Maps of each IRA showing the ROS within the IRA are included in Appendix 4.




Figure 5. Inventoried roadless areas in the project area.

Table 16. Inventoried roadless areas acreage by ROS by forest

Forest	Inventoried Roadless Area Name	Total IRA Acres	ROS CODE	Within Project Area (Acres)	Within Project Area (Percent)	Outside Project Area (Acres)	Outside Project Area (Percent)	Grand Total (Percent)
Apache-Sitgreaves	Chevelon Canyon	5,569	SPM	1	0%		0%	0%
			SPNM	5,568	100%		0%	100%
	Leonard Canyon	3,082	RN		0%	0	0%	0%
			SPNM	1,815	59%	1,267	41%	100%
Coconino	Barbershop Canyon	1,310	SPNM	1,310	100%		0%	100%
	East Clear Creek	2,005	RN	4	0%		0%	0%

			SPNM	2,001	100%		0%	100%
	Jacks Canyon	2,855	SPNM	1,717	60%	1,139	40%	100%
Tonto	Hellsgate Wilderness Contiguous	6,165	SPM	266	4%	4,107	67%	71%
			SPNM	72	1%	1,721	28%	29%
	Mazatzal Wilderness Contiguous	16,977	P			918	5%	5%
			RN			56	0%	0%
			SPM	257	2%	5,233	31%	32%
	Sierra Ancha Wilderness Contiguous	7,781	SPNM	59	0%	10,453	62%	62%
			RN	421	5%	102	1%	7%
SPM			1	0%	1,228	16%	16%	
			SPNM	4,192	54%	1,838	24%	77%
Grand Total		45,745		17,683	39%	28,062	61%	100%

Dispersed Recreation

The Land Management Plan defines dispersed recreation as the type of outdoor recreation that tends to be spread out over the land and in conjunction with roads, trails, and undeveloped waterways. Activities are often day-use oriented and include hunting, fishing, gathering of forest products, boating, hiking, off-road vehicle use, cross-country skiing, mountain biking, and rock climbing.

Dispersed Camping

Dispersed recreation includes the full suite of outdoor nonmotorized and motorized recreation opportunities available throughout the year. Visitors to the area camp using a variety of shelters, including large Recreational Vehicles (RVs), live-in toy haulers, and tents. Many campers come from the Phoenix metro area to escape extreme summer temperatures and enjoy the cool weather provided by the high elevation of the project area.

Dispersed camping requires no additional facilities other than road or trail access, though the relatively unconstrained nature of dispersed camping can cause resource impacts such as soil compaction and erosion, loss of vegetation, increased fire risk, displacement of wildlife, and accumulation of trash and human waste. The number of dispersed campers in the project area is also difficult to estimate.

Motor Vehicle Use

As Arizona’s population has grown, the state has also seen a dramatic increase in ownership and use of personal Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs). Arizona Trails – 2010 reported a 623% increase in sales of off- highway motorcycles and ATVs in Arizona between the years 1995 to 2006 (McVay et al. 2010). NVUM indicates a particular great increase of OHV use to recreate from 3.6% to 27.5% activity participation for the Tonto National Forest The Coconino and the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests show a decrease in OHV use (Tables 6-7-8). The growth in ownership and use of OHVs has greatly influenced how users recreate in the project area.

The 18-202220 Arizona Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) reports that based on the 2015 Arizona Trails Plan, 13% of adult Arizona residents have used a motorized trail at least once during their time in Arizona.

Visitors are extremely mobile, require large areas for camping to accommodate trailers and toy haulers, and their recreating patterns directly relate to the road system in the project area.

In November 2005, the USDA Forest Service announced new Federal Regulations called the Travel Management Rule (TMR), requiring each National Forest to establish a designated system of roads, trails, and areas by vehicle type and time of year. Designated roads, trails, and areas would then be identified on a Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM), made available to the public for free (36 CFR 212.56).

The travel management planning (referred to as TMR). TMR project prohibits cross-country travel and restricts public motorized travel on the forests except on designated roads, trails and areas as per the final TMR rule <http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/ohv/final.pdf>. It does allow for emergency activities, and limited administrative motorized use of non-designated forest roads, trails and areas. Each forest’s motorized vehicle use maps (MVUM) regulate travel management. These include information about authorized motorized activities including designated roads, trails and areas, dispersed camping, motorized game retrieval and fuelwood gathering (USDA-Forest Service 2011a). Non-motorized recreation activities are not included in the travel management MVUM.

In 2010, the Apache-Sitgreaves NF proposed a draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) with a travel management plan and alternatives were released for public comment. Because of the Wallow Fire, the changes to the landscape and species status, and the release of the ASNFs revised Land Management Plan in 2015; it was decided to present a modified proposed action to the public for comment in a Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIS). The RDEIS is a continuation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The ASNFs Public Motorized Travel Management Plan reinitiated the analysis process. The APSNF is developing the revised proposed action. The 4FRI project will adhere to the TMR decisions for the Coconino, Tonto and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest.

Recreation Special Uses

Many authorizations are for reoccurring activities like Outfitting and Guiding and some are for facilities such as Recreation Residences. In addition, four areas have been designated for temporary activities like Recreation Events and Non-Commercial Group Use (NCGU). Appendix 2 compiles the authorized recreation special use permits in the project area.

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum




Figure 6: Recreation Opportunity Spectrum, USDA ROS Primer and Field Guide 2011

The Forest Service uses the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) to provide a framework for defining classes of outdoor recreation environments, activities, and experience opportunities (USDA Forest Service, ROS Primer and Field Guide 2011). Figure 4 depict the various ROS categories and characteristics of them. The ROS is a land classification system that categorizes national forest land into six classes, each class being defined by its setting and by the desired opportunities and characteristics the

setting offers. The six ROS classes are: Primitive (P), Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (SPNM), Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM), Roaded Natural (RN), Rural (R), and Urban (U). There is no wilderness or recommended designated wilderness area within the proposed project area. Opportunities for experiences along the spectrum represent a range from very high probability of solitude, self-reliance, challenge and risk, to a very social experience where self-reliance, challenge and risk are relatively unimportant (Table 15).

The purpose of the ROS is to identify desired conditions across the Forest so that different parts of the forest may facilitate different recreational experiences. The ROS represents management objectives, which may not always reflect actual user experiences.

Table 17: ROS settings and characteristics (USDA Forest Service, 1986)

ROS Setting	Evidence of Human Contact and Human Use	Social Encounters
Rural and Roaded Natural	Highest contact with other visitors and highest evidence of use compared to other ROS settings	Social encounters are higher within ½ mile of trailheads, paved roads, and residential areas.
Semiprimitive Motorized and Semiprimitive Non-motorized	Lower contact with other visitors and lower evidence of human use than in Rural and Roaded Natural but higher levels than Primitive or Wilderness ROS settings.	Social encounters are higher within ½ mile of trailheads and at destination features such as water, natural formations, cultural features, vistas.
Primitive	Lower contact with other visitors and lower evidence of human use than in Semiprimitive Motorized and Semiprimitive Non-motorized but higher levels than Wilderness ROS settings.	Social encounters are higher within ½ mile of trailheads and at destination features such as water, natural formations, cultural features, vistas.

Most of the Rim Country project area falls into the SPM and RN classes. Approximately 418,675 acres or 35% of the project area is SPM. RN makes up 418,675 acres or 50%. SPNM makes up 13% of the area. With the recent Land Management Plan Revision, for the Coconino and the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests updated ROS maps that represent the desired conditions for ROS classes across the Forest. Not all acres on the Forests currently meet these desired conditions. The desired conditions are meant to guide project design, alternative development, and assessment of potential project impacts. ROS classifications are also used to determine if project activities will help meet or move toward desired conditions for recreation opportunities at the Forest level.

Throughout much of the project area, numerous resource management activities have occurred including vegetation management, road maintenance, developed recreation site construction, trail construction and maintenance, prescribed burning, hazard tree removal, utility corridor clearing and others. In addition, there have been numerous wildfires in the area. Not all projects have met or currently meet the characterizations and mapped ROS classes at this time.

All three national forests in the project area offer numerous developed recreation opportunities as illustrated in Figure 5. The Rim Country project does not include restoration activities in developed recreation sites, special areas, or designated Wilderness. Outside of these areas, many forest users engage in dispersed recreation including hiking, dispersed camping, driving motorized vehicles, rock climbing, cross country skiing, snow play and many other activities. There would be restoration activities in many places where dispersed recreation occurs.

A spectrum of high-quality outdoor recreation settings and opportunities would be available in the project area. Roaded Natural and Semi-Primitive Motorized ROS areas would provide high scenic

and recreational values and in Semi-Primitive settings would provide more natural appearing settings. The national forest system lands in the project area provide high quality recreation opportunities and settings that compliment and support local communities’ tourism industries, and contribute to local residents’ quality of life.

Management activities on national forest system lands are consistent with recreation setting objectives that provide opportunities for the public to engage in a variety of developed and dispersed recreational activities, in concert with other resource management and protection needs.

Table 18: Acres of land by recreation opportunity spectrum in the Rim Country project area

ROS class	Acres	Percentage (%)
R- Rural	18,309	2
RM- Roaded Modified	8,645	1
RN- Roaded Natural	598,373	50
SPM- Semi-Primitive Motorized	418,675	35
SPNM- Semi-Primitive Non-motorized	153,798	13
U- Urban	4,009	0
Total	1,201,810	100




Figure 7 Rim Country Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Class

Approximately 50% of the project area is classified as RN. Under this designation:

- ◆ Access in the project area can range from full access via road or trail to neither road nor trail being an available opportunity.
- ◆ Individuals can experience either full remoteness where they perceive themselves as removed from the sights and sounds of human activity (more than 1 ½ hour walk) or in other locations where they are not out of sight and sound of other humans.
- ◆ Experiences may range from encountering very few other recreationists, to experiencing moderate to frequent contact with other recreationists in developed sites or when on roads and trails.
- ◆ Some locations will offer on-site information that is noticeable but is presented in a manner that harmonizes with the natural environment, and other locations may not offer any on-site information.
- ◆ Recreationists will find some sites that offer no facilities for user comfort while other sites may offer some facilities that are rustic and built out of native materials. These facilities offer some on-site protection from the natural elements.

As mentioned, 35% of the project area is designated SPM. Under this designation:

- ◆ Access can include non-motorized and motorized trails, and primitive roads.
- ◆ Remoteness is more evident than in areas classified as RN.
- ◆ Human encounters can range from under 6, up to 15 parties met per day, or less than 3, up to 6 parties seen at a campsite per day.
- ◆ Information facilities provided on-site range from very limited to nonexistent.
- ◆ On-site protection facilities range from rustic or rudimentary to nonexistent.
- ◆ SPM management direction stipulates that limited to no site hardening occurs at / on recreation sites and locations that fall within this designation.
- ◆ Visitors' impacts range from unnoticeable with no site hardening to subtle site hardening.

As mentioned, 13% of the project area is designated SPNM- Semi-Primitive Non-motorized. Under this designation:

- ◆ Access include non-motorized trails and existent primitive roads if usually closed to motorized use. Motorized roads are at least 0.5 mile but no further than 3 miles from the designated area.
- ◆ Remoteness is evident and the environment offers challenge and risk.
- ◆ Human encounters can range from under 6, up to 15 parties met per day, or less than 3, up to 6 parties seen at a campsite per day.
- ◆ On-site protection facilities range from rustic or rudimentary to nonexistent.
- ◆ SPNM management direction stipulates that limited to no site hardening occurs at / on recreation sites and locations that fall within this designation.
- ◆ Visitors' impacts range from unnoticeable with no site hardening to subtle site hardening.

Issues/Indicators/Analysis Topics

Analysis topics identified relative to recreation and lands management resources are based on Land Management Plan desired conditions, management approaches, guidelines, and standards. There were very few public comments identifying issues or concerns related to recreation, except for potential effects from treatments on the Arizona National Scenic Trail and its users. Consequently, this resource area was determined to require cursory analysis. The primary issue of concern to recreation resources from the proposed activities is to minimize and mitigate effects on recreation features (e.g., developed campgrounds, signs, trails, and trailheads) and recreation activities (e.g., driving for pleasure, dispersed camping, hiking, mountain biking, equestrian use, hunting, boating, special use events, and developed camping).

Assumptions and Methodology

This assessment includes use of the best available science, based on relevant peer-reviewed literature, published reports from regulatory and land management agencies, existing resource inventories, field visits, and the professional judgment of interdisciplinary and cooperating agency team members.

The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) is the guiding system that the Forest Plan directs the Forest to consider when planning projects to properly manage and balance recreation opportunities. The ROS provides a framework to assist managers in identifying different outdoor recreation environments, settings, activities, and experiences desired by the public, and deciding how to provide these different recreational opportunities over the landscape within the forest (USDA Forest Service, ROS Book, 1986). ROS classifications are identified to distinguish the desired conditions across the landscape. ROS classifications within the project area were referenced to determine if project activities would affect the potential for meeting or moving toward desired conditions identified in the RO classifications.

The Special Uses Database System (SUDS) was used to generate a list of all recreation special use authorizations within the project area. This report was sorted by status. The authorizations were considered part of the existing condition if they had statuses of application accepted, pending signature, or issued.

Data and experiences from both the Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) and Cragin Watershed Protection Project were used in this analysis because of proximity to the project area, probability that users would recreate in all the project areas, and the similarity of terrain and vegetation.

This specialist report includes analysis of effects and Land Management Plan compliance information for a specific forest resource. In some situations, the EIS may present the information in a summarized or slightly different manner. The final EIS is the instrument used to inform the decision-making process. Specialist reports are still important reference sources for more detailed information on affected environment, methodology, analysis, and forest plan compliance. This is based on the Council for Environmental Quality's NEPA regulations (Section 1508.9), which identifies and Environmental Assessment as a "concise public document" to include "brief discussions" of the proposal, alternatives, environmental effects of the alternatives, and a listing of agencies and persons consulted.

The timeframes for direct and indirect effects would include the potential for up to 20 years of project implementation. The thinning treatments may take up to 20 years to complete, with each thinning contract generally completed within a three-year timeframe. Implementation would include prescribed burning over a 20-year period, with multiple burn intervals of two to 10 years across the project area.

Summary of Alternatives and Resource Protection Measures

Design Features can be found in Appendix C of the FEIS.

Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 – No Action

Direct and Indirect Effects

Under this alternative, recreation resources would be managed as they are currently without any effects from vegetation treatments and prescribed burning proposed in the Rim Country project area. Consequently, active, and approved projects will occur. Although electing the no-action alternative would not result in impacts to these resources from prescribed burning or thinning, this alternative would not reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire that could cause important resource damage, damage to recreation and lands infrastructure, and subsequent flooding. Wildfires ignited by lightning could be managed for resource benefit given conditions allow, however, the use of this strategy to decrease future crown fire risk is unpredictable and unlikely to affect most of the project area. Alternative 1 is the point of reference for assessing action alternatives 2 and 3.

Recreation Sites and Uses

Recreation Resources

The threat of uncharacteristically severe wildfire continues to increase with ongoing, un-managed growth of vegetation. Uncharacteristic wildfire would severely impact recreation values and experiences in the project area. Research has demonstrated some negative effects wildfire can have on recreation activities as well as benefits (Englin et al., 2001). Recent wildfires in other areas on the Coconino National Forest (Schultz Fire in 2010 and Slide Fire in 2014), Apache-Sitgreaves (Rodeo-Chediski Fire in 2002 and Wallow Fire in 2011) demonstrate the significant effects of uncharacteristic wildfire on recreation. In all cases, recreation facilities had to be closed to the public, with many remaining closed for months or even years. After the Slide Fire, Slide Rock State Park in Oak Creek Canyon was closed for several months during the period of highest visitation, and eventually opened after a very expensive early warning system for potential flash floods was installed.

During NVUM, visitors were asked what they would do if they were unable to visit this national forest due, for example, to closures related to wildfire damage and rehabilitation. Most visitors responded that they would have gone elsewhere for the same activity (Table 10). This suggests that if the Rim Country project area was closed due to wildfire or related effects, visitors would seek alternative locations to enjoy the same recreation activities. This could lead to overcrowding in nearby areas, resulting in resource damage and undesirable recreational experiences.

Developed Recreation Facilities

Developed recreation facilities, such as campgrounds and group event sites, could be negatively affected if there is no action to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire. The changes to landscape character and visual quality following a severe fire would considerably diminish the quality of recreation experiences and activities in affected areas. Effects of severe wildfire on other recreation-related infrastructure such as restrooms, kiosks, bulletin boards, and trail signs, would be substantial and would result in high costs to repair and/or replace damaged facilities. Historic sites such as lookout towers and guard stations could not be replaced if destroyed.

Trails

While the Schultz Fire on the Coconino NF severely damaged several trails, subsequent flooding was more destructive and caused more substantial damage than the fire itself. Large debris flows caused by rainfall on the denuded slopes destroyed major sections of the Little Bear Trail. In other areas, trails sections were rendered unpassable and invisible due to large boulders and tree trunks transported by the floodwaters and debris flows. Much of this flood damage occurred on trails that cross steep slopes or drainages. The economic cost and effort to reopen these trails was immense. Little Bear trail was closed from the fire in 2010 until October 2016. The Deer Hill trail was also closed and only reopened at the end of November 2017.

The Rim Country project area contains parts of four National Trails: the Arizona National Scenic Trail (70 miles in the project area), the entire Blue Ridge National Recreation Trail (9.4 miles), the General Crook National Recreation Trail (95 miles in the project area miles), and Highline National Recreation Trail (44 miles in the project area). Figure 5 illustrates the location of the national trails in the project area. The Rim Country project area contains 728 miles of trail, ranging from most primitive to fully developed. Some trails in the Rim Country project area share characteristics with the trails that were damaged in the Schultz Fire. Wildfire and/or flood damage to segments of trails within the project area would require closures of affected sections until they could be properly repaired and determined safe for use. In the interim, potentially lengthy re-routes would have to be established for visitors wishing to hike any affected trails, especially for the statewide Arizona National Scenic Trail.




Figure 8: National Scenic and Recreation Trails in the Rim Country project area

Several research papers and lessons from the Schultz Fire reveal that the no-action alternative, which has no vegetation management actions to reduce the risk of wildfire, could have negative and unpredictable effects on trails and trail users if an uncharacteristically severe wildfire occurred in the Rim Country project area.

Overall, trail users respond negatively and show decreased short-term return rates to areas that have experienced uncharacteristic wildfire, such as the Schultz Fire and Slide Fire (Hesseln, Loomis, Gonzalez-Caban, & Alexander, 2003) (Starbuck, Berrens, & McKee, 2006) (Bawa, 2017). In New Mexico, Hesseln, et al. (2003) found that visitation to areas recovering from crown fires, by both hikers and mountain bikers, decreased through time. Similarly, Starbuck, et al. (2006) showed that unrestored areas in the five national forests of New Mexico that experienced uncharacteristic fire were unappealing to bikers and hikers. According to the study's model, decreases in post-fire recreational visitation by hikers and bikers resulted in estimated losses of \$51.65 million in output, \$23.31 million in earnings, and a loss of 1,240 jobs.

While short-term effects of uncharacteristic wildfires on recreation are almost uniformly negative, longer-term effects may differentially affect certain user groups. Fire-damaged trees can take many years to fall, and it is likely that any affected trail system would experience increased numbers of downed trees across trails for many years, despite routine maintenance. Crossing downed logs on trails is more burdensome for mountain bikers, who must stop, dismount, and lift their bikes over fallen trees, than it is for hikers, who may be able to simply step over these obstacles. Hesseln, et al. (2003) found that the value of net benefits for hikers increased during the 40 years following crown fire, whereas the net benefits for mountain bikers declined over the same period. This demonstrates that different intensity fires may affect groups engaged in different recreation activities in different ways.

Overall trail users respond negatively and have a decreased return to forested areas that have experienced uncharacteristic wildfire. "The lack of mature trees and the large numbers of downed trees make the area unattractive to hikers and mountain bikers" (Starbuck et al. 2006, p. 63). So, the No Action Alternative which has no vegetation management actions or prescribed burning treatments to reduce the risk of wildfire could have negative effects on trails and trail users if an uncharacteristic wildfire was to occur in the Rim Country project area.

Eligible Wild and Scenic River

The opportunities to experience a spectrum of river-related recreational activities on the eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers could be at higher risk of being negatively affected by catastrophic fires. There is the potential for fire-related closures that could prevent access to the rivers. During these fires, closures in areas of the forest could touch some visitors by redirecting them to other areas of the forest. The recreation opportunity spectrum should not be reduced. The Wild and Scenic Rivers would continue their management per the directions in the respective Land Management Plans.

Inventoried Roadless Areas

No management activity will occur in the IRA, increasing risk of catastrophic fire that could potentially disturb recreationists visits to these areas as discussed in the Eligible Wild and Scenic River section above. The inventoried roadless character would not be altered.

Dispersed Recreation

Following the Rodeo-Chediski fire in 2002, dispersed camping in the burned area was prohibited for nearly 7 years. The major reasons for this restriction was to protect visitors and property from damage due to falling trees and flooding, and to reduce recreation effects on fragile fire-damaged soils. The time it takes a fire-damaged tree to fall is unpredictable and depends on several factors including weather, topography, burn-severity, and flooding. Trees that have been killed or damaged by fire may be unstable and parts or all such trees can easily become dislodged and can fall onto forest visitors, vehicles, or camping equipment.

Dispersed camping is popular in the Rim Country project area and an uncharacteristic wildfire could result in closing a fire area to camping and other activities. This would affect thousands of visitors every summer that visit the project area to camp in the desirable summer temperatures. Even after the initial threat of and hazards of fire damaged trees has passed, visitors may avoid the area because it would be less appealing because of the loss of trees, shade, and desirable dispersed camping locations. Shelby et al. (Shelby, Thompson, Brunson, & Johnson, 2004) found that camping in areas affected by wildfire were universally lower quality levels than those for hiking after the same period. Hence, the No Action Alternative could have adverse effects on dispersed camping. Should a wildfire result in large, long-term closures for safety or resource protection purposes, activities such as camping, hunting, and other recreational uses would be lost or severely degraded during both short-term (1-5 years) and long-term (5+ years) timeframes.

Recreation Special Uses

Although the No Action Alternative would not have any effects from vegetation management or prescribed burning on Recreation Special Use activities, the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire would not be reduced. Uncharacteristic wildfire could impact recreation special uses because sites (recreation events) would likely be unsafe and less appealing for recreation special use activities after such a fire and would likely result in closures (short-term and long-term) depending on severity.

Effects on recreation residences at Diamond Point and Elison Creek and organization camps including Camp Shadow Pines, Tall Timbers County Park, Arizona Cactus-Pine Girl Scout Camp, and Grand Canyon Council Boy Scout Camp could be extreme. In similar post-wildfire situations, such as after the 2005 Cave Creek Complex Fire on the Tonto National Forest, eleven recreation residences were destroyed by wildfire. After five years of planning, ten residences were approved for reconstruction and the permits for three residences were either revoked or expired without renewal. Thus, this alternative could result in a long-term decrease of recreational use and opportunity in the project area.

Motor Vehicle Use

Motorized Travel Management implementation in combination with the No Action alternative is expected to have no effects on recreation settings. Present and future activities may result in degradation along heavily used camping corridors, but these will be small and localized.

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

ROS will remain within Land Management Plan guidelines unless stand replacement wildfire affects a large proportion of the project area. Locations and results of unplanned fire ignitions are impossible

to predict, however, it is fairly likely that an uncharacteristic wildfire would move conditions away from desired conditions for semi-primitive areas where the evidence of humans is meant to be limited (semi-primitive areas). Uncharacteristic wildfire would likely include several alterations to the forest environment such as cutting of dead roadside hazard trees, increased signage to warn of post-fire dangers, re-constructed roads, or recently constructed dozer or hand-built fire line. All of these would result in short and some long-term effects that would move conditions away from desired conditions identified for semi-primitive areas.

Cumulative Effects

The approximate acres of current, ongoing, and foreseeable vegetation management activities within the project area are shown in Table 20.

Table 19. Approximate acres of current, ongoing, and foreseeable vegetation management activities within the project area

Treatment	Treatment Type	Current Projects Approximate Acres	Reasonable Foreseeable Projects Approximate Acres
	Thinning -Habitat Improvement	89,579	10,975
Mechanical Vegetation Management	Thinning – Fuels Reduction Emphasis	114,570	41,046
	Thinning – Restoration Emphasis	53,578	285
	Savanna/Grassland Restoration	0	39,000
	Salvage	5,678	0
	Range Cover Manipulation	34,701	54,147
	Invasive Plant/Weed Treatment	0	0
	Powerline Hazard Tree Removal and Right of Way	4,580	22,963
Total Mechanical:		302,686	168,416
Fuels Treatments (With Mechanical)	Mechanical Fuels Treatment	155,244	49,165
	Pile and Burn	133,168	5,070
	Broadcast Burn	250,373	59,640
Total Fuels Treatments		538,175	113,875

This alternative would mainly result in indirect effects of increasing risk of loss or degradation of recreational and lands infrastructure and opportunities. Uncharacteristic wildfire could impact recreation because sites (recreation events) would likely be unsafe and less appealing for recreation special use activities after such a fire and would likely result in closures (short-term and long-term) depending on severity. Such a fire would also have severe impacts to permitted lands and could destroy infrastructure, limit access to private lands, and degrade water quality in the reservoir and other waters such as the eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers.

This alternative would cumulatively contribute to these same risks identified as indirect effects. The increased risk of uncharacteristic wildfire resulting from this alternative would contribute to the issue of limited recreational access and opportunities on the National Forest. Over the last several years, there have been a number of large high-intensity wildfires such as the Slide Fire, Wallow Fire, Schultz Fire, General Fire, and others; which have resulted in area closures and loss of temporary access and recreational use. Given an increasing likelihood of wildfire and a greater likelihood of

high-intensity wildfire throughout the southwest under predicted climate change scenarios, the increased risk of wildfire under this alternative would cumulatively increase these effects of risk to permitted infrastructure, limited recreational access, and loss of recreational opportunities and access in project area and surrounding areas. This alternative would also cumulatively combine with the increasing risk of high intensity fire from climate change to result in an elevated risk to lands and events managed under short-term or long-term special use permits.

Increasing population growth is also expected to drive increasing recreational demand, which would further result in decreasing recreational access and opportunity. By 2020, the Coconino National Forest is expected to experience an addition 338,000 national forest visits per year compared to current use (English, Froemke, & Hawkos, 2014). Closures resulting from wildfires within or near the project area would combine cumulatively to further reduce the available supply of recreation opportunities and access compared to the demand and would result in fewer visits to the national forests in some cases and increased crowding and degradation of user experiences in surrounding areas that forest users travel to as a substitute recreational experience.

Alternative 2 – Modified Proposed Action

This is the Proposed Action as presented for scoping, with additional detail, clarifications, corrections, and modifications in response to public comments received.

The Coconino, Apache-Sitgreaves and Tonto NFs propose to conduct more than 900,000 acres of restoration activities over approximately 20 years or until objectives are met. The restoration activities listed for Alternative 2 include vegetation treatments (mechanical thinning and burning), , as well as comprehensive restoration treatments (other restoration treatments) for grassland, aquatics, and wildlife habitat.

Proposed activities for alternative 2 are described in detail in FEIS Chapter 2.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Recreation Sites and Uses

Developed Sites

Any vegetation treatments or prescribed burning in developed recreation sites would generally occur in fall, winter, or spring, which are low use recreational periods. All treatments in recreation sites would be designed to protect and enhance existing vegetative structure, while maintaining the character of the site. Proposed mechanical treatments and prescribed fire adjacent to developed recreation sites must be reviewed and approved by the district ranger. The district recreation staff will help determine boundaries or no treatment zones around constructed features that need to be protected in campgrounds. Treatments around the perimeter of campgrounds are encouraged. The timing of treatments must be worked out with districts. Treatments would generally avoid summer. Activity slash must be piled in agreed upon locations, and treated as soon as possible. If campgrounds remain open into fall and winter, provide information about upcoming closures and management activities onsite, at FS offices, and on FS Web sites (design feature RS014, table 17).

Facilities at developed sites and campgrounds in the project area would be protected from adverse effects from management activities, and such treatments would protect the developed sites from any short- or long-term risk of uncharacteristic wildfire.

Trails

Trail use level is not expected to change. The proposed action includes prescribed burning and thinning activities adjacent to the Arizona National Scenic Trail, Highline Recreation Trail and General Crook National Recreation Trail within the project area. Trails within the project area may be temporarily closed during prescribed burning activities; but, throughout the project, trails and trail infrastructure would be considered and protected, and effects on scenic qualities minimized to the extent practicable. Damage to trails or necessary trail maintenance resulting from the prescribed burning or mechanical treatment in the area will be rehabilitated as soon as possible.

In the proposed action, mechanical thinning activities would avoid National and forest system trails if possible. Coordination with the District Recreation Planner, District Trails Specialist, and local trail stewards will occur during prescription or burn plan development, layout, marking, thinning, and burning where any treatment will occur on, adjacent or near National and system trails. This is to ensure that trails and trail infrastructure are considered and protected and effects on scenic qualities are minimized to the extent practicable (design feature RS001). If trails are temporarily closed due to thinning, trails shall be returned to pre-treatment conditions (design feature RS009).

Skidding activities would avoid National and forest system trails, if possible, except where motorized use is already authorized (trails located on open system and administrative roads). If it is determined necessary that a trail must be used as a skid trail crossing, make perpendicular trail crossings. Trail crossing locations, including those on the Arizona National Scenic Trail and the General Crook and Highline National Recreation Trails would be designated and flagged with input from the District Trails Specialist, Recreation Planner or Archaeologist. The trail would be restored to USFS standards (pre-project condition) following treatment (design feature RS007).

There would be no use of motorized equipment on national scenic and recreation trails, or other forest system trails if these are used for control line, the district recreation staff would help coordinate the implementation (design feature RS004). Where new temporary roads intersect existing roads or trails, native materials such as logs, slash, and/or boulders would be placed along temporary road to line-of-sight or first 300', whichever is greater (design feature RS005).

Road closures, one-way traffic, and area closure restrictions would be implemented as deemed necessary by forest officials for health and safety concerns during any operation. Signs would be placed at major intersections on hauling routes during periods of active hauling. If it is necessary to close forest roads or areas of the forest, notices and signs would be posted at key locations adjacent to and within the project area, such as along major FS roads accessing the area or on kiosks at trailheads, bulletin boards, electronic sign boards, etc. Closures due to operations would also be posted online and on social media as well as being publicized via news releases. Coordinate with the District Recreation Planner or trails specialist to ensure well marked and publicized detour routes for the Arizona Trail, General Crook Trail, and Highline Trail, and system trails during operational closures within the project (design feature RS015).

Dispersed Recreation

Vegetation treatments, prescribed burning and fuel treatments, occurring over time and space, would have little effect to the recreating public. Alternative 2 would support the re-integration of low-intensity fire as regulatory process on the landscape. Several cases show low-intensity wildland fires yielding virtually no effects on recreational value and in some instances imparting positive social effects. Both Sanchez et al. (Sanchez, 2016) and Starbuck et al. (2006) show visitations in California and New Mexico increasing under low-intensity fire scenarios. The only anticipated effect that the proposed action alternative will have on dispersed recreation is when prescribed

burning coincides with hunting seasons, especially in the fall of the year, or during brief closures of campsites, roads or trails.

There may also be temporary area closures while prescribed burns are being implemented, and less often closures for managed fire activities. Spring burning would affect fewer people using dispersed campsites. In total, the action alternative is not expected to considerably affect dispersed recreation within the project area. Treatments would be planned to be staggered throughout the project area in both time and space, so that even during temporary closures from active treatments, there would be many other places to hunt, camp and recreate. Efforts would be taken to limit forest treatment activities within the project area during high-use weekends and holidays, such as Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Labor Day, especially in locations where concentrated use is expected to occur.

Temporary closures from treatments would result in the temporary loss of recreational access or opportunities and could result in decreased satisfaction of nearby recreational sites where there is overcrowding. This is most likely to occur during high-traffic weekends from Memorial Day through Labor Day, which often includes heavy use of dispersed camping sites within the project area. It can also occur during hunting season.

The transportation system proposed for use under alternative 2 utilizes a combination of existing Forest Service system roads, improved existing non-system roads and new temporary roads. No new permanent roads are proposed. Road use during the project for hauling and prescribed burning would affect dispersed recreational uses such as OHV riding where project activities occur on MVUM open roads. Dispersed camping areas along open roads that are being used for implementation may be affected by noise and dust.

There may be temporary road closures enacted during thinning operations or prescribed burning but these closures would be short term for burning and mainly on forest service administrative use roads. The effects from disturbance and closure would be a minor effect on dispersed recreational uses because they would be of limited duration and there would be many other open areas to camp and recreate during this time period.

Spring restoration and improvements would improve the resilience of these areas and make them more attractive to dispersed recreationists. Water in the Southwest is a rare feature, and people are attracted to it for recreation activities including hiking, picnicking, camping, scenery, wildlife and wildflower viewing.

Recreation Special Uses

The proposed action would reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire in areas with recreation special uses activities. Coordinated efforts would be made with sponsors of recreational special-use events such as running or mountain biking races, to minimize the effects of such proceedings during Rim Country project implementation activities. Appropriate signage would be used to inform the public of thinning or prescribed burning activities (design feature RS015). The proposed action would allow for continued recreation special uses activities at current levels throughout the project area during and beyond the timeframe of project implementation.

Eligible Wild and Scenic River

Proposed treatments would diminish the risk of large, high intensity, catastrophic fires that could result in forest closures. This could impact visitors trip itineraries but would not change the recreation opportunity spectrum. There are three design features, best management practices and mitigations in Appendix C of

the FEIS to protect the eligibility of the possible national designation. The recreation Outstandingly Remarkable Value will be protected and possibly enhanced.

Table 20. Alternative 2 Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridors Acres Per Treatment

Eligible Wild & Scenic Rivers by Class	Prescribed Fire Only	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire	Hand Thin & Prescribed Fire	Total Acres
Barbershop Canyon (Wild)	1,503	2,153		3,656
Canyon Creek (Recreational)	129	1,785		1,914
Chevelon Creek (All Classes)	4,554	2,229		6,782
<i>Chevelon Creek (Recreational)</i>		617		617
<i>Chevelon Creek (Scenic)</i>		1,611		1,611
<i>Chevelon Creek (Wild)</i>	4,554	1		4,554
Christopher Creek (Recreational)		890		890
East Clear Creek (Scenic)	2,086	3,289		5,375
Leonard Canyon (Recreational)	2,701	3,209	3	5,913
Pueblo Canyon (Wild)	9			9
Tonto Creek (Upper) (Scenic)		208		208
West Clear Creek (Wild)	352	1,008		1,360
Wet Beaver Creek (Wild)		8		8
Willow Creek (Wild)	4,806	0		4,806
Workman Creek (Recreational)		82		82
	16,140	14,860	3	31,003

Inventoried Roadless Area

As discussed with the eligible wild and scenic rivers in the above discussion, proposed treatments would diminish the risk of large, high intensity, catastrophic fires that could result in forest closures. This could impact visitors trip itineraries but would not change the recreation opportunity spectrum. No roads will be built as indicated in Appendix C of the FEIS, design features, best management practices and mitigations. The proposed activities would help preserve the natural appearing character of the landscape and lessen the risk of loss in the event of a wildfire. The inventoried roadless character will be protected and possibly enhanced.

Maps of each inventoried roadless area presenting the proposed treatment are incorporated in Appendix 5. Table 22 displays the number of acres per treatment per recreation opportunity spectrum code.

Table 21. Inventoried Roadless Area Recreation Opportunity Spectrum acres treated by proposed action

ROS Code	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire (Acres)	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire (Percent)	Hand Thin & Prescribed Fire (Acres)	Hand Thin & Prescribed Fire (Percent)	Prescribed Fire Only (Acres)	Prescribed Fire Only (Percent)	Prescribed Fire Total (Acres)	Prescribed Fire Total (Percent)	No Proposed Treatments	Grand Total
R	12,907	1%		0%	2,287	0.23%	15,194	2%	3,115	18,309
RM	1,062	0.1%		0%	7,281	0.73%	8,343	1%	302	8,645

ROS Code	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire (Acres)	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire (Percent)	Hand Thin & Prescribed Fire (Acres)	Hand Thin & Prescribed Fire (Percent)	Prescribed Fire Only (Acres)	Prescribed Fire Only (Percent)	Prescribed Fire Total (Acres)	Prescribed Fire Total (Percent)	No Proposed Treatments	Grand Total
RN	436,066	44%	614	0.06%	35,847	4%	472,527	48%	125,846	598,373
SPM	323,783	33%	384	0.04%	30,868	3%	355,035	36%	63,640	418,675
SPNM	97,500	10%	192	0.02%	37,943	4%	135,636	14%	18,163	153,798
U	3,688	0.4%		0%	321	0.03%	4,009	0.40%	0	4,009
WPS	1	0%		0%	0	0%	1	0%		1
WSP	0	0%		0%		0%	0	0%		0
WT	0	0%		0%		0%	0	0%		0
Grand Total	875,007	88%	1,190	0.12%	114,547	12%	990,745	100%	211,066	1,201,810

Motor Vehicle Use

There would be log truck and other activity related traffic on the designated road system, although not all roads would be used as haul routes. Hauling would not occur on all roads at the same time. Recreationists could expect increased noise, dust and traffic on some haul routes.

Approximately 150 miles of existing non-system roads would be reconstructed or improved as part of project implementation. Road improvement activities are defined as activities that result in an increase of an existing road’s traffic service level, expansion of its capacity, or a change in its original design function. Activities included in road improvement include, but are not limited to, widening corners to improve turn radiuses, straightening of road segments to improve haul safety, installing turnouts to improve haul safety, and changing alignments at road intersections to improve site distance and haul safety. These activities may result in limited removal of vegetation. Road relocation may include relocating roads out of drainages, construction of rock riprap, the installation of new culverts, and the construction of low water crossings.

There would be short-term disturbance and temporary changes in ROS classes and roadside recreation settings during road improvement activities. Recreation visitors may be inconvenienced and have to wait during some activities, or roads may be temporarily closed causing displacement. Road relocation would result in a safer road to travel on. It would also result in short term disturbances such as increased bare ground and decreased roadside visual quality in scattered locations. Long-term effects would be improved water quality at stream crossings, and safer and better-maintained roads for forest user enjoyment.

Road decommissioning would occur on approximately 230 miles of existing system and unauthorized roads on the Coconino and Apache-Sitgreaves NFs and approximately 20 miles of unauthorized roads on the Tonto NF. Decommissioning includes applying various treatments, including one or more of the following:

1. Reestablishing former drainage patterns, stabilizing slopes, and restoring vegetation;
2. Blocking the entrance to a road or installing water bars;
3. Removing culverts, reestablishing drainages, removing unstable fills, pulling back road shoulders, and scattering slash on the roadbed;
4. Completely eliminating the roadbed by restoring natural contours and slopes; and
5. Other methods designed to meet the specific conditions associated with the unneeded road.

Short-term effects of road decommissioning would include ground disturbance and sedimentation and noise disturbance to recreationists. Short-term effects would last from 3-10 years as the project activities rotate around the project area. There would be a long-term improvement of recreation settings as vegetation is established, soil erosion is minimized and there is decreased disturbance from motorized vehicles. Once recovered, these former routes are often not apparent to the casual user. Decommissioning 860 miles of roads would improve recreation settings over time and would improve ROS classes, especially in the semi-primitive non-motorized ROS class where all 85 miles of haul routes would be decommissioned.

About 350 miles of temporary roads for haul access would be constructed to support restoration activities. Construction may include tree removal, ground disturbance, installation of drainage structures, road blading and other disturbances. Following implementation, the temporary roads would be obliterated using techniques noted for road decommissioning. Temporary road construction would result in short term disturbance. When possible, there will be relocation and reconstruction of existing open roads adversely affecting water quality and natural resources, or of concern to human safety. This will have long-term positive effects on water quality, natural resources and human safety.

There may be some increase in illegal motorized vehicle use of these roads until they are decommissioned. Once these roads have been decommissioned, they are usually not apparent to the casual user. Mitigation measures will be used to close off entrance and exit locations of these roads, as well as use of Best Management Practices (see soil and watershed sections in the DEIS and Mitigation table).

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

There may be temporary effects on recreation users at areas during implementation activities, mainly harvesting operations and hauling. There would-be longer-term potential effects from increased traffic and noise near processing site locations. However, since most of the project area is located within Roded Natural and a small amount of Rural ROS settings, these effects would be consistent with recreation opportunity objective settings for most of the project area.

Construction of all new temporary roads would be like a primitive, native surface road that would be cleared and opened for short-term use during thinning and hauling operations. The construction and use are consistent with the RN or SPM designations and after use, the temporary road would be completely rehabilitated and would become naturalized within several years after use. The very slight encumbrance of the SPNM area would likely not result in long-term effects on the ability of the area to meet SPNM characteristics over the long- term.




Figure 9 Treatments in the project area and ROS designations for Alternative 2

Mechanical and prescribed fire, hand thin and prescribed fire and fire only treatments would primarily occur in Roaded Natural (RN) (48%) and Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM) (36%) areas, with a lesser amount occurring in Semi-Primitive Non- Motorized (SPNM) (14%) in the project area (Table 23 and Figure 12). Mechanical treatments are expected to result in short-term effects (1-2 years after treatment) where the sights and sounds of humans are more noticeable on the landscape. However, after a short period of time and subsequent treatments such as prescribed fire, the evidence of treatments fades and is not expected to affect ROS designations. As a result, none of the mechanical treatments would prevent an area from meeting or moving toward ROS classifications over the long term (>1 years).

Table 22. Acres of mechanical and prescribed treatment per ROS Code for Alternative 2

FOREST	NAME	Total IRA Acres	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Code	Prescribed Fire Only	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire	Prescribed Fire Total
Apache-Sitgreaves	Chevelon Canyon	5,569	SPM	0		0
			SPNM	4,815	373	5,188
	Leonard Canyon	3,082	SPM		0	0
			SPNM	1,095	717	1,812
Coconino	Barbershop Canyon	1,310	SPNM	850	460	1,310
		2,005	RN	2	1	3

	East Clear Creek		SPNM	1,292	708	2,000
	Jacks Canyon	2,855	SPNM	548	1,169	1,717
Tonto	Hellsgate Wilderness Contiguous	6,165	SPM		266	266
			SPNM		72	72
	Mazatzal Wilderness Contiguous	16,977	SPM		257	257
			SPNM		59	59
	Sierra Ancha Wilderness Contiguous	7,781	RN	12	409	421
			SPM		1	1
SPNM			1,235	2,957	4,192	
Grand Total		45,745		9,850	7,447	17,298

Spring restoration and improvements would improve the resilience of these areas and make them more attractive to dispersed recreationists. The proposed improvements may cause short-term changes in the recreation settings but would result in improvements in the setting characteristics and ROS classes over time. In both action alternatives, up to 184 springs would be improved. Mitigations to use native materials or natural appearing materials appropriate to the ROS setting would result in natural appearing improvements. The spring improvements would improve and meet ROS classes.

There are also 647 miles of channel restoration proposed. This would improve recreation settings over time. Mitigations to use native materials or natural appearing materials appropriate to the ROS setting and to consult the Landscape Architect regarding the project design would result in natural appearing improvements. The channel improvements would improve the settings and meet ROS classes.

Aspen treatments would take longer for recreation settings to be natural appearing in roaded natural and semi-primitive settings due to the need to fence or create barriers to ungulate grazing. Aspen groves are popular recreation settings for many users throughout the year, but especially for fall color viewing. The restoration activities would assure that aspen continue as a vital component within the ponderosa pine forest. There would be short to moderate term changes in ROS settings where aspen is treated. Aspen restoration requires that ungulates be kept out of sprouting trees until they are large enough to withstand the browsing pressure. Fencing and jackstraw piling are both proposed methods for keeping the ungulates out.

Up to 200 miles of protective barriers around springs, aspen, native willows, and big-tooth maples, as needed for restoration would be constructed. This would cause temporary changes in the ROS class setting characteristics since the natural appearing environment would be somewhat altered. More developed settings would appear altered for a shorter time since human alterations may be visible in these settings. Since the barriers must stay in place for many years, the primitive ROS settings would be altered for at least 20 years or until the trees can survive browsing. When the protective barriers are removed or begin to break up and decompose, treatment areas would meet ROS classes.

Cumulative Effects

Alternative 2– Proposed Action

The cumulative effects of Alternative 2 and past, present, and future projects would have short term and local negative cumulative effects on the provision of recreation opportunities and the associated

recreation settings on the forests. Forest users seeking ponderosa pine recreation settings may be displaced or restricted, and the quality of recreation sites may temporarily decrease during management activities on this project and other current or future projects. Long distance hikers may have trips disrupted or may be rerouted to different areas in the short term.

Alternative 2 would restore the ponderosa pine forest health and sustainability to 991,060 acres; this combined with other restoration activities would decrease the risk of high severity wildfire or large insect outbreaks. Increasing numbers of recreation users and demand for ponderosa pine recreation settings would continue to strain the agency's capacity and in some areas of concentrated use, the resource capacity. With increasing demand for ponderosa pine forest settings, the large scale improvements to forest health and sustainability of this project and similar vegetation and burning projects such as Upper Beaver Creek Forest Restoration, Hart Prairie Forest Restoration, Marshall Forest Restoration, Rim Lakes Forest Restoration and others are expected to result in cumulative retention or improvement in the quality of recreation settings and an increase in the ability of the Apache- Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto National Forests to meet recreation demands over the long term.

The current and planned vegetation management treatments and burning projects on all three forests, as well as opportunities for managed wildfire, cumulatively result in improvements in forest health and sustainability in the ponderosa pine that are large and widespread. In the event of a wildfire, or insect infestation the restored forest would likely experience more typical low severity fire and small-scale insect infestation. The cumulative effects on desired recreation settings and ROS class characteristics forest users seek would be to maintain and improve them.

Alternative 2 is expected to have mostly positive effects on recreation settings due to decommissioning of user created routes and some existing forest roads. The quality of some recreation settings in ROS classes were declining due to unconfined motorized use. Present and future activities may result in additional degradation along camping corridors, but these would be short term and localized. There would be positive cumulative effects and an overall improvement in ROS classes because of these activities.

No new road construction is proposed now or in the future in cumulative effects projects. Motorized trails projects include new construction, road to trail conversion and route decommissioning in appropriate ROS classes. This would have positive cumulative effects in more primitive ROS classes when decommissioned routes naturalize, and expected characteristics are re-established.

Desired recreation setting characteristics such as large, mature trees, healthy understory, and diversity of tree age classes, sizes, and species are also at high risk from the effects of climate change. While drought cycles are common in the Southwest, increasing temperatures and decreases in precipitation in combination with overstocked forest conditions and high fuel loads are predicted to result in an increase in high severity wildfires (Westerling, 2006) (Marlon, 2012) (CLIMAS., 2011). Unmanaged forests have shown increases in tree stress and mortality because of global warming, and old, mature trees are especially vulnerable (Ritchie, Wing, & Hamilton, 2008.) (Van Mantgem, 2009.) (Williams, 2010). Alternative 2 and other restoration projects will cumulatively result in improved forest structure, composition and diversity and more resilient forest conditions, decreased tree stress and potential for decreased mortality.

Over time, effects would lessen, and the crown fire risk predicted for the project area because of climate change would decrease. Recreation structures and environment would be made more resilient to wildfire effects by mechanical thinning and prescribed fire treatments. Since direct or indirect effects resulting from project activities would be mitigated by project design features, there would be

no cumulative effects on trails, recreation sites, other structures related to recreation, and recreationists' experience.

Ongoing or planned projects of a similar nature to Rim Country Project within the project boundary include the Cragin Watershed Protection Project (64,430 acres), Upper Beaver Project (49,210 acres), Timber Mesa Vernon (41,162 acres), Upper Rocky Arroyo (33,436 acres), Larson Project (30,041 acres), Rim Lakes Project (33,770 acres) and Clint Wells (17,741 acres). These thinning and burning projects would have similar effects on recreation as would Rim Country and resource effects would be mitigated similarly. Rim Country Project in combination with ongoing and future projects would not result in any detrimental cumulative effects on recreation.

Summary

The primary concern to recreation resources from the proposed action is the need to minimize and mitigate effects on recreation features (e.g. developed campgrounds, signs, trails, and trailheads), recreation activities (e.g. driving for pleasure, dispersed camping, hiking, mountain biking, equestrian use, hunting, boating, and developed camping) and the overall recreation experience. Important infrastructure within and adjacent to the project area are also of great concern, as these facilities and lands would likely be largely affected by uncharacteristic wildfire, as well as face effects due to prescribed burning, thinning, and other land management activities as defined in the proposed action alternative.

The No Action Alternative includes some thinning or prescribed burning treatments in the project area, slightly decreasing the likelihood of uncharacteristic wildfire that may have lasting effects on recreation areas throughout the Rim Country Project. Uncharacteristic wildfire could also result in major effects on private land and developments within the project area, including long-term effects on communities that rely on these lands for their water supply. In addition, utilities and other infrastructure could be damaged or destroyed during a wildfire that could cost companies and their customers in service interruptions and fees for repairs or replacements facilities.

Alternatively, the Proposed Action, which includes much thinning and prescribed burning throughout the project area, will reduce the risk of extensive crown fire and uncharacteristic wildfire. This alternative will protect the developed campgrounds, trails, and dispersed recreation areas within the Rim Country area, maintaining open recreation areas and activities for users during and in the years following the project implementation. Shorter-term effects will occur to uses during implementation, including the potential effects from larger processing sites near campgrounds, highways and dispersed recreation areas.

In the long-term, the proposed action will support the health and safety of recreationalists and surrounding communities, as well as reduce potential effects on water supplies, utilities and other infrastructure within and adjacent to the project area.

Alternative 3 – Focused Alternative

Proposed activities for alternative 3 are described in detail in FEIS Chapter 2.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Recreation Sites and Uses

The effects described in Alternative 2 would be the same for Alternative 3 with the exception of the number of acres restored. Design features described in alternative 2 would be applied in alternative 3. Alternative 3 treats 45% less area than alternative 2. Approximately 46% less acres would receive

mechanical and prescribed fire restoration treatments, about 28% less prescribed fire-only. Additionally, the Severe Disturbance Area Treatment would be 76% less in alternative 3 than alternative 2. Alternative 3 would provide less potential to reduce the risk of large scale, high-severity fires in the project area. It would have a less positive effect than Alternative 2 on protecting and maintaining high quality recreation settings over time.

Developed Sites

Any vegetation treatments or prescribed burning in developed recreation sites would follow the same design features as in alternative 2. Consequently, the effects from management activities, and such treatments on developed sites would protect the developed sites from any short or long-term risk of uncharacteristic wildfire similarly to alternative 2. However, facilities at developed sites and campgrounds in the project area would be less protected from adverse short and long term effects from the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire because of the fewer area treated.

Trails, Dispersed Recreation, Recreation Special Uses, and Motor Vehicle Use

The effects explained in Alternative 2 would be the same for the following areas: dispersed recreation, recreation special use, and motor vehicle use.

Eligible Wild and Scenic River

Proposed treatments would diminish the risk of large, high intensity, catastrophic fires that could result in forest closures. This could impact the visitors trip itineraries but would not change the recreation opportunity spectrum. Short term impacts caused by the sounds and/or smoke of proposed treatments will be mitigated as per the design features, best management practices and mitigations per the description in Appendix C of the FEIS. The recreation Outstandingly Remarkable Value will be protected and possibly enhanced.

Table 23. Alternative 3 Eligible Wild and Scenic River Corridors Acres Per Treatment

FOREST	NAME	Total IRA Acres	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Code	Prescribed Fire Only	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire	Prescribed Fire Total
Apache-Sitgreaves	Chevelon Canyon	5,569	SPM	0.2		0.2
			SPNM	3,960	305	4,265
	Leonard Canyon	3,082	SPM			
			SPNM	441	333	773
Coconino	Barbershop Canyon	1,310	SPNM	850	460	1,310
	East Clear Creek	2,005	RN	2	1	3
			SPNM	1,292	708	2,000
Jacks Canyon	2,855	SPNM	20	79	99	
Tonto	Hellsgate Wilderness Contiguous	6,165	SPM			
			SPNM		2	2
	Mazatzal Wilderness Contiguous	16,977	SPM			
			SPNM			
	7,781	RN				

	Sierra Ancha Wilderness Contiguous		SPM		0.3	0.3
			SPNM	5	20	25
Grand Total		45,745		6,570	1,907	8,477

INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS

As discussed with the eligible wild and scenic rivers in the above discussion, proposed treatments would diminish the risk of large, high intensity, catastrophic fires that could result in forest closures. This could impact visitors trip itineraries but would not change the recreation opportunity spectrum. No roads will be built as indicated in Appendix C of the FEIS, design features, best management practices and mitigations. The proposed activities would help preserve the natural appearing character of the landscape and lessen the risk of loss in the event of a wildfire. The acreage treated is about 50% less than the proposed treatment in alternative 2. The inventoried roadless character will be protected and possibly enhanced.

Maps of each inventoried roadless area presenting the proposed treatment are incorporated in Appendix 5. Table 25 displays the number of acres per treatment per recreation opportunity spectrum code.

Table 24. Acres by treatment by Inventoried Roadless Area by Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

FOREST	NAME	Total IRA Acres	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Code	Prescribed Fire Only	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire	Prescribed Fire Total
Apache-Sitgreaves	Chevelon Canyon	5,569	SPM	0.2		0.2
			SPNM	3,960	305	4,265
	Leonard Canyon	3,082	SPM			
			SPNM	441	333	773
Coconino	Barbershop Canyon	1,310	SPNM	850	460	1,310
	East Clear Creek	2,005	RN	2	1	3
			SPNM	1,292	708	2,000
Jacks Canyon	2,855	SPNM	20	79	99	
Tonto	Hellsgate Wilderness Contiguous	6,165	SPM			
			SPNM		2	2
	Mazatzal Wilderness Contiguous	16,977	SPM			
			SPNM			
	Sierra Ancha Wilderness Contiguous	7,781	RN			
			SPM		0.3	0.3
SPNM			5	20	25	
Grand Total		45,745		6,570	1,907	8,477

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

This alternative provides for the long-term protection of recreational settings and facilities on 528,803 acres where mechanical thinning and burning would occur by improving stand conditions and reducing fuel loading, and would lower the risk of high severity fire somewhat on 316,580 acres where treatments would occur. Maintaining healthy, green forests and reducing the risk of large

scale, high-severity fires in the project area would have a positive effect on protecting and maintaining high quality recreation settings into the future. Effects from alternative 3 would be similar to those from alternative 2 although on an area almost half the size.




Figure 10 Treatments in the project area and ROS designations for Alternative 3

Mechanical treatments would primarily occur in RN (44%) and SPM (39%) areas, with a lesser amount occurring in SPNM (15%) in the project area (Figure 12). Mechanical treatments are expected to result in short-term effects (1-2 years after treatment) where the sights and sounds of humans are more noticeable on the landscape. However, after a short period of time and subsequent treatments such as prescribed fire, the evidence of treatments fades and is not expected to affect ROS designations. As a result, none of the mechanical treatments would prevent an area from meeting or moving toward ROS classifications over the long term (>1 years).

Table 25. Acres of mechanical and prescribed treatment per ROS Code for Alternative 3

ROS Code	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire (Acres)	Mechanical & Prescribed Fire (Percent)	Hand Thin & Prescribed Fire (Acres)	Hand Thin & Prescribed Fire (Percent)	Prescribed Fire Only (Acres)	Prescribed Fire Only (Percent)	Prescribed Fire Total (Acres)	Prescribed Fire Total (Percent)	No Proposed Treatments	Grand Total
R	8,326	2%		0%	125	0.02%	8,451	2%	9,858	18,309
RM	607	0.1%		0%	32	0.01%	639	0%	8,006	8,645
RN	217,292	41%	236	0.04%	12,943	2%	230,471	44%	367,902	598,373
SPM	182,232	34%	300	0.06%	22,878	4%	205,410	39%	213,265	418,675
SPNM	55,930	11%	54	0.01%	23,795	5%	79,779	15%	74,019	153,798
U	3,533	0.7%		0%	321	0.06%	3,854	1%	155	4,009
WPS	0	0%		0%		0%	0	0%	1	1
WSP		0%		0%		0%	0	0%	0	0
WT	0	0%		0%		0%	0	0%	0	0
Grand Total	467,921	89%	590	0%	60,094	11%	528,616	100%	673,206	1,201,810

							0 5			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--

Cumulative Effects

Alternative 3– Focused Alternative

The focused alternative would have similar minor, short term and temporary negative direct and indirect effects on recreation sites and uses as alternative 2. As noted in the alternative effects description, less area inside the project boundary would be affected by treatments. Consequently, the predicted crown fire risk because of climate change would menace more area in the project area than in alternative 2. This would heighten the danger of disastrous consequence to recreation structures, sites, and recreation settings.

Effects Common to Both Action Alternatives

Items Common to All Action Alternatives

Alternatives 2 and 3 of the proposed actions include:

- **Grassland and Meadow Restoration:** Includes reducing or eliminating tree encroachment (pines and junipers), and applying prescribed fire. Trees established since interruption of the historic fire regime would be removed, promoting and re-establishing the historic meadow edge. All pre-settlement trees would be retained and replacement trees left where evidence of historical large trees exist. Grasslands and meadows would be treated with prescribed fire where and when feasible.
- **Road Decommissioning:** Stabilizing and restoring of unneeded roads to a more natural state would be accomplished with a variety of methods, including: ripping compacted road surfaces and seeding, re-establishing former drainage patterns, removing culverts, scattering slash and/or large rocks on the road surface, blocking the entrance to the roadway, completely eliminating the roadway by returning it to natural contours, constructing water bars to prevent erosion, or pulling berms back into the roadway.
- **Road and Trail Relocation/Reconstruction:** Specific treatments for roads, trails, and unauthorized routes that are affecting water resources would be evaluated prior to mechanical and fire treatments in the vicinity. Generally, routes crossing and those within 300 feet of streams and waterbodies are the highest priority for evaluation and treatment. Treatments could include: adding gravel to the road surface of existing authorized routes, stabilizing slopes, and restoring vegetation; closing roads, trails, or unauthorized routes by blocking the entrance or installing water bars; removing culverts, reestablishing drainages, removing unstable fills, pulling back road shoulders, and scattering slash on the roadbed; and obliterating the roadbed by restoring natural contours and slopes. Specific treatments for improving stream crossings that are affecting water resources would be evaluated prior to mechanical and fire treatments in the vicinity. Treatments could include: armoring downstream outlets of culverts, upsizing existing culverts, installing culverts or additional culverts, installing culvert arrays to mimic existing channel width, installing low water crossings, installing bridges, restoring downstream channels created from crossings, using sediment reduction methods on connected disturbed areas upstream from roads that connect to the drainage, paving crossings, and relocating the segment of the road that has the crossing issue out of the stream.
- **Spring Restoration:** Specific treatments to restore springs would be identified prior to mechanical and fire treatments in the vicinity. Treatments could include: removing tree canopy close to the spring, applying fire, re-plumbing the spring improvements to conserve water, protecting the spring with fencing, and removing or relocating adjacent roads or trails.
- **Riparian Stream and Stream Channel Restoration:** Restoration is needed to restore the functionality of these streams. Specific treatments to restore riparian streams and stream channels would be identified prior to mechanical and fire treatments in the vicinity. Treatments could include:

reestablishing former drainage patterns, stabilizing slopes, restoring vegetation, protecting sites from grazing ungulates, removal of upland species that compete with riparian species, returning fire to the system (prescribed fire), and/or removing stock tanks. The emphasis will be on non-structural rather than structural methods.

- **Stream Habitat Restoration:** Proposed stream habitat treatments may be needed within all or some portion of the fish-bearing streams. Restoration treatments may include channel restoration (one rock dams, grade control or induced meandering) and channel structural improvements (felling or girdling trees to provide large woody debris for cover and habitat complexity).
- **Aspen Restoration:** Remove post-settlement conifers within 66 feet (one chain) of the aspen clone. Within the clone, remove aspen, disturb the ground, and/or apply fire as needed to stimulate suckering. Evaluate the need for barriers to reduce ungulate browsing.
- Restore approximately 184 springs.
- Restore function and habitat in up to 647 miles of streams, including stream reaches with habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive aquatic species. Heavy mechanical stream restoration activities could be used on 402 miles of those streams.
- Decommission up to 200 miles of existing system roads on the Coconino and Apache-Sitgreaves NFs, and up to 290 miles on the Tonto NF.
- Decommission up to 800 miles of unauthorized roads on the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, and Tonto NFs.
- Construct or improve approximately 330 miles of new temporary roads or existing non-system roads to facilitate mechanical treatments; decommission all temporary roads when restoration treatments are completed.
- Relocate and reconstruct existing open roads adversely affecting water quality and natural resources, or of concern to human safety.
- Construct up to 200 miles of protective barriers around springs, aspen, native willows, and big-tooth maples, as needed for restoration.

Developed Sites

Mechanical and prescribed fire treatments could negatively affect developed recreation sites. However, developed recreation sites would not be modified by any alternatives, as design features have been developed to protect the sites from possible negative effects from proposed treatments in alternatives 2 and 3.

Recreation Special Use

All alternatives would not have any effects from vegetation management or prescribed burning on Recreation Special Use activities. All permittees can execute their business as intended in their authorized special use permit.

ELIGIBLE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

Proposed treatments would diminish the risk of large, high intensity, catastrophic fires that could result in forest closures. This could impact the visitors trip itineraries but would not change the recreation opportunity spectrum. Short term impacts caused by the sounds and/or smoke of proposed treatments will be mitigated as per the design features, best management practices and mitigations per the description in Appendix C of the FEIS. The recreation Outstandingly Remarkable Value will be protected and possibly enhanced. Wild and scenic river eligibility characteristics (free flow, water quality, and outstanding-remarkable values) are protected.

INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS

Both alternatives proposed activities would help preserve the natural appearing character of the landscape and lessen the risk of loss in the event of a wildfire. The inventoried roadless character will be protected and possibly enhanced.

Effects Unique to Each Action Alternative and Differences among Them

The No Action Alternative does not include any thinning or prescribed burning treatments in the project area, increasing the likelihood of uncharacteristic wildfire that may have lasting effects on recreation areas throughout the Rim Country project area.

Alternatively, the Proposed Action and the Focused Alternative, which includes thinning and prescribed burning throughout the project area, would reduce the risk of extensive crown fire and uncharacteristic wildfire. These alternatives would protect the developed campgrounds, lands infrastructure, trails, and dispersed recreation areas within the project area, maintaining open recreation areas and activities for users during and in the years following the project implementation. Shorter-term effects would occur to users during implementation, including the potential effects from larger processing sites near residences, highways and dispersed recreation areas.

In the long-term, the proposed action would support the health and safety of recreationalists and surrounding communities, as well as reduce potential effects on water supplies, utilities and other infrastructure within and adjacent to the project area.

Trails

Overall trail users respond negatively and have a decreased return to forested areas that have experienced uncharacteristic wildfire. Trail users would be minimally affected by the proposed treatments in both alternatives 2 and 3 since design features are developed to mitigate any issues related to trails. Effects like visitor displacement and possible overcrowding of some areas where visitors choose to go instead of areas closed or disturbed by proposed treatments are difficult to estimate. However, all three alternatives present different possibilities of risks of uncharacteristic wildfires. The No Action alternative presents the highest risk because of the lack of concentrated treatments on a large landscape scale. Consequently, alternative 2 has the lowest risk because of its sizeable number of acres treated. Alternative 3 has lower risk than the No action alternative and higher risks than the proposed alternative. The greatest effects on trails results from uncharacteristic wildfires. This risk can be reduced with proposed treatments. Alternative 1 poses the greatest threat to the trail systems, followed by alternative 3. The proposed alternative offers the best possible outcome for the current and future use of the trail systems, treating the most acres of forest.

Dispersed Recreation and Motor Vehicle Use

Dispersed recreation and motor vehicle use display the same effects for Alternatives 2 and 3 while alternative 1 has no impact unless there is an uncharacteristic wildfire. Alternatives 2-3 might result in some reduction of recreation opportunities during active forest thinning and prescribed burning, and potentially longer slash treatment duration. Areas may be closed to the public due to hazardous conditions that would result in forest user displacement and user dissatisfaction. There could also be an increase in crowding in nearby open forest areas.

Alternatives 2 and 3 propose to decommission 230 miles of existing system and unauthorized roads on the Coconino and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests and 20 miles on the Tonto National Forest. The Rim Country project would adhere to the TMR decisions for the Coconino, Tonto and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest. Design features address any issues related to the construction of temporary roads for haul access insuring decommissioning of all temporary roads after treatments are completed. Hence, both alternatives would reduce access or ease of access to recreate in certain areas on their respective forests. However, decommissioning unauthorized roads could positively affect recreation resources by protecting resources and removing access to motorized recreation where unlawful.

Alternatives 2 and 3 display similar effects but vary proportionally with the treatments' area size. Minor effects are mitigated through design features.

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

The No Action Alternative would allow ROS to remain within Land Management Plan guidelines unless stand replacement wildfire affects a large proportion of the project area. Locations and results of unplanned fire ignitions are impossible to predict, however, it is fairly likely that an uncharacteristic wildfire would move conditions away from desired conditions for semi-primitive areas where the evidence of humans is meant to be limited (semi-primitive areas). Uncharacteristic wildfire would likely include a number of alterations to the forest environment such as cutting of dead roadside hazard trees, increased signage to warn of post-fire dangers, re-constructed roads, or recently constructed dozer or hand-built fire line. All of these would result in short and some long-term effects that would move conditions away from desired conditions identified for semi-primitive areas.

Alternatives 2 and 3 might cause temporary effects on recreation users at particular areas during implementation activities, mainly thinning operations and hauling. There would be longer term potential effects of increased traffic and noise near processing site locations. However, since most of the project area is located within Roaded Natural, Semi-Primitive Motorized and to a lesser amount Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS settings, these effects would be consistent with recreation opportunity objective settings for the majority of the project area.

Effects from Rock Pit Use and Expansion

Effects Common to All Alternatives

All alternatives would increase the level of noise, dust, and traffic in the Project Area. All alternatives would experience a temporary loss of access to desired recreation areas when rock pits are being used to mine and process roadbed material. There would also be potential safety issues when recreationists are using roads that are haul routes for roadbed material.

There would be no effects or indirect effects on recreation special use permittees as they can continue their normal operations as directed in their permit. Motor vehicle use should not be affected, as these rock pits would not add any access restriction or modification to recreationists.

Figure 6 displays the ROS in the areas where the pits are located in relation to major travel ways and forest boundaries. Most rock pits are located in ROS in forested areas making them difficult to view. Under both action alternatives, design features would help mitigate the impact to recreation from rock pits.




Figure 11 Rim Country project rock pits location and recreation opportunity spectrum

Alternative 1- No Action

Direct and Indirect Effects

General Effects on Dispersed Recreation, Recreation Special Uses, Developed Recreation Sites, Trails, Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers, Inventoried Roadless Areas, and Motor Vehicle Use

If Alternative 1 - No Action were to be implemented, there would be rock mining, processing, and hauling activities at the existing and currently operational rock pits.

Alternative 1 - No Action could cause a short-term disruption of recreation uses and displacement of recreation users at and near the existing and operational pits during times when aggregate materials are being hauled. This would have the effect of concentrating operations and hauling to a relatively small number of locations, and as a result this alternative would concentrate rock mining, processing and hauling at currently operating pits or on main hauling routes (when aggregate material is purchased from private sources and hauled onto the Forest), increasing the amount of time spent in each location since fewer pits would be used.

Indirect effects associated with Alternative 1 - No Action would include dust and noise effects on nearby trails and recreation areas. Portions of the trails and recreation areas that are in proximity to these rock pits would be likely to experience increased dust, noise and perceptions of human activity when the pits are operational. These effects would be temporary and short-term.

Recreational Opportunity Spectrum

Rock pits are located in Roaded Natural, Roaded Modified and Semi-Motorized ROS setting. The pits developed in Roaded Natural, Roaded Modified and Semi-Motorized settings would comply with the setting characteristics. Since the pits are located away from or not in the viewshed of primary (sensitive) travel corridors, these would comply with the setting characteristics.

Cumulative Effects

This analysis includes the potential cumulative effects on recreation during the 20-year implementation of this project. Numerous other projects would require the use of the same roads that are used to access recreational resources on the three national forests. Other restoration projects would also result in a cumulative increase in hauling by heavy machinery on main Forest travel corridors and concentrated hauling for periods of several weeks in project areas.

The cumulative effects would be an increase in potential safety hazards such as dust and truck traffic to motorized recreation users, especially during duplicate hauling periods (which includes hauling associated with road maintenance and hauling associated with tree and slash removal). However, this cumulative effect is considered less than significant because of the long period and large area for implementation of the future foreseeable actions. If any activity from a particular project in combination with actions associated with existing rock pit activity were to affect recreational access, recreationists could find other areas on the three national forests with similar recreation opportunities.

The largest cumulative effect from this alternative would be the cumulative effect of hauling, causing traffic, noise, and dust in areas near recreation sites or on the main road system being used to access recreation opportunities. Under this no action alternative, there would still be cumulative effects on the recreational experience for several thousand forest visitors over the next two decades.

Both Action Alternatives

A total of 21 rock pits were identified for use and potential expansion up to 30% of the existing footprint for this project. Ten pits are on the Coconino NF and 12 are on the Apache-Sitgreaves NF. The materials from the rock pits may be used for a variety of road maintenance activities, from general maintenance of primary roads to construction or rehabilitation of temporary roads. The proposed use and expansion of rock pits would include hauling of equipment and aggregate materials to and from the pits for use in road maintenance, road construction, and erosion control during the duration of the 4FRI Rim Country project.

Direct and Indirect Effects

General Effects on Dispersed Recreation, Recreation Special Uses, Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers, Inventoried Roadless Areas, Developed Recreation Sites, Trails and Motor Vehicle Use

Indirect effects associated with Alternative 2 - Proposed Action would include dust and noise effects on these resources. Portions of the trails and recreation areas that are in proximity to these trails would be likely to experience increased dust, noise, and perceptions of human activity. However, the maximum values of estimated noise levels for most of the heavy equipment associated with pit development would be in the 40-50 dB range for locations 0.5 miles away or comparable to a running computer or refrigerator.

Direct effects of Alternative 2 - Proposed Action would include disruption of recreation use at and near pits where roadbed materials are being mined and processed, and along haul routes that provide recreational access. Access to desired recreation resources could be altered, requiring recreationists to use another route, or go to another recreation resource where access is not disrupted by hauling activities.

There also could be safety effects if recreationists are using the same roads that are used for hauling. Potential safety effects on recreationists would be reduced by placing signs at major intersections on hauling routes during periods of active hauling. The effects at, and in proximity to, active pits would be temporary and short-term. Based on the application of recreation related design features (RS003, RS018, RS019, and RS020), effects on the trails and recreation areas would be temporary, short-term, and therefore less than significant.

Recreational Opportunity Spectrum

Most of the rock pits are located in Roaded Natural settings. One rock pit is located in the Roaded Modified and two rock pits are located in Semi-Motorized ROS setting. The pits developed in Roaded Natural, Roaded Modified and Semi-Motorized settings would comply with the setting characteristics. Since the pits are located away from or not in the viewshed of primary (sensitive) travel corridors, these would comply with the setting characteristics.

The pits are similar to a very small mechanical treatment area, which would generally be consistent with natural vegetation patterns. For example, rock pit development would occur at the scale of non-ponderosa pine inclusions such as aspen and meadows that naturally occur in northern Arizona forests. The development would meet the intent of the management direction in the Apache-Sitgreaves Land Management Plan.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are similar to Alternative 1, which include the effect of hauling, causing traffic, noise, and dust in areas near recreation sites or on the main road system being used to access recreation opportunities. However, since more rock pits are available for use, this would spread the effects to more areas while lessening the impact in areas where rock pits would be more intensively used without the addition of the new rock pits. Furthermore, the cumulative effects would be less for Alternative 3 since the treatment area is half the size of Alternative 2.

Effects from Use of In-woods Processing and Storage Sites

A total of 12 in-woods processing sites are proposed for use in this project. Tasks carried out at processing sites includes drying, debarking, chipping stems and bark, cutting logs, manufacturing and sorting logs to size, producing wood cants, scaling and weighing logs and creating poles from suitable sized logs. Equipment types commonly used at processing sites include circular or band saws, various sizes and types of front-end loaders, log loaders and chippers of several types and may include timber processors, planers and mechanized cut to length systems, associated conveyers and log sorting bunks for accumulation and storage of logs. Electric motors and gas or diesel generators are also used to provide power.

Eight processing sites were proposed and analyzed for environmental effects in the Cragin Watershed Protection Project. These sites carried forward for potential use in implementing the Rim Country Project. An additional 12 processing sites have been proposed that range in size from 4 to 21 acres. Table 19 lists **Table 26. Proposed in-woods processing sites**

the 12 proposed sites, with approximate acreage and analysis summary. Figure 7 displays the ROS and the areas where the proposed processing sites are located in relation to developed recreation sites. Most processing sites are located in forested areas making them difficult to view even from 300 feet to 0.5 miles.

Site Name	Ranger District	Size (ac)	Recreation Sites?	Visual Screen/Concern
Coconino				
137 / 96	Mogollon Rim	18	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
145A / 9615X	Mogollon Rim	7	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
294 / 294D	Mogollon Rim	18	No concerns.	No concerns. Located approx. 0.7 miles from Arizona Trail in valley, but in Modification VQO.
81 / 81E	Mogollon Rim	7	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
9364L / FH3	Mogollon Rim	21	No concerns.	High concern. Located in High Scenic Integrity Area without much tree coverage/screening potential. Would be viewed from FH3. <u>This part UNSUITABLE. Western half of proposed area would be more ideal as farther from the road and in moderate SIO.</u>
9731G / Hwy87	Mogollon Rim	9	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
Site Name	Ranger District	Size (ac)	Recreation Sites?	Visual Screen from Road
Tonto				
117 / 1321	Payson	4	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
582 / Hwy87	Payson	5	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
74 / 64	Payson	8	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
288/2781	Pleasant Valley	4	No concerns.	High concern. Located in Retention Visual Quality Area along From Desert to Tall Pines Scenic Byway. Activity related to processing sites may be visible from foreground/ middleground/ background. However, footprint of the canopy opening is existing from previous activity and located in dense forest canopy. If selected, <u>locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from road.</u>
3238 / 512	Pleasant Valley	20	No concerns.	No concerns (locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways).
609 / 1938	Pleasant Valley	7	Entrance to site used heavily by recreationists.	Incomplete visual data for analysis, but moderate concern of visibility from high use road by recreationists. Locate to provide for a buffer of 100 or 300 feet from forest roads and state highways.




Figure 12. In-woods processing sites

Alternative 1 - No Action

Alternative 1 proposes no in-woods processing sites and storage sites and initiates no human-caused changes to the recreation resources within the project area. Alternative 1 would meet the ROS in both Coconino and Tonto national forests.

Alternative 2 – Modified Proposed Action

Direct and Indirect Effects

The processing sites may be used as part of the 4FRI Rim Country Restoration project over its implementation period. Following completion of use of processing sites and removal of all equipment and materials, site rehabilitation would have to be accomplished including but not necessarily limited to removal of aggregate, restoration of pre-disturbance site grades, decompaction of soil for seedbed preparation, and seeding and mulching of the site with native grasses and forbs. To hasten recovery and help eliminate unauthorized motorized and non-motorized use of skid trails and temporary roads, use physical measures such as re-contouring, pulling slash and rocks across the line, placing cull logs perpendicular to the route, and disguising entrances.

Of the proposed 12 processing sites, nine are in Roaded Natural ROS, 3 are in Semi-Primitive Motorized and one overlaps Semi-Primitive Motorized and Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized. Development and operation of the processing sites would not conflict with the desired conditions for SPM and RN designations where there are occasional or regular sights and sounds of human influence. The processing sites could have a broader impact on ROS experience within the immediate area where operations can be heard (0.14 to 2.4 miles around a site) and seen but these would not be inconsistent with the RN, SPM or SPNM settings. During use of a processing site, the appearance of the forest would change because most of the trees would be cleared on the site. The locations of the processing sites have been selected to limit the need for tree removal and would be designed so that

there is visual screening from the main roads, thereby moderating the visual effects of the sites. Also, during use, there would be increased traffic and interaction between log trucks, chip vans or other vehicles and equipment in use at the site and public use of the forest. The time of effects on ROS from the processing sites would be variable; smaller processing sites would be used over a shorter time, 5-10 years than the larger sites which could be in use from 10-20 years. After use, the areas would be completely rehabilitated, and trees and vegetation would slowly be reestablished.

All the sites are located 100 to 300 feet from forest system roads to provide for visual screening. Effects on dispersed recreational use from the processing sites includes noise disturbance from equipment and increased truck traffic entering and leaving the site. These effects would range from temporary over a few months that the logging operation was active to several years for the large sites (10-15 acres) that would service as focal points for in woods processing of logs etc.

There could be longer-term use of some processing site locations under the larger 4FRI effort. Therefore, the authorization of these sites may combine with the effects of other projects occurring adjacent to the project area resulting in longer-term effects of their use beyond the Rim Country project. Those effects would be related to noise and traffic near some processing sites.

Alternative 3 – Focused Alternative

Direct and Indirect Effects

Effects on recreation resources would be of the same type as described for Alternative 2, as all proposed in-woods processing sites could potentially be utilized.

Effects from the Land Management Plan Amendment

One plan amendment with three exceptions are proposed to the Tonto National Land Management Plan. They would remove language restricting mechanical equipment on slopes of over 40 percent, amend Plan language and components to align with the Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan, and redefine the treatment for ponderosa pine vegetation types. The significance of each exception was evaluated in accordance with Forest Service Manual (FSM) 1926.51 and FSM 1926.52. The amendment does not alter multiple use goals and objectives, or adjust management area boundaries or management prescriptions. The changes in standards and guidelines are considered to be minor because they reflect the latest, best available science (Reynolds et al. 2013). The amendments bring the alternatives into alignment with the revised Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan. No exceptions in the amendment would alter the long-term relationship between levels of multiple-use goods and services originally projected for the Tonto NF. These outputs were specific to a planning period ranging from 10 to 15 years (as identified in 1987) (Rim Country Summary, Chapter 1 pp.viii, ix).

With the proposed nonsignificant forest plan amendment (see Appendix B), Alternatives 2 and 3 are consistent with the direction in the 1985 Tonto Forest Plan as amended (Rim Country Summary, Chapter 1 pp.viii, ix). There would not have any measurable direct or indirect effects on recreation.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

There are no irreversible or irretrievable commitments related to recreation resources from the alternatives.

Other Agencies and Individuals Consulted

Acronyms

NVUM	National Visitor Use Monitoring survey
RM	Roaded Modified
RN	Roaded Natural
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
SPM	Semi-Primitive Motorized
SPNM	Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized

Glossary

References Cited

- Arizona State Parks & Trails. 2017. Arizona 2018-2022 SCORP Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. Online:
<https://d2umhuunwbec1r.cloudfront.net/gallery/0004/0044/B769EB06A8DB4BF19F3D34B745FCD969/ASPT-SCORP2017-web.pdf>
- Bawa, R. S. 2017. Effects of wildfire on the value of recreation in western North America. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 36(1), 1-17. doi:10.1080/10549811.2016.1233503
- CLIMAS. 2011. Climate Change in the Southwest. Retrieved from
<http://www.climas.arizona.edu/content/feature-articles>
- Englin, J., Loomis, J., Gonzalez-Caban, A. (2001). The dynamic path of recreational values following a forest fire. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 10, pp.18-37.
- English, D., Froemke, P., & Hawkos, K. (2014). Paths more traveled: Predicting future recreation pressures on America's national forests and grasslands—a Forests on the Edge report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service.
- Headwaters Economics. 2012. A profile of demographics of Arizona, Coconino County, AZ. Produced by Economic Profile System Human Dimensions Toolkit. 57pp.
- Headwaters Economics. 2021a. A Demographic Profile Combined area Selected Geographies: Coconino County, AZ; Navajo County, AZ; Yavapai County, AZ; Gila County, AZ; Arizona United States. Produced by Headwaters Economics' Economic Profile System (EPS)
<https://headwaterseconomics.org/eps>
- Headwaters Economics. 2021b. A Profile of Land Use Selected Geographies: Arizona United States Benchmark Geographies: U.S. Produced by Headwaters Economics' Economic Profile System (EPS)
<https://headwaterseconomics.org/eps>
- Hesseln, H., Loomis, J. B., Gonzalez-Caban, A., & Alexander, S. (2003, December). Wildfire effects on hiking and biking demand in New Mexico: a travel cost study. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 69(4), 359-368.
- Marlon, J. R. (2012, February 28). Long-term Oerspective on Wildfires in the Western USA. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1112839109>

Ritchie, M. W., Wing, B. M., & Hamilton, T. A. (2008.). Stability of the Large Tree Component in Treated and Untreated Late-Seral Interior Ponderosa Pine Stands. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 919-923.

Sanchez, J. B. (2016). Valuing hypothetical wildfire impacts with a Kuhn–Tucker model of recreation demand. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 71, 63–70.

Shelby, B., Thompson, J. R., Brunson, M., & Johnson, R. (2004, May). A decade of recreation ratings for six silviculture treatments in Western Oregon. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 75(3), 239-246.

Starbuck, M. C., Berrens, R. P., & McKee, M. (2006, January). Simulating changes in forest recreation demand and associated economic impacts due to fire and fuels management activities. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8(1), 52-66.

United States Census Bureau. 2021. Urban Areas Facts. Online: [Urban Areas Facts \(census.gov\)](https://www.census.gov/urban-areas-facts/). Accessed 12/01/2021.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1993. Potential Wild, Scenic, and Recreation, River Designation. Retrieved from:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1wq3f66mAw_b1BnVFITWUJtNXc/view?resourcekey=0-LiVrLx7s0BGSvfIHTqotDg

United States Department of Agriculture 2007. 2007 Arizonan Agricultural Statistics. USDA. Washington, D.C. p.52.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 2011a. Travel Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement, Coconino National Forest. USDA Forest Service, Coconino National Forest. 795 pp. <https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/coconino/landmanagement/projects/?cid=stelprdb5263010>

United States Department of Agriculture. 2012. Outdoor Recreation Trends and Futures: technical document supporting the Forest Service RPA Assessment. Gen. Technical Report SRS-150. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station, 167. Cordell, H. Ken

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service 2016. Federal outdoor recreation trends: effects on economic opportunities. Gen. Technical Report PNW-GTR-945. Portland, OR. 46p.
<https://doi.org/10.2737/PNW-GTR-945>

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021a. Visitor Use Report Coconino NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2005.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021b. Visitor Use Report Apache-Sitgreaves NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2007.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021c. Visitor Use Report Tonto NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2008.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021d. Visitor Use Report Coconino NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2010.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021e. Visitor Use Report Tonto NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2013.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021f. Visitor Use Report Apache-Sitgreaves NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2014.

- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021g. Visitor Use Report Coconino NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2015.
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021h. Visitor Use Report Tonto NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2016.
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Updated 2021i. Visitor Use Report Apache-Sitgreaves NF. USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2018.
- United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 2021j. Visitor Use Report Southwest Region (R3). USDA Forest Service Region 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019.
- Van Mantgem, P. J. 2009. Widespread Increase of Tree Mortality Rates in the Western United States. *Science*, 521-524.
- Westerling, A. L. 2006. Warming and earlier spring increases western U. S. forest wildfire activity. *Science*, 313, 940-943.
- Williams, A. P. 2010. Forest responses to increasing aridity and warmth in the southwestern United States. *Proceedings of the National*, 21289-21294.
- Bawa, R. S. (2017). Effects of wildfire on the value of recreation in western North America. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 36(1), 1-17. doi:10.1080/10549811.2016.1233503
- CLIMAS. (2011). Climate Change in the Southwest. Retrieved from <http://www.climas.arizona.edu/content/feature-articles>
- English, D., Froemke, P., & Hawkos, K. (2014). *Paths more traveled: Predicting future recreation pressures on America's national forests and grasslands—a Forests on the Edge report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service.
- Hesseln, H., Loomis, J. B., Gonzalez-Caban, A., & Alexander, S. (2003, December). Wildfire effects on hiking and biking demand in New Mexico: a travel cost study. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 69(4), 359-368.
- Marlon, J. R. (2012, February 28). Long-term Oerspective on Wildfires in the Western USA. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1112839109>
- Ritchie, M. W., Wing, B. M., & Hamilton, T. A. (2008.). Stability of the Large Tree Component in Treated and Untreated Late-Seral Interior Ponderosa Pine Stands. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 919-923.
- Sanchez, J. B. (2016). Valuing hypothetical wildfire impacts with a Kuhn–Tucker model of recreation demand. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 71, 63–70.
- Shelby, B., Thompson, J. R., Brunson, M., & Johnson, R. (2004, May). A decade of recreation ratings for six silviculture treatments in Western Oregon. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 75(3), 239-246.
- Starbuck, M. C., Berrens, R. P., & McKee, M. (2006, January). Simulating changes in forest recreation demand and associated economic impacts due to fire and fuels management activities. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8(1), 52-66.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1993. Potential Wild, Scenic, and Recreation, River Designation. Retrieved from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1wq3f66mAw_b1BnVFITWUJtNXc/view?resourcekey=0-LiVrLx7s0BGSvfIHTqotDg

Van Mantgem, P. J. (2009.). Widespread Increase of Tree Mortality Rates in the Western United States. *Science*, 521-524.

Westerling, A. L. (2006). Warming and earlier spring increases western U. S. forest wildfire activity. *Science*, 313, 940-943.

Williams, A. P. (2010). Forest responses to increasing aridity and warmth in the southwestern United States. *Proceedings of the National*, 21289-21294.

Appendix 1. Identification of recreation facilities in Rim Country project area

	Apache-Sitgreaves NF	Coconino NF	Tonto NF
Boating site	Black canyon Lake Scott Reservoir Boat Launch Willow Springs Boat Launch Woods canyon Lake Area	Blue Ridge Knoll Lake	
Campground	Aspen Campground Black Canyon Rim Campground Canyon Point Campground Chevelon Canyon Lake Campground Chevelon Crossing Campground Crook Campground Gentry Campground Lakeside Campground Los Burros Campground Mogollon Campground Rim Campground Scott Reservoir Campground Sinkhole Campground Spillway Campground	Blue Ridge Clints Well Kehl Springs Knoll Lake Rock Crossing	Airplane Flat Alderwood Christopher Creek Colcord Ridge Haigler Canyon Ponderosa Rose Creek Sharp Creek Upper Canyon Creek Upper Tonto Creek Valentine Ridge
Camping Area	Bear Canyon Lake Campground Brown Creek Campground FR 169 FR 171 FR 195 FR 237 FR 84 FR 89 Camping Area FR 9350 FR 9354		Creekside

	Apache-Sitgreaves NF	Coconino NF	Tonto NF
	FR 9512E Larson Ridge CG Promontory Pit Road		
Day Use Area	Al Fulton Picnic Area Baca Ranch Deer Springs Lookout General Crook Road Gentry Lookout Historic Heber Ranger Station Joe Springs Trail OHV Access Polimana Day Use Area Rock Shelter Sardine Point West Loop OHV Access Wildcat Road OHV Access Wilford Town Site		
Group Campground	Lewis Canyon Group Campground Spillway Group Campground Woods Canyon Group Campground	Long Valley Moqui	Christopher Creek Group Ponderosa Group Reynolds Creek Group Sharp Creek Group
Interpretative Site	Canyon Point Amphitheater Mogollon Rim Visitor Center Woods Canyon Amphitheater		
Info Site/Fee Station		Happy Jack Information Kiosk Mogollon Rim District Office Stoneman Lake Road	Canyon Creek Fish Hatchery
Interpretive Site		Moqui Amphitheater	
Lookout/Cabin		Apache maid	
Observation Site	Military Sinkhole Vista Woods Canyon Vista		Pleasant Valley Vista Rim Lakes Vista
OHV Staging Area	Panorama Motorized Trailhead Timber Mesa Motorized Trailhead		
Organization Site	Camp Shadow Pines Tall Timbers County Park		Arizona Cactus-Pine Girl Scout Camp Grand Canyon Council Boy Scout Camp
Other Recreation Concession	Canyon Point Dump Station Woods Canyon Dump Station		
Picnic Site	Rocky Point Picnic Area	Stoneman Lake	Christopher Creek Picnic Horton Creek

	Apache-Sitgreaves NF	Coconino NF	Tonto NF
	Willow Springs Picnic Ground		Second Crossing Third Crossing
Recreation Residence			Diamond Point Ellison Creek
Trailhead	237B Trailhead Billy Creek Trailhead Blue Ridge #1 Trailhead Blue Ridge #2 Trailhead Buena Vista Trailhead Canyon Drive OHV Access Carr Lake Trailhead Cottonwood Wash Trailhead Country Club Trailhead Drew Trailhead Durfee Trailhead General Crook Trailhead Ghost of the Coyote Trailhead Hangman Trailhead Horse Trap Trailhead Horton Trailhead Ice Cave Trailhead Joe Springs Drive OHV Access Juniper Ridge #1 Trailhead Juniper Ridge #2 Trailhead Lake Mountain Trailhead Land of the Pioneers Trailhead Larson Ridge Trailhead Long Draw South Trailhead Los Burros #1 Trailhead Los Burros #2 Trailhead Los Caballos Trailhead Mallard Trailhead Meadow Trailhead Merganser Trailhead Mogollon Campground Trailhead Mogollon Trailhead Old Rim Trailhead Panorama Trailhead Rim Campground Trailhead Rim Top Trailhead Rocky Point Trailhead See Canyon Trailhead Sinkhole Trailhead Sky Hi OHV Trailhead Springs Trailhead Tall Timbers Trailhead Telephone Ridge Trailhead Three Oaks Trailhead Timber Mesa Trailhead Two-O-Eight Trailhead Willow Springs Lake Trailhead Woods Canyon Lake Trailhead	General Springs Hay Meadow Jumbo Pine Canyon Pine Spring	Bear Flat TH Box Canyon TH Circle Ranch TH Geronimo TH Hatchery TH Hellsgate TH McFadden Peak TH Pine TH Red Rock TH Reynolds TH See Canyon TH Strawberry TH Two-Sixty TH Washington Park TH

	Apache-Sitgreaves NF	Coconino NF	Tonto NF
	Woods Canyon Lake Vista Trailhead		
Wildlife Viewing Site		Stoneman Lake	

Appendix 2. Special Use Activities within the Rim Country Analysis Area

Name	Type of Special Uses	General Location	PURPOSE
GRAND CANYON COUNCIL BSA	Organization camp		Organization camp called CAMP GERONIMO, including a service road, water pipeline, troop-sites with dining shelter and Adirondacks, entry sign, campfire-ring, pit latrines, washstands with spigot, plus a chapel with a trail
ARIZONA CACTUS-PINE GIRL SCOUT COUNCIL, INC.	Organization camp		Camping area equipped with sleeping facilities, fire circles, an outhouse (vault-type) and an old Quonset hut (used for storage)
GRAND CANYON COUNCIL BSA	Organization camp		Organization camp called CAMP GERONIMO, including a service road, water pipeline, troop-sites with dining shelter and Adirondacks, entry sign, campfire-ring, pit latrines, washstands with spigot, plus a chapel with a trail
BAILEY, JAMES	Recreation residence		Use for a private family cabin.
KAHN, DEBORAH VEZIE	Recreation residence		Use for a private family cabin.
JOANN LUTZ	Recreation residence		Use for a private family cabin.
SUNNY DAY HOLDINGS	Marina		Woods Canyon Lake Store and Marina including a convenience/general store, boat dock, boat rental building, storage room, workshop, living quarters, and ice plant, plus four parking spaces directly behind the store
RECREATION RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	Concession campground		Provide high-quality public service in the operation and maintenance of Government-owned recreation facilities located on the Payson Ranger District, Tonto National

Name	Type of Special Uses	General Location	PURPOSE
			Forest.
RECREATION RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OF AMERICA, INC.	Concession campground		<p>OPERATING AND MAINTAINING FOREST SERVICE CAMPGROUNDS AND RECREATION FACILITIES AS DESCRIBED IN THE PERMITTEE'S OPERATING PLAN EXHIBIT B.</p> <p>THE PERMITTEE IS ALLOWED TO CHARGE REASONABLE FEES FOR THE USE OF FACILITIES AND REQUIRED SERVICES PROVIDED TO THE PU</p>
HERRERA, RANDY	Outfitter/Guide		<p>hunting outfitter and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>45 priority use service days in Forest, excluding Wilderness and MA 6F</p>
Ogle, Bryant	Outfitter/Guide		<p>hunting outfitter and guide service using certified guides.</p> <p>50 priority use service days with the following restrictions: 10 service days in Mazatzal Wilderness (MAs 1B, 1C, 1E, 3A, 4A, 4B, 6A) 10 service days in Hellsgate Wilder</p>
Starr, Douglas A.	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>20 priority use days with the following restrictions: no more than 10 service days in Hellsgate Wilderness (MAs 4C, 5B) and excluding MA 6F</p>
MOSSBACK PRODUCTIONS INC	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>30 priority use days with the following restrictions: 10 service days in Hellsgate Wilderness (MAs 4C, 5B) 20 remaining service days in remainder of Forest, excluding</p>





Name	Type of Special Uses	General Location	PURPOSE
JARRED NICHOLS	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>45 priority use days with the following restrictions: 10 service days in MA 3B 10 service days in MA 6B 10 service days in MA 6J 5 service days in Mazatzal Wilderness</p>
Hatch, Tyson	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>50 priority use service days with the following restrictions: 10 service days in Hellsgate Wilderness (MAs 4C, 5B) 20 service days in Mazatzal Wilderness (MAs 1B, 1C,</p>
COLBURN AND SCOTT OUTFITTERS, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>90 priority use service days with the following restrictions: 20 service days in Mazatzal Wilderness (MAs 1B, 1C, 1E, 3A, 4A, 4B, 6A) 10 service days in Hellsgate Wil</p>
KROGH, GREG M.	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>90 priority use service days with the following restrictions: 20 service days in Mazatzal Wilderness (MAs 1B, 1C, 1E, 3A, 4B, 6A) 10 service days in Hellsgate Wildern</p>
PHOENIX WILDERNESS ADVENTURES, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality rock-climbing and canyoneering guide service using certified guides. 300 service days in MA 2F (Globe RD)</p>





Name	Type of Special Uses	General Location	PURPOSE
			225 service days in MA 6J (Tonto Basin RD) 75 service days in MA 6H (Tonto Basin RD) 75 service days in MA 5E (Pleasant Val)
PHOENIX WILDERNESS ADVENTURES, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Conducting a high quality rock-climbing and canyoneering guide service using certified guides. 300 service days in MA 2F (Globe RD) 225 service days in MA 6J (Tonto Basin RD) 75 service days in MA 6H (Tonto Basin RD) 75 service days in MA 5E (Pleasant Val)
360 ADVENTURES, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Conducting a high quality rock-climbing canyoneering guide service using a certified guide. 170 priority use service days with the following restrictions: 40 service days in MA 2F 40 service days in MA 5E 40 service days in MA 4D 50 service days in MA 6H
PEREGRINE EXPEDITIONS, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Conducting a high-quality guided canyoneering and rock climbing service in the Superstition Mountains and Christopher Creek.
COLORADO HIKING, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Conducting a high-quality outfitter/guide service providing 6-day scenic desert hiking tours and camping on the Highline Trail. 288 user days
ADVENTURE ON PURPOSE LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Conducting high-quality guided hiking and canyoneering trips on the Mesa, Payson, Pleasant Valley, and Tonto Basin Ranger Districts. Permanent anchors will not be installed.
MTM RANCH, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Conducting high-quality guided horseback tours on the Cave Creek, Mesa, and Payson Ranger Districts. Approved trails include: Mesa- Trail 109 from Rogers Trough TH to Reavis Ranch

Name	Type of Special Uses	General Location	PURPOSE
			Cave Creek- Cave Creek System Trails 4, 245, 246, 247, 248, 250, and FR 48
MTM RANCH, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Conducting high-quality guided horseback tours on the Cave Creek, Mesa, and Payson Ranger Districts. Approved trails include: Mesa- Trail 109 from Rogers Trough TH to Reavis Ranch Cave Creek- Cave Creek System Trails 4, 245, 246, 247, 248, 250, and FR 48
HERMOSA TOURS, LLC	Outfitter/Guide		dba AZT Expeditions Conducting a high-quality outfitter/guide service providing overnight camping equipment and hiking supplies for preregistered hikers on the Arizona Trail and other major trails in the Globe, Mesa, Tonto Basin, and Payson Ranger Distri
BARS HUNTING SERVICE, LLC.	Outfitter/Guide		Operating a high quality hunting outfitter guide service on the Coconino National Forest, per the following conditions as well as all operating conditions as outlined in the attached operating plan.
DEADFALL OUTFITTERS LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Outfitting and Guiding on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests.
BOGGS, CHRISTINA	Outfitter/Guide		Providing a high quality hunting/ fishing outfitting and guide service using a certified guides on the Tonto National Forest Land/Lakes.
BACK 2 BASICS SOBER LIVING, L.L.C.	Outfitter/Guide		Providing guided hiking and backpacking trips as part of an adventure therapy program for alcohol and drug rehabilitating adults. Routes consist of designated trails on the Cave Creek, Mesa, Payson, and Tonto Basin Ranger Districts as identified in the at
PINETOP LAKES ASSOCIATION LLC	Outfitter/Guide		Public horseback trail rides from Pinetop Equestrian Center

Name	Type of Special Uses	General Location	PURPOSE
PORTER MOUNTAIN STABLES	Outfitter/Guide		Stables operating trail rides on NFS trails.
DBA A DAY IN THE WEST	Outfitter/Guide		<p>The purpose of this permit is to authorize the following outfitting and guiding activities:</p> <p>Priority Use Outfitter/Guide permit for guided hiking, biking, and jeep tours in accordance with approved Operating Plan, Appendix B.</p> <p>and assigning use as follo</p>
HUBBARD, KEITH	Outfitter/Guide		To conduct a high quality hunter outfitter guide operations on the Coconino NF.
JAMES BEDLION	Outfitter/Guide		To conduct hunting outfitter guide operations on the Coconino National Forest.
STEWART	Outfitter/Guide		Trail rides
PORTER MOUNTAIN STABLES	Outfitter/Guide		Trail rides on the Sitgreaves National Forest.
Elmer Guide Service	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>70 priority use service days with the following restrictions: 5 service days in Mazatzal Wilderness (MAs 1B, 1C, 1E, 3A, 4A, 4B, 6A) 5 service days in Hellsgate Wilder</p>
FIRRIOLO, MARCO	Outfitter/Guide		<p>Conducting a high quality hunting outfitting and guide service using a certified guide.</p> <p>10 priority use service days on Forest, excluding MA 6F</p>
TOWN OF PINETOP-LAKESIDE/PARKS & RECREATION	Outfitter/Guide		Multi-event permit for Woodland Lake Park including the ramadas, ball fields and Cool Runnings recreation event.
RIM COUNTRY BOWHUNTERS	Outfitter/Guide		<p>To conduct an archery target shoot on the Mogollon Rim Ranger District.</p> <p>#2 Long Valley Draw/Long Valley Work Center</p>

Name	Type of Special Uses	General Location	PURPOSE
PINE/STRAWBERRY FUEL REDUCTION, INC	Outfitter/Guide		Annual Fire on the Rim mountain bike race September 16, 2017 around Strawberry Mountain on FR 428 (Hardscrabble Road), FR 1559, Trail #15, and routes identified in Exhibit A.
STACY	Outfitter/Guide		Annual Trail Event Ride with the Scottsdale Charros, Inc. as a club event. Private club event for members only. Horseback riding and working with a range permittee, Four of a Kind cattle ranch.
MOUNTAIN MEADOW RANCH BIBLE CAMP INC.	Outfitter/Guide		Bigfoot Hustle 5K run September 23, 2017 on FR 284 and 114. All event staging and parking will take place on non-Forest System Lands.
WILLIAMS	Outfitter/Guide		Multi-use permit for the Town of Pinetop-Lakeside.
ARIZONA TRAIL RIDERS	Outfitter/Guide		The Howlin' at the Moon dual sport / adventure ride for street legal motorcycles October 21-22, 2017. Permit Holder will obtain separate authorizations for use of additional roads or lands outside the Tonto National Forest. Authorized route is identified
ARIZONA TRAIL RIDERS	Outfitter/Guide		The Howlin' at the Moon dual sport / adventure ride for street legal motorcycles October 21-22, 2017. Permit Holder will obtain separate authorizations for use of additional roads or lands outside the Tonto National Forest. Authorized route is identified
Hancock Family Reunion, Van	Outfitter/Guide		Family Reunion at the Naegle Ranch area north of AP-3140. Returning family reunion annually for 100 years.
Hancock Family Reunion, Van	Outfitter/Guide		Family Reunion at the Naegle Ranch area north of AP-3140. Returning family reunion annually for 100 years.
CAMPBELL, MIKE	Outfitter/Guide		Group campout Shotgun shoot SUPA #9 Picnic Tank





Appendix 4. Inventoried Roadless Area Maps with Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

